United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2021 No. 109

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOMEZ).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 23, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIMMY GOMEZ 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 11:50 a.m.

THE NEED FOR WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a much-needed investment in our Nation's infrastructure, specifically our water infrastructure.

Let me be very clear: Our crumbling and outdated water infrastructure is in a state of emergency. It is leaving our most vulnerable Americans struggling with water access and unaffordable rates, including my hometown of Detroit, Michigan.

I want to commend President Biden and my colleagues for promoting the American Jobs Plan, a comprehensive Federal investment to repair and strengthen our infrastructure.

This could not be more timely, as Federal investment in public water infrastructure projects have fallen from 63 percent of our overall investment in 1977 to just 9 percent in 2014.

The American Jobs Plan will deliver the investments we need and eliminate all lead pipes and service lines in our drinking water systems.

It is unacceptable that in the United States of America, schools are forced to put plastic bags over their drinking fountains because it is not safe for our children to drink water because there are elevated levels of lead.

Too much of our existing infrastructure is jeopardized because of lead pipes. My home State of Michigan knows about this issue all too well. The Flint water crisis brought national attention to the dangers of elevated levels of lead in our drinking water.

Unfortunately, what happened in Flint is happening all across this country. In my district, the same problem exists in the city of Detroit. About 1,500 children under the age of 6 test positive for elevated levels of lead every year, and of those tested, about 7 percent are diagnosed with lead poisoning.

Congress cannot stand by and watch as Americans get sick and poisoned from their own drinking water.

I always like to emphasize: Water is not a luxury. A pothole is an inconvenience, but water is a necessity to life.

We have the opportunity to address this issue right now by passing the American Jobs Plan. It is a once-in-a-generation investment in our communities and families. It also includes provisions similar to my legislation, the WATER Act. My bill would fully fund the Drinking Water and Clean Water State Revolving Funds, provide funding for public schools to test and replace drinking water infrastructure, provide grants to replace lead service lines leading to our households, and much more to fix and strengthen our water infrastructure.

Earlier this Congress, I submitted Community Project Funding requests to support water system improvements for two of my communities: Pontiac and Royal Oak Township. These communities are not alone. Similar water system improvement projects are needed across the country. With the American Jobs Plan, we can make that a reality.

I look forward to continuing to fight for access to clean, safe, and affordable drinking water for every American.

THE NEED FOR BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this April, the House Agriculture Committee hosted an important hearing on one of America's most pressing issues, broadband connectivity.

For years, the digital divide has left many Americans unable to access reliable high-speed internet service, resulting in lost opportunities to expand businesses, learn new skills, or even participate in daily activities.

I see this cost and frustration every day. I am fortunate to live in the service territory of a rural electric cooperative which offers quality internet services to my home. But, just a few miles away, my neighbors are on the wrong side of the digital divide.

I represent 14 counties in rural Pennsylvania, and I can tell you, it is like

Printed on recycled paper.

this all across my district, with digital haves and have-nots just down the road from one another. It is a checkerboard of connectivity.

In the height of the pandemic, I heard one too many home-schooling horror stories that were a result of not having reliable access to the internet. A number of families were driving to the nearest local library, sitting in the parking lot, and connecting to the public WiFi in hopes of completing assignments.

COVID–19 laid bare the urgency of rural broadband, but the connectivity struggles in rural communities predate this pandemic, and they will not ease as we return to normal. As more of American life is being put online, more of it is being put out of reach of Americans without high-speed internet access, and those without are falling further behind.

Despite years of efforts and billions of dollars spent, too many communities are being left behind.

Broadband is not just needed for our homes; it is desperately needed on our farms as well. The demands of a 21st century farm economy depends on reliable connectivity.

The Agriculture Committee has done tremendous work on a bipartisan basis to address the digital divide, most recently with the broadband provisions in the 2018 farm bill. Those changes reflected 2 years of work to develop policies and design programs which meet the unique challenges of rural communities. That farm bill became law with broad bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate.

Unfortunately, those policies and programs are languishing. Changes and improvements championed by Members of both parties regarding eligible areas, long-term network viability, assistance for our most rural communities, program integrity, and more, remain unfunded and unimplemented more than 2 years after they were signed into law.

This is unacceptable. That is why I recently introduced the Broadband for Rural America Act. This bill is the responsible path forward to bridging the digital divide. It prioritizes the needs of rural communities and is a step in the right direction as we begin to rebound into a resurgent post-COVID economy. I urge my colleagues to join me on this critical piece of legislation.

The one issue that unites rural Members on both sides of the aisle is the need to address the digital divide. This critical infrastructure void has been exacerbated by the challenges faced by rural families and businesses during the pandemic.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to tell the story of the 2018 farm bill and the improvements we made and continue to fight for broadband investments so desperately needed in our rural communities.

RECOGNIZING PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand in support of the LGBTQ community and to recognize this Pride Month.

This month is one of reflection: reflection on the strides our country has made toward acceptance and inclusion and on the struggles that still exist today.

From Stonewall, to the AIDS epidemic, to attacks on transgender youth across our country today, the struggle for equality continues.

This month is one of recognition for the trailblazers of decades past and the advocates on the ground today who make this country welcoming for everyone.

But most of all, this month is one of celebration. I am here to say loudly and clearly to all of my LGBTQ constituents in Nevada's Third District, you are respected and loved, and I have your back here in Washington.

While we mark 6 years of marriage equality this week and have continued to reach milestones in the time since, we have more work to do.

I am proud to have voted to pass the Equality Act out of the House, and it is time for the Senate to join us.

I hope you all take time this month to celebrate who you are. And from the bottom of my heart, Happy Pride Month.

HONORING CHRIS OBERHEIM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Champaign Police Officer Chris Oberheim of Monticello, Illinois, who tragically lost his life in the line of duty on May 19 of this year.

Officer Oberheim was a 21-year veteran of law enforcement. He joined the Champaign Police Department in 2013 after beginning his career with the Decatur Police Department in 2000. During his career, he received two medals of valor for selfless acts of bravery.

In his time off duty, Chris enjoyed coaching softball and spending time with his family. He was a loving husband, father, son, coach, and trusted friend. His four daughters were his inspiration. Those who knew Chris remember him most for his commitment to loving his family and serving his community.

My prayers are with his wife, Amber, and daughters Hannah, Avery, Addison, and Aubree, as well as the rest of his family, friends, and fellow officers. Chris was nothing short of a hero.

In closing, I would like to share a Bible verse that Chris' family says he lived by: ''Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God.''

HONORING GRACE HERSCHELMAN

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Grace Herschelman of Hillsboro, Illinois, who passed away on May 19 at the age of 9 after a lifelong battle with infantile neuroaxonal dystrophy, INAD.

When Grace was 3 years old, she was diagnosed with INAD, a neurodegenerative disease that results in a loss of muscle strength, movement, and the ability to speak. Grace did not let this stop her from enjoying many trips to the Saint Louis Zoo; rooting on her favorite soccer, softball, and basketball teams; and having a blast with her sister and best friend, Charlotte.

Grace and her family also had a huge impact on awareness and fundraising for INAD research. Since Grace was diagnosed in 2014, the Herschelman family has raised about $200,000 for the INAD Cure Foundation, with donors from all 50 States.

Grace was an inspiration to all who met her, never failing to light up any room with her smile.

My prayers go out to her parents, Kyle and Mary, her sister, Charlotte, and the rest of her family.

Grace, may you rest in peace.

CONGRATULATING MARK BUTCHER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mark Butcher on his retirement after 30 years of teaching math and science in the Rochester school district, Lincoln Christian University, and Lincoln Land Community College.

After working in the private sector for many years, Mark decided to go back to school to get his teaching certificate in 1991. Ever since then, he has taught at Rochester and also part-time at night at Lincoln Land where he would frequent my family's McDonald's in Taylorville for a quick dinner.

Over the past 30 years, Mark has taught, mentored, and given valuable career advice to thousands of students. Mark is known for his Einstein-like appearance and science experiments, which were highly educational but sometimes caused heartburn among the administration and school board members. He was instrumental in developing the dual credit program at Rochester, which has allowed hundreds of students to receive college credit for courses while still in high school.

Mark received numerous awards throughout his career, including the Rochester Teacher of the Year, the Golden Apple Excellence in Leadership award, Lincoln Land's Outstanding Adjunct Faculty Award, and being named the State Journal Register's Top Teacher of the Year.

Congratulations on your retirement, Mark. Enjoy your time with your wife, Brenda, four children, and your six grandchildren.

□ 1015

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF MARVIN ALTON HYATT, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Marvin Alton Hyatt, Sr.

Marvin passed away on May 7, 2021, and returned to the God he faithfully served for 87 years.

Marvin was born in Dillon, South Carolina on May 12, 1933. He attended and graduated from the University of South Carolina in 1959, with a degree in pharmacy, and later established a scholarship fund within the University of South Carolina School of Pharmacy for those students choosing to enter the lifelong profession that he loved and cherished for so long.

He founded Good Pharmacy in Rock Hill, South Carolina, which he operated for 58 years. Marvin was the face of Good Pharmacy, where he greeted everyone with a smile, true compassion, and a desire to serve the hundreds of customers, regardless of race, standing in life, or ability to pay.

Marvin was legendary for meeting anyone, anywhere, at any time, and was genuinely concerned and interested in the well-being of his customers. In short, when it came to customer service, Marvin Hyatt not only talked the talk, but he walked the walk, which is rare in today's world.

Marvin Hyatt was active in his church, Woodland Methodist, for over 60 years, where he served as treasurer and as a board member. His community service included serving as a board member of Guardian Fidelity bank, WRHI radio station; past president of the Sertoma Club, Rotary Club, Elks Lodge, and the Alexa R. Good ALS Foundation.

Marvin was married to the love of his life, Lois Jones Hyatt, for 63 years. Together, they had two children: Marvin Alton Hyatt, Jr., and Laura Hyatt Sweat, both of whom are registered pharmacists and are working in Good Pharmacy today. Marvin and Lois have three grandchildren: Alton, Katie Jane, and Tyler.

The legacy of Marvin Alton Hyatt will be that of a man who served his God, his country, and his fellow man. He exemplified service above self, and for the 87 years that he walked on this Earth, his life was a true testament of living out his Christian faith in word and in deed.

O.V. LEWIS CELEBRATES 90 YEARS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor O.V. Lewis of Blairsville, Georgia, for his 90th birthday on June 16.

O.V. has dedicated the majority of his life to Young Harris College. He served as an instructor of accounting for 48 years, and registrar for 31 years at Young Harris College, and retired with the longest tenure of any previous employee.

During his time at the school, Lewis had an unparalleled commitment to his students, both inside and outside the classroom, that has lasted well beyond graduation. Those who have been influenced by Lewis, such as myself, praise his positive impact on their education and career.

Throughout his whole life, Lewis has been generous with his time, talent, and resources as he continues to devote his life to improving those around him.

As a graduate of Young Harris College, I am proud to rise today to recognize O.V. Lewis's 90th birthday and lifetime of mentoring and inspiring our future generations.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF FRITZ NOACK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember and honor the life of Fritz Noack, who passed away on June 3, 2021.

After serving as an organ building apprentice in Germany, Fritz immigrated to the United States and founded the Noack Organ Company in 1960 in Lawrence, Massachusetts.

As a leading figure of the organ revival movement, Fritz influenced the American organ building scene during the late 20th century. After priding himself on the production of first-rate organs for 55 years, Fritz retired in 2015.

Fritz directed the construction of 160 organs during his time in the industry. His instruments are found across America, as well as Iceland and Japan. In fact, Fritz's 100th organ is located at Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church in Savannah, Georgia. The music provided by this organ has entertained the congregation of Wesley Monumental for many years, and I am certain Fritz's legacy will continue through his instruments around the world.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF HARRY STRACK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Harry Strack for his remarkable service to our country.

Harry was drafted into the military in 1968, and completed his basic training at Fort Bragg. He served in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970, in the 196th Light Infantry Brigade.

Harry has become a recognized veteran in the Sea Isle community by sharing his story and honoring those who served alongside him. Since returning from Vietnam, Harry has been proud to honor those who made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

During the Sea Isle Memorial Day ceremony, Harry received a Quilt of Valor to recognize his selfless service and sacrifice. Harry's pride in his service and duty to honor and remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice is extraordinary, and I am honored to recognize him today.

I know that everyone in Georgia's First Congressional District thanks him for his service.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND JAMES OWENS AS A PROVISIONAL ELDER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend James Owens' commission as a provisional elder in the South Georgia Conference of the United Methodist Church.

Reverend Owens has served at Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church in Savannah, Georgia, for the past 7 years. Before moving to Savannah, Reverend Owens earned a bachelor of arts in journalism from the University of Georgia and a master of divinity from Denver Seminary and Duke University Divinity School.

As a provisional elder, Reverend Owens will faithfully serve Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church and the Savannah community. With his passion to share and teach the gospel, I know Reverend Owens will continue his tremendous work as a provisional elder at Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church.

I am proud to rise today to recognize Reverend Owens for his tremendous achievement, and I know that he will continue to inspire his congregation.

THE STAFF AT THE ARC OF SOUTH CAROLINA ARE HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend an incredible effort put forth in my State during the pandemic.

The Arc of South Carolina is a nonprofit organization that advocates for the rights of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Their work is critical in South Carolina and South Carolina's First Congressional District, and they deserve to be recognized for all of their efforts.

Like many organizations during the past year and a half, the Arc of South Carolina has struggled to acquire PPE, hiring staff, and coping with different social distancing guidelines, particularly given the scope of their work.

Margie Williamson and her team had to continue providing services at disproportionately high costs compared to businesses who received State and Federal assistance. A staggering number of their staff fell ill to COVID–19 during the pandemic, but their team and their organization was able to provide superior support to all of these families with enormous needs nonetheless.

I cannot begin to thank the staff, not only at the Arc of South Carolina, but every worker across the State everywhere who persevered. You are the heroes of South Carolina's pandemic story.

The Arc of South Carolina is dedicated to helping families, and I wanted to highlight all they were able to accomplish during the most challenging of times.

ANTONIO GREENE'S ACT OF KINDNESS

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a local Amazon driver named Antonio Greene, who learned that someone living along his route was undergoing chemotherapy.

When Antonio learned this, he thought back to his own family. He lost his parents and grandmother over the last couple years, and occasionally he would buy cards and flowers for members of his family to offer encouragement and support.

Greene, a North Charleston native, did the same last summer for another individual in South Carolina's First Congressional District who had been immunocompromised during the pandemic.

Antonio's act of kindness has landed him among seven people to be recognized by the JFK Foundation, and I applaud all of those individuals carrying out small acts of kindness during the pandemic. I commend Antonio and anyone who has risked their own health and safety to protect others during COVID–19. Those who showed compassion in ways like this always deserve this kind of recognition.

RESTAURANTS OVERCAME UNCERTAINTY DURING PANDEMIC

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to restaurants and the resilience of so many in this industry; specifically, Vintage Lounge, Butcher & Bee, Harold's Cabin, and Chasing Sage in South Carolina's First Congressional District.

These restaurants did not take any aid or receive any relief during the COVID–19 crisis. They were even closed during the beginning of the pandemic and they were unable to receive any restaurant relief funds as well, but they survived despite these challenges.

Every restaurant owner with hopes of making it through the COVID–19 crisis had to choose a survival strategy that worked. I would like to bring attention to all four of these restaurants, which are now open or in the process of reopening post-pandemic. This is a major feat worth celebrating, especially since they faced unprecedented challenges to an already vulnerable industry.

In Charleston, in South Carolina's First Congressional District, our hospitality and restaurant industry has been critically hit. These companies and restaurants had to prompt guests to wear masks, in line with city regulations; and if they weren't out by 11 p.m., they had to go, by State order.

But so many were determined to uphold the same hospitality standards they had in place prior to the pandemic. Vintage Lounge, Butcher & Bee, Harold's Cabin, and Chasing Sage, among hundreds of other restaurants, are now open for business again. I commend their stories of success during the pandemic.

RECOGNIZING TEE YOUNG AND PRESTON WHITE

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great honor and pride to bring awareness to two constituents in South Carolina's First Congressional District for their fantastic effort they put forth in our community.

Tee Young and Preston White helped facilitate the First Annual Crosstown Basketball Tournament, which was held in Hampton Park this last Saturday, just next door to my alma mater, the Citadel.

These young men arranged the tournament as a way to bring the east and west sides of the city of Charleston together and provide a nice evening for the community filled with food and basketball.

I cannot be more proud of Tee and Preston showing Charleston and South Carolina and all of our communities how we are stronger and better together and showing how strong Charleston is.

God bless these young men, the State of South Carolina, and the United States of America.

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS CAN REBUILD INFRASTRUCTURE EFFECTIVELY FOR LESS MONEY

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the importance of our Nation's infrastructure and how to rebuild our transportation system the right way.

While we are hearing about the various proposals from Congress and the administration that would raise taxes or add to the deficit to spend hundreds of billions of dollars and even trillions of dollars on infrastructure, I would suggest that this body take a closer look at how frequently infrastructure can be built effectively without further burdening the taxpayer or our children for generations to come.

As a member of the House Financial Services Committee, I hear routinely from the private sector, the financial services industry, banks, insurance companies, asset managers, pension funds, private equity firms, life insurance firms, and the like that trillions of dollars of private capital is readily available to efficiently rebuild our Nation's infrastructure without undermining American competitiveness through higher taxes.

Public-private partnerships utilize the best features of the public sector and the private sector to finance, design, build, and even operate our critical infrastructure necessary to support safe and efficient channels of commerce, grow our economy, and sustain our quality of life.

The best example I have seen comes from my own State of Kentucky, where the small community of Brandenburg partnered with a contractor, The Walker Company, and GRW Engineers, to design, build, and finance a new wastewater treatment plant for Brandenburg. This project had significant urgency due to the announcement that Nucor Steel intended to build a new $1.7 billion steel mill on the property that included the site of the existing treatment plant.

The P3 delivery method, authorized by Kentucky statutes passed in 2016, was utilized to cut $3.5 million in cost from the $8.3 million project and to save at least one year over the normal taxpayer-financed, design-bid-build process.

Relocating this plant in a timely and cost-effective manner allowed Nucor Steel to begin construction of its facility, which soon will bring over 400 good-paying jobs to the region.

Mr. Speaker, whatever infrastructure bill emerges from this Congress, I would urge my colleagues to reject the Biden administration's call for growth-destroying tax increases and instead look to America's deep and liquid capital markets as the solution and use public-private partnerships as a significant feature of the legislation.

RECOGNIZING OUR NATION'S POLICE OFFICERS

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our Nation's police officers and honor the sacrifices that many brave men and women of law enforcement make every single day.

We mourn for Detective James Kirk, Officer Martez Hughes, and Special Deputy Sheriff Lee Daniel Manns from Kentucky, as well as the hundreds of other law enforcement officers from across the country who have given their lives in the line of duty over the last year.

Beginning in 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed into law a proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the week in which that date falls as National Police Week. Republicans and Democrats continued the tradition of honoring officers who serve and officers who died in the line of duty each year since.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, President Biden broke this tradition in his proclamation on May 7 and politicized this year's National Police Week and Peace Officers Memorial Day by criticizing police for the distrust that some Americans have of law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, blaming the police for the increase in antipolice sentiment is not how we honor those who swear an oath to uphold public trust, even though the officers may become targets for senseless acts of violence.

□ 1030

According to the FBI's Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted database, fatal felony attacks on officers spiked 31.6 percent in early 2021. This comes on the heels of our Nation's major cities, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles, all vowing to defund their police departments. It is no wonder why these cities have tragically seen a devastating and dramatic increase in homicides and shootings in 2021. This is what you get when you call for defunding the police.

To our brave law enforcement officers who protect and serve our communities, I stand with you, and I am grateful for all you do to keep us safe.

I will always defend and fight against defunding the police.

HONORING SHEILA CURRANS

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a dedicated leader in rural healthcare.

After 48 years, Sheila Currans retires as the CEO of Harrison Memorial Hospital. Mrs. Currans' service began as a high school candy striper. She served as a medical-surgical nurse, an ICU/CCU head nurse, and supervisor of nursing. She led for 5 years as COO and then was named CEO in 2009.

Harrison Memorial Hospital, located in rural Cynthiana, Kentucky, serves people from a seven-county region and is one of the few remaining independent, not-for-profit hospitals in Kentucky.

The people of Harrison County and the surrounding counties have been fortunate to have a great leader in Mrs. Currans and her passion for healthcare excellence, leadership experience, and understanding of rural healthcare needs. She will be missed, and I wish Sheila Currans all the best in her well-deserved retirement.

PRESERVE HYDE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our most fundamental God-given right, our right to life.

Enshrined in our Declaration of Independence is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our government should reflect this commitment to life, but the continued practice of abortion-on-demand across the country runs contrary to this commitment. Abortion deprives innocent, defenseless, unborn babies of their right to life.

Thankfully, there are certain legal protections, like the Hyde amendment, in place to safeguard hardworking Americans' tax dollars and save lives. The Hyde amendment simply prevents the taxpayer funding of abortions. Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has saved 2.5 million lives.

According to a Marist poll taken this year, the vast majority of Republicans and Independents, and nearly a third of Democrats, believe that tax dollars should not be used to pay for abortions.

Since 1976, Republican and Democrat Members of Congress have found agreement in keeping the Hyde amendment. President Biden himself publicly supported the Hyde amendment for decades. In a 1977 letter to constituents, which I have right here, Senator Biden wrote that voting to support the Hyde amendment ''is the position which I have consistently supported.''

He goes on to say: ''The Senate, however, passed a broader definition of the circumstances under which Medicaid funds could be used to pay for an abortion. I did not support this version.'' Those are Senator Biden's words.

Furthermore, in 1994, in another letter to a constituent at the time, Senator Biden upheld his support of Hyde protections, saying: ''Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.''

But today, President Biden has kowtowed to the radical left and has removed Hyde protections from his budget proposal. President Biden is turning his back on innocent life in their mother's womb.

The Hyde amendment has saved millions of lives and has stopped Americans who are morally opposed to abortion from being forced to pay for it.

I call on President Biden to return to his previous position, which opposed the taxpayer funding of abortion, abide by the teaching of his own self-professed Catholic faith, and follow the lead of his predecessors from both sides of the aisle who preserved the Hyde amendment in their Presidential budget proposals.

HONORING KENNETH C. THAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible life and military career of one of New York State's most decorated World War II veterans, U.S. Army National Guard veteran Private First Class Kenneth C. Thayer, the handsome man you see pictured behind me.

Mr. Thayer is part of a distinguished National Guard unit that displayed heroic and patriotic service in defense of the United States. In recognition of his unwavering service to our Nation, I recently had the opportunity to present Mr. Thayer with the Presidential Unit Citation, one of the highest honors a military unit can receive. Here is the picture of me meeting Mr. Thayer this weekend.

The Army has requested this Presidential Unit Citation for the 30th Infantry Division since 1946. It wasn't until last year, nearly 75 years later, that President Trump recognized this unit and the well-deserving group of men for their selfless acts of bravery and devotion to our country.

Mr. Thayer was a soldier in the National Guard's 30th Infantry Division, a unit known for their exemplary conduct in both World War I and World War II. The 30th Division was formed in 1917, soon after the United States had entered World War I. They fought heroically in France against the German Army, and once the war ended, they returned to their prewar status in the National Guard.

Then, on September 1, 1939, Hitler invaded Poland, initiating World War II. The 30th Division was quickly reinstated by 1940 and called upon to fight. They first saw combat on Omaha Beach on June 11, 1944.

Mr. Thayer entered Active service on December 9, 1943, just 2 years after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. A Utica native, Mr. Thayer was sent to the 30th after recovering from an injury he sustained in 1944. His division was nicknamed ''Old Hickory'' because the majority of the men were from Southern States closely associated with President Andrew Jackson, and Mr. Thayer would grow very close with many of them.

The 30th would go on to become one of the most important forces in the United States' European Theater Operations. The 30th Division was in active combat from June 1944 to April 1945, a total of 282 days.

One of its most challenging battles was fought at Mortain, France. From August 6, 1944, to August 12, 1944, the 30th Infantry Division was faced with continuous attack from German forces, who were attempting to break through Allied lines.

Over 2,000 men in this division alone died while fighting to drive Germans from France, but the courage of this division helped turn the tide of the war and will be remembered for generations to come.

Mr. Thayer coauthored two volumes titled ''The Young Liberators: From Civilian to Soldier''—I have the book here, a wonderful account—with historian Allan Foote, whose father also served in the 30th Infantry Division during World War II, Master Sergeant Arthur A. Foote.

Writing about one of the artillery barrages during that period, Mr. Thayer states in his book: ''I kept on scrambling around in a futile attempt to find someone, anyone I could help. . . . Out of 220 men, I was the only survivor. It was an absolute nightmare.''

It is almost impossible to imagine the atrocities that these men witnessed. As Americans, we remember the bravery and sacrifice that Mr. Thayer and so many of the 30th endured.

Between June 1944 and May 1945, the men of the United States 30th Infantry Division participated in every major Western European campaign, from Normandy to the Elbe River. Known as the ''Workhorse of the Western Front,'' the 30th was ranked as the top infantry division by a team of historians who worked under General Eisenhower. His chief historian, Colonel S.L.A. Marshall, declared the 30th ''the finest infantry division in the European Theater of Operations.''

The reputation of Old Hickory is that of resolute dedication and valor. They are viewed as heroic not only to Americans but to those whom they saved overseas.

For instance, in the Netherlands, where the 30th Division liberated the town of Maastricht, the townspeople created a cemetery for these lost souls. To this day, the community continues to place American flags at the gravesites every May in their memory. The town officials still keep in touch with Mr. Thayer even though he is living in assisted living.

For this service, Mr. Thayer has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, two Bronze Stars, and three Purple Hearts.

A man of incredible courage and personal fortitude, Mr. Thayer is a true hero. He served our Nation through tremendous strife, yet he remains humble, gracious, and incredibly sharp.

It was an honor to meet Mr. Thayer, along with his coauthor, Allan Foote, this past weekend and present him with this well-deserved recognition. His life of courage and commitment to our Nation is unparalleled. It would have been easy for him to give up in the face of evil, but Mr. Thayer and the men of the 30th Infantry never gave up. They were fiercely dedicated to changing the course of the war, and they worked fearlessly to ensure that America and freedom would prevail.

It is truly an honor to share Mr. Thayer's unique story in this historic Chamber today. It was the opportunity of a lifetime to spend time with Mr. Thayer and hear his firsthand account of his experiences as a critical player in this major event of human history.

At age 95, nearly 96, he is the last survivor of this venerable group of heroes. We will remember him, and we thank him for his great service.

I highly recommend this wonderful book by this great veteran of World War II.

REPUBLICANS PLAN FOR REAL AMERICAN INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, as the American economy struggles to recover from COVID, the last thing we need is more wasteful spending on liberal priorities.

Inflation is higher than it has ever been in over a decade, and businesses are struggling to get workers back to work because of the lavish handouts from our Federal Government.

What our country needs is a pure investment in American infrastructure, one that would put people back to work and increase mobility for Americans; new roads, bridges, and pipelines built by Americans for Americans.

Unfortunately, the Democrats have yet again decided to play politics with America's future. Rather than investing heavily in new roads, pipelines, and bridges, Democrats are using their infrastructure bill as a means to push radical left ideas on energy, leaving out oil and gas workers while funding goes toward achieving the Green New Deal.

House Republicans have introduced our version of real American infrastructure. It is $460 billion versus the Democrats' $1 trillion plan. It includes investment in roads, bridges, and transit, water infrastructure, and broadband. It will help put Americans back to work and build a brighter future for America.

That is what real American infrastructure is about, not pushing far-left policies to appease the base. If the Democrats ever get serious about wanting to build out America's infrastructure, Republicans are ready to work with them.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Loving God, You who have been revealed in Scriptures, proclaimed through countless testimonies, and made known through innumerable and profound displays of Your steadfast love, how humbling it is to realize that You, O God, have called each one of us to this time and to this place to have a role to play in the revelation of Your gracious plan for all of creation.

When we are called to account for this hope we find in You, may we not be found wanting, but may we be prepared and willing to give answer.

When we are confronted by the counter-narratives of cynicism and bitterness, may our words provide witness to Your truth.

When we are convinced of our self-sufficiency only to discover our inadequacy, may You be merciful to us.

And when we stray from the calling to which You have called us, call us back that we may once again respond to Your grace and follow You.

Today may our words be as if they were Your own and our service be fortified with the strength that You alone provide, that You would be glorified in the living of our lives.

It is in Your sovereign name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

NATION-BUILDING HERE AT HOME

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Innovation Centers Acceleration Act, introduced by my friend and colleague, JOE MORELLE.

This bill creates an $80 billion national competition that could direct new resources for communities like Rochester, Buffalo, and western New York to foster innovation and create new jobs and opportunities.

I am also a cosponsor of the Endless Frontiers Act, a version which passed the Senate with the support of our Senators, that would create similar opportunities and competition.

For too long, Congress has lacked the vision to nation-build here at home. Now we can enact a plan to compete with China and foster new opportunity and growth.

Groups like the Northland Workforce Training Center, the M&T Bank's technology hub, and the Thomas Beecher Innovation Center are leading the way in creating tech ecosystems in my region.

Enacting this bill could help propel these entities to achieve their full potential for the benefit of the entire community that could last for generations.

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

PROTECTING THE HYDE AMENDMENT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, one of the most sacred American values is the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The right to life is not to be forsaken, and today we see Democrats reject the science of life and the fact that life begins at conception.

One of the longstanding acts of bipartisanship is the Hyde amendment, with one of its most vocal supporters being then-Senator Joe Biden. Since first enacted in 1976, it has saved over 2.4 million innocent lives.

Americans who hold their pro-life convictions should not be forced to front the bill for abortion services and violate their belief that life is worthy of protecting.

President Biden's recent budget proposal excludes this lifesaving amendment after 40 years of being included. This should not be controversial.

I will continue to fight to uphold the Hyde amendment and make sure not one dollar of taxpayer dollars goes to destroy the life of an unborn child. These children are the future of our country.

Life is too sacred, and we must respect the millions of Americans who believe everyone has a right to life.

In God we trust.

HELP IS ON THE WAY

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, many families across the country have felt the crushing economic burden of the pandemic, but additional help is on the way.

The American Rescue Plan is delivering on President Biden's promise to help working families make ends meet. This once-in-a-generation investment includes an expanded child tax credit, and many American families are eligible for a refund of up to $3,600 per child, with $300 monthly payments beginning on July 15.

This direct assistance to families will help parents put food on the table, buy clothing for their children, or pay for other expenses while building better lives for their families. These tax credits will also help lift millions of families and children out of poverty, including more than 145,000 children in my district of Ventura County in California.

Ending childhood poverty will help increase educational attainment and lifetime earnings, allowing for a prosperous future for America's families and children. The expanded child tax credit also ensures families can keep more of their hard-earned money and keep our Nation on the path to recovery.

ABORTION IS NOT HEALTHCARE

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Hyde amendment and stand to denounce President Biden's budget that proposes the most radical pro-abortion budget in decades.

For nearly 45 years, the Hyde amendment has saved millions of lives by ensuring no taxpayer dollars are appropriated to support abortion services. This amendment has been included in every single government funding bill with widespread support since 1976. Even President Biden himself voted in favor of the amendment for decades.

What has changed? Who is running the show at the White House?

The Democrats love to talk about the big lie. The biggest lie in the country right now is President Biden's promise to be bipartisan.

The good people of eastern North Carolina do not want their hard-earned tax dollars paying for abortions, like done with Planned Parenthood. We must put faith and family back in the center of our lives and promote policies that support our innocent unborn.

I am a physician. Abortion is not healthcare. It is murder. The Constitution is clear on our right to life, and the Hyde amendment protects that. I believe the Hyde amendment should be included in every budget.

WHEN FAMILIES DO WELL, OUR NATION DOES WELL

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, with each passing week, we are seeing the tremendous impact of the American Rescue Plan on our Nation, in New York State, in New York City, and in my own district of New York 12.

Included in the American Rescue Plan is the 1-year expansion of the child tax credit. Next month, families will begin to receive credits of up to $300 per month to help with food, to help with rent, to help with the cost of childcare.

It is estimated that this funding will cut childhood poverty in half. Let me repeat that. It will cut childhood poverty in half. In my district alone, New York 12, this will help 54,000 children and lift nearly 5,000 children out of poverty.

Knowing the impact this tax credit will have on our families, I am asking all of my colleagues to join me in working to make it permanent.

When families do well, our Nation does well.

WE DESERVE ANSWERS ON COVID–19'S ORIGINS

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

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand answers and call for all intelligence into the origins of the COVID–19 virus to be declassified.

The United States should not rely on the World Health Organization, the same organization that covered for the Chinese Communist Party in the early days of the pandemic, to deliver answers to the American public about the origins of a virus that wrecked our economy and tragically claimed hundreds of thousands of American lives.

In April of last year, President Trump and Secretary Pompeo raised concerns of a COVID–19 lab leak. These concerns were completely ignored and censored by social media companies and traditional news outlets due to their vitriol and hatred for the former President. Now Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats are stonewalling House Republicans' efforts to deliver answers.

It is our responsibility to keep this country safe. If the CCP is indeed found responsible for the leak and cover-up, they must be held accountable for the needless loss of life and for our economy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to immediately join Republicans in our call for answers. The American people, and all those around the world who have lost loved ones, deserve answers.

CHILD TAX CREDIT BRINGS MUCH-NEEDED RELIEF

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, on Monday, I had the privilege of joining my colleagues, Representatives BILL FOSTER and SEAN CASTEN, and three incredible working mothers from my community, to speak about the importance of the expanded child tax credit.

We heard from these working moms how the child tax credit will deliver much-needed relief for their families after an incredibly difficult year. They will no longer have to worry about how they will afford their mortgage, childcare, and putting food on the table for themselves and their kids.

It is estimated that the expanded credit will cut child poverty in half, lifting 5,400 kids in my district out of poverty and benefiting thousands more.

We must sustain this investment in our kids and working families by making the child tax credit permanent to ensure millions of children have the resources they need for a brighter future.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2062, PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 239, EQUAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION FOR VETERANS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1443, LGBTQ BUSINESS EQUAL CREDIT ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RELATING TO ''UPDATE OF COMMISSION'S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES''; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 14, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL 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 PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 15, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL 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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 486 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 486

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, 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 report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution 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.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section 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 respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-7 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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''. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 8. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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''. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 9. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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''. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 10. House Resolution 485 is hereby adopted.

SEC. 11. (a) 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 as though under clause 1 of rule XV with respect to multiple measures described in subsection (b), and the Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion.

(b) A measure referred to in subsection (a) includes any measure that was the object of a motion to suspend the rules on the legislative day of June 22, 2021, or June 23, 2021, in the form as so offered, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX.

(c) Upon the offering of a motion pursuant to subsection (a) concerning multiple measures, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

□ 1220

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 486, providing for consideration of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, under a structured rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman SCOTT and makes in order five amendments. The rule provides for en bloc authority to Chairman SCOTT or his designee and for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 1443, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 13, S.J. Res. 14, and S.J. Res. 15 under closed rules. It provides the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Financial Services each 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by their respective chairs and ranking minority members. It also provides each joint resolution one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule deems passage of H. Res. 485 and provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested rollcall votes on suspension bills considered on June 22 or 23. This authority lasts through June 25.

Madam Speaker, the House is set to take up a number of critical bills and resolutions in this rule, but I would like to begin by saying a few words about H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Instances of age discrimination at the workplace, including being passed up for a promotion or forced to retire early, are far too common across the country. A recent survey conducted by AARP found that nearly two out of three workers 45 years and older have seen or experienced age discrimination while on the job.

Importantly, we can expect this problem to be exacerbated in the coming years by the continued growth of the number of older workers in America, which is outpacing the growth of the overall labor force.

Discrimination against workers is not only unfair and morally wrong; it creates a major drag on the U.S. economy. According to a recent report, the economy missed out on an additional $850 billion in GDP in 2018 all because older workers aged 50 years and older were not given the opportunity to remain in or re-enter the labor force, switch jobs, or be promoted within their existing company. Clearly, age discrimination not only harms older workers; it harms the country as a whole.

Despite the enormity of this problem, the Supreme Court in 2009 made it much more difficult for age discrimination lawsuits to be successful. The Court's ruling in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. imposed a much higher burden of proof on plaintiffs alleging discrimination than previously required under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act passed by Congress in 1967.

This new standard from Gross requires plaintiffs to prove that age discrimination was the decisive, determinative but-for cause for any adverse employment action taken by the employer. The new sole-factor test replaced decades of precedent allowing that employees need only show that their age was a key factor, potentially among other factors, in the employer's adverse employment action.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act simply restores the pre-2009 evidentiary threshold, allowing individuals to show a discriminatory motive was merely a key factor for the adverse employment action, which is consistent with the standard for other workplace discrimination claims based on race, religion, sex, or national origin. This legislation ensures that older workers can pursue their livelihoods and hold employers accountable for age discrimination.

This rule also sets up consideration of three Congressional Review Act resolutions, all of which overturn harmful rulemaking implemented by the Trump administration.

S.J. Res. 13 overturns a rule finalized by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that provides employers with significant unfair advantages during the informal conciliation process, which allows parties to settle a charge of employer discrimination without going to court.

S.J. Res. 14 overturns efforts by the Trump EPA to gut a 2016 rule finalized by the Obama administration, which placed critically important limits on methane emissions from the oil and gas industry sector.

The last CRA resolution overturns the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's true lender rule, which makes it easier for predatory lenders to launder loans through out-of-State banks that are not subject to State interest rate caps. Prior to this rule, the ''true lender'' in partnerships between banks and nonbank financial service companies was whichever entity had the primary economic interest in the loan. This harmful OCC action changed the test for the ''true lender'' to be simply whichever bank is listed on the loan origination documents, making it extraordinarily easy to create a rent-a-bank relationship between nationally chartered banks and nonbanks, allowing nonbanks to avoid State interest rate cap laws where they are actually doing business.

Especially during the midst of a once-in-a-lifetime pandemic and economic crisis, it is astounding that the Trump administration chose to focus on making it easier for predatory lenders to take advantage of Americans in need.

Finally, the House is also set to consider two additional bills. The Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, H.R. 239, prohibits the Department of Veterans Affairs from requiring copayments for contraception coverage, bringing the policy in line with the Department of Defense and the private sector. The second bill, LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, H.R. 1443, requires financial institutions to collect the sexual orientation and gender identity of the principal owners of small businesses, in addition to existing requirements that institutions collect data on sex, race, and ethnicity.

Both of these bills should be noncontroversial. Although Members of the House Republican Conference inexplicably blocked these bills from passing under suspension last week, I am pleased that we will not further delay passage of this critical legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, three CRAs to overturn harmful administration actions of the previous administration, and commonsense legislation to support women veterans and the LGBTQ business community.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE for yielding me the customary 30 minutes. I would parenthetically note that it took about 30 minutes to read the actual rule itself, so this is one of the longer rules that we have had under consideration.

There are six measures included in this rule. First is a bill that seeks to protect older Americans from discrimination in the workplace, protection

which already exists. There are two bills that failed to pass on suspension last week, and three Congressional Review Act resolutions.

The legislation considered in this rule will revoke commonsense regulations, expand the Federal Government, and create duplicative and unnecessary red tape for America's small businesses, employees, and consumers.

□ 1230

In 1967, Congress enacted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to protect applicants and employees over 40 years old from discrimination on the basis of age in employment matters. This act is enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

In 2009, the Supreme Court held in the case of Gross v. FBL Financial Services that the standard of proof for a claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act requires that age stand alone as the cause of the adverse action rather than in conjunction with other evidentiary factors.

In 2013, the Supreme Court also ruled, in the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Naiel Nassar, that the plaintiff must prove that a retaliatory motive was the decisive cause of an adverse employment action.

H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, would reverse the Supreme Court decisions by allowing mixed-motive claims in Age Discrimination Employment Act cases where age would only need to be a motivating factor for discrimination, even though other factors also motivated discrimination. In other words, the bill shifts the burden of proof to allow plaintiffs in age discrimination cases to demonstrate that any practice by an employer for which age was a motivating factor is covered. Eliminating the decisive factor approach disregards two Supreme Court cases and existing law.

Other provisions of H.R. 2062 prohibit a court from awarding damages or requiring any employment activity other than injunctive relief, making the only true beneficiaries of this legislation members of the plaintiffs' bar.

The Supreme Court stated in the Nassar case that ''lessening the causation standard could also contribute to the filing of frivolous claims, which would siphon resources from efforts by employers, administrative agencies, and courts to combat workplace harassment.''

Republicans are committed to eliminating discrimination in the workplace; that includes for older Americans. Discrimination of any kind is already against the law through the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and the Civil Rights Act.

Today's rule also contains two bills that were brought up on suspension last week but were unable to pass with the required two-thirds vote: The Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, and the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act.

The final three measures included in the rule utilize the Congressional Review Act to overturn three Trump-era rules that attempted to provide commonsense regulations, reduce red tape, and to promote transparency. But in the zeal to repeal all things Trump, commonsense reduction of red tape, and promoting transparency may just be regarded as collateral damage, as everything associated with the former President must be undone in the eyes of House Democrats.

First, S.J. Res. 15 nullifies a rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders. This agency rule provides clarity by determining exactly when a national bank or a Federal savings association is, in fact, the ''true lender'' when partnering with a third party to provide loans.

In today's markets, it is common for financial technology companies to partner with banks to meet the needs of their consumers. Unfortunately, Court rulings have created uncertainty when partnerships occur in determining who is the ''true lender'' in these circumstances.

This Office of Comptroller of the Currency rule provides much-needed clarity for market participants and ensures consumers are, in fact, adequately protected. Federal law requires ''true lenders'' to comply with certain consumer protection laws, and clearly delineating the ''true lender'' will eliminate this uncertainty.

While the majority claims that this rule gives a green light to predatory relationships by allowing a ''rent-a-charter'' partnership, this could not be further from the truth. This rule provides greater transparency into such practices, allowing better protections for consumers. With more transparency comes more accountability; after all, sunlight is the best disinfectant.

The next resolution, S.J. Res. 13, uses the Congressional Review Act to nullify the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's rule titled ''Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures.'' Conciliation is a process by which two parties may resolve disputes informally and confidentially without ever having to go to court.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission rule is designed to bring its conciliation procedures in line with the Supreme Court's decision in Mach Mining, LLC v. EEOC, and would update these procedures for the first time since 1977.

By encouraging the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission claims to be resolved outside of court, this rule ensures that disputes can be resolved at less expense in a more timely basis and ensure accountability.

Passing S.J. Res. 13 would not promote a better workplace for employees; it would only encourage more litigation. And by utilizing the Congressional Review Act, this resolution would prevent the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from ever updating its conciliation procedures without additional Congressional action. Simply put, this resolution would only make it more difficult to settle workplace disputes.

The final resolution in this rule is S.J. Res. 14, which would use the Congressional Review Act to nullify the Environmental Protection Agency's rule titled ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review.'' Should this be signed into law, it would have significant ramifications for America's energy industry but, in fact, it would have little impact on America's public health or America's environment.

In 2020, the Environmental Protection Agency issued new regulations that right-sized New Source Performance Standards for the oil and gas industry. Despite the hyperbolic language in the media and from interest groups, the Environmental Protection Agency found that these methane rules had no real impact on emissions.

Let's say that again, because it is so important: Despite the language in the media and from interest groups, the EPA found that these methane rules had no real impact on emissions. Simultaneously, barriers to entry were lifted and companies of all sizes were able to compete. This allowed America to regain its position as a global energy leader.

Throughout the Trump administration, Americans benefited from historically clean air and cleaner water. Greenhouse gas emissions fell throughout the Trump Presidency. The lesson is quite simple: Promoting innovation and investment in the energy sector is a better way to promote economic and environmental success.

I am very concerned about this resolution's impact, especially in my home State of Texas. In recent months, Americans have seen sharp increases, sharp increases in the price of gasoline, sharp increases in the price of electricity. Energy costs are rising, and this resolution only threatens to send them higher. History shows us that the most substantive changes that can be made occur faster through innovation and not greater regulation.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments from my friend and my colleague on the Committee on Rules, Mr. BURGESS.

I do want to just note that when it comes to discrimination, the standard that we use for discrimination in the workplace that relates to race, religion, sex or national origin, is that

those factors are a key motivating factor in an employment decision that allows a claimant to come forward. That is what we wish to make the standard for age discrimination for older Americans.

What is being suggested by my friends on the other side of the aisle, however, are two different standards. In this case, when it comes to age discrimination, that it needs to be the sole factor. Prior to the 2009 Supreme Court case, indeed these were on par. The same standards would apply, the same criteria that it be a key motivating factor.

And frankly, when you think about it, if you are an older American and you are being denied a promotion, you are being denied a pay raise, and your employer suggests, well, you are a little older, and oh, by the way—and lists a couple other things. Well, because it is not the sole factor that they articulated, you don't have a cause for a claim. And we believe that there shouldn't be two different standards when it comes to discrimination. If it is a key motivating factor, which it was up until the 2009 opinion, that is how it should stand. And we should make certain that the law of the land when it relates to employment discrimination is the same, whether or not it is because of race, religion, sex, national origin, or age.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule providing consideration for my bill, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act.

As you know, this rule is necessary to bring critical veterans' healthcare legislation to the floor, because last week House Republicans failed to support the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act when it was considered under the suspension of the rules.

They voted ''no'' despite the bill having passed in the 116th Congress by voice vote with broad support.

They voted ''no'' despite the fact that veterans' service organizations overwhelmingly support the bill.

They voted ''no'' despite the fact that women veterans have put their lives on the line for our country and overwhelmingly want equal access to healthcare.

They voted ''no'' despite 87 percent of the American people supporting women's access to contraception.

While it is both disappointing and perplexing to me that anyone would vote to deny women veterans equal access to healthcare—the same healthcare we give women currently serving in the military—I am grateful the Speaker and the majority leader have given us—all of us—a second chance to do what is right. I thank the Committee on Rules for its swift action.

Contraception is a medication used by millions of Americans for a wide range of conditions, and it is estimated that 62 percent of our Nation's 2 million women veterans use contraception. In addition to family planning, contraception is used to treat or alleviate migraines, acne, endometriosis, and PCOS.

In fact, the median number of contraception methods used by women in the U.S. is three, and nearly one-third of women in the U.S. have used five or more methods over their lifetime. Contraception is essential to a women's whole health and to her economic security. Yet women veterans who use VA healthcare are not treated the same as women in the military or civilian women.

Addressing this inequality is long overdue. All veterans and former servicemembers deserve the very best healthcare without any unnecessary barriers. They earned it, and they deserve it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to demonstrate their commitment to the patriotic women who make up 20 percent of our military and 10 percent of our veteran communities and vote ''yes'' on the rule so we can bring the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans back to the floor.

Let's do the right thing, for equality, health, and economic security for our women who bravely served our country for all of us to have the same.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, this bill, introduced by Representative CHRIS SMITH, prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions or for health coverage that includes abortions.

The Hyde Amendment first passed Congress in 1976 to ban Federal funding for most abortions. President Biden's fiscal year 2022 budget request omits this ban for the first time in over 40 years, breaking longstanding precedent.

H.R. 18 would make the ban on Federal funding for abortions permanent, with exceptions for rape, incest, or if the mother's life is in danger.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, and a true leader on this issue, to further explain the amendment.

□ 1245

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, more than 20 peer-reviewed studies show that more than 2.4 million people are alive today in the United States because of the Hyde amendment, with about 60,000 babies spared death by abortion each and every year.

Over 2.4 million girls and boys who would have been aborted instead survived because taxpayer funding was unavailable to effectuate their violent demise. Growing numbers of Americans, Madam Speaker, continue to be shocked to learn that the methods of abortion include dismemberment of a child's fragile body, including decapitation, and that drugs like RU–486 starve the baby to death before he or she is forcibly expelled from the womb. There is nothing benign or compassionate about abortion methods.

The multibillion-dollar abortion industry cleverly markets the sophistry of choice while going to extraordinary lengths to ignore, trivialize, and cover up the battered baby victim. By reason of their age, dependency, immaturity, inconvenience, fragility, and unwantedness, unborn children have been denied justice and the most fundamental of all human rights, the right to life.

The right to life, Madam Speaker, is for everyone, not just the planned, the privileged, and the perfect.

Ultrasound has not only been an amazing diagnostic tool for treating disease and disability before birth, it has also made the unborn baby more visible. Today, for many expectant moms, first baby pictures aren't of their precious newborn baby, but of ultrasound imaging photos and videos chronicling the amazing miracle of their child's journey before birth.

Madam Speaker, 166 Members of Congress have cosponsored my bill, H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, to make the Hyde amendment and other current abortion funding prohibitions permanent.

According to public opinion polls, most Americans, by a decisive margin of 58 percent to 38 percent in a recent Marist Poll, agree that taxpayers should not, I say again, should not be compelled against their conscience to fund abortion.

Years ago, then-Senator Joe 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 in another letter, ''I have consistently—on no fewer than 50 occasions—voted against Federal funding of abortions. Those who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.''

So says Joe Biden in the past.

I wholeheartedly agree. Those of us opposed to abortion should not be compelled or forced to pay for them.

Madam Speaker, someday future generations of Americans will look back and wonder how and why such a seemingly smart, enlightened, and compassionate society could have enabled and facilitated the extermination of over 62.5 million children, a number of child

deaths that equates with the entire population of Italy.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. So with deep respect for my colleagues, I believe unborn children need the President of the United States and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to be their friends and advocates, not powerful adversaries.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to just talk for a moment about H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, which is actually before us today. Although some might want to make this debate about other issues, it is not.

Comprehensive healthcare for women, including access to contraception, is critically important. Access to contraception is an economic issue. It helps people stay in the workforce, earn wages, support stronger families. It has even been shown to lift women out of poverty.

Even relatively small copays have been found to be a barrier to accessing contraception. Costs associated with contraception result in women foregoing it completely, choosing less effective methods, or using it inconsistently.

Congress eliminated copays for contraception as part of the Affordable Care Act. And, as I said, for members of the Defense Department, for people in military service, there is no copay. It is time we did the same for those brave women who entered armed services and now are veterans.

We also want to make sure that we have equal access. Women represent the fastest growing subpopulation of veterans in the Nation, yet they lack access to the basic preventative healthcare needs like contraception.

So I want to make sure that we focus on what is before us, the bills before the House, what this conversation is about, and not to be distracted by things not before us and part of an extreme agenda.

This is a simple issue. It has passed by voice vote in the last Congress, and it is not clear to me what has changed. This is an important issue for women all across America, and we owe that to our veterans to make sure that they don't have additional barriers to contraception that no one else in American has.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LETLOW), one of our newest Members, to speak again on defeating the previous question and considering the amendment.

Ms. LETLOW. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can amend the rule to allow the consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

This critical bill will finally codify the Hyde amendment and uphold the longstanding bipartisan agreement that prevents taxpayer dollars from funding abortions.

While Republicans and Democrats have engaged in heated debates over abortion in the past 40 years, we were always able to agree on the simple principle that public funding should not be used for abortions. The Hyde amendment, which explicitly spelled this policy out, has been included in every single appropriations bill since 1976, including those passed under the Clinton and Obama administrations.

This commonsense, lifesaving amendment has been supported by many Members of this body, including many of my colleagues across the aisle. It is incredibly disappointing to see that this administration and the Democratic majority have decided to ignore four decades of consensus and instead embrace a controversial new policy opposed by over 60 percent of Americans.

As both a Christian and a mother, I deeply understand the preciousness of an innocent child's life. When I arrived in Congress a few months ago, one of my first actions was to sign on to H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. But whether you are a strong pro-life advocate like me, or hold an opposing view, we should all be able to get behind this bill.

Taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions. It is a simple, commonsense measure that should have as much bipartisan support this year as it has in the past.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of our Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the previous question, and I fully support the immediate consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021.

The bill would codify protections for the unborn and would make them permanent. These protections are commonly carried as part of the Hyde amendment, which has been carried in the appropriations bills produced by the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of Appropriations, where I am the ranking member, for the past 45 years.

There is no cause greater for any Member of Congress than defending life, especially amongst the most vulnerable. When I was privileged to be chair of the subcommittee, every one of the annual appropriations bills passed out of the subcommittee carried this important protection.

Yet the majority has once again begun the misguided assault on life; first, with President Biden's revocation of the Mexico City policy, followed by legislative efforts to dismantle the Hyde amendment, both of which protect life and prevent taxpayer-funded abortions.

Since the Hyde amendment was first enacted in 1976, it is estimated that this provision has saved more than two million lives. It has been supported by lawmakers of both parties on both sides of the aisle, and signed into law by Presidents of both parties every single year since then. Indeed, every Democratic Member, other than freshmen, has voted for legislation containing the Hyde Amendment.

When he was serving in the United States Senate, President Biden, at that time, expressed his support for the inclusion of this provision, a stance he has since abandoned. Eliminating this provision in the annual appropriations bills would be a terrible mistake and at odds with the beliefs of a strong majority of the American people.

A recent Marist Poll found that 58 percent of Americans oppose the taxpayer funding for abortion, while only 38 percent support it. Hyde protects the conscience rights of the great majority of Americans who are opposed to publicly funded abortions for religious, moral, or fiscal reasons. It allows States to choose to fund elective abortions or not with State taxpayer dollars, and the people of 34 States have voluntarily chosen not to do so.

As we look ahead to the annual appropriations process, I would remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that 200 Republicans, including every single Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, signed a letter to congressional leadership stating that they would oppose any spending bill that did not include Hyde protections.

I see no better way for us to continue to celebrate life and ensure protections for the unborn than by making the Hyde amendment permanent, which we can do if we pass H.R. 18 into law.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) on the motion against the previous question.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge immediate consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act.

Our Nation has stood unified in our opposition to federally funded, on-demand abortion services for the past 40 years. The Hyde amendment has acted as a stopgap against publicly funded abortion and as a safeguard for our Nation's most vulnerable, the unborn.

Before the Hyde amendment took effect in 1980, over 300,000 American children per year were denied their most basic right to life and were aborted using taxpayer-funded dollars. This fight is one that we must undertake in

Congress to protect our most fundamental rights and important tenets that make our country great.

The Biden administration and congressional Democrats seem to have forgotten the bipartisan support the Hyde amendment has received from both Republican and Democrat administrations in the past, as well as the overwhelming support from the American public, for this important provision.

It is a national shame for this administration and congressional Democrats to overlook and marginalize the right to life that we, as Americans, hold dear. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is not just a saying; it is a guiding principle by which we should all govern.

Let's come together as Americans, leave party lines behind, and support the right to life because America's future depends on it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and provide for immediate consideration of H.R. 18 for the sake of America's future generations.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I just note that we have in front of us two CRAs. We have two important bills: The LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, as well as the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021.

And we are not talking about any of those. So I am prepared to talk about those, which are actually before the House, whenever my friends choose to.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), a valuable member of the Rules Committee, to speak against the previous question.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, in 1994, then-Senator Joe Biden said: ''Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.''

Well, Mr. President, I certainly agree.

For more than four decades, the Hyde amendment has ensured the American people are not forced to fund abortion on-demand, a procedure at great odds with so many of our personal and religious beliefs, and an injustice that leaves an irreversible mark on so many lives.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has had bipartisan support from Congress, has been signed into law by both Republican and Democrat Presidents, and has been supported by the majority of the American people.

□ 1300

It has saved the lives of millions. But President Biden and the Democrats want to end those protections, forcing the American people to fund a procedure that is at such serious odds with our personal, religious, and moral beliefs.

There is no more vulnerable person than a child in the womb. Do they not deserve our care and our protection? Does that life not also have value, just like the lives of you and me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I will say it again: We are treading in dangerous territory. Instead of working toward a government that builds all people up for the common good, we are choosing to subsidize the deaths of unborn babies.

I believe that is appalling, and I urge my colleagues to reconsider their positions. We must pass H.R. 18 and respect the wishes of the American people: Tax dollars should not be used to fund abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge ''no'' on the previous question.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MFUME). The gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close if that is in accordance with the wishes of the majority, so I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the bills in this lengthy rule will not achieve the benefits for the American people that are being claimed.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act lowers the threshold for age discrimination cases in the workplace. It is already illegal to discriminate against an employee because of age. Lowering the burden of proof to allow for mixed-motive claims will, in fact, only benefit the trial lawyers who actually bring the suits.

I do want to direct attention to a letter that most Members received from the United States Chamber of Commerce. It is a very good letter opposing S.J. Res. 15. This is the Congressional Review Act repeal of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's rule on national banks and Federal savings associations and lenders.

The reason I bring this up is because I know many of my friends on the other side of the aisle do claim that their support from the United States Chamber of Commerce is what makes them bipartisan and, hence, they should be reelected. But here we have the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sending each of us a letter talking about how damaging excluding that rule from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency would be.

If I may just read a portion of this letter: ''Partnerships between banks and third parties have become a critical avenue for making credit available to both consumers and small businesses. . . . Fintech partnerships provided funding for many of America's smallest businesses which, according to McKinsey & Company, are disproportionately minority-owned.''

Mr. Speaker, by undoing this Trump-era rule, you are, in fact, going to be hurting some of the smallest businesses in the country, and I don't think that is what you would have intended.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 18, 2021.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly supports the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's (OCC) rule on ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders,'' also known as the ''True Lender'' Rule, and strongly opposes S.J.Res. 15, which would effectively overturn it.

The True Lender Rule provides important legal certainty for national banks and federal savings associations regarding loans they may issue in conjunction with third-parties. Various judicial rulings have created legal uncertainty as to who is the ''True Lender'' of a loan when a bank works with a third party, thus calling into question the laws that apply to these loans. This legal uncertainty discourages financial institutions from partnering to provide credit to consumers and small businesses.

Partnerships between banks and third parties have become a critical avenue for making credit available to both consumers and small businesses. In fact, FinTech partnerships represented 15% of Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) loans to small businesses last year. More importantly, the median value of FinTech partnership-enabled PPP loans was $15,000. That median value amount was the smallest of all lending providers including Minority Development Institutions and Nonprofits. That means FinTech partnerships provided funding for many of America's smallest businesses which, according to McKinsey & Company, are disproportionately minority-owned.

The OCC's rule establishes a clear test for determining the ''True Lender'' when a bank makes a loan, which clarifies what legal frameworks are applicable to a loan. The rule provides that a bank is the ''True Lender'' when it, as of the date of origination, (1) is named as the lender in the loan agreement or (2) funds the loan. This clarification is critical for banks to partner with third parties and does not undermine the myriad consumer protection laws enforced by state and federal regulators.

The Chamber opposes S.J.Res. 15.

Sincerely.

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

Mr. BURGESS. The Congressional Review Act is a legitimate tool to review executive actions, but it should not be used as a political tool to overturn a previous administration's actions simply because, Mr. Speaker, you don't like the previous occupant of the White House.

The CRAs in this rule are not based on sound policymaking. They are instead being used as an attempt to score political points by undoing Trump-era policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Members to reconsider these measures by simply focusing on the policy and not the policymaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other conclusion than to urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, a ''no'' vote on the rule, and a ''no'' vote on the underlying measures.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman, Dr. BURGESS, a colleague and friend on the Rules Committee. I always appreciate hearing from him.

I think there are compelling issues here in this rule and the reasons that the House should adopt the rule.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a critical tool for so many Americans who are discriminated against in the workplace. It deserves our support. I am confident that it will pass the House, but we should remember how important it is, not only to those workers, but to the U.S. economy.

H.R. 239, the Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, makes sure that women who have served and are veterans have the same rights that every other person in America has to not have to pay copays in order to receive contraception from their healthcare policy.

We also take up critical legislation regarding LGBTQ businesses, to make sure they get equal access to credit and equal access to investments. H.R. 1443 would require lenders to start to gather information on those businesses that are owned by LGBTQ individuals.

The CRAs, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, are all well-informed, and they do focus on the policies, policies which, frankly, we don't agree with here in the House and which the Senate didn't agree with. The Senate has passed these on to us in bipartisan fashion, so these aren't simply questions of whether or not we approve of the previous President. This is about the policies themselves, and they have found themselves here to be voted on because our colleagues across the corridor in the Senate agree with us that these rules ought to be overturned using the CRA process.

This is an important rule. It affects millions of Americans in so many ways.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 486

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 12. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 18) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 18.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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 question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MFUME) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2062, PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 239, EQUAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION FOR VETERANS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1443, LGBTQ BUSINESS EQUAL CREDIT ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 13, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION RELATING TO ''UPDATE OF COMMISSION'S CONCILIATION PROCEDURES''; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 14, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL 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 S.J. RES. 15, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL 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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 209, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—218

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

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

NAYS—209

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

NOT VOTING—3

Burchett
Donalds
Pascrell

□ 1356

Messrs. RUTHERFORD, BANKS, and BACON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 2021, I missed one roll call vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 175—Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule, H. Res. 486.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt (Moolenaar)
Amodei (Balderson)
Clarke (NY) (Jeffries)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
García (IL) (Garcia (TX))
Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mullin (Cole)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pappas (Kuster)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Vela (Gomez)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 205, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

YEAS—218

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—205

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Blumenauer
Burchett
Emmer
Gohmert
Jackson
Moore (AL)
Scott, Austin

□ 1417

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 176.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 176.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt (Moolenaar)
Amodei (Balderson)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
García (IL) (Garcia (TX))
Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mullin (Cole)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pappas (Kuster)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Vela (Gomez)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DISPARITY AND FAIRNESS IN GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to section 10 of House Resolution 486, House Resolution 485 is hereby adopted.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 485

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AMOUNTS FOR COMMITTEE EXPENSES.

For the expenses of the Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the "Select Committee"), including the expenses of all staff salaries, there shall be paid, out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives for committee salaries and expenses, not more than $3,500,000 for the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress.

SEC. 2. SESSION LIMITATIONS.

Of the amount specified in section 1—

(1) not more than $1,500,000 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning on the date of the adoption of this resolution and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2022; and

(2) not more than $2,000,000 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2022, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2023.

SEC. 3. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the Select Committee, signed by the Chairman of the Select Committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 11 of House Resolution 486, I move to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 482, H.R. 704, H.R. 961, H.R. 1314, H.R. 2571, H.R. 2679, H.R. 2694, H.R. 2922, H.R. 3182, H.R. 3239, H.R. 3241, H.R. 3723, H.R. 3752, H.R. 3841, S. 409, and S. 1340.

The Clerk read the title of the bills.

The text of the bills are as follows:

NEWBORN SCREENING SAVES LIVES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

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.

ARTISTIC RECOGNITION FOR TALENTED STUDENTS ACT

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.''.

JUSTICE FOR JUVENILES ACT

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.

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

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).

ADVANCING MUTUAL INTERESTS AND GROWING OUR SUCCESS ACT

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.

FOUNDATION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION CHARTER AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2021

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.

CRIMINAL JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 2021

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.''.

ELDER ABUSE PROTECTION ACT OF 2021

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.''.

SAFE SLEEP FOR BABIES ACT OF 2021

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.

MAKING IMPROVEMENTS IN ENACTMENT OF TITLE 41, UNITED STATES CODE, INTO A POSITIVE LAW TITLE AND TO IMPROVE CODE

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 2531 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)''; and

(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''.

MAKING IMPROVEMENTS IN ENACTMENT OF TITLE 54, UNITED STATES CODE, INTO A POSITIVE LAW TITLE AND TO IMPROVE CODE

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).

CONSUMER SAFETY TECHNOLOGY ACT

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.

PANDEMIC EFFECTS ON HOME SAFETY AND TOURISM ACT

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.

TRIBAL HEALTH DATA IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2021

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).''.

PROVIDING FOR AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS FOR CUSTOMER EDUCATION INITIATIVES AND NON-AWARDS EXPENSES OF COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION WHISTLEBLOWER PROGRAM

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.

REDEFINING EASTERN AND MIDDLE JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF NORTH CAROLINA

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 House Resolution 486, the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated to the end that all such motions are considered as withdrawn.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bills.

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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 103, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—325

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Feenstra
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
LaHood
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch

Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—103

Allen
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Banks
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brady
Brooks
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kustoff
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Loudermilk
Mace
Mann
Massie
Mast
McClintock
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Nehls
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Rose
Rosendale
Roy
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Smith (MO)
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tiffany
Timmons
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Burchett
Case

□ 1444

Mr. WESTERMAN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. MULLIN, ARMSTRONG, and PASCRELL changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bills were 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

Aderholt (Moolenaar)
Amodei (Balderson)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
García (IL) (Garcia (TX))
Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Leger Fernandez (Jacobs (CA))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mullin (Cole)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pappas (Kuster)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Vela (Gomez)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 486, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor printed in the bill, 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 House Report 117–71, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2062

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 ''Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. STANDARDS OF PROOF.

(a) AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967.—

(1) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF AGE IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 4 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g)(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, an unlawful practice is established under this Act when the complaining party demonstrates that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was a motivating factor for any practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

''(2) In establishing an unlawful practice under this Act, including under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—

''(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence; and

''(B) shall not be required to demonstrate that age or an activity protected by subsection (d) was the sole cause of a practice.''.

(2) REMEDIES.—Section 7 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 626) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking ''The'' and inserting ''(1) The'';

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking ''Amounts'' and inserting the following:

''(2) Amounts'';

(iii) in the fifth sentence, by striking ''Before'' and inserting the following:

''(4) Before''; and

(iv) by inserting before paragraph (4), as designated by clause (iii) of this subparagraph, the following:

''(3) On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that age was a motivating factor for any employment practice under section 4(g)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

''(A) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in subparagraph (B)), and attorney's fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 4(g)(1); and

''(B) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''Any'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (b)(3), any''.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 11 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 630) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) The term 'demonstrates' means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.''.

(4) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 15 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 633a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) Sections 4(g) and 7(b)(3) shall apply to mixed motive claims (involving practices described in section 4(g)(1)) under this section.''.

(b) TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—

(1) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–2) is amended by striking subsection (m) and inserting the following:

''(m) Except as otherwise provided in this title, an unlawful employment practice is established when the complaining party demonstrates that race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or an activity protected by section 704(a) was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.''.

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Section 717 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) Sections 703(m) and 706(g)(2)(B) shall apply to mixed motive cases (involving practices described in section 703(m)) under this section.''.

(c) AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) DEMONSTRATES.—The term 'demonstrates' means meets the burdens of production and persuasion.''.

(2) CLARIFYING PROHIBITION AGAINST IMPERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATION OF DISABILITY IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12112) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PROOF.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, a discriminatory practice is established under this Act when the complaining party demonstrates that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was a motivating factor for any employment practice, even though other factors also motivated the practice.

''(2) DEMONSTRATION.—In establishing a discriminatory practice under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof, a complaining party—

''(A) may rely on any type or form of admissible evidence; and

''(B) shall not be required to demonstrate that disability or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503 was the sole cause of an employment practice.''.

(3) CERTAIN ANTI-RETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 503(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12203(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''The remedies'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the remedies''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CERTAIN ANTI-RETALIATION CLAIMS.—Section 107(c) shall apply to claims under section 102(e)(1) with respect to title I.''.

(4) REMEDIES.—Section 107 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12117) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) DISCRIMINATORY MOTIVATING FACTOR.—On a claim in which an individual demonstrates that disability was a motivating factor for any employment practice under section 102(e)(1), and a respondent demonstrates that the respondent would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factor, the court—

''(1) may grant declaratory relief, injunctive relief (except as provided in paragraph (2)), and attorney's fees and costs demonstrated to be directly attributable only to the pursuit of a claim under section 102(e)(1); and

''(2) shall not award damages or issue an order requiring any admission, reinstatement, hiring, promotion, or payment.''.

(d) REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Sections 501(f), 503(d), and 504(d) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791(f), 793(d), and 794(d)), are each amended by adding after ''title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111 et seq.)'' the following: '', including the standards of causation or methods of proof applied under section 102(e) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 12112(e)),''.

(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) to section 501(f) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791(f)) shall be construed to apply to all employees covered by section 501 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 791).

SEC. 3. APPLICATION.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply to all claims pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, which I reintroduced this year with our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

For decades, the Federal Government has recognized the need to protect older workers against discrimination on the basis of age. Unfortunately, in 2009, the Supreme Court severely eroded protections for older workers in the case of Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.

In its decision, the Court set a significantly higher burden of proof for workers alleging age discrimination. Under this standard, workers must prove that age discrimination was the decisive cause of an employer's action rather than just one of the motivating factors, as was the case before the Gross decision.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the NAACP supporting the bill and discussing the Gross decision.

NAACP,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2021.

Re NAACP Support for H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021 (POWADA) Urges a ''Yea' Vote on Final Passage.

Hon. ROBERT (BOBBY) SCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT: On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), our nation's oldest, largest and most widely recognized grassroots based civil rights organization, I thank you for your leadership and work for the passage of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021 (POWADA). This bill is a crucial component of the NAACP's vision for ensuring a society in which all individuals have equal rights and equal protection under the law as a key measure to ensure that illegal workplace discrimination is ended for all. To that end, we are convinced that POWADA takes a critical steps forward to ensure older workers, especially those who are persons of color and women, are protected from age discrimination in the workplace.

The Supreme Court's 2009 decision *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, significantly reduced the ability for employees to challenge an employer's age discriminatory employment practices in court. The decision forces employees to prove that age is a 'but-for' cause of an age discrimination employment action. Worse, some circuit courts extended the *Gross* but-for standard into other civil rights statutes as well. The NAACP urges full Congressional support for, and passage of POWADA, a bill that restores the ability of plaintiffs to challenge age and other forms of discrimination in court by returning the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the retaliation provisions of Title VII to the mixed-motive standard of proof used under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act for decades.

The importance of countering age discrimination cannot be understated, especially since age discrimination often intersects with other forms of discrimination based on race and gender. The evidence for this is clear: Nearly two-thirds of women and more than three-fourths of African American workers age 45 and older say they've seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace. Over 9 percent of African Americans felt pressured into early retirement because of their age, compared to 6.7 percent for other races. During the COVID–19 pandemic, the decline in employment for older African American, Hispanic, and Asian worker was twice that of older white workers. The ability for workers to confront age discrimination is an integral part of confronting discrimination generally in our Country.

For the preceding reasons, the NAACP strongly urges Congress to pass POWADA (H.R. 2062) and protect our nation's older workers as soon as possible.

Thank you again for your leadership and attention to this crucial issue of civil rights and equal protection under law. If you have any questions or other concerns with the NAACP's position on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP Washington Bureau & Senior Vice President for Policy and Advocacy.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, making cases more difficult to prove contradicts our responsibility to support older workers who have been vulnerable to workplace discrimination. In fact, more than half of older workers are pushed out of longtime jobs before they choose to retire.

Age discrimination also holds back our economy. Research by AARP and the Economist Intelligence Unit found that, absent age discrimination, older workers would have contributed $850 billion more in 2018 to the gross domestic product. Clearly, our labor market and economy cannot fully recover from the pandemic if we fail to support our older workers.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a bipartisan initiative that would restore the pre-2009 evidentiary standard for age discrimination claims. This would effectively realign the burden of proof for age discrimination claims so it would again be the same standard that is required for proving discrimination based on sex, race, religion, and national origin.

This legislation also reinstates this standard for disability discrimination claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act, as well as claims for retaliation for rights protected under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These statutes have all been implicated by the Gross decision.

Last Congress, 261 bipartisan House Members voted in favor of passing the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. This Congress, I hope we can come together again and take this next step to ensure that older workers can achieve justice.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy in support of H.R. 2062.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2062—PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT—REP. SCOTT, D–VA, AND 112 COSPONSORS

The Administration supports House passage of the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA). The bipartisan legislation would restore legal protections for older Americans and hold employers accountable for age discrimination.

The bill amends the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, to replace the ''but-for'' test established in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. with the ''motivating factor'' test. The bill thereby aligns the burden of proof for age discrimination with similar standards for proving discrimination based on race and national origin. In addition, the bill allows individuals claiming discrimination to rely on any type or form of admissible evidence to prove an unlawful practice occurred.

Workplace discrimination prevents people from fully accessing the American dream and limits the contributions that they can make to our shared prosperity. Ending it is a priority for the Administration. The President supports this bipartisan legislation that protects workers from age discrimination.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Every worker—every worker—including older Americans should have the law on their side to protect them from workplace discrimination. The good news is that existing Federal statutes already prohibit workplace discrimination.

Despite what Democrats might have you believe, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of laws protecting Americans of all ages against discrimination in the workplace. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, CRA; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, ADEA; the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Rehab Act; and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, ADA, make employment discrimination based on an individual's race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability unlawful.

My Republican colleagues and I appreciate the stated purpose behind H.R. 2062. Age discrimination is wrong, but the bill before us today is fundamentally flawed and a classic example of a solution in search of a problem.

Age discrimination in the workplace is already illegal. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that over and over and over today. Age discrimination in the workplace is already illegal.

There is no evidence indicating this bill is necessary. The committee's cursory examination of the bill earlier this year failed to uncover any suggestion that workers have been discouraged from filing discrimination or retaliation charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEOC, the primary agency that enforces Federal laws that make it illegal to discriminate.

Over the last couple of decades, rates of age discrimination charges, a signed statement asserting employment discrimination, filed with the EEOC have remained steady. Additionally, the available data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show unemployment trends for older workers are heading in a positive direction.

In 2018, older Americans earned 7 percent more than the median for all workers, a large increase from 20 years ago. For workers age 65 and older, employment tripled from 1988 to 2018, while employment among younger workers grew by about one-third. Likewise, over the past 20 years, the number of older workers on full-time work schedules grew 2½ times faster than the number working part-time.

The legislation we are debating today is another sweeping one-size-fits-all scheme. This ill-advised bill rewards Democrats' favored political friends, disregards real-world workplace experience, and rejects decades of Supreme Court precedent.

Our Nation's uncertain economic times demand pro-growth and pro-worker policies, but House Democrats would rather consider misguided proposals such as H.R. 2062. The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act stifles job creation and harms small businesses and aging workers at a time when our languishing post-pandemic economy most needs their contributions.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation enriches trial lawyers, not plaintiffs. H.R. 2062 overturns Supreme Court precedent by allowing the plaintiffs to argue that age was only a motivating, not decisive, factor that led to an employer's unfavorable employment action. It allows these kinds of mixed-motive claims across four completely different nondiscrimination laws.

H.R. 2062 also allows mixed-motive claims where the plaintiff alleges the employer has taken action against a plaintiff because of a prior complaint of discrimination. Allowing mixed-motive claims in cases alleging retaliation puts employers in the impossible position of trying to prove that a legitimate employment decision was not in response to a prior complaint.

The only party that will be paid in nearly all mixed-motive cases is the plaintiff's attorneys. We know this will happen because, under the legislation, employers will be able to demonstrate that they would have taken the same action in the absence of the impermissible motivating factors.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, older Americans, the very people this legislation is purported to help, will in the vast majority of cases receive no monetary damages or other redress under H.R. 2062.

H.R. 2062 also increases frivolous legal claims against business owners. Job creators will spend valuable time and resources battling these undeserving claims, as the Supreme Court pointed out in the 2013 Nassar case. These same resources could be better used to prevent workplace harassment and discrimination.

When H.R. 2062 was considered by the Education and Labor Committee, Republicans offered amendments to address fundamental flaws in H.R. 2062.

We offered an amendment to strike the ill-advised and unworkable provisions allowing for mixed-motive retaliation claims.

We proposed collecting data and evidence to understand how age discrimination and retaliation charges and lawsuits have changed because of Supreme Court rulings.

We attempted to make sure the public understands that even successful plaintiffs under the bill will likely not receive any monetary damages while their lawyers will be paid.

We proposed a noncontroversial clarification to maintain protections for workers with disabilities.

And we tried to clarify the evidentiary standard for proving a claim under the bill.

□ 1500

Unfortunately, our commonsense amendments were defeated by Democrats along party lines.

Mr. Speaker, all workers should be protected from workplace discrimination, and they already are under current law.

H.R. 2062 is a distraction from the real problems plaguing our Nation, like the crisis at the border, over 9 million jobs begging for qualified workers, unaffordable college costs, and runaway economic inflation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2062, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the co-chair of the House Democratic Caucus Task Force on Aging.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my leader here who has done such a great job to protect workers.

We are here today to fix a terrible 2009 Supreme Court decision that weakened protections against age discrimination under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

A 2020 AARP survey found that three in five workers age 45—yes, age 45 and older—had seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace. So, there is absolutely evidence that this exists. It is real, and we need to do something to fix it.

Meanwhile, Americans are working more and longer than they ever have. Workers deserve strong workplace protections throughout their entire careers, full stop.

I am absolutely proudly and enthusiastically looking forward to voting ''yes'' on H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, to ensure that older workers can hold employers accountable for age discrimination.

When asking workers, ''Have you ever experienced any kind of discrimination based on age?'' and when the answer is three out of five say yes, beginning at age 45, I trust that this is true. This was in a survey that was done by the AARP, which has millions of members, that told us that. So, the current laws that were cited across the aisle are not doing the job that needs to be done right now to protect our older workers.

Let's pass this bill today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. FOXX for her leadership.

Every small business has its own unique characteristics and challenges, and that is a good thing. Having diversity of business structures and operations is what makes America productive and competitive. The Federal Government should move with caution when they pass legislation which puts every detail and decision of American businesses under overbearing rules and regulations.

There are already laws in effect which prevent employers from discriminating against older Americans. As it should be, age discrimination in the workplace is illegal.

I oppose H.R. 2062 because there has not been thoughtful deliberation with the real Americans involved. The proponents of this bill have not provided the Members of this body with data and evidence which shows that the regulatory changes in this bill are needed or even wanted.

The legislation before us today represents big wins for the Democrats' special interests—namely, trial lawyers, not working-class America.

Our land is the land of opportunity because everyone from all ages and walks of life has the chance to participate and prosper, and thankfully, they are protected by law against discrimination. Rather than successfully addressing real-world problems, this bill will only enrich Democrats' political allies.

I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding and for his leadership on this important legislation. I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

My home State of Oregon has one of the most rapidly aging populations in the country, and I have heard from many workers, particularly those in the technology industry, who believe they have been dismissed or denied employment because of their age. In fact, 6 in 10 older workers say they have experienced age discrimination, and 90 percent say that it is common.

My office has helped older workers who have filed age discrimination complaints before the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, but the burden of proof is very high and often results in uncertain outcomes.

Congress recognized the need to protect older workers from pervasive age discrimination when it enacted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. But decades later, in 2009, the Supreme Court, in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, imposed a much higher burden of proof for workers to prove age discrimination under the ADEA. Because of the Court's holding in Gross, workers now must prove that age discrimination was the decisive cause for their employer's adverse action rather than just a motivating factor in their employer's adverse action.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I joined Chairman SCOTT in reintroducing the bipartisan Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. This needed bill is a commonsense legislative fix that will simply restore the pre-2009 standard in age discrimination claims and, importantly, align the burden of proof with the same standards for proving discrimination in other areas, such as those based on sex, race, religion, and national origin.

As we discussed during the joint Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee and Workforce Protections Subcommittee hearing earlier this year, Americans are living longer and working longer. We must make sure they are protected from age discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations in support of the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

LEADERSHIP COUNCIL OF AGING ORGANIZATIONS,
May 13, 2021.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The Leadership Council of Aging Organizations (LCAO) is a coalition of 69 national nonprofit organizations concerned with the well-being of America's older population and committed to representing their interests in the policymaking arena. We are writing to urge you to vote for passage of the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA, H.R. 2062, S. 880). POWADA is bipartisan and bicameral legislation introduced in the House by Representatives Bobby Scott (D–VA) and Rodney Davis (R–IL). In the Senate, the bill is sponsored by Senators Bob Casey (D–PA), Chuck Grassley (R–IA), Patrick Leahy (D–VT) and Susan Collins (R–ME).

Age discrimination is pervasive and stubbornly entrenched. It often starts in the hiring process when employers circumvent anti-age discrimination laws by using such tactics as setting a maximum number of years of experience that a prospective employer will consider. Whether it starts at the hiring process or not, six in 10 older workers say they have experienced age discrimination and 90 percent of them say it is common. It is even more pervasive among older women and African American workers—nearly two thirds of women and three-fourths of African Americans say they have seen or experienced workplace discrimination. The COVID–19 pandemic has wreaked havoc on employment for everyone, with older workers taking a harder hit. Older workers experienced a 1.1 percent higher unemployment rate from April through September of 2020 than their mid-career counterparts (9.7 percent were unemployed versus 8.6 percent). The rates were worse for older workers who were black, female, or who did not have a college degree.

Courts have not taken age discrimination as seriously as other forms of discrimination and older workers have fewer protections as a result. Over ten years ago, the Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services Inc. (2009), set a higher standard of proof for age discrimination than previously applied, and much higher than for other forms of discrimination. Since Gross, court decisions have continued to chip away at protections. As a result plaintiffs now must prove that age was a determinative cause for their employers adverse treatment of them. Before the Gross cases it was enough for plaintiffs to prove that age was one of the motivating factors.

POWADA would restore the standard of proof in age discrimination cases to the pre-2009 level and treat age discrimination as unjust as other forms of employment discrimination. Moreover, because courts have applied Gross' higher burden of proof to retaliation charges and to disability discrimination, POWADA would also amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, Title VIT's provision on retaliation, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Please vote to restore fairness for older workers by passing the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (H.R. 2062, S. 880).

Sincerely,

AARP, AFL-CIO, Alliance for Retired Americans, AMDA—The Society for Post-Acute and Long-Term Care Medicine, American Postal Workers Union Retirees Department, American Society on Aging, Association for Gerontology and Human Development in Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Association of Jewish Aging Services, Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores, Caring Across Generations, Center for Eldercare Improvement, Altarum, The Gerontological Society of America, Justice in Aging, LeadingAge, Medicare Rights Center, National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, National Adult Day Services Association, National Alliance for Caregiving, National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Programs, National Association of Social Workers, National Caucus and Center on Black Aging, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, National Council on Aging, National Indian Council on Aging, National Senior Corps Association, Pension Rights Center, Social Security Works, Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand up for older workers and to support this bipartisan, bicameral bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the other side say that workers feel they have been discriminated against. Well, we all have feelings and perceptions that are not accurate. I think my colleague from Illinois pointed out that the data simply does not support the feelings of many people, and I think we understand that in day-to-day life.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle also contend that the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services has weakened age discrimination protections. They also contend this decision has deterred workers from seeking relief from age bias. But let's look at the data; let's not go on feelings.

In the 11 years preceding the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEOC, the primary agency that enforces Federal laws that make it illegal to discriminate, received an average of 18,548 charges of discrimination per year related to age discrimination. An EEOC charge is a signed statement asserting employment discrimination. Now, in the 11 years following Gross, the EEOC received an average of 19,783 charges per year relating to age discrimination, a slight increase from the previous 11 years.

So, it is obvious from EEOC data that there is clearly no evidence workers have been discouraged from filing age discrimination charges with the agency since the 2009 Supreme Court decision. And we had a Democrat administration during that time and 1 year of a Republican administration.

We also find that age discrimination charges as a percentage of all charges

filed with EEOC are approximately the same for the 11 years before and after the Gross decision, 22.4 percent and 22.5 percent, respectively. Again, this does not indicate workers are somehow discouraged from filing age discrimination charges.

Congress should make fact-based decisions, Mr. Speaker, and in this case, the facts do not support feelings or the assertions made by the proponents of H.R. 2062.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

Fifty-four years ago, Congress passed the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. This law prohibits workplace discrimination against Americans over the age of 40, yet too many older Americans still face discrimination in the workplace.

In 2018, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission acknowledged that ''age discrimination remains a significant and costly problem for workers, their families, and our economy.'' This is corroborated by a 2019 AARP survey which found that roughly 60 percent of older workers have witnessed or experienced age discrimination.

Making matters worse, a misguided Supreme Court ruling in 2009 set a precedent which now requires a plaintiff in an age discrimination suit to prove that his or her age was the only motivating factor in an employer's adverse actions. This is, quite frankly, unacceptable.

Older Americans bring unrivaled experience and wisdom to their jobs. It is up to us to restore the workplace protections to what Congress intended.

I would also like to note that age discrimination affects many workers with disabilities. This is an added challenge for the disability community, which faces several other barriers to competitive, integrated employment.

Even more disheartening is that some courts have applied the same misguided 2009 Supreme Court standard of claims to disability-based employment discrimination. In doing so, these lower courts are undermining the key promise of the Americans with Disabilities Act and throwing the congressional intent to the wind.

H.R. 2062 will correct that record. In fact, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act will restore vital employment protections to millions of older American workers and workers with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me today in supporting its final passage. It is the right thing to do.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, when considering any legislation, Congress first should determine whether the legislation is needed and, next, whether the bill under consideration will provide a workable, feasible, and effective response to the issue at hand.

Proponents of H.R. 2062 claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Gross, 2009, and Nassar, 2013, have harmed workers who faced age discrimination or unlawful retaliation. Publicly available data does not show that the Supreme Court decisions in Gross or Nassar have discouraged individuals from filing Equal Employment Opportunity Commission charges of discrimination, which is a signed statement asserting employment discrimination.

□ 1515

Unfortunately, the one subcommittee-level hearing earlier this year in the Committee on Education and Labor on H.R. 2062 also covered several other unrelated bills.

At the very least, this far-reaching legislation deserves more than a cursory examination.

Furthermore, a Democrat-invited witness who testified at the hearing in favor of H.R. 2062 acknowledged that ''it is difficult to quantify the impact that the Gross decision has had on the number of older workers who bring cases and the number of those who win them.''

The reality is that a review of EEOC data shows that the rate of EEOC age discrimination charges as a percentage of all charges filed is approximately the same for the 11 years before and after the Gross decision.

In fact, there has been an uptick in title VII retaliation charges as a percentage of all charges filed in the 7 years following the Nassar decision, which does not indicate individuals have been discouraged from filing these charges.

Court decisions show that plaintiffs have continued to win age discrimination and title VII retaliation cases in the wake of the Supreme Court's decisions in Gross and Nassar.

Like other Democrat-sponsored legislation in the 117th Congress, H.R. 2062 has been rushed through the committee without necessary examination, discussion, or consideration.

We should go back to the drawing board on this bill, because H.R. 2062 begs for reliable data and evidence, thoughtful deliberation, and genuine consideration.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman SCOTT for the time that he has put in on this incredible piece of legislation, and thank Representative DAVIS for the work done to put together this important work.

As my colleagues today have said, this is a bipartisan, commonsense bill. It is exactly the type of work and things that Congress should be doing. This is our system at work.

The facts are very simple: Right now, because of a court decision, the standards for age discrimination are higher than that of any other type of discrimination. This bill fixes that and returns the country to what it was intended to be; that all forms of discrimination are illegal and must be stopped; that no form of discrimination is less wrong than another form of discrimination.

This is the right thing to do and this is the right time to do it. That higher standard has made it harder to prove cases and leaves older workers exposed to discrimination.

Age discrimination is wrong, plain and simple. It is also costly. According to a study by AARP, we lose out on $850 million of GDP each year because of it.

The cost is not just in abstract dollars. It comes from Americans who were skipped over for promotions they deserved. It comes from constituents who want to switch jobs but don't get a call back. It comes from your neighbor who lost their job and can still work but can't get anyone to even look at their resume.

The standard for proving age discrimination must be fair, it must be level, and it must be treated as other forms of discrimination.

Americans of all ages deserve the chance to work and to provide for their families, and the law should recognize their ability to work.

There is no place for ageism in the workforce, and this must stop.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights dated June 22, 2021, asking for a yes vote on the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, H.R. 2062.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2021.

VOTE YES ON THE PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT (POWADA), H.R. 2062

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 220 national organizations to promote and protect the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, we urge you to vote yes on H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA), without amendments that would limit the bill's scope or undermine its protections. POWADA is a priority of The Leadership Conference, and we will include your vote in our voting record for the 117th Congress.

Despite longstanding federal prohibitions against workplace discrimination based on age, pervasive age discrimination in the United States continues to harm older workers—denying working people dignity on the job and threatening their economic security. In 2020, 78 percent of older workers reported

having seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace, with Hispanic workers perceiving slightly more age discrimination at 82 percent. These numbers reflect an increase in age discrimination during the COVID–19 pandemic for all workers, across race and gender. Previous research on age discrimination before the pandemic reflects that women workers and workers of color, especially Black workers, have been more likely to experience age discrimination, and unemployment rates suggest that workers of color may continue to be more vulnerable. For example, although the unemployment rate in May 2021 for White workers ages 45–59 was 4.2 percent, for Black workers, the rate was 10.6 percent.

The ability to enjoy employment opportunities, free from unlawful discrimination, is key to promoting economic security for marginalized and multi-marginalized communities. Systemic racism and decades of structural inequality in almost every area of life, including education, health care, housing, and employment, have resulted in economic disparties that have severely threatened the lives and well-being of far too many people in the United States. Women, for example, are nearly two-thirds of all individuals aged 65 and over living in poverty, with women of color struggling at increased rates. LGBTQ older adults are also at increased risk of poverty compared to non-LGBTQ older adults, and people with disabilities are twice as likely to live in poverty than people without disabilities. Congress must ensure that our federal laws are able to protect all persons in the United States from unlawful discrimination. A key step toward that goal is to ensure that unlawful discrimination plays no role in employment practices,

POWADA is critically needed legislation that would restore fairness by reinstating well-established legal protections against workplace discrimination that were undermined by the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc, which imposed a higher burden of proof on working people in age discrimination cases. After Gross, working people must prove not only that age discrimination influenced an employer's conduct but that age played a decisive role in the employer's conduct. The burden of proof for age discrimination is now higher than the standard of proof for allegations of discrimination based on sex, race, religion, or national origin, sending the signal that some amount of age discrimination in the workplace is acceptable. Just as troubling, though, is that the Gross decision paved the way for the same unreasonably difficult burden of proof in cases in which an employer retaliates against workers who challenge workplace discrimination based on race, sex, or other grounds. POWADA is necessary to return the law to what it was before the Gross decision.

Simply put, no amount of unlawful discrimination in the workplace is acceptable. We therefore urge you to vote yes on H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Gaylynn Burroughs, senior policy counsel.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
Interim President & CEO.

JESSELYN MCCURDY,
Managing Director and Interim Executive Vice President for Government Affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, Democrats claim H.R. 2062 merely conforms age discrimination and retaliation claims with current law regarding mixed-motive discrimination claims under title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

However, Congress specifically drafted the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA, to be different from title VII, because age is uniquely different from the characteristics on which title VII prohibits discrimination, namely, race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

The ADEA states that it is lawful for an employer to take an employment action otherwise prohibited by the statute if the differential treatment is ''based on reasonable factors other than age.''

Notably, this provision is not found in title VII.

The Supreme Court has also explained in several cases why age discrimination differs from other forms of discrimination.

For example, the Supreme Court, in Meacham v. Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, in 2008, wrote that, ''Congress took account of the distinctive nature of age discrimination and the need to preserve a fair degree of leeway for employment decisions with effects that correlate with age.''

In addition, the Supreme Court, in the 2013 Nassar case, explained why a mixed-motive standard is ill-suited for retaliation claims.

The Supreme Court observed that with regard to mixed-motive standards in retaliation cases, ''lessening the causation standard could contribute to the filing of frivolous claims, which would siphon resources from efforts by employers, administrative agencies, and courts to combat workplace harassment.''

Allowing mixed-motive claims in age and retaliation cases, which H.R. 2062 does, will lead to more frivolous legislation.

We should heed congressional and Supreme Court precedents and vote down H.R. 2062.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the AARP, which says, in part, ''Older workers are valuable assets to their employers and the economy. Despite that, 78 percent of older workers reported having seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace in 2020, up markedly from 61 percent in 2018. More than half of older workers are forced out of a job before they intend to retire. Nine out of 10 of those who do find work never again match their prior earnings. Making matters worse, the COVID–19 pandemic has significantly diminished job prospects and future retirement security of older workers. In April, over half of job seekers ages 55 and older continued to be long-term unemployed, 53.3 percent, compared to 42.3 percent of job seekers ages 16 to 54. The labor force participation rates for older women workers, along with their earning power and future retirement security, have been particularly hard-hit by COVID.'' All of that is in the letter.

AARP,
June 14, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, AARP urges you to vote in support of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA), important bipartisan legislation sponsored by Chairman SCOTT and Rep. RODNEY DAVIS (R–IL) to restore protections against age discrimination.

Older workers are valuable assets to their employers and the economy. Despite that, 78 percent of older workers reported having seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace in 2020, up markedly from 61 percent in 2018. More than half of older workers are forced out of a job before they intend to retire. Nine out of 10 of those who do find work never again match their prior earnings. Making matters worse, the COVID–19 pandemic has significantly diminished the job prospects and future retirement security of older workers. In April, over half of job seekers ages 55 and older continued to be long-term unemployed (53.3 percent) compared with 42.3 percent of job seekers ages 16 to 54. The labor force participation rates for older women workers, along with their earning power and future retirement security, have been particularly hard-hit by COVID.

POWADA is a bipartisan, commonsense bill that would restore fairness for older workers. The bill reinstates well-established legal standards on workplace discrimination that were undermined by the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. and subsequent discrimination cases. POWADA would help level the playing field for older workers and restore their legal rights. Older Americans have waited for over a decade for this legislation to be enacted.

AARP strongly supports POWADA and urges you to enact it as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, or have your staff contact Michele Varnhagen on our Government Affairs staff.

Sincerely,

BILL SWEENEY,
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT,
Government Affairs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat: Republicans hate discrimination in any form. We particularly do not want any kind of discrimination in the workplace, and we do not want discrimination against older workers.

We know that older workers were excelling in the pre-pandemic economy. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS, employment for workers age 65 and older tripled from 1988 to 2018, while employment for younger workers grew by only a third.

The number of employed people age 75 and older nearly quadrupled from 461,000 in 1988 to 1.8 million in 2018.

As the country continues to recover from the COVID–19 pandemic, BLS recently reported that job openings reached a record high of 9.3 million in April 2021, while hiring lags far behind.

Employers are desperate to fill good-paying jobs, but qualified workers are hard to find because of Democrat-enacted policies.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to paint a bleak picture of job opportunities for older Americans, when, in fact, employment trends for older workers have been positive in recent decades and will continue to improve as the country fully reopens following the pandemic.

According to BLS, in 1998, the median weekly earnings of older, full-time employees was 77 percent of the median for workers 16 and up. In 2018, older workers earned 7 percent more than the median for all workers.

The labor force participation rate for older Americans has been rising steadily since the late 1990s. Participation rates for younger age groups either declined or flattened over this period.

Over the past 20 years, the number of older workers on full-time work schedules grew 2½ times faster than the number working part time.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support your bill to protect older Americans against discrimination.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, but age discrimination and ageism are still very common in many American workplaces.

During the worst of this pandemic, older workers and women experienced many of the demotions and layoffs that we have heard about so much.

Protections against age discrimination are more important than ever as we seek to ensure that employers do not use someone's age as a motivating factor to deny them a promotion, to demote them, or to even fire them.

When age discrimination occurs, many people do not report it. But when they do, under current law, it is incredibly difficult to prove that age was the motivating factor.

Therefore, Congress must ensure that we do not place burdensome requirements of proof of age discrimination on those who actually bring age discrimination claims to the forefront.

That is why this bill is so very, very important, and I thank the chairman for his tireless efforts on this cause.

While this is an excellent bill, there is one provision I wish we had included that currently is not. In the fight against age discrimination, we need to clearly protect folks at the very first opportunity, the hiring process.

That is why I introduced a bill last week, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act. It simply clarifies that the provisions under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act also apply to job applicants. Most people already assume this is the case. However, it is not.

After two recent Federal court cases about age discrimination, there has been confusion about the applicability of protections to applicants or employees only.

My bill seeks to provide clarity and ultimately protect older Americans from the very beginning, at the application.

I know that this is a priority for the chairman also, and I will continue to work with him to make sure that we continue the conversation on this shared priority, because nobody should be denied a job opportunity solely because of their age.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1530

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a statement of support for this bill from AARP.

AARP,
June 14, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our nearly 38 million members and all older Americans nationwide, AARP urges you to vote in support of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act (POWADA), important bipartisan legislation sponsored by Chairman SCOTT and Rep. RODNEY DAVIS (R–IL) to restore protections against age discrimination.

Older workers are valuable assets to their employers and the economy. Despite that, 78 percent of older workers reported having seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace in 2020, up markedly from 61 percent in 2018. More than half of older workers are forced out of a job before they intend to retire. Nine out of 10 of those who do find work never again match their prior earnings. Making matters worse, the COVID–19 pandemic has significantly diminished the job prospects and future retirement security of older workers. In April, over half of job seekers ages 55 and older continued to be long-term unemployed (53.3 percent) compared with 42.3 percent of job seekers ages 16 to 54. The labor force participation rates for older women workers, along with their earning power and future retirement security, have been particularly hard-hit by COVID.

POWADA is a bipartisan, commonsense bill that would restore fairness for older workers. The bill reinstates well-established legal standards on workplace discrimination that were undermined by the 2009 Supreme Court decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc. and subsequent discrimination cases. POWADA would help level the playing field for older workers and restore their legal rights. Older Americans have waited for over a decade for this legislation to be enacted.

AARP strongly supports POWADA and urges you to enact it as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, or have your staff contact Michele Varnhagen on our Government Affairs staff.

Sincerely,

BILL SWEENEY,
Senior Vice President,
Government Affairs.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work on this bill.

Although House Democrats continue to work for an end to the pandemic, COVID–19 has changed the American workforce. People from all walks of life have suffered. Older Americans in the workforce continue to feel the fallout from the coronavirus.

The perception that older workers are not as valuable as their younger counterparts persists. The myth that older workers are unproductive and costly persists. The idea that older Americans do not value their careers, their job, or their work persists. Because of these challenges, older workers are more likely to remain out of the workforce when they lose a job.

Age discrimination is a real threat to our workforce, but it doesn't have to be that way. That is why the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is so very important. Older workers need specific protections under the law.

As we look ahead to a stronger economy and upcoming legislation, I urge Members to remember the importance of older workers to our economy, to our workforce, and to our families.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the group Paralyzed Veterans of America.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2021.

Hon. ROBERT SCOTT,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) is pleased to support reintroduction of the Protecting Older Workers against Discrimination Act (POWADA). PVA is the nation's only Congressionally-chartered veterans service organization solely dedicated to representing veterans with spinal cord injuries and/or disorders. POWADA is important to our members as people with disabilities because it will restore well-established legal standards on workplace discrimination that were undermined by a 2009 Supreme Court decision.

In 2009, in the case of Gross v. FBL Financial Services, the U.S. Supreme Court decided to impose a much higher burden of proof on workers who allege age discrimination than on those who allege discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, or religion. By changing the legal standards in age discrimination cases—from having to prove that age played a role in the worker's treatment to having to show that age played the decisive role in the worker's treatment—the Court set aside decades of legal precedent and signaled to employers that some amount of age discrimination is permissible. Moreover, the decision made it exponentially more difficult for workers who have experienced age discrimination to seek redress in court and prove their case.

Many courts began applying the Gross decision to weaken other civil rights laws, including disability discrimination cases. In 2019, in the case of Natofsky v. City of N.Y., the Second Circuit joined the Fourth, Sixth, and Seventh Circuits in ruling that disability discrimination under the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 must be established under the higher, ''butfor'' standard. Federal courts have consistently, but in our view erroneously, applied Gross to claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), ADA retaliation, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Some courts have questioned the applicability of Gross to disability

claims without deciding the issue, but no court has declined to apply Gross to the ADA/Rehabilitation Act. Some courts have even begun to apply Gross to disability discrimination in public accommodations.

The unemployment rate for workers with disabilities is almost double the rate for workers without disabilities. For all the workers affected by the Gross decision, POWADA is a jobs bill.

By clarifying that discrimination may play no role in employment decisions under the ADA and certain other laws, this legislation would simply restore the law prior to the Gross decision.

PVA appreciates your continued pursuit of this important legislation and urges Congress to act swiftly on its passage.

Sincerely,

HEATHER ANSLEY, MSW, ESQ.,
Associate Executive Director.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, older Americans make vital contributions in the workplace. Committee Republicans are committed to eliminating discrimination in the workplace, rebuilding our sluggish economy, and producing a competitive workforce.

Unfortunately, H.R. 2062 is a destructive and misleading bill that does not protect older workers, and it rewards trial lawyers at the expense of sound public policy. It is Democrats promising deliverance, but delivering disappointment.

This sweeping one-size-fits-all ruse is not the answer, unless Congress decides it wants to benefit trial lawyers at the expense of older American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2062, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is a bipartisan bill that has been introduced over many Congresses with growing support. Over the last decade, Members have debated this bill through multiple legislative hearings, and bills in both the House and the Senate have been introduced and improved every Congress since 2009.

Despite the bipartisan legacy of this proposal, some of my colleagues have raised disappointing opposition today. But let's be clear. This bill is not about increasing the number of age discrimination claims. It is about giving victims of discrimination a fair shot at getting relief. It is simply restoring basic protections for older workers.

Yes, discrimination against older workers is already illegal, but, regrettably, it is unnecessarily harder to prove because of the 2009 decision. In spite of the fact that it is more difficult, cases are still being brought. But if the cases were as easy to bring or the same difficulty to bring as other cases, even more cases would have been filed.

We know this is more difficult because in the original case of Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Jack Gross successfully proved that his employer had demoted older workers who refused to accept a buyout, while giving their jobs to younger workers. Yet it was only after the Supreme Court changed the rules and required Mr. Gross to retry his case that he lost with the higher standard, because, despite having the same facts, the same parties, and the same court, he lost his case.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is designed to ensure that older workers like Mr. Gross are not denied justice and fair treatment that they deserve.

We have heard about attorneys' fees. We need to just remind everybody that lawyers are only awarded attorneys' fees when they win the case. So if you want to reduce attorneys' fees, the businesses can stop discriminating.

I hope we can all agree that it is time to stand up for older workers and treat all workers facing discrimination, whether it is on the basis of sex, race, religion, national origin, or age, with consistency and fairness.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) again for working with me on this bipartisan priority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this measure.

I'm so pleased to see bipartisan support for this bill. Providing older workers with the legal tools they need to challenge unjust discrimination in the workplace should not be a partisan issue.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, our workforce is working longer than they have before. Those who are still working at or above the retirement age may be forced to do so because they have no other choice.

This vulnerable part of the American workforce deserves to have the same promotions and prospects as any other age group in a truly fair labor force. Unfortunately, age-based discrimination in the workplace can make it difficult for older individuals.

And since a 2009 Supreme Court ruling, employees who felt that they were wrongly discriminated against based on age have had to meet a much more burdensome standard to get relief in court under federal law.

That ruling went against decades of legal precedent and weakened protections for our working class, burdening victims and shielding those employers who in engage in discriminatory actions from accountability.

That is why it is so important that we pass H.R. 2062, and help older workers who have suffered discrimination.

Those facing discrimination should not have to jump through more hoops to ensure that their rights are protected. As noted by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, ''The ability to enjoy employment opportunities, free from unlawful discrimination, is key to promoting economic security for marginalized and multi-marginalized communities.''

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill to protect our American workers and hold companies accountable for discriminatory practices.

I thank the Chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the Democratic Task Force on Aging and Families, and as cosponsor, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan H.R. 2062, the ''Protecting Older Americans Against Discrimination Act of 2021,'' which restores the burden of proof standard for workers alleging age discrimination back to the pre-2009 standard—returning the burden back to the same standard used for alleged discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, and religion.

This important bill is supported by numerous key organizations, including AARP, Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, National Council on Aging, Justice in Aging, AAUW, Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD), American Association of People with Disabilities (AAPD), Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund (DREDF), National Disability Institute, Easter Seals, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Women's Law Center, National Education Association, AFSCME, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, and Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Mr. Speaker, prior to 2009, older workers alleging age discrimination in the workplace faced the same burden of proof as those who allege discrimination based on race, sex, national origin, or religion.

This burden of proof is called the ''mixed-motive'' standard, where the complaining party need only prove that age (or whatever type of discrimination is being alleged) was one of the motivating factors behind the employer's adverse action.

This situation changed dramatically in 2009, when in a 5–4 decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services Inc., 557 U.S. 157 (2009), the Supreme Court erected a new and substantial legal barrier in the path of older workers—imposing a much higher burden of proof on workers alleging age discrimination.

This higher burden of proof requires the older worker alleging age discrimination to prove that age was the decisive and determinative cause for the employer's adverse action rather than just a motivating factor in the employer's action.

Mr. Speaker, this Supreme Court decision sent a terrible message to employers and the courts that some types of discrimination are not as wrong, or as unlawful, as other forms of discimination.

H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Americans Against Discrimination Act of 2021, simply returns the burden of proof for workers alleging age discrimination back to where it was before the odious decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services.

In addition, since the Gross decision in 2009, some courts have extended the Gross's unreasonably difficult burden of proof to two other types of worker discrimination complaints: retaliation cases, in which an employer retaliates against a worker who challenges workplace discrimination; and disability discrimination cases.

As a result, in returning to the pre-Gross burden of proof standard, H.R. 2062 ensures that all victims of workplace discrimination face the same burden of proof—the ''mixed motive'' burden of proof that has historically

been used in worker discrimination cases—by amending not only the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), but also the anti-discrimination provision of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that age discrimination continues to be a significant problem in the workplace.

Enforcement statistics from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) show complaints of age discrimination to be climbing.

In 2000, the EEOC received roughly 16,000 charges of age discrimination; in 2017, the EEOC received over 20,000 complaints—accounting for 23 percent of all discrimination charges filed.

A 2013 AARP study found that more than 6 in 10 workers ages 45 to 74 said they have seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace .

In this 2013 AARP study, nearly 20 percent of respondents said they were not hired for a job because of their age and nearly 10 percent said they were laid off or fired due to their age.

Age discrimination is a key reason it takes unemployed older workers nearly a full year, on average, to find another job.

And when they do land a new job, it is often for less money, which can have a crushing impact on older workers' long-term financial security and ability to live independently as they age.

Older workers are a valuable asset to their employers and the economy, yet more than half of older workers are forced out of a job before they intend to retire, and even if they find work again, 9 in 10 never match their prior earnings.

This is wrong; it is unfair and that is why I strongly support H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Americans Against Discrimination Act of 2021, and urge all Members to join me in voting for its passage by a resounding and overwhelming margin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–71 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 486, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117–71, 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 respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 486, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1 and 3, printed in part B of House Report 117–71, offered by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. REPORTS.

The Chairman of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report at 1-year intervals on the number of age discrimination in employment claims brought under this Act with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the period for which such report is submitted.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. REPORT.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Employment Commission shall submit to the Congress, and make available to the public, a report that contains analysis of any disparities that covered individuals, as defined in subsection (b), face in pursuing relief from discrimination in employment under the mixed motive evidentiary standard.

(b) COVERED INDIVIDUALS DEFINED.—The term ''covered individuals'' means individuals who face discrimination in employment based on characteristics protected under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 combined with one or more intersectional characteristics protected under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, or the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments in this en bloc amendment.

Mr. BROWN has offered an amendment to require the EEOC to submit an annual report to Congress on the number of age discrimination claims brought under this act.

Ms. WILLIAMS has offered an amendment to require the EEOC to submit a report to Congress on any remaining disparities faced by workers pursuing relief under the mixed motive standard whose cases were covered by the ADEA, as well as other antidiscrimination laws.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Democrat amendments.

As I understand it, Representative BROWN's amendment requires the EEOC chair to submit five annual reports to Congress on the number of age discrimination claims brought to the EEOC under this act. If H.R. 2062 somehow gets signed into law, these reports will be a day late and many dollars short because the law will have already harmfully reduced the burden of proof in these cases and nullified decades of Supreme Court precedent.

Before discussing my concerns with this amendment, I admit I am puzzled that it requires a study on how this legislation will affect future age discrimination claims when evidence is sorely lacking that there is a need for H.R. 2062 in the first place.

A witness who testified on H.R. 2062 before the Committee on Education and Labor acknowledged that EEOC data has not shown workers are discouraged from filing age discrimination charges with the EEOC following the Supreme Court's 2009 decision in Gross v. FBL Financial Services.

With respect to this amendment, I have concerns about the feasibility and viability of the mandated reports. The amendment requires the EEOC to report each year for 5 years on charges filed with the agency under H.R. 2062.

H.R. 2062 drastically expands liability by allowing mixed motive claims in cases involving the Age Discrimination in Employment Act—ADEA—and three other statutes. However, when workers file charges with the EEOC, the worker will likely not indicate whether the charge involves mixed motives, nor is EEOC likely to be able to classify charges as being mixed motive or not. EEOC will therefore be unable to determine whether charges have been filed pursuant to H.R. 2062.

I am very doubtful EEOC would be able to comply with this amendment's requirements, and Congress should not include an unworkable mandate on an agency. Congress has enacted significant laws prohibiting employment discrimination, including the ADEA, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act, and the Civil Rights Act, CRA.

Congress purposefully enacted separate nondiscrimination statutes, including the ADEA, because age discrimination involves unique and complex factors, as do the other forms of discrimination addressed in these statutes.

H.R. 2062 overturns Supreme Court precedent, allows a plaintiff to argue that age was only a motivating but not decisive factor that led to an employer's unfavorable employment action. Allowing such mixed motive claims will eliminate the carefully balanced standard Congress adopted when it passed the ADEA, resulting in more frivolous lawsuits.

Here's why: Under H.R. 2062, a plaintiff is very unlikely to receive any

monetary award from the defendant because most employers will be able to demonstrate they would have taken the same employment action regardless of the worker's age or other impermissible reasons.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS).

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act and my amendment to the bill.

For older job seekers and workers, age discrimination remains a barrier to both getting employed and staying employed. According to an AARP survey released in 2019, three in five older workers report that they have seen or experienced age discrimination on the job.

Age discrimination should have no place in decisions about an employee. It doesn't matter if age is one factor or the only factor in these decisions. Discrimination is still wrong.

Under current law, an older worker must prove that a negative action was taken against them solely because of their age to pursue legal remedy for age discrimination. That leaves out a lot of workers who have been marginalized because of their age.

The bill before us would create a reasonable burden of proof under the law to allow more workers who have faced age discrimination to pursue relief.

Enacting this legislation would be a monumental step, but we have more to do to ensure that all older workers are served well by protections under law because the circumstances facing older workers are not all the same.

Many older workers face intersectional discrimination based not only on their age, but also due to factors like their race, their gender, or disability status. For example, in a 2017 experimental study published by the Federal Reserve Bank, researchers found that older women encounter more age discrimination in the hiring process and callback process than men.

To ensure equitable protection for individuals experiencing intersectional discrimination, we have to understand any disparities they may face in pursuing relief from discrimination as this legislation is implemented.

My amendment tasks the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with completing a study on these disparities and reporting back to Congress within 2 years. This analysis will be crucial to ensuring our laws are serving all of us and that we are truly reaching the ideal of equality for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the underlying legislation.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, Representative WILLIAMS' amendment requires EEOC to submit a contrived and convoluted report to Congress analyzing disparities that individuals face in pursuing relief under the mixed-motive evidentiary standard. The report must examine age discrimination combined with discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or disability.

This amendment does nothing to address the fatal flaws in the bill that would allow mixed-motive claims in age retaliation and disability cases, which will increase frivolous litigation while not providing any monetary damages for nearly all plaintiffs.

As a practical matter, I question whether EEOC will be able to complete the tortuous analysis proposed in the amendment.

As I noted previously, workers filing discrimination or retaliation charges with EEOC do not indicate whether they involve a mixed-motive claim, and EEOC does not collect this data. A mixed-motive claim is something a plaintiff's attorney adds to a lawsuit.

As such, I am skeptical whether EEOC will be able to find any data relating to mixed-motive claims.

More importantly, the amendment, which was submitted and then amended after the Rules Committee's stated deadline, will not fix the bill's many shortcomings, such as allowing mixed-motive claims in age discrimination and retaliation cases, even though congressional and Supreme Court precedents strongly advise against these changes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendments en bloc, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first recognize the hard work and the leadership of Chairman BOBBY SCOTT and the entire Education and Labor Committee on this outstanding underlying bill.

When older workers lose their jobs, they are much more likely to join the ranks of the long-term unemployed. Unfortunately, discrimination seems to be a significant factor in this.

Enforcement statistics from the EEOC show age discrimination complaints are climbing. In 2000, the EEOC received roughly 16,000 complaints of age discrimination, and 17 years later, the EEOC received 20,000 complaints that year, accounting for 23 percent of all discrimination charges filed.

As Ms. WILLIAMS mentioned, a 2018 survey conducted by the AARP found that three in five workers age 45 and older have seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act would restore legal protections for older Americans and hold employers accountable for age discrimination.

My amendment would require the EEOC to submit annual reports to Congress on the number of age discrimination claims brought under this act. Congress needs this information in a timely and transparent way to ensure our older workers are being properly protected and heard.

Discrimination is discrimination, whether it be age, race, gender, religion, gender identity, or sexual orientation, and all should be treated fairly under the law.

My amendment and the underlying bill are commonsense pieces of legislation that would restore fairness for all workers. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendments en bloc and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that these two amendments would improve the bill.

The one from Mr. BROWN would give information that is already being provided now, but this would just make sure it continues. It is being provided on a voluntary basis, these annual reports.

And Ms. WILLIAMS offers a very interesting analysis that some people may be being discriminated against on multiple grounds and pointed out the Federal Reserve study that showed that older workers who happen to be women fared a lot worse than the older workers who happen to be men. We may need to figure out how we deal with that, but we need the data before we can move forward.

I hope that we adopt this amendment, and, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the only parties who will win in nearly all cases under H.R. 2062 with these amendments, if they are passed, are trial lawyers. Unfortunately, Democrats have chosen to further their pro-trial lawyer agenda by putting forward H.R. 2062, legislation that masquerades as protection for workers.

H.R. 2062 is yet another one-size-fits-all approach that fails to address the purported problem, neglects real-world experiences, and disregards decades of Supreme Court precedent.

These poorly drafted fig leaf amendments in the en bloc do nothing to address the fundamental flaws in H.R. 2062 and place an unworkable mandate on EEOC. I urge my colleagues to oppose them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 question are postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 486, I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 2 and 5, printed in part B of House Report 117–71, offered by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN OF GEORGIA

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) GAO STUDY.—Subject to subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until the date the Government Accountability Office reports to the Congress the results of a study such Office carries out to determine whether—

(1) the Supreme Court's decisions in *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, 557 U.S. 167 (2009), and *Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar*, 570 U.S. 338 (2013), have discouraged individuals from filing age discrimination charges and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 retaliation charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission,

(2) such decisions have discouraged individuals from filing age discrimination cases and title VII retaliation cases, and

(3) the success rates of age discrimination cases and title VII retaliation cases brought has decreased.

(b) LIMITATION.—If the results of the study carried out under subsection (a) show that individuals have not been discouraged as described in such subsection and that the success rate of cases described in such subsection has not decreased, then this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 1, beginning on line 14, strike ''or an activity protected by subsection (d)''.

Page 2, beginning on line 2, strike '', including under paragraph (1) or by any other method of proof'' and inserting ''with respect to subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f) of section 623''.

Page 4, line 2, insert ''discriminatory'' after ''involving''.

Page 4, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 24 (and make such technical and conforming changes as may be appropriate).

Page 5, beginning on line 17, strike ''or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503''.

Page 6, beginning on line 5, strike ''or an activity protected by subsection (a) or (b) of section 503''.

Page 6, strike lines 8 through 18 (and make such technical and conforming changes as may be appropriate).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, when considering any legislation, the House should first determine whether legislation is needed and, next, whether the bill under consideration will adequately address or improve the situation.

Before H.R. 2062 was brought to the House floor, the Committee on Education and Labor did not have a standalone hearing on the bill and instead held a subcommittee-level hearing on multiple, wide-ranging topics.

This complex and sweeping legislation deserves further examination by the committee so Members can gather more information from a variety of experts to make an informed decision regarding its practicality.

Supporters of H.R. 2062 claim the Supreme Court's 2009 decision in the Gross case and 2013 decision in the Nassar case have harmed workers who faced age discrimination or unlawful retaliation for claiming discrimination. Publicly available data does not show that the Supreme Court decisions in the Gross or Nassar cases have discouraged individuals from filing EEOC charges.

A Democrat-invited witness who testified acknowledged that ''it is difficult to quantify the impact that the Gross decision has had on the number of older workers who bring cases and the number of those who win them.''

This witness also acknowledged that ''when we might have expected a drop in charges due to Gross-inspired discouragement from employment attorneys, there was a sizeable jump in the number of ADEA charges filed with the EEOC.''

In addition, a review of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or EEOC, data shows that, as a percentage of all charges filed, the rate of EEOC age discrimination charges is approximately the same as 11 years before the Gross decision, with a slightly higher percentage of age discrimination charges filed after the Gross decision.

As a percentage of all charges filed in the 7 years following the Nassar decision, there has also been an increase in title VII retaliation charges, which shows that individuals have not been discouraged from filing these charges.

Further, a review of court decisions shows that plaintiffs have continued to win age discrimination and title VII retaliation cases in the wake of the Supreme Court's decisions of Gross and Nassar.

Bottom line, we must ensure that before we continue to legislate on an issue that may not need additional Washington interference, we have accurate data.

My amendment simply states that before H.R. 2062 goes into effect, the Government Accountability Office must conduct a study and report to Congress on whether individuals have been discouraged from filing age discrimination or title VII retaliation charges and from filing lawsuits following the decisions in Gross and Nassar and whether there have been fewer plaintiffs winning age discrimination and title VII retaliation lawsuits.

If the GAO finds that individuals have not been discouraged from filing charges and lawsuits, and have, in fact, won more lawsuits than prior to the Supreme Court decisions, then the bill would not go into effect.

Let's not put the cart before the horse. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment to ensure this legislation is actually needed and adequately addresses the purported concerns of the bill's sponsors.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to my Republican colleague's amendment mandating a study before the bill can go into effect.

This is not an earnest attempt to look into the Supreme Court's impact on age discrimination cases. It is a delay tactic and nothing more.

We know that age discrimination happens. In fact, not long ago, we heard compelling witness testimony in the Education and Labor Committee highlighting the need for this very legislation.

Ageism is one of the most common and, sadly, most accepted forms of discrimination in the workplace. Last year, the EEOC received over 14,000 age discrimination complaints, accounting for over 20 percent of all discrimination charges filed in this country.

This is a problem that impacts not just workers but our entire economy, and it particularly harms women and people of color. According to the AARP, nearly two-thirds of women and more than three-quarters of Black workers age 45 and over say they have seen or experienced age discrimination in the workplace.

We don't need a study to tell us that a substantially higher burden of proof for some forms of discrimination makes it more difficult for workers who can prove discrimination to get their day in court and to prevail. That is just common sense.

What we need is a return to a mixed-motive standard, which says that any consideration of age, as opposed to ability to perform a job, is impermissible in employment decisions.

We can look at two cases that were proceeding under a mixed-motive standard but were dismissed following the Supreme Court's precedents. Courts dismissed both of these cases on the grounds that the facts, which were sufficient under a mixed-motive standard, were no longer sufficient under the heightened but-for standard.

First, there is the case of Jack Gross, an older gentleman who had been demoted after refusing a buyout when his employer underwent a merger. As he and many older workers were demoted,

his younger colleagues received promotions.

Mr. Gross challenged his demotion under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and won his case at trial under the motivating factor framework. However, after the Supreme Court changed the rules and required him to retry his case under the new and more stringent but-for causation standard, he lost despite the fact that he had proved the same set of facts with the same parties in the same courts as before.

□ 1600

Second, consider the impact of the Nassar case on anti-retaliation claims under the Civil Rights Act. In the case of Shumate v. Selma City Board of Education, an elementary school cafeteria worker alleged that she had been passed over for promotion due to having filed earlier discrimination claims, and that those claims had been discussed by the interview panel.

The district court denied the employer's motion for summary judgment on her retaliation claim. However, the Nassar decision was issued a few months later and the employer moved for reconsideration under the new causation standard. This time, the district court dismissed the worker's retaliation claim and granted summary judgment to the employer, stating that, ''the Supreme Court has changed the rules since then.''

Same facts. Same case. Different causation standard, and a win was turned into a loss.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act reinstates the legal standard for proving age discrimination and aligns it with the existing standard for proving discrimination based on sex, race, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, there is simply no excuse for discrimination of any kind in the workplace, and there is no reason to delay this legislation any further. We have already had a 12-year delay in restoring justice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the Allen amendment and support the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6½ minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, again, I simply state this: My amendment says that the Government Accountability Office must conduct a study and report to Congress on whether individuals have been discouraged from filing age discrimination or title VII retaliation charges and from filing lawsuits following the decisions in Gross and Nassar, and whether there have been fewer plaintiffs winning age discrimination and title VII retaliation lawsuits.

We must have the data before we move in this body. We do not have sufficient information at this point. Again, no one wants discrimination in the workplace, but we have a justice system that provides for relief for people who bring these cases. And I have just cited the cases presented here today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote for this amendment so that we can get the proper data.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, (Ms. MANNING), a distinguished member on the Committee of Education and Labor.

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Foxx amendment.

The amendment proposed by my colleague from North Carolina would weaken the essential civil rights protections that are the very purpose of the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

The goal of the bill we are voting on today is to treat workers who are discriminated against based on age, the very same way we treat workers who are discriminated against because of their race, gender, national origin, or religion.

In our world of rising costs, shrinking pensions and retirement savings, and longer life spans, many workers must work longer in order to be able to live out their retirement years in dignity. That, in addition to the reasons of basic fairness, is why the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act is so important.

This bill would apply the same burden of proof to age discrimination claims that are currently applied to other forms of employment discrimination and retaliation prohibited by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes.

The Foxx amendment would weaken these protections by creating two different burdens of proof; one, for proving an act of discrimination, and a tougher burden of proving retaliation against a worker who has reported that discrimination.

The Foxx amendment would actually make it harder for an employee to secure relief from employer retaliation under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as other civil rights statutes. In other words, an employer who retaliates against an older worker for reporting discrimination would have an easier time getting away with it.

If an employer has less risk of being held accountable for retaliating against an older worker who reports discrimination, by firing or otherwise penalizing the employee, then the underlying protections of the law are weakened because people will be deterred from reporting retaliatory acts.

H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, clarifies the standard applied to age discrimination and retaliation—the mixed-motive standard—that was originally applied to claims under title VII of the Civil Rights Act prior to the Supreme Court's wrong-headed decisions in the 2009 Gross case. This is the same standard applied to discrimination claims under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Rehabilitation Act.

It is important to note that the changes in language proposed by the Foxx amendment would have a particularly egregious effect because the enforcement of civil rights laws rely heavily on individuals to assert their rights. That is why every civil rights law makes it a separate act of discrimination for an employer to retaliate against employees for exercising their civil rights or opposing unlawful acts. Charges of retaliation are the most filed type of charge with the EEOC.

In 2020, more than half of the charges filed involved retaliation claims. Since so many workers who report discrimination also report retaliation, it is critical that H.R. 2062 correct the legal standard set by the 2013 case, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar.

In that case, the Supreme Court applied the but-for standard to retaliation claims under title VII of the Civil Rights Act instead of the mixed-motive standard used for all other types of employment discrimination. It makes no sense to have separate provisions of title VII requiring different standards of causation.

The legislation before us today fixes the problem created by the Supreme Court rulings in the 2009 Gross decision and the 2013 Nassar decision by applying a mixed-motive standard to cases of age discrimination and retaliation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. MANNING. The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act establishes the use of a mixed-motive standard, settling the confusing separation of related civil rights claims and strengthening workers' rights.

We should reject the Foxx amendment because prohibitions on retaliation do not punish employers multiple times for the same offense; rather, they help to deter employers from punishing employees multiple times—first, by discriminating and denying the equal opportunity, then again by punishing employees for challenging that discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on the underlying bill, H.R. 2062.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that there was a higher percentage of Republicans who voted for the 1964 Civil Rights Act than Democrats, a higher percentage of Republicans voted for the ADEA, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and under

the ADA. It was President Bush who signed that bill.

So Republicans have a pretty good record on promoting and protecting the civil rights of Americans in this country, all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, for an employer to retaliate against an employee because that employee has previously made a discrimination complaint is wrong and it is already illegal.

H.R. 2062 reduces the standard of proof in retaliation cases by allowing mixed-motive claims, overturning the Supreme Court's 2013 decision in the Nassar case.

Allowing mixed-motive claims in retaliation cases is unworkable and contrary to the text, structure, and history of title VII, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote in the majority opinion in Nassar that in retaliation cases, ''lessening the causation standard could contribute to the filing of frivolous claims, which would siphon resources from efforts by employers, administrative agencies, and courts to combat workplace harassment.''

Justice Kennedy also wrote in his opinion that the concern about diverting resources was especially true because retaliation charges filed with the EEOC had nearly doubled in the past 15 years and had become the second most frequently filed category of complaint.

This concern is even more relevant today because retaliation is now the most frequently filed EEOC charge. All retaliation claims are inherently about differing explanations.

In these situations, the plaintiff has already made a discrimination complaint, and under the mixed-motive standard required under H.R. 2062, it will be a mere formality to plead that any subsequent negative action by the employer related to the employee was retaliatory.

Under H.R. 2062, a plaintiff claiming retaliation will always survive the summary judgment stage of the litigation and the case will either settle or go to trial. This will increase the number of frivolous claims against unsuspecting business owners and impose related financial costs noted in the Supreme Court decision, thus limiting important resources that could otherwise be used to combat discrimination.

Furthermore, there is no evidence to support the claim that employees have been harmed by the Nassar decision.

And, by the way, when employees win lawsuits claiming retaliation under the current standard, they can receive monetary damages, back pay, and reinstatement, as well as attorneys' fees and costs. Under H.R. 2062, this won't happen in nearly all of the cases. Only the trial lawyers will be paid.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment strikes the harmful, overly broad, and unworkable provision in H.R. 2062, which allows mixed-motive claims in retaliation cases.

The amendment protects the current standard of proof as described in the Nassar case, and I urge Members to support it.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the first amendment that requires the GAO study only seeks to say whether the cases went up or down. The cases can go up because there is more discrimination. It has nothing to do with whether or not it was because of the change in standard. It could be in spite of the standard. And all it does is delay the implementation of the bill.

The other sets a different standard for retaliation, where you can win your case that you didn't get promoted but lose your case on the fact that you got hired just because there is a differential standard. Well, that doesn't make much sense.

It seems to me that we should go back to the way it was before the Gross decision, have one standard in all of the discrimination cases, and have people be able to prove their case the way they have always been able to prove their case.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendments en bloc containing Representatives ALLEN's and FOXX's amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Louisiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the previous question is ordered on amendments en bloc No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 question are postponed.

□ 1615

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 117–71.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 5. STUDY AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall jointly conduct a study to determine the number of claims pending or filed, in addition to cases closed, by women who may have been adversely impacted by age discrimination as a motivating factor in workplace discrimination or employment termination. The Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Commission shall jointly submit to the Congress, and make available to the public, a report that contains the results of the study, including recommendations for best practices to prevent and to combat gender and age discrimination as it relates to women in the workplace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan amendment to the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, a bill that I am proud to be working on with my good friend, Chairman SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his hard work on this amendment and on the bill itself. He has been a leader on helping older workers avoid discrimination.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois and cosponsored by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), would provide further information on how many women are adversely affected by age discrimination as a motivating factor in the workplace, as well as provide best practices to combat gender and age discrimination. These practices will help support older women who may face multiple kinds of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for offering the amendment, and I also want to thank him for his distinguished leadership on the underlying legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides an important fix caused by the outcome of the 2019 Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc., Supreme Court decision in order to ensure that older workers can seek the justice they deserve when they face age discrimination in the workplace, on a level playing field.

The amendment that I introduced with Representative CHELLIE PINGREE highlights the discrimination that women face in the workplace based not only on gender, but on age as well.

According to a 2018 report from the EEOC, women, especially older women, but also those at middle age, were subjected to more age discrimination than older men. Research suggests that ageism at work begins at age 40 for women, 5 years earlier than men. This is unacceptable and we must find ways to correct this problem.

This amendment would require the DOL and EEOC to conduct a comprehensive study on these age discrimination cases. DOL and EEOC would then be required to make recommendations for best practices to combat age discrimination of women in the workplace.

Challenges that women face are not partisan issues and, together, we should make every effort to address them. Employers should make, and have the right tools to make, conscious efforts to ensure that women have equal rights and opportunities in the workplace, regardless of their age.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PINGREE for co-leading this amendment, and also Chairman SCOTT for his kind words and support of its inclusion. I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment and to vote ''yes'' on this amendment and the underlying bill to protect older adults from workplace discrimination.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 486, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 1, printed in part B of House Report 117–71, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—231

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—7

Buchanan
Burchett
Cawthorn
Costa
Escobar
Fulcher
LaMalfa

□ 1648

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. HINSON changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

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

Aderholt (Moolenaar)
Amodei (Balderson)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
García (IL) (Garcia (TX))
Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mullin (Cole)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pappas (Kuster)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Torres (NY) (Clark (MA))
Vela (Gomez)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Waters (Takano)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 2, printed in part B of House Report 117–71, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 243, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—182

Aderholt
Allen
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brady
Brooks
Buck
Bucshon
Budd

Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Duyne
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—243

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Grothman
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

NOT VOTING—5

Buchanan
Burchett
Curtis
Fulcher
Garbarino

□ 1710

Mr. MEEKS, Mses. CRAIG, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, ESHOO, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. LaMALFA, LAMBORN, and Ms. CHENEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the en bloc amendments were rejected.

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

Aderholt (Moolenaar)
Amodei (Balderson)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
García (IL) (García (TX))
Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mullin (Cole)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pappas (Kuster)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Torres (NY) (Clark (MA))
Vela (Gomez)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Waters (Takano)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 178, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—247

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Grothman
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—178

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin

Baird
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brady
Brooks
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
McCarthy
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Valadao
Van Duyne
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—5

Buchanan
Burchett
Castor (FL)
Fulcher
Pence

□ 1732

So the bill 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

Aderholt (Moolenaar)
Amodei (Balderson)
DeFazio (Davids (KS))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
García (IL) (Garcia (TX))
Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kelly (IL) (Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mullin (Cole)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pappas (Kuster)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Torres (NY) (Clark (MA))
Vela (Gomez)
Velázquez (Jeffries)
Waters (Takano)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3093

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I seek to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3093.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is accepted.

CONGRATULATING MICHAEL PAUL WILLIAMS ON WINNING PULITZER PRIZE

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Michael Paul Williams, a columnist from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, the primary newspaper of record for the Commonwealth, which is located in my district.

Mr. Williams was recently awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Commentary. He is the first Pulitzer Prize recipient at the Times-Dispatch since 1948.

Throughout his nearly 40-year career, he has been a dedicated and effective journalist who has focused much of his work on issues of race and racial inequality in Virginia.

The first commentator of color at the Times-Dispatch, he has provided unique, insightful, and impactful commentary that has sparked public discourse, helped shape narratives and understandings of race in Virginia, and challenged readers to consider the inequities that communities of color face.

It is with great honor that I congratulate Michael Paul Williams for his award-winning commentary on the issues impacting our communities in Richmond.

RECOGNIZING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Religious Freedom Week. Religious Freedom Week began on Monday and runs through June 29.

Freedom of religion is a fundamental human right. Our Founding Fathers made sure it would always be protected. The First Amendment protects freedom of religion along with the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press.

This assurance of freedom gives us all the opportunity to openly practice and speak our beliefs. It allows me to speak on the House floor right now.

The United States is a place where all faiths can be peacefully practiced free from the fear of persecution.

The very foundation of our Nation, a place of freedom and liberty for all, was conceived by individuals in search of religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America will always be a beacon of light in the world, and we will always protect our fundamental, unified commitment of religious freedom because no person should live in fear for their beliefs.

FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS BLOCK FOREST CLEANUPS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, access to our public lands is being cut off by road closures throughout the national forests in Region 5. The U.S. Forest Service is citing public safety concerns due to hazardous trees from past fire seasons.

But this blocks the public from accessing the public lands, and it also prevents those roads being used as evacuation routes or access points to fight fires in coming seasons.

One road that has been closed, the Greyback Road in the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest in northern California, is a California Office of Emergency Services designated evacuation route for the town of Happy Camp, California. If Highway 96 is blocked, this is the only other way out of Happy Camp.

Litigation is preventing the U.S. Forest Service from working with private-sector partners to clean up the forests. For example, in the Mendocino National Forest, 300,000 acres burned in 2018. The Forest Service wanted to do 4,700 acres, a tiny 2 percent of that, yet it was blocked by a lawsuit from doing that cleanup work.

Without offering the salvage timber sale, that means it is going to cost taxpayers $5.5 million instead of being able to recover some of the money.

This litigation harms the public by leaving hazardous trees and snags out in the forest, which create safety issues and become fuel for the next fire season.

We must reform NEPA and ESA.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN PAUL MITCHELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join several of my colleagues tonight to recognize our former colleague, Mr. Paul Mitchell.

Paul was recently diagnosed with cancer, and so many of us wanted to send our well-wishes that we decided the best way we could do it was from the well of the House, a place that Paul Mitchell loved and spent so much of his time.

Paul represented Michigan's 10th District in our State's thumb from 2017 until his retirement just this year. In that time, he proved himself to be the kind of principled, practical leader that Michigan is known for.

Paul knew that the path to good government runs through reaching across the aisle. The proof is in his record. Paul was intentional about ensuring key legislation be introduced in a bipartisan fashion, and the folks he drew to his legislation ran the gamut of the political spectrum.

Paul was an advocate for students, for investing in innovation, and for

economic development. Whether you were on the left or the right, Paul worked with you to get things done.

These days, some might call that behavior an independent, being a maverick. But to us, that was just Paul.

When he announced his retirement in July 2019 in order to spend more time with his family, we, of course, wished him all the best. But I also felt a twinge of sadness in losing a funny, charming, and humble servant leader.

He charted his own course in Congress as both a legislator and a friend. His presence is deeply missed in this Chamber.

Earlier this month, we received the news that Paul had been diagnosed with renal cancer. Weeks before, he had had emergency surgery to remove a mass and a blood clot that had moved to his heart. His doctors at Henry Ford Macomb Hospital estimated a 10 percent chance of survival, but true to form, Paul pulled through.

I am happy to announce that last night Paul went home to his family in Dryden. He has a long road of recovery ahead of him, one that will require things like physical therapy and immunotherapy, but Paul is approaching his recovery with a typical can-do approach.

We want to send him all of our love and all of our strength for recovery, those of us who spent so much time with him. Here assembled, we have members of the Michigan delegation and members of the Problem Solvers Caucus, two groups that spent a ton of time with Paul Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, it is, therefore, my privilege to turn the floor over to some of those friends to recognize him in the place that we know he loved so much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

□ 1745

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. SLOTKIN for yielding and for organizing this Special Order in honor of our dear friend, Paul Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, I represent parts of Macomb and Oakland counties. And during my first term in Congress, Paul and I shared representation of Macomb. Paul represented the northern part; I represent the southern part. And while there were plenty of policies we disagreed on, there were a lot of things we connected on, too.

We wanted to bring better water infrastructure to Macomb. And, Paul, I am still working on it, and we are going to get there.

We talked about our shared history in the workforce world. Paul was a real leader in workforce policy through his company, and I used to run the State workforce system in Michigan. And he was a real leader and a thought leader in that area. And, Paul, I am trying to carry that on as best I can, too, as we look towards WIOA reauthorization.

And when we did spar over policy positions, it wasn't mean-spirited. In fact, it was really close to my ideal of what it means to serve in this body. It was real, honest debate, the kind I was happy to have and honored to have.

Paul and I now share one more connection, and it is one we didn't share. As a two-time cancer survivor, I know what it is like to get that diagnosis, and I know the stress and the pain that Paul and his family are facing. It is something I wouldn't wish on anyone, and I am devastated that they have to go through it.

I want Paul to know that Mary and I are thinking about you and praying for you as your treatment begins, and that I am here to lend an ear or even talk through this experience, the same way that you did for me when I was just coming to Congress. You were one of the most generous colleagues I knew.

Mr. Speaker, I was lucky to have a neighbor like Paul Mitchell, and I look forward to the day we can celebrate your remission, Paul, and joust happily once again over the issues of the day.

God bless you.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLOTKIN. 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 this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague from Michigan for putting together this Special Order for us to talk about our former colleague—and for so many of us—our friend, Representative Paul Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, I first had the opportunity to meet Representative Mitchell on the floor of the House when his youngest son was visiting. We were on the House floor, entering our cards in for a vote, and Paul's son wanted to help push the voting button for different Members. Paul, at that time, was a Republican; I am a Democrat. And if you gave your card to Paul's son, he would invariably vote with the Republicans, regardless of who you were. So there were quite a few engaged Democrats who thought they were being so kind letting a child vote, who had to run over to the well right behind me to change their vote, because, indeed—I believe he was 10 at the time—a 10-year-old had somehow mischievously voted incorrectly.

Paul was simultaneously delighted by what was a bit of a funny experience on the House floor, but also a little bit embarrassed that people were running over,

That was Paul. He would bring, and does bring, joy to every meeting. He is a serious person, focused on policy, focused on truth, on reality, on the things that matter to him, which were: his incredible career in business, on his wonderful family, eminently proud of his children; and, particularly, always willing to draw on his personal experiences in business, as a parent—as a parent of a law enforcement officer—to find commonality and to advocate for the things that he believes in.

And during our time in Congress, I was so grateful to serve on the Problem Solvers Caucus, or to be part of the Problem Solvers Caucus with Paul, where invariably during our weekly meetings, he would be a jovial part of those meetings, focused on the hard work of legislating, but also on bringing a bit of humanity and commonality to the people gathered around the table, sometimes engaging in very, very difficult conversations.

Paul made the very hard decision to retire after his terms in Congress. It was one that, as a friend, I heard him talk through the pros, the cons, whether he was ready to leave this place. A place that, while he was here, he so deeply loved, and a place where I believe as a colleague, I saw him make a significant impact. But ultimately, with a young child at home, a beautiful farm with lots of sheep, and a renewed interest in a love of racing, Paul did decide that it was time for him to retire.

Since his retirement, I have been a friend who has been on the receiving end of so many photos, as I am sure so many of our colleagues here have been, of snowy days on the farm in Michigan, beautiful views of the water, and race cars.

As a Virginian, we have a NASCAR racetrack just on the line of my district—I generally like to claim it. And Paul was scheduled before his diagnosis to come to Virginia for a race. And I just thought how hysterical is that for a man I used to talk hard policy issues and debate policy and disagree—sometimes very fervently—with is now going to be literally racing through my district—or just adjacent—in his race car.

So I look forward to the time when Paul—because he is a fighter, regardless of any diagnosis—I think we know that he is intent on getting back in his race car, back to his farm, and certainly continuing to be engaged and focused.

I look forward to the time when we could welcome him in Virginia for him to race around the track. I am unsure whether or not I may choose to enter into that vehicle with him, but I might stand on the sidelines and cheer.

Mr. Speaker, Paul was an incredible friend. He was an incredibly good Member of Congress, because at every moment, he just was focused on what was right. I know that is how he was in business, in his personal life before he came here. I know that is how he continues to be.

Certainly, as a new Member of Congress, witnessing someone who has always genuinely shown kindness and heart, every conversation he had here in the Halls of Congress was a great example to me. I am so proud to have

served with him during his time in Congress, but far more than that, I am deeply honored to call Paul Mitchell a friend, a real friend, and deeply honored to know that he is someone who will always stand up for truth, who will always stand up for what is right, who will always stand up for his family, for his friends, and for his country.

So my dear friend, I wish you the very best as you continue in your recovery. We are all thinking of you. I am so grateful for your friendship.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Mr. Mitchell, we will now start going Democrat-Republican, Democrat-Republican to demonstrate our bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER).

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the great State of Michigan, and I guess, I would thank Paul for all of the service he has given this body, has given our country, has given our State.

The morning when I was supposed to first meet Paul, was the same morning that he announced that he was not running for reelection. He defined that spirit of making decisive moves.

It is no secret that for the freshman class who have entered, the past 6 months have been less than normal. I take the assurances of my colleagues, who have been in this body for many terms, that what we have seen so far has been atypical. But I cannot thank Paul enough for the example that he set, for the wisdom that he shared, and for his perennial, ever-blunt honesty.

All too often people, especially politicians, can walk and dance and do a jig around the truth. And Paul was always incredibly clear about where he stood and what he believed. So I am grateful for the friendship that I have been able to develop with him as a freshman, and I look forward to many more of those moments.

I want Paul and his family to know that he is in our prayers. My wife, Gabrielle, and I will keep him in our prayers. The challenges that he is dealing with are being felt by too many, but I am proud to call him a friend as he continues to fight on.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for doing this, and I am sorry to sort of jump people in line, but we are in a committee markup, so I have to get back.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that my friend, Paul Mitchell, grew up the eldest of seven kids. Literally, a natural born leader of the pack. He was the first of his extended family to graduate from college. He has noted that his mom raised him to believe that those with talents and resources were expected by God to make a difference in the world. And by God, he did.

Tenacious and focused like a laser beam, he set and met goals. A scrappy fighter, he has now met his most formidable foe, that is for sure, and he is all in for that fight.

And in a text that I got from him a little bit earlier today, he said, ''as you know, I am one tough cuss.''

Yes, Paul, you are. And you know what, everybody knows it—not only your Republican and Democratic colleagues, but certainly the former President, and probably all of your constituents back in Michigan as well. You are a tough cuss.

Yesterday, my colleague, DIANA DEGETTE, and I introduced a discussion draft called 21st Century Cures 2.0.

Mr. Speaker, 392 of us in this Chamber, including Paul, voted for the 21st Century Cures enacted in 2016, which expedites the approval of new drugs. This bill that we are working on now, 2.0, could well indeed speed the approval of new drugs even faster. So it indeed could be the very lifeline for Paul and so many like him—thousands of Americans and around the world—that somehow are impacted by this terrible disease that we all want to survive.

Paul's life is characterized by exceeding expectations, defying the odds. And we know that is what he intends to do now, for sure. And if anybody can, it is Paul. So we are with you, Paul—you may be watching—every step of the way. All of us.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD Paul's farewell address that he stated back in July of 2019 as part of this tribute.

REPRESENTATIVE PAUL MITCHELL'S (MI–10) FLOOR REMARKS ON WEDNESDAY JULY 24, 2019

Madam Speaker, America is an amazing place and we too often as Americans take that for granted. Opportunities exist in this country that simply aren't available in much of the world. And my life is an example of the many possibilities in the United States of America.

I ask you: Where else can a kid born into poverty, beginning life in a subsidized housing project, become a national legislator? Yet—here I stand as a Member of Congress.

In how many countries can the oldest of seven children with parents that were an hourly autoworker and a Salvation Army office manager become the first in their extended family to graduate from college, build a career and become CEO of a major workforce development company and, after retiring, be elected to Congress?

America is truly a unique and special place that we must love and respect with all our heart and soul.

My mother raised me to believe that those with talents and/or resources were expected by God to make a difference in the world. I have tried to do that throughout my life.

My mission for 35 years was to assist people in identifying and securing career opportunities. My professional career allowed me to support my family while assisting adults of all ages and backgrounds develop skills to support their families and build careers.

I assisted individuals ranging from laid off steel workers and autoworkers to long term public assistance recipients develop the skills they needed to secure a job and build a new career.

I worked with individuals requiring literacy education or ESL and adults that had worked in the same job for years and suddenly found their jobs and industries had evaporated, and their lives turned upside down.

I worked, in some way or another, with tens of thousands of people searching for assistance in securing a job and a career path.

I believed then, and I continue to believe, that most Americans find value and opportunity in working—sometimes they just need a hand and assistance to overcome adversity.

I brought that passion and commitment to Washington. I was, and remain, committed to making a difference in the world. I literally approached being a Member of Congress like my earlier career—full tilt and leaving no stone unturned to have a meaningful impact, and to make a difference on issues where I could.

It is an honor to stand on this floor, debate issues, and represent the people of Michigan's 10th Congressional District. I am proud to be among the 12,500 or so Americans that have had the privilege of serving in Congress.

But I have also begun asking myself about making a difference for my family. My children of all ages—but the youngest just nine years old—have accepted their dad traveling this country extensively, working a demanding schedule, and frequently interrupting ''family time'' with calls, emails and text messages. My spouse Sherry has been so supportive and more patient than probably warranted.

A career in Washington has never been my objective. My objective has always been simply to work to address significant challenges this nation faces: health care, immigration, and infrastructure for example.

However, it appears to me that rhetoric overwhelms policy, and politics consumes much of the oxygen in this city.

The time has come to make a difference for my family—to focus my time and energy upon them—their needs and goals.

As George Washington is quoted: ''I would rather be on my farm than emperor of the world.''

As a result—I have decided I will not seek to continue to represent Michigan's 10th District next term. After serving out the remainder of the 116th Congress—I will return to my family and our small farm..

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank ELISSA, again, for organizing this time for many of his friends that would like to say a few words tonight and push him forward to get to that finish line and come back.

God bless you.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congresswoman SLOTKIN, for organizing this tribute session to our friend and former colleague, Paul Mitchell.

It is very symbolic of what it is like to be a member of the Michigan delegation. There are 14 of us—7 Democrats, 7 Republicans—representing a State of just a little over 10 million people. And yet, we come together time and time again to champion matters and issues for our State, whether it is the Great Lakes or veterans' issues or our automotive industry.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing here today. We are standing up for our friend who is in a fight—a fight against cancer. And we are doing it on the floor of the House of Representatives, for this man loves the floor of the House of Representatives.

So there is no place more symbolic than this to tell Paul, ''You have got this.''

Sherry, you have got this. And to your kids, who I know you love dearly, we are standing by you every step of the way.

□ 1800

Paul was certainly a champion not only for the legislative process and the business of doing government right by people, but he was a champion for Michigan. And if you hear his words, if he has talked about his experience, his recent diagnosis, you hear Paul saying: This was a gift from God. This was a gift from God.

Even when it got scary, because he is getting a little bit more of life. He is getting more of a chance to continue to push and to stand up for what he knows he has worked his life for, which is the creation of his wonderful family, and being in the State he loves so dearly.

Paul, I will just tell you, I have so many fond memories of you. I have fond memories from learning from you on this very floor. I have fond memories of being at Chrysler with you, which was really exciting for a first-term Congresswoman to be alongside you, seeing the new vehicles, and having discussions with the workforce at Chrysler in my district, but I know you have many Chrysler employees in the Michigan 10th District as well.

So those are the memories and those are the things that we celebrate with your service and also with your continued dedication. So it is a real privilege and honor to be here with my colleagues, telling you, Paul: You have got this, you are going to keep going, and we are going to keep fighting another day.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I truly thank my colleague for organizing this Special Order this evening for our friend Paul Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, I come here this evening with no prepared remarks other than to make some comments, as shared by my colleagues about this great man.

Paul Mitchell is truly a friend. Paul Mitchell is someone I have gotten to know over the years here in Congress, and watched him develop in his own right. I watched him become a very serious and astute legislator. I watched him join the Problem Solvers Caucus that we started, and many of the colleagues have talked about the Problem Solvers Caucus.

Paul came to us from leadership, and in that process he did some things, because that is a very special club, and we have some very special rules and commitments to each other. In order to fulfill those commitments and those terms of honor in serving in that caucus with our colleagues, he demonstrated publicly, privately, and to our fellow members of the Problem Solvers Caucus what it means to be an honorable Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, for that, I was forever grateful to have been in a position to encourage Paul to join the Problem Solvers Caucus. And he, in particular, one day exhibited that very limited leadership quality that is so lacking here in the United States House of Representatives today, in my opinion. He showed true courage, true statesmanship, true leadership.

I just have to tell you, Paul, as we got the news about your diagnosis—and I am speaking to you directly here from the floor, Paul—we all immediately came to your side. We all, immediately in our thoughts, in our prayers, in our bond of friendship, stood with you and your family. And we are standing with you and your family as you go through this next chapter of your life, and please know that you are not alone.

To you and to your family, as a Member of this body, as a member of the Problem Solvers Caucus, as a member serving your country, as a great citizen, we all stand with you and your family as you go through this ordeal that you face.

That being said, I join with my colleagues in saying, We know Paul Mitchell. We know your heart, Paul. We know your tenacity and your perseverance. And we know you are going to get through this, and you are going to get through this in a way only Paul Mitchell can get through it.

So as we come here today to give some fine words on behalf of you, Paul, and on behalf of your family, know we are also sending more than words. We are sending our shoulders to cry upon; our shoulders to lean upon; and, as you have exhibited over the years, even a shoulder to laugh upon during this difficult time.

And it is those lessons of life that you taught me, serving with you here in the House, that you cannot take life too seriously; that life is too short.

That is why, as my colleagues noted, Paul retired to be with his young family and his other children, to make sure that he kept his priorities straight.

And you did, Paul. You put your family, you put your health, and you put your future first in regards to the time of your life to make that decision to retire from this body.

So I am just humbled to be here with my colleagues. I truly thank my colleagues on the Democratic side and on the Republican side for coming here tonight to honor one of our best from the U.S. House of Representatives, Paul, and that is you. And for that, we will be forever grateful to be able to call you a friend; a colleague; and, in the end, a survivor.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. REED for those heartfelt words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS), another member of the Problem Solvers Caucus.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Michigan and all my friends for this Special Order hour.

Paul, you might not know this, but you are an important mentor of mine, one of the most important mentors I have had in my brief career in this Chamber. You represent the very most precious and sometimes rare of attributes in the U.S. Congress, and that is principle.

You are a man of principle at a time when our country needs that and you more than ever. You are a man of great intelligence and success and decency and empathy and honesty and integrity.

I remember my first conversation with Paul, we were speaking about higher education. And it was that conversation that reminded me that we can learn so much more from people of different perspectives than we do from those who are cut from the same cloth.

And when Paul made the difficult but very principled decision to become an Independent at the end of his career here in Congress, he wrote a letter to the House Clerk to announce the change in affiliation, and the last line of the letter read: ''While admittedly symbolic, we all know that symbols matter. We all know that symbols matter.''

And when you retired from Congress, Paul, you said: ''I can't begin to express to you how difficult it is to say something like 'I am done' because I have never been done before.''

And let me tell you, my friend, you are not done yet, and we sure as heck are not done with you. We love you, Paul, and America joins me in sending our love to you and yours as well.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PHILLIPS for his heartfelt words.

In conclusion, Paul, as you can imagine, we, of course, had our schedule changed 12 different times today. There are many, many more of our colleagues who are submitting official notes for the RECORD, and who are stuck in various places and will reach out directly.

But to you and your family, for the legacy that you left in this place, please know that we see you, we recognize you, we believe in your will to fight, and we are behind you 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for joining on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I wouldn't have missed this.

We have an Energy and Commerce markup that continues on.

I guess through the chair to Paul, I wouldn't miss the opportunity to encourage you, and express through the chair, Paul, my deep appreciation for you as a friend, as a colleague, as a fighter.

Though I have not heard all the comments of my colleagues, I am sure that they have said to you: We love you. We are pulling for you, for Sherry, for the

family. We are in your corner. But we also know that you are the one who has to fight this; and friends sometimes feel that, in a very unique way, it is a helpless feeling.

As we think about you and pray for you, and as a co-chairman of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, you probably ought to expect that I am praying for you, and I will. I am praying that God will give you strength, patience, endurance, and even a joy in the process of what you are modeling to your family as you go through this.

I know you are a tough guy. We have had our verbal battles together all the time, and I am not even going to admit today that you may have won on a few occasions. I know that you race cars, and you race cars not to lose, and you race cars to take that victory lap after you went through the checker flag. And right now we are expecting you to race, to give it your absolute best, to use all the resources necessary to continue on because your life is important to your family, to your friends, and to those of us who look on.

If we admit, though you are going through a physical challenge that none of us are going through right now, but in the reality of life, none of us on the floor right here now have any more certainty about any longer time given to us than you have. I might not make it tomorrow. So it is important that we buy up the day that we have. And my prayers are that you are doing that in the challenges that you face, Paul, in the disappointments, in the discouragements that come, and the dark hours at night.

Yet there is someone. And I am not saying this to you simply because I am a preacher, even though I have gone to the dark side. I am saying it to you because my relationship with the Savior makes it possible for me to look to the future, whatever that future means, with hope, with certainty. The Jesus who I hope is a spirit I exude to my colleagues, my friends, my neighbors, and to you tonight, Paul, is the same one who said: I come that you might have life and have it abundantly.

He is the same one who came to die for each of us and understands our needs. He is the same one who said: I am the resurrection and the life. He that believes in me, though he die—and we all will—yet shall he live. For whosoever lives and believes in me shall never abide in death.

That is an eternal thing. And, Paul, you and I have talked about those spiritual things as well. Pull on to your faith. You and Sherry pull on that faith. Let it strengthen you. Let it encourage you. Let the loving, loving Savior who gave himself for you and me and everyone give you the strength to battle on, to go on that racetrack of challenge and whatever, to find a certainty that in Him there is an eternity, there is an eternity that begins here and now.

Paul, we love you. I love you. I will be praying for you. I am counting on you to do everything you can. I am counting on your family to be blessed because of the example you are setting. But I am also saying to you that we are going to keep on supporting you. God bless you, brother.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WALBERG for those kind words.

Paul, I hope you know the strength that we are sending you, all of us on both sides of the aisle. We feel it, we have been talking about you and Sherry and the kids constantly. And we hope that from our convening on you, you feel that strength and the power to fight back and beat this thing.

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

□ 1815

REPUBLICANS ARE ADDRESSING THE MAJOR CRISES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIMENEZ. 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 subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, during our time tonight, my colleagues and I will address the major crises happening here at home and happening abroad. Our message tonight will all have a consistent theme: House Republicans are leading the fight, whether it is protecting the Hyde amendment, taking action to fix President Biden's economic crisis, or holding China accountable for the COVID–19 coverup once and for all.

On the last point, the time has come for Congress to take seriously its job to hold China accountable for their role in the proliferation of the COVID–19 pandemic. This pandemic has killed over 600,000 Americans, ruined the American economy, forced into closure many people's livelihoods, and destabilized our way of life.

Just as we did in the aftermath of 9/11 and in response to the Great Recession, Speaker PELOSI and her colleagues on her side of the aisle cannot abdicate Congress' constitutional responsibility to investigate the origins of COVID–19 and the roles both the Chinese Communist Party and the World Health Organization played in preventing an expeditious global response.

A March 2020 report by the University of Southampton found that if interventions in China could have been conducted 1, 2, or 3 weeks earlier, then cases could have been reduced by 66 percent, 86 percent, and 95 percent, respectively. That is inexcusable.

Luckily for the American people, Republican Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY and House Republicans have a plan to hold China accountable and ensure an atrocity such as the CCP virus never happens again.

The American people deserve transparency. That is why Congress must declassify information related to the origins of COVID–19. Yes, that includes any report that comes from President Biden's recent requests.

For far too long, the government has allowed individuals with known ties to the CCP or Chinese state-owned enterprises to benefit from American research and innovation. That is why we must continue to pursue policies that curb any gains made by the Chinese Communist Party.

It is also time for Congress to prohibit the National Institutes of Health or any entity that receives grants and funding from NIH from conducting research or spending resources on research with malicious foreign actors. This includes China. Our taxpayer dollars should not be going into arming our adversaries.

Foreign policy is a crucial element in holding China accountable. Congress must compel the administration to flex its foreign policy posture and reform the World Health Organization. As more information comes forward, it is evident that the WHO was complicit in China's coverup of the exploding pandemic. Their negligence is directly responsible for the loss of millions of lives. We need trusted actors such as Taiwan to form part of the organization.

In keeping in line with a tough foreign policy stance, Congress must implement a new round of tough and deliberate sanctions on anyone—whether they are Chinese nationals with ties to the CPP or high-level executives at the World Health Organization—who willfully participated in the coverup of the COVID–19 pandemic and helped prevent a robust global response. Millions of lives are on their hands.

Another tool at our disposal is for Congress to pass the resolution introduced by my Florida colleague, Congressman MICHAEL WALTZ, and Senator RICK SCOTT to prevent Beijing from hosting the Winter Olympics.

Finally, we need to allow them to sue the Chinese Communist Party and any CCP official who participated in the coverup that killed over half a million Americans. They deserve no sovereign immunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to do our jobs and join Leader MCCARTHY and the House Republicans in holding China accountable, holding our adversaries accountable, and ensuring an atrocity such as this never happens again.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce the Congressman from Texas, Congressman VAN TAYLOR. Congressman VAN TAYLOR is a decorated Iraq

War veteran and an important member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida's 26th District for yielding.

On the heels of a global pandemic, which crippled small businesses and hurt workers, President Biden has offered a budget that doesn't address the problems that we so desperately confront as Americans.

There is not any additional funding for border security at a time right now when our border is in crisis, despite the fact that this budget has the highest sustained tax burden and is the largest budget ever in the history of this country. It is the largest budget to ever be before this body.

The prescription in that budget is exactly the opposite of where we need to be going. As our economy comes out of the fits and starts of recovering from COVID, this threatens to overheat even further our economy.

We know our economy is overheated. Let me give you a couple of examples.

Since May 2020, home prices have increased by almost 13 percent. Used car and truck prices are up over 20 percent. Lumber prices are up over 300 percent. Cold rolled steel has gone from $630 a ton to $1,450 a ton.

Our economy is overheated. The last thing we need is the massive $55 trillion of taxes and spending that is in the budget today in front of this body. You heard me correctly, Mr. Speaker, $55 trillion directly from the pockets of Americans who are already struggling to pay these higher gas prices and to pay for higher prices for groceries. This is all a result of President Biden's misguided fiscal policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Democrat colleagues to please reconsider your support for Biden's broken budgeting methods. In the great State of Texas, small businesses and families live within their means. We must do the same.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague from Texas for his great words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 22nd District of Texas (Mr. NEHLS), who is a veteran law enforcement officer.

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight some of the stated goals of the INVEST in America Act.

The INVEST in America Act creates and sustains good-paying jobs, restores global competitiveness, tackles climate change, modernizes infrastructure, and spurs long-term economic growth.

These are laudable goals that most if not all of us here support. However, Mr. Speaker, when you focus on the rail title, the INVEST in America Act misses on all of those marks and, in fact, has the potential to turn back the clocks on our envy-of-the-world freight rail system.

Freight railroads provide excellent, high-paying jobs, with a Class 1 freight employee's compensation averaging $132,000 per year.

On competitiveness, the freight rail industry met the demands of our Nation during the pandemic by never closing and continually moving the goods we needed to preserve public health. They did all of it, I might add, without asking for any bailout money.

On the environment, freight railroads are also the most fuel-efficient way to move freight over land. On average, railroads move 1 ton of freight more than 480 miles on 1 gallon of fuel.

On modern infrastructure, unlike the rest of our Nation's transportation system, our freight rail system receives the highest grade from the civil engineers for their infrastructure, a B.

On economic opportunity, freight rail's economic impact in 2017 alone manifested itself in over 1.1 million jobs, $219 billion in economic output, $71 billion in wages, and nearly $26 billion in total tax revenues.

The freight railroads can meet all of these goals because the railroads, not the American taxpayers, spend the $25 billion annually needed to improve and maintain their infrastructure. Private companies are simply better custodians of infrastructure networks than the Federal Government, and we should be utilizing that simple reality, not bemoaning it.

While President Biden, Secretary Buttigieg, and Chairman DEFAZIO regularly profess their love for trains, the truth is that it only extends to the highly subsidized passenger version.

The INVEST in America Act spends almost $100 billion on Amtrak. Amtrak ridership was already collapsing outside of the Northeast Corridor before COVID. Where passenger rail makes sense, private companies like Virgin Trains are building new passenger lines.

The rail title couldn't include provisions to accelerate the deployment of new safety technologies on freight rail but ensures that French toast will be served on every Amtrak train. It does nothing to expand freight rail service by moving new and in-demand products like liquefied natural gas but will pay to roll empty Amtrak trains through new parts of the country.

If Amtrak is so good and deserves an 850 percent funding increase from the previous rail title, I challenge everyone voting for the INVEST in America Act to use Amtrak instead of an airline the next time you need to head from your district to the Capitol.

This rail title is too expensive, too damaging to the economy, and too partisan to pass. However, it is not too late to work together.

I introduced an amendment to the Rules Committee to strike the entire rail title. The base text is simply too flawed to fix, and we must do better.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce the Congressman from California, MIKE GARCÍA. Congressman GARCÍA flew over 30 combat missions during Operation Iraqi Freedom as a naval aviator. We thank him for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Congress and the Biden administration to hold China accountable for its role in the COVID–19 pandemic. The evidence suggests that this virus, like too many other things in the world, was made in China.

Despite the growing evidence surrounding China's lack of transparency and mishandling of the COVID–19 pandemic, House Democrats continue to stonewall Republican efforts to investigate the origins of COVID–19. Republicans have made numerous calls for the need to investigate the origins of COVID and hold China accountable, but the majority has yet to hold a single hearing on it.

This is shameful. Americans deserve transparency, and they deserve answers. We must hold China accountable for its coverup of this deadly virus that has taken the lives of 3.8 million humans worldwide, including 600,000 American lives.

Under the Trump administration, we had an investigation in place to investigate the origins of COVID–19, but that necessary investigation was ended by this Biden administration. Instead of holding our adversaries accountable, the current administration is bowing down to them. They have chosen a strategy of appeasement rather than accountability.

If America wants to remain a leader on the global stage and if we want to remain a safe and secure nation, then we must hold China and other adversaries absolutely accountable.

My Republican colleagues and I stand ready to work across the aisle to deliver the transparency and answers that Americans deserve. I hope that our colleagues across the aisle will join us in our efforts.

□ 1830

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, GLENN GROTHMAN from Wisconsin is an experienced legislator in Wisconsin and a United States Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

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

As we turn on the news every night and we think again and again about all of the changes to America that have happened in the last 4 months, it is so easy to just focus on the border or focus on the inflation or focus on the constant drumbeat that America is a horrible, racist nation. And by doing so, we forget the huge changes we have had in American law and American funding that affect the number of abortions that happen not only in the United States, but around the world.

It is hard to believe that throughout most of this country's history, even before ultrasounds were invented, the consensus in this country was that abortion was horrific; it was murder.

What have we done in the last few months?

First of all, we have repealed the Mexico City policy so that funds are once again going to organizations abroad that don't directly but indirectly fund abortions.

Secondly, we have overturned President Trump's Protect Life rule, which will reopen Title X Family Planning funding for Planned Parenthood. We believe that under this, Planned Parenthood has received $60 million a year, which not only, in part, goes to fund abortions, but also goes to fund an organization that is designed to encourage or change America's traditional dislike of abortion.

We are restoring funding to the U.N. Population Fund, which supported China's birth limit law, and is also proselytizing for abortion.

In the latest attack on unborn babies and pro-life Americans, President Biden released a fiscal year 2022 budget that removes the Hyde amendment, the longstanding provision that prohibits Federal funding of abortions.

We don't believe this is what Americans want. The vast majority of Americans do not support taxpayer funding of abortion. So much for the unity that President Biden promised us.

There is, over time, more and more scientific literature that demonstrates unborn babies can feel pain at a very earlier gestational age, at the 15-week-old gestational age. So much for science. This is pro-abortion extremism. We can start by making the Hyde amendment permanent by passing H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more with the gentleman about the Hyde amendment. I think the majority of Americans couldn't agree with the gentleman more about the Hyde amendment. We need to maintain that the majority of Americans do not want to fund taxpayer-funded abortions.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman JOHN ROSE from Tennessee is an eighth-generation farmer and a key member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GIMENEZ for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise before you tonight to speak on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. The right to life is one of the founding principles of our Nation. Every human being born or unborn is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our government was created to secure these rights without exception, not to take them away. Yet, today, we see this right under attack as the Biden administration continues their war on the unborn by seeking to remove the Hyde amendment, a longstanding pro-life protection that has saved 2.5 million lives from abortion since 1976.

As a father of two sons, Guy and Sam, I have been blessed to watch them grow from a tiny dot on a medical monitor to the strong and healthy boys they are today. When I look at my sons, I am crestfallen for the millions and millions of children whose lives have been cruelly taken right as they were beginning.

Not too long ago, President Joe Biden stated: ''Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for it.''

But this proposed budget fails to include the Hyde amendment, making it clear that President Biden does not value life. Before coming to Washington, I vowed to be unapologetically pro-life.

I stand before you tonight because I, along with most of my fellow Tennesseans, disagree with this administration and believe taxpayer dollars should never be used to fund abortions.

Societies are measured by how they treat their most vulnerable. That includes the unborn. This is why it sickens me to see the Biden administration's intention to use the power of the Federal Government to force us to support and fund organizations that perform abortions.

I thank God for the miracle that is life, and I will work to secure a chance at life for every unborn baby so that we may hear their voice, see their potential, and give them the same basic opportunity at living that we have secured and received ourselves.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Congressman GLENN THOMPSON from Pennsylvania is the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee. Mr. THOMPSON and I share a common experience as former firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), a Congressman and a former firefighter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my brother firefighter for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the importance of the Hyde amendment.

In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson penned three unalienable rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

As Members of Congress, it is our job to uphold those rights, and that can start with protecting the Hyde amendment. For over 40 years, the Hyde amendment has maintained bipartisan support and passed through Congress. Even President Joe Biden, then-Senator Joe Biden, supported this amendment.

The Hyde amendment ensures that Americans are not forced to pay for abortions with their tax dollars. But this year, the Hyde amendment is under attack. The current administration budget proposal calls for the Hyde amendment to be removed from the fiscal year 2022 budget. This is radical, even for Democrats.

The Hyde amendment saves lives. Since its original introduction, nearly 2.5 million lives have been saved from abortion. With nearly 60 percent of Americans agreeing that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions, we must keep the Hyde amendment in the fiscal year 2022 budget and beyond.

For these reasons, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This bill would make the Hyde amendment permanent and governmentwide. Mr. Speaker, we know life begins at conception. That is why we must stand up and continue to fight for the unborn.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman SCOTT PERRY from Pennsylvania retired as a brigadier general in the Army and now represents the people of Pennsylvania's 10th District. I thank the gentleman for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GIMENEZ for being here and inviting us.

Over the past year and a half, the American people have endured a nationwide pandemic and its impact on every aspect of all of our lives. More than 600,000 Americans have died, and their families have suffered the immeasurable grief of that. This was all preventable.

The Communist Party is directly responsible. I don't know why we can't say it. I don't know why we can't look into it. Our economy was devastated and lives were crushed; things that can never be gotten back. People lost jobs. People lost their dreams. It can't be gotten back.

It is going to take our economy years to rebuild. Americans want answers and they deserve answers. I don't understand why the majority party here doesn't want to investigate this. They want to investigate everything else, but they are not interested in this.

Let me tell you what we know. In November of 2019, scientists at the Wuhan Institute of Virology came down with a sickness consistent with COVID–19. We know that the World Health Organization's initial report—and I say initial because it was so politically charged, they had to come up with another one—China maintained sole authority of those investigating it.

Oh, by the way, 60 of the people who were investigating it weren't scientists. Somehow we trust them, but we can't have our own investigations. The Chinese Communist Party is guilty of obstruction of evidence. It is clear. It is clear.

Now, while the majority has denied calls for an investigation, continuing the cult of fear—and let me talk to you about the cult of fear. Remember when touching a doorknob was supposed to give you the virus?

You couldn't shake hands. You had to buy as much toilet paper and water as you could because you couldn't go to the store. You couldn't visit your loved

ones. And heaven forbid your kids go to school. And even today, when we want our kids to go to school, we are told we are terrorists and science deniers.

Let's stop the cult of fear. Let's stop it. Let's get the majority party, let's beseech the majority party to open an investigation because the American people deserve to know the origins of this virus.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman for his comments. I couldn't agree with him more. My opening statements were about China and their complicity, and we do need to investigate China and the World Health Organization and find out what did they know and when did they know it. Again, as I said, if we had known about this 1, 2, or 3 weeks earlier, we could have saved an incredible number of lives.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman MICHAEL CLOUD represents the 13th District of Texas and is the only Texas Republican on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being here, and I thank the gentleman for leading this. This is such an important topic.

We have seen ourselves in the last year and a half go from the greatest economy the world has ever seen to very perilous times for the American people.

Some of it not of our choosing; some of it, unfortunately, of our choosing. About a year and a half ago I would ask in virtually every meeting I went to in my district throughout Texas, I would ask every industry: What is your biggest problem right now?

And they would tell us: We can't find enough people.

Now, the reason was very different a year and a half ago than it is today. I get the same answer, but for very different reasons. A year and a half ago the economy was doing so good. Businesses were booming. We were hiring. Wages were growing across every demographic. Now it is because we are paying people to stay home.

This is an attack against the American worker, against the American economy, against the American work ethic that took us from struggling Colonies to an amazing, amazing influence on the world stage, to the greatest economy ever in all of humanity.

Now, what is really troubling is to see the attack against the American worker that this administration has chosen to pick out, certain industries that were very strong for us, particularly the energy industry. We have seen pipelines shut down here, while pipelines are encouraged to be built in our adversarial nations. We have seen this push toward green energy so that we can buy solar panels from China, while China continues to build hundreds of coal power plants.

So this, obviously, isn't about the environment. This is about destabilizing the economy here at home, while we empower adversarial nations abroad.

Recently, I was at the border. And we funded border infrastructure in the last administration. But now we have stopped it, even though the contract is already signed, and we won't even continue the contracts enough to plug in the lights that are already built at the border.

What is going on at the border is wreaking havoc on communities throughout our States and throughout this Nation.

We talk also about China and the devastating impact they have had on the coronavirus. We need to investigate that. This administration needs to step up and investigate that. There was some talk some time ago about how Fauci had sent money to the Wuhan lab and whether or not that was funding gain-of-function research or not.

Whether or not it was, what in the world are we doing sending money to a Wuhan lab when China is the number one thief?

They steal more intellectual property than any other nation-state from us.

We can make America work. America works when we support the American worker. Let's get back to doing that.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CLOUD for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman JOHN JOYCE of Pennsylvania is part of the Doctors Caucus and has worked with the U.S. Navy at Naval Hospital Portsmouth in Virginia during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. I thank the gentleman for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my commitment to life is rooted in the unequivocal truth that every person is created in the image and likeness of God. As a father and a grandfather, I can tell you that there is no greater gift than new life.

As a doctor, I can tell you that science confirms what we have known for centuries. Every unborn child is a person deserving of fundamental rights. During the span of my own medical career, I have witnessed remarkable innovation. With today's technology, there can be no doubt that a child in the womb is a living person.

Despite this evidence, Democrats are mounting unprecedented attacks on pro-life protections. First, President Biden repealed the Mexico City policy. Then House Democrats blocked the Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. Now they are attempting to repeal the Hyde amendment, which bans Federal funds from being used to pay for abortion services.

□ 1845

Since 1976, this key protection has been attached to all legislation passed in Congress, preventing American taxpayers from funding abortion against their will.

It is wholly reprehensible to require pro-life Americans to pay for abortion against their conscience. As Congress considers appropriations legislation, I urge my colleagues to dispense with their attack on the longstanding Hyde amendment.

To uphold the dignity of human life, we must preserve this protection. It is simple: The Hyde amendment saves lives.

Despite the challenges ahead, we must persevere in this fight. As we read in Romans 12: ''Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.''

Our enduring commitment to protect image-bearers and defend the sanctity of human life will prevail.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, who would know better about protecting life and saving life than the good doctor from Pennsylvania and my colleague, Congressman JOHN JOYCE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), who has led a distinguished career in business and public service and serves as a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and appreciate him calling us together tonight to talk about the mistakes that President Biden is making, the crises that his policies are brewing across a number of areas.

Tonight, I rise, Mr. Speaker, to address the state of our economic future.

In the wake of the COVID–19 pandemic, Congress came together last year on a bipartisan basis and targeted relief to provide for families and hardworking Americans.

Now, as vaccines are distributed and Americans are returning to work, the Biden administration is spending an unprecedented amount of money in an untargeted way. Six trillion dollars, Mr. Speaker, and $6 trillion of deficits for 10 years to come. They are funding a manic, untargeted wish list that, in my view, is going to impoverish our kids and grandkids and contribute to too many dollars chasing too few goods.

When you combine this fiscal policy with the Federal Reserve buying of $120 billion of Government debt every month, you are brewing inflation, Mr. Speaker. In my view, inflation is just a tax on hardworking Americans trying to save for retirement, trying to save money for kids in college, trying to buy the necessities of gas, food, build a new home, add onto a home; and this inflation is a tax on working Americans. Joe Biden and his illiterate economic policy, both in monetary policy and fiscal policy, are contributors.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have a better way. We have a better way to target spending, balance our budget, and not impoverish our kids and grandkids. If Republicans take this House back, Mr. Speaker, we will get our economic house in order.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), who comes from a family dedicated to public service. He serves as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, we are here with over 600,000 American fatalities from the COVID virus.

Anyone who referred to the COVID virus as the China virus, or originating in Wuhan, has been somewhat ridiculed along the way. Yet, the evidence continues to mount that the origins of the virus were certainly from Wuhan and very likely from the Wuhan virology lab.

Leader MCCARTHY recently put out eight pillars of action, an action plan, for what we, in a bipartisan manner, as Americans, should mandate, should require, should pursue.

The first, number one, is declassification of intelligence; bringing transparency to U.S. intelligence about what China knew about the virus, about its origins, and when they knew it.

Number two, prohibit the dangerous gain of function research in and with China.

Number three, prohibition on the National Institutes of Health that are funding adversarial foreign governments. We need to ensure American tax dollars don't fund foreign governments intent on harming the U.S. and our allies.

Number four, an overhaul of the World Health Organization and counterintelligence investigation. Transparency and clear understanding of the inner workings of the World Health Organization is what Americans and the world are demanding.

Number five, utilizing existing authorities to perform investigations and launch independent investigations of COVID's origins.

Number six, visa restrictions and sanctions on any agency or individual who there is evidence to show was involved in any form of coverup or misleading of the general public when it comes to COVID's origins.

Number seven, yes, waive Chinese sovereign immunity; allow families of COVID victims to sue China for any damages.

And, unless the above is met, we relocate the 2022 Olympics from China. The world cannot gather in China for peaceful games when we have strong evidence to believe that this virus originated in Wuhan and was covered up.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania's 13th District for those strong words and strong ideas on why we need to hold the people accountable who unleashed this horrific virus on the United States and the world at large.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), who is a farmer, a business manager, and a member of the Agriculture Committee and Education and Labor Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration is promoting its American Jobs Plan as an infrastructure proposal. In reality, it is just a tax-and-spend package that has little to do with actual infrastructure.

We can all agree that the Nation's infrastructure is a key component to a well-functioning economy. However, Democrats are disguising a liberal wish list of big government programs as infrastructure.

Of the $2.25 trillion in total spending, only 5 percent is going to go toward traditional road infrastructure projects.

The Biden administration is labeling everything they propose as infrastructure in an attempt to deceive the American people into thinking that they are talking about roads and bridges.

Our constituents deserve an honest accounting of what Congress proposes to do with their hard-earned tax dollars.

President Biden's infrastructure plan is not about infrastructure; it is about growing the size and power of the Federal Government.

This plan is fiscally irresponsible, and it adds to the massive debt burden that we are leaving our children and grandchildren. We should mourn over what we are leaving our children and grandchildren.

The American people deserve better.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree with the Congresswoman more. As a father and a grandfather, it is atrocious, the debt that we are going to be leaving our children and our grandchildren. We are stealing their future. They will not have the money that they need to provide for their programs and their infrastructure that they are going to need to fund in the future. That is one of the reasons why I wholeheartedly agree with her.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN), who is a fifth generation Kansan and proudly serves on the Agriculture Committee and Veterans' Affairs Committee. He represents Kansas' First District.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss winners and losers under President Biden's policies.

When I was a kid playing eight-man football for the Quinter Bulldogs in rural Kansas, there wasn't much room for debate on the winners and losers of the game. You either won or you didn't. You either scored more touchdowns, more 2-point conversions, and got more tackles than the other team, or you didn't. Plain and simple.

The same is true with America today. President Biden's progressive policies make for very clear winners and very clear losers. Consider these three examples:

Winner number one: Communist China. Loser: America.

On January 31, 2020, America received warning that the coronavirus had possibly been engineered in the Wuhan Institute of Virology in Wuhan, China. In late 2020, America began investigating the link between the spread of the coronavirus and the Wuhan lab. In one of his first acts as President, Joe Biden prematurely ended the investigation into the Wuhan lab.

Now, with new, insurmountable evidence that the coronavirus could have been engineered in the Wuhan lab, President Biden and Speaker NANCY PELOSI refuse to investigate the origins of COVID–19 even with overwhelming support for an investigation. On top of that, President Biden refuses to stop American taxpayer-funded research at that very Wuhan lab.

It has been more than a year since the pandemic shut down the country. Today, nationwide, coronavirus cases have dramatically decreased. America is finally getting back to normal. Businesses across the country are ready to reopen and welcome back customers. Unfortunately, President Biden's bonus, the new monthly unemployment checks being distributed on top of the already existing unemployment checks, is paying a premium for workers to remain at home rather than finding work. The data doesn't lie. There are nearly 8 million job openings in America right now, a new record. I have heard from countless small business owners in the Big First who cite the Biden bonus as the reason they cannot find workers and completely reopen.

While Communist China covers up COVID–19, President Biden is denying science, keeping people unemployed, and hurting America's prosperity. Under President Biden's policies, America loses.

Winner two: The Mexican cartels. Loser: America.

President Biden created a full-scale crisis at our southern border. He promised outright citizenship to more than 11 million illegal immigrants, placed a moratorium on deportations, and halted border wall construction.

These lax policies lure drug cartels, who in turn make hundreds of millions of dollars exploiting children. The cartels will even throw migrant children in the Rio Grande as a distraction, to avoid being apprehended. The daily average of unaccompanied minors crossing the southern border has skyrocketed since President Biden took office.

These policies also create chaos for Americans living near the border. American farmers and ranchers on the border are forced to check their livestock in the daylight, as it is too dangerous for them to leave their homes at night. American families are keeping their kids indoors at all hours of the day. American law enforcement officers and Border Patrol are overworked and shorthanded.

Meanwhile, President Biden and Vice President Harris have yet to visit the border and refuse to secure our country and enforce immigration laws. Under President Biden's policies, America loses.

Winner three: Socialism. Loser: America.

Just a few weeks ago, later than any other President in a transition year, President Biden released his $6 trillion

budget. The budget is the most egregious, most shortsighted, and costliest budget America has ever seen.

President Biden's budget is a progressive wish list in disguise. He wants us funding the Green New Deal, spending $174 billion on subsidies to the electric car market and $40 billion to retrain employees who lost their jobs after he blocked the Keystone Pipeline, all in an attempt to replace the oil and gas industry. He wants $63.5 billion for international spending, but none for America's longtime ally, Israel, clearly bowing to Democrats on their record of anti-Semitic language and slurs. And he refuses to protect our dollars from being spent on abortions, removing a pro-life protection that 77 percent of Americans support and a protection even Biden supported for years before his Presidential campaign.

While socialists are pleased with Biden's latest spending spree, the economic disaster to follow will cripple American families' purchasing power and leave future generations with the crushing burden of the national debt. Under President Biden's policies, America loses.

Sadly, the greatest loser in all of this is our freedom, the freedom to open our businesses and make a living when we choose, the freedom to own land without the fear of a land grab, the freedom for law-abiding Americans to own and use firearms, the freedom to live out our faith without being persecuted by the government, the freedom to speak freely on college campuses, and the freedom to win.

Our Founding Fathers ensured that these freedoms do not flow from a king, another country, or government, and they never will. Under freedom, America always wins.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CARL), who is a successful small business owner and a valued member of the Armed Services Committee and Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GIMENEZ for overseeing this and calling us together.

Mr. Speaker, let's not forget what we have gone through in the last year and a half.

In the last year and a half, personally, I have seen a campaign that we have had to run while talking through doors. We had campaigns that were virtually unheard of in the past.

Those of us that did win, when we came to Washington, we were all treated equally, but we were treated like a disease. We were locked down in a hotel; our food was slipped to us through a plastic cover, in a paper bag; and that is the way we lived for a week through orientation.

□ 1900

I am not blaming anyone. We had no idea what was going on. We all lived in fear. We all worried about this. But we are Americans and we are tough. We are tough. So we have made it. We have made it so far.

The changes we have seen, the birthdays that we have missed, the parents that we have seen that have passed away without us being there with them, I mean, we have all lived through this. We have got to reach across the aisle, and we have got to get America answers, answers to where this pandemic actually started. I encourage everyone to do that.

Millions have lost jobs and necessary incomes while countless others lost loved ones to the virus. Meanwhile, the American public is constantly being misled over the origins of the spread of this COVID–19.

First, we need to declassify all information related to the origins of COVID–19. Then we need to prohibit the National Institutes of Health from giving funds to irresponsible foreign governments, like China. And, finally, we need to investigate the Chinese Communist Party's role in the origin and the spread of this virus.

The evidence is clear that the Chinese Communist Party intentionally hid information and lied about the truth about this virus. It is time for answers, and it is time for us to hold them accountable for the spread of this horrific pandemic. The American people and the whole world deserves to know the truth.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stop, hesitate, and let's work together on this. Let's join together and find out the truth and prevent something like this from happening again. It is very important to this country and this Nation.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), who represents Texas' 36th District. He is a lifelong resident of east Texas and my colleague on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida, a former mayor, for yielding. I am a former mayor myself.

Mr. Speaker, every single action that the Chinese Communist Party takes leaves me with no doubt that they are not friends of ours. For years, Beijing has stolen American intelligence, technology, and intellectual property in their relentless pursuit to supersede us as the number one superpower in the world.

So it should come as no surprise to anyone that more than a year after COVID–19 magically manifested itself and escaped China and took the world by storm, killing millions, we are still asking ourselves: How did it happen? Is there something that China is not telling us?

The simple answer is yes, there is plenty that the CCP is not telling us. We can't even begin to solve the question of how this happened until we start a formal investigation.

Unfortunately, it is not just the CCP who refuses to allow a transparent and thorough investigation into the pandemic's origins. It is also my colleagues across the aisle. After all, secrecy and diversion seem to be a standard practice for both the Democrat Party and Beijing.

Why are the Democrats refusing to allocate resources so that we can solve the problems and questions surrounding something this major?

They are perfectly happy to spend $1.9 billion of Americans' hard-earned tax dollars for security upgrades to the Capitol complex due to the events of January 6, where one person died, but cannot be bothered to spend a dime to investigate how 600,000 Americans died.

There is mounting evidence that the COVID–19 pandemic started in a Chinese laboratory and that the Chinese Communist Party covered it up.

Don't the more than 33 million Americans who have been infected with COVID and the loved ones of the more than 600,000 Americans who passed away from it deserve an explanation?

To blindly just believe that this global pandemic started from a bat in a wet market in the very same city where genetic analyses of coronaviruses are done at the Wuhan Institute of Virology without doing any sort of an investigation is a dereliction of our duty. It is inexcusable and downright ignorant.

This administration and this Congress must hold the Chinese Communist Party's feet to the fire and give us some answers. We deserve the truth.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANKLIN), my friend and colleague. He has served as a naval aviator in the U.S. Navy for 26 years. I thank him for his service.

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because of its great weather, beautiful beaches, and low taxes, a friend who once served as my Congressman liked to say that, for many around the country, Florida is the reward for a life well lived.

As liberal States continue to run their governments into the ground and the pandemic has accelerated our ability to work remotely, it is no longer just retirees who are moving to the Sunshine State in droves. In fact, nearly 330,000 have relocated there in the past year alone.

With its strategic location along central Florida's I–4 corridor, Florida's 15th Congressional District is one of the fastest growing areas in the country. Our current transportation infrastructure is already inadequate. It is a problem that will only accelerate going forward unless we act now. I am sure many communities across the country can relate.

Both sides of the aisle can agree that our Nation's highways, airports, water infrastructure, ports, and broadband networks are the arteries of our national commerce and worthy investments of taxpayer money.

The good news is Republicans are taking the lead to meet these infrastructure needs. First, we are proposing a major overhaul of our Federal

project review and permitting processes. When I formerly served on the board of the Transportation Planning Organization in my home district, we routinely had critical needs that waited years for funding. Some of those have still not been funded. So speeding up that process is a critical first step.

We are also proposing a $460 billion framework that will make crucial investments in our Nation's transportation system, water infrastructure, and broadband networks. This framework represents an investment in the real infrastructure Americans need, not bizarre reinterpretations of infrastructure or partisan pet projects.

Congress has talked about infrastructure investment for years. It is time to put words into action. I hope the President will continue to listen to voices on both sides of the aisle to enact a bipartisan solution that our country so desperately needs.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. HARSHBARGER). She has been a successful pharmacist and business owner for over three decades.

Mrs. HARSHBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the important need for an investigation into China's role in the origin of COVID–19.

More than 600,000 Americans and 3.8 million people have died worldwide from the virus, and now it is becoming more evident than ever that the virus may have originated from a leak at the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

It is also clear that China withheld critical information at the beginning of the pandemic to cover up how deadly the virus could become. We have demanded an investigation to find out what Chinese Communist Party leaders knew and when they knew it. My colleagues from across the aisle have blocked our attempts.

Millions have died and countless others have suffered from the economic effects of the pandemic. The American people deserve answers as to how the outbreak originated, and the Chinese Communist Party must be held accountable if they are responsible for the outbreak and its global spread.

The bottom line is this: China lied and people did die. We need an investigation now.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN). He is an experienced government official. We share a common background in local government, having both served as mayors.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, over 3.8 million people across the world have died from COVID–19, over 600,000 Americans have died. We deserve to know how the COVID–19 pandemic began.

There is mounting evidence to show that the Wuhan Institute of Virology is a probable source of that. If we look at the assertions by China to say that this was transmitted naturally from a bat through a wet market, things just don't add up.

If we look at the information we have gotten from our intelligence communities, if we look at what we have seen to this point across the whole spectrum, we deserve to know exactly what has happened.

If we want to uncover the truth behind COVID–19, if we are serious about preventing future pandemics, if we are serious about holding China accountable, then I believe we need to do everything we can to follow the science.

By profession and by education, I am a biologist. In fact, I worked in and ran laboratories for years, laboratories that handled pathogenic organisms. I know the things that need to be done to uncover exactly what happened at the Wuhan lab.

It doesn't make sense to look at the assertions that China makes and somehow believe that that is indeed the case. I don't think that this is a random event. I do believe that there are links to the Wuhan lab that must have an independent and thoughtful evaluation of exactly what happened.

We have to force China to allow a free, objective, and independent evaluation of exactly what happened at the Wuhan Institute of Virology and determine what role did it play in the origins of this pandemic. We have to do that.

I want to ensure the investigation happens and that we hold Chinese officials accountable. That is why I introduced The World Deserves to Know Act, because, indeed, the world deserves to know. The World Deserves to Know Act will sanction key Chinese officials in their Centers for Disease Control, in their national health commission who obfuscated data, the data necessary to determine exactly what happened; and also, through our intelligence gathering, to identify those individuals in the Chinese Communist Party that persecuted scientists, that persecuted citizen journalists that sought to divulge the truth about what happened there. There must be a free, open, and independent evaluation that is allowed in order for us to know. Again, the world deserves to know.

In the meantime, what my bill would do is also prohibit funding from going to China from any U.S. institution, our universities, our colleges, anyplace that would send money either to the National Health Commission or any entity associated with the National Health Commission, like the Wuhan lab for the research that we have seen going on there, the gain-of-function research. We have to make sure that that happens.

I want to make sure, too, that we identify where dollars have gone from the U.S., from the National Institutes of Health or any other governmental entity or any entity associated with our Federal Government, State governments, or local governments that may have sent money to China for gain-of-function research. We have to know exactly where the money went, where it came from, and who was the decision-maker about how that money got there. And that needs to go all the way up through our bureaucracies not only at the Federal level, but at the State level also. Anywhere there is an association, that needs to be known.

I want to make sure, too, that my bill allows Taiwan observer status in the World Health Organization to make sure that they check China's malign influence over the organization. Taiwan was at the very beginning of making sure that this was transparent.

This is not about political gamesmanship. This is about getting to the truth not only for the sake of truth itself, but to make sure the United States never suffers another pandemic like the one we just endured.

I hope that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in holding China accountable and supporting and cosponsoring The World Deserves to Know Act.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). He represents California's First District. He serves on the Agriculture Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about infrastructure around here. The American people wonder what is that actually going to mean coming out here. Well, it really needs to be focused on things that we are short of, but would be fixing our highways, fixing our bridges, things like that.

In California, where I come from, the subject is water. Water storage is desperately needed. We have had some years of drought, but we also have not added to our water storage in a significant way in 40 years. With a growing population, there is a growing need.

For example, what does that mean to all Americans, not just Californians?

The food we eat. The top crops in California that are grown approximately 99 percent or more in California are almonds, artichokes, celery, figs, garlic, raisins, kiwis, honeydew, nectarines, olives, cling peaches, pistachios, plums, sweet rice, and walnuts.

If California is not growing those items, where do we intend to get those?

□ 1915

For almonds especially, California grows all the domestic production Americans use and 77 percent of the global production. We also produce 92 percent of the Nation's avocados, grapes, lemons, and mandarins. No avocados? No guacamole.

What are we going to do, import all this? We have to be producing this stuff in the State of California.

What does that mean? We need to invest in water infrastructure. We can be raising Shasta Dam, which is a Federal project. Eighteen feet yields over 600,000 new acre-feet for these crops. We could be building Sites Reservoir. Both of these have been invested in slightly by the Federal Government lately. We need to do much more because we are the leading State in so

many of the important products that Americans actually use.

So, we have to talk a lot more about water storage.

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

HIGHLIGHTING JUNETEENTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again highlight our newest Federal holiday, Juneteenth, or Emancipation Day.

For Americans who are not familiar with this day, it has been celebrated within the Black community for over 150 years. This was the day when the message finally reached Black Texans living in Galveston that slavery was over and that they were indeed free.

The Emancipation Proclamation was signed by President Abraham Lincoln on September 22, 1862. Union General Gordon Granger arrived with over 2,000 troops to deliver this message to the former slaves on June 19, 1865, 3 years later.

The lesson that can be learned from this special day is twofold. For almost 3 years, Black Texans lived as slaves at a time when the price had already been paid for them to live free. As it was with Juneteenth 1865, it would be the Republican Party that delivered the message to my race: You are free.

In America, in the land of freedom, success is a personal choice. It is not easy, nor is it guaranteed. But if you choose to dream, work, sacrifice, and remain patient, you can, regardless of your skin color, live your American Dream.

The remarkable success of the late 1800s all-Black Greenwood community speaks to the tenacity, pride, innovation, and entrepreneurial spirit of a race that rose in less than 50 years from slavery. Its destruction in 1921, within 12 hours, also highlights the vulnerability of the American Dream in the absence of the rule of law. Deep Greenwood, referred to as ''Little Africa'' and ''Black Wall Street,'' was the most wealthy and prosperous Black community in America in the early 1900s.

During the 1820s, several successful and prominent Black entrepreneurs were drawn to Oklahoma due to a nationwide economic depression and the discovery of oil. The local economy boomed, with Blacks in Tulsa representing all professional occupations, from day laborers, cooks, and shoe shiners to physicians, schoolteachers, and entrepreneurs.

Racism and the influence of Jim Crow laws made it so that Blacks could work in White areas but could not spend their money there. This led to the creation of Deep Greenwood.

With business dollars circulating only within their own community, many Blacks began to buy land and start their businesses. Black Wall Street became the center of the town, featuring restaurants, jewelry stores, hotels, theaters, places of worship, and three Black newspapers.

By the way, in the 1960s, when I was growing up, this describes my segregated community, a community of entrepreneurs where, across our country, 50 to 60 percent of Black Americans belonged to the middle class.

Over 600 business owners helped Black Wall Street become influential, including a funeral parlor, barbershops, dental and medical offices, schools, libraries, a hospital, insurance and loan companies, airline charter services, a bus service, international businesses, and nightclubs.

The Black community was thriving, and their collective success rivaled that of Tulsa. But in these times of racism and deep prejudices, the success of Black Wall Street created a tinderbox of tension.

On May 30, 1921, a 17-year-old White woman accused Dick Rowland, a Black shoe shiner, of criminally assaulting her when he accidentally stepped on her foot. She slapped him, and in response, he grabbed her arm to prevent her from hitting him.

Realizing his self-defense move might cause problems, he fled the scene. The next day, he was jailed. The Tulsa Tribune printed a story announcing that a ''negro would be lynched tonight.''

Three hours after the Tulsa Tribune released the story, hundreds of White men gathered at the Tulsa courthouse where Rowland was being held. Many Blacks who wanted to protect Rowland from being lynched rushed to the courthouse to defend him.

False rumors about the incident caused a struggle between White protestors and Blacks in front of the courthouse. Shots rang out, and 12 men were killed.

As the fighting continued, Tulsa Whites began an all-out assault on Deep Greenwood, including dropping firebombs from the air. Fire engulfed the entire Black district. Deep Greenwood burned all day on May 31. At the end of the attack, Black Wall Street was no longer standing.

In total, 300 people were murdered; 35 acres of commercial and residential property were destroyed; 1,400 homes and businesses were looted and burned; 10,000 people were left homeless; $1.8 million in damage, which in today's dollar amounts would be $27 million. It was estimated the total value lost would be valued at $200 million in today's dollars. Over 600 businesses were destroyed, and as is today, these businesses were the engine that powered the self-sufficient middle class.

By the time the police chief asked the National Guard to help quell the ''negro uprising,'' it was too late. The city was already destroyed. A grand jury held him responsible for dereliction of duty. He was removed from office, found guilty in the trial, but never served any time in jail.

I would like to introduce you to some of the Black leaders in Deep Greenwood, Oklahoma, the city of millionaires.

Dr. A.C. Jackson, a physician, transcended the color lines, servicing both Black and White patients. He was considered the most skilled Black surgeon in America, with a net worth of over $100,000, which, in 2019, would have a value of over a million dollars. Dr. Jackson was murdered during the massacre at age 40.

E.W. Woods was the first principal of the all-Black Booker T. Washington High School. Woods set the standard for high expectations at school.

John Stradford was the owner of a 45-room luxury hotel in Greenwood, the largest Black-owned-and-operated hotel in Oklahoma, and one of the few Black-owned hotels in the United States. He was the son of an escaped slave, and he came to Oklahoma in 1899 and was the wealthiest man on Black Wall Street.

Simon Berry owned a nickel-a-ride jitney service, a bus line, a boutique hotel, and a charter plane service.

John and Loula Williams owned a 1911 luxury Norwalk Touring. This couple launched multiple venues, a theater, a confectionary, a rooming house, and a garage.

Buck Colbert Franklin, an attorney in Deep Greenwood, was known for defending the survivors of the Greenwood massacre. He was the father of civil rights advocate and historian John Hope Franklin.

These successful Black leaders all faced the darkness of the 1921 massacre.

John Stradford's hotel laid in ruins after the burning of Deep Greenwood and was never rebuilt. Stradford was indicted for inciting a riot and fled Greenwood.

The Mt. Zion Baptist Church was just 40 days old and was destroyed. The cost to rebuild and furnish was $135,000.

During the riot, homes were looted and burned, and thousands of Black people were left homeless.

There were 88 indictments served against Blacks and Whites alike, but all charges were either dismissed or ignored.

The KKK used the massacre as a recruiting tool, stating that ''the riot was the best thing that ever happened to Tulsa'' and sold postcards in Tulsa's downtown streets to raise money.

Republican Representative Dyer from Missouri introduced a Federal antilynching bill, the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill. Democrats in the Senate delayed the bill and eventually killed it. Between 1882 and 1968, nearly 200 antilynching bills were introduced in Congress, and seven U.S. Presidents between 1890 and 1952 also asked Congress to pass a Federal antilynching law. All efforts failed to pass due to the stalling tactics by the Democratic Congress and Senate.

The comparison of 1921 Tulsa and the 2020 summer can be summarized in these words: a lack of rule of law.

In 1921, what had taken nine decades to build in Greenwood was destroyed within a matter of 12 hours. Ninety-nine years later, following the murder of George Floyd, riots stretched throughout our country in predominantly Black urban cities. Over the summer of 2020, more than 1,500 businesses, residences, and government buildings were destroyed, along with the lives of 25 Americans.

Jeremiah Ellison, a councilman in Minnesota, where a police precinct house itself was set on fire, advised the mayor to leave the vandals alone. ''The focus of anger is the police and this building,'' he reasoned. ''If we let the crowd do its thing, we might spare the neighborhood.'' History will forever note how wrong he was.

In Portland, Oregon, the summer riots of 2020 have resulted in $23 million lost. Yet, the Portland mayor, Ted Wheeler, tweeted that Federal officers were bringing violence and life-threatening tactics to the city. ''The best thing they can do is stay inside their building or leave Portland altogether,'' he said.

In Kenosha, Wisconsin, over half the people arrested in the aftermath were from out of town. Property damage topped $50 million and put close to 40 businesses out of business.

Even in my own Salt Lake City, cop cars were burned. The Salt Lake City Council chairman declared that overturning and burning a police cruiser was a ''small sacrifice over physical clashes between officers and civilians.'' Meanwhile, 21 police officers were injured.

At the end of the summer riots of 2020, over 20 States witnessed violent riots, with insurance claims between $1 billion and $2 billion.

Once again, most tragically, 25 American citizens lost their lives, including a respected retired Black officer who was murdered in cold blood protecting the store of a friend.

In New York City, politicians passed no-bail laws, allowing criminals and rioters to return to the streets the very next night to loot and again attack New York City police.

In Portland, as the city is still reeling and businesses remained hostages to criminals, thousands of rioters' charges have been dropped.

We must learn several things from our history. Whether it be the destruction of 1921 Black Wall Street businesses or 2020 Black urban cities throughout our Nation, consistent is a pattern of failure of elected officials to uphold the rule of law. Instead of championing Black and minority business owners, many of these officials stood aside as these communities were destroyed. Consistent with the acts in 1921 and that of 2020 was the criminal predators' justification, always in the name of so-called racial justice.

From these two dark chapters, accountability must be a lesson learned. As we demand equal opportunity for all Americans for life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and property, we the people become more unified and free.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 24, 2021, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC–1455. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Phillip G. Sawyer, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral 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–1456. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2018, as required by the Older Americans Act of 1965, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3018(a); Public Law 89-73, Sec. 207(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-501, Sec. 205); (114 Stat. 2234); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC–1457. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Nicaragua that was declared in Executive Order 13851 of November 27, 2018, 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–1458. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting 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, 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–1459. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–1460. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–1461. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–1462. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting the 2020 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, 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–1463. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–1464. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Semiannual Report to the Congress for the period ending March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–1465. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Office of Inspector General semiannual report for the period October 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021, and Management Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–1466. A letter from the General Manager, Woods Hole, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Steamship Authority, transmitting the Authority's Annual Report for 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 4074. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the availability of supplemental benefits to certain Medicare Advantage enrollees; 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. CARBAJAL (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4075. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 4076. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to give the Department of Education the authority to award competitive grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support

school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk students in middle school and high school in developing cognitive and social-emotional skills to prepare them for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROSS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4077. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits be calculated using the value of the low-cost food plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 4078. A bill to establish requirements relating to credit scores and educational credit scores, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LAMB, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. LIEU, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 4079. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take certain actions related to pesticides that may affect pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. CAWTHORN):

H.R. 4080. A bill to impose additional duties on imports of goods from the People's Republic of China until China provides full compensation and reimbursement relating to the COVID-19 pandemic to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 4081. A bill to require the disclosure of a camera or recording capability in certain internet-connected devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 4082. A bill to prevent catastrophic wildland fires by establishing a commission to study and recommend wildland fire prevention, mitigation, suppression, management, and rehabilitation policies for the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Armed Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 4083. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to impose certain additional requirements on applicants for COPS grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 4084. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to levy a fee on methane emissions from oil and natural gas facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESTES (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KIND, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H.R. 4085. A bill to allow for the transfer and redemption of abandoned savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 4086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. KILMER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 4087. A bill to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to extend the management plan submission deadline for certain National Heritage Areas to 4 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself and Mr. MOONEY):

H.R. 4088. A bill to provide for improvements to National Flood Insurance Program rate maps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

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

H.R. 4089. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop and disseminate best practices for rental companies and dealers to report suspicious behavior to law enforcement agencies at the point of sale of a covered rental vehicle to prevent and mitigate acts of terrorism using motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 4090. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make college affordable and accessible; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 4091. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to terminate certain contracts on the basis of detrimental conduct to the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN):

H.R. 4092. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Coastal Program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to work with willing partners and provide support to efforts to assess, protect, restore, and enhance important coastal areas that provide fish and wildlife habitat on which Federal trust species depend, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 4093. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify the distribution of funds under the tribal transportation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 4094. A bill to conduct a pilot program at foreign last point of departure airports to permit passengers and their accessible property to continue on additional flights or flight segments originating in the United States without additional security re-screening, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 4095. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain post-graduation scholarship grants from gross income in the same manner as qualified scholarships to promote economic growth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS (for herself, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 4096. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make available to the public on the websites of their respective departments certain information relating to individuals processed through U.S. Customs and Border Protection or Department of Health and Human Services facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4097. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 4098. A bill to develop a non-opioid pain management directive indicating to health care professionals and emergency medical services personnel that an individual with respect to whom a form has been executed must not be administered an opioid or offered a prescription for an opioid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada):

H.R. 4099. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a grant program to provide grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities for large-scale water recycling and reuse projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COLE, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. LAMB, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. BACON, Mr. CROW, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 4100. A bill to amend the national service laws to prioritize national service programs and projects that are directly related to the response to and recovery from the COVID-19 public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 4101. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure that non-animal methods are prioritized, where applicable and feasible, in proposals for all research to be conducted or supported by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 4102. A bill to provide for contracting with Native CHamoru Organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 4103. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUSH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CORREA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 4104. A bill to reform the disposition of charges and convening of courts-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and increase the prevention of sexual assaults and other crimes in the military; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4105. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to expand the list of categories of essential travel into the United States at land ports of entry along the United States-Canada border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and 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. STEVENS:

H.R. 4106. A bill to amend the Stop Student Debt Relief Scams Act of 2019 to make technical corrections; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and reform rules relating to investigations and whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 4108. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a pilot grant program to make grants to school food authorities to provide 100 percent plant-based food and milk options, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4109. A bill to ensure that an employment relationship is not established between a franchisor and a franchisee if the franchisor engages in certain activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4110. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide hereditary cancer genetic testing for individuals with a history of a hereditary cancer gene mutation in a blood relative or a personal or ancestral history suspicious for hereditary cancer, and to provide coverage of certain cancer screenings or preventive surgeries that would reduce the risk for individuals with a germline (inherited) mutation associated with a high risk of developing a preventable cancer; 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. WATERS (for herself and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 4111. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to direct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to advocate that the Fund provide technical assistance to Fund members seeking to enhance their capacity to evaluate the legal and financial terms of sovereign debt contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H. Res. 491. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 9th as ''Collector Car Appreciation Day'' and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. ROY, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. STEIL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EMMER, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FALLON, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H. Res. 492. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require inflationary impact statements in committee reports; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOOD

of Virginia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. FALLON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. ROY):

H. Res. 493. A resolution expressing disapproval of the failure to uphold the constitutional duty to ''take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed'' and the usurpation of the legislative authority of Congress by the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 494. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2021 as ''Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Month'' in order to educate communities across the United States about sickle cell disease and the need for research, early detection methods, effective treatments, and preventative care programs with respect to complications from sickle cell disease and conditions related to sickle cell disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 495. A resolution calling for sickle cell trait research, surveillance, and public education and awareness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BASS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. WILD, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. OMAR, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. COHEN):

H. Res. 496. A resolution supporting the continued work of the United States African Development Foundation as it creates pathways to prosperity for underserved communities on the African Continent through community-led development; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-33. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Resolution No. 165, urging all Illinois legislators at all levels of government to endorse the Puerto Rico Self-Determination Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ML-34. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 53, urging President Joe Biden to support the Keystone XL Pipeline, reverse his decision to cancel the permit, and to support American jobs and energy cooperation with our Canadian neighbors; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ML-35. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2004, urging Congress to fund a study on floodwater harvesting; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 4074.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4075.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4076.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

The Congress shall have Power . . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 4077.

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

Article I, Section VIII of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 4078.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4079.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 4080.

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

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4081.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4082.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 4083.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 4084.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ESTES:

H.R. 4085.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2: To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 4086.

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

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 4087.

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

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 4088.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 4089.

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

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 4090.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 4091.

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

U.S.C. Article I Section 8

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4092.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 4093.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 4094.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 4095.

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

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H.R. 4096.

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

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4097.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4098.

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

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 4099.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 4100.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which states: ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . ''

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 4101.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 4102.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, Congress's authority to make all rules and regulations respecting the Territories and possessions

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress's authority to make laws which shall be necessary and proper

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 4103.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4104.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4105.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 4106.

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

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4107.

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

Article I

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4108.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4109.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 4110.

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

The U.S. Constitution, Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 4111.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 18: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 28: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 67: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 69: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 130: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 151: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 157: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 228: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARCIA of California, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 263: Mr. KAHELE and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 265: Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 308: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 310: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MEUSER, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 333: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 471: Mr. KUSTOFF and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 475: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 503: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 516: Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 541: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 565: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 598: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 677: Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 695: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 763: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 764: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 821: Mr. COLE and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 852: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 869: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 962: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 997: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1009: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1016: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1062: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1066: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1145: Ms. MACE and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 1155: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1177: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 1182: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1210: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1226: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 1235: Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 1259: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1283: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1297: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1321: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1346: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.

H.R. 1378: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 1436: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1474: Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 1492: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 1527: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1531: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1551: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1592: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1670: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1696: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1783: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1819: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1914: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1959: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1992: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2005: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2030: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. EVANS, and Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 2099: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. FULCHER.

H.R. 2139: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 2168: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2169: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 2193: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 2214: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2234: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 2255: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2257: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2265: Mr. STEIL and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 2294: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 2307: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 2337: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KAHELE, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 2358: Ms. BOURDEAUX.

H.R. 2371: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2372: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2424: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 2436: Mr. POCAN, Mr. CROW, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. WILD, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2499: Mr. COHEN, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DEAN, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. LAMB, and Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 2611: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2639: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2716: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2750: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2763: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2773: Mr. COHEN and Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 2810: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2811: Mr. NEGUSE and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 2817: Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 2840: Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2890: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2900: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 2915: Mr. MEIJER.

H.R. 2954: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. ROSS, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3104: Mr. MANN and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 3106: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3107: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3108: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 3114: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3135: Mr. HIMES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3157: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 3160: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 3165: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3196: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 3224: Mr. CASTEN and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 3256: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 3345: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3353: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 3362: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3367: Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 3368: Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 3369: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 3370: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3372: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 3385: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. JACKSON, Ms.

WILD, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3407: Mrs. TORRES of California and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 3424: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 3434: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 3440: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3455: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3482: Mr. KATKO and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 3492: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 3513: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 3515: Mr. GOODEN of Texas and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 3529: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3530: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 3541: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3548: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3554: Mr. BURCHETT and Mr. CARL.

H.R. 3613: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3630: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3631: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3648: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 3665: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PANETTA, and Mrs. KIM of California.

H.R. 3685: Mr. CASE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COMER, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 3710: Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3728: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3749: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 3764: Mr. NADLER and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 3796: Mr. ARMSTRONG and Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 3807: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3811: Mr. JACKSON and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 3834: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 3843: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 3860: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 3883: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 3888: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 3922: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CARL, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H.R. 3926: Mr. CAWTHORN.

H.R. 3929: Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3938: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 3946: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3947: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 3958: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 3959: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 3961: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 3968: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3972: Mr. BARR, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3985: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. WILD, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3995: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 3999: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LUCAS, and Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 4007: Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 4024: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4071: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr.MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HERN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. EVANS.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. ROSE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ESTES, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. KELLER.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. PETERS.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H. Res. 47: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H. Res. 109: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H. Res. 136: Ms. ROSS.

H. Res. 289: Mr. VALADAO.

H. Res. 305: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. BERA.

H. Res. 344: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. STRICKLAND.

H. Res. 456: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. JACKSON.

H. Res. 471: Mr. YOUNG.

H. Res. 484: Mr. COMER.

H. Res. 488: Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Res. 489: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HIMES, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. CLEAVER.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 3093: Mr. CORREA.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

PT-36. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Oakland County Board of Commissioners, Michigan, relative to Miscellaneous Resolution No. 21135, supporting the U.S. Citizenship Act of 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PT-37. Also, a petition of the Council of the City of New York, New York, relative to Resolution No. 1229, calling for the United States Congress to pass, the President to sign, the Adoptee Citizenship Act of 2021 (H.R. 1593/S. 967), in order to secure U.S. citizenship of international adopted children who are now adults or aging into adulthood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PT-38. Also, a petition of the Council of the City of New York, New York, relative to Resolution No. 1372, calling upon the United States Congress to pass, and the President to sign, H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2021 No. 109

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious God, today accept the love and loyalty of our hearts. We are grateful for Your loving kindness and tender mercies.

Lord, we desire to please You by living for Your glory. Continue to bless our lawmakers. May they seek guidance from Your holy Word, permitting sacred precepts to provide lamps for their feet and light for their path. May this light also illuminate the road ahead for others who walk in darkness, so that Your will for our Nation and world may be done.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, yesterday, the Senate was given an opportunity to begin debate on a subject that by all rights should be beyond debate: protecting the right to vote.

As we all know, Republican legislatures across the country are passing some of the most draconian restrictions on the right to vote in decades—a throwback to Jim Crow.

Every single Democrat yesterday voted to begin debate on legislation to fight back against this assault—and that is what it is, an assault on our democracy—every single one. It was the first time in this Congress that we have united all 50 Democrats on moving forward with strong and comprehensive voting rights legislation.

Senate Republicans, to the very last Member, voted against allowing the Senate to even have a debate on voting rights. Not a single Republican voted to move forward with a simple debate. In fact, the Republican leader went so far as to say that ''regardless of what may be happening in some states''—voter suppression laws, phony audits, or the partisan takeover of election boards—he believes the Federal Government should not intervene. Who said that? Southern Senators from the Civil War all the way through said States' rights—used as a tool to prevent particularly people of color from voting. And to invoke that in 2020? The majority leader is way off—way off base. It is disgraceful that he would even invoke that.

Yesterday's vote was another piece of evidence that voter suppression is now part of the official platform of the Republican Party. But I want to be clear about one thing. As I said last night, the fight to protect voting rights is far, very far from over. Yesterday's vote was the starting gun, not the finish line.

As the Senate majority leader, I reserve the right to bring up this issue for debate again. Yesterday was the first time we tried to consider major voting rights legislation, but it won't be the last. Democrats will explore every option available to us for reconsidering legislation on this topic. We will leave no stone unturned. Voting rights are too important. The fight against modern-day voter suppression is just beginning.

One other point. Some of them like to make this point: Oh, this is just a partisan fight. Bull. This is a fight for the soul of America, and it shouldn't be partisan, and it never was in the past. When legislatures try to prevent poor people, people of color, urban people, and young people from voting, that is not a political fight; that is what America is all about. So don't try to hide under that guise.

It is Republican legislatures doing this. But in the past, when legislatures, usually in the South, tried to do these things—and in other places—both parties united to stop it. No more, sadly. Shame, shame, shame, shame on my Republican colleagues. This is a very bad day for them that history will recognize.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now on another matter, this week, the Senate will continue restoring balance to the Federal courts by considering more of President Biden's judicial appointments.

Over the next 2 days, we will consider Deborah Boardman to serve as district judge in Maryland and Candace Jackson-Akiwumi to serve as judge on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Together, Ms. Boardman and Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi have had over 20 years of experience as Federal defenders.

I believe that bringing professional diversity as well as personal diversity to the bench should be and is now a top priority. There are plenty of former prosecutors and corporate lawyers wearing black robes. It is time that some voting rights attorneys, civil rights attorneys, and former Federal defenders, like these two nominees, bring their perspectives to the bench.

A final vote on Ms. Boardman's nomination will come this afternoon, and then we will proceed to the nomination of Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi, which we will finish before the end of the week. Again, the Senate will not leave for the week until we finish considering these judges. The Democratic majority in the Senate will continue to swiftly fill judicial vacancies.

On a related note, today, Chairman PETERS will ask the Senate to approve two critical cyber security nominees: Jen Easterly to be the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and Robin Carnahan to be the Administrator of the GSA. Both of these Agencies play a critical role in our Nation's cyber security.

The threat of ransomware attacks and other cyber crimes is on the rise from State actors as well as cyber bandits who were given sanctuary by our adversaries. We need people at the helm on these important Agencies to focus on hardening our Nation's cyber security. This should be a completely nonpartisan issue, and my Republican friends should not object.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in addition to our important work on judicial appointments, the Senate is moving forward on multiple legislative proposals to make historic investments in our Nation's infrastructure.

We have a chance in this Congress to get something big and bold done on infrastructure—something we haven't managed in a very long time. If we want America to prosper in the 21st century, we can't do it with infrastructure that is stuck in the last century. This is our chance to update, modernize, repair, and rebuild for another century of American economic growth, creating thousands upon thousands of good-paying jobs in the process.

Later today, Speaker PELOSI and I will meet with representatives from the White House to discuss the next steps on this very topic. Here in the Senate, Democratic members of the Budget Committee continue to build on the fruitful conversations we had last week. In fact, earlier today, I spoke with all of our committee chairs about a forthcoming budget resolution.

As I have said, discussions about infrastructure are progressing along two tracks. The first is bipartisan, and the second incorporates elements of the President's American jobs and families plan. The second track is something we must support even if it doesn't get any Republican support. For several weeks, the trains have been chugging down both tracks quite well. When the Senate returns after the July 4 work period, it will be time to take the next step forward.

This summer, the Senate will begin considering the fiscal 2022 budget resolution and a bipartisan infrastructure bill on the floor. It is my hope to have both a bipartisan infrastructure bill and a budget resolution for the Senate to consider this summer. I believe the progress we have made in recent weeks will ultimately produce the result that will set our economy on a path to prosperity for generations to come.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, one final matter: student loans. Today, I have joined Senator WARREN and a number of my House and Senate colleagues to urge the Biden administration to extend the pause on payments and interest for the vast majority of Federal student loans.

For millions of student borrowers, one of the most difficult challenges is balancing their debt with their dreams of starting a career, starting a family, and buying a home. When the pandemic hit, these challenges were magnified a hundredfold. Job opportunities disappeared, and our economy came to a halt. The pause on student loan repayment during the pandemic was a life-altering policy that allowed tens of millions of young people to escape financial ruin.

Right now, the current pause on repayment of student debt is set to expire on September 30. I believe that is too soon. Our economy is still recovering. Americans are still pulling themselves up and dusting themselves off after one of the greatest economic crises in our history. The October 1 expiration date could risk putting millions of student loan borrowers back into financial hardship.

Very simply, I am urging the Biden administration to extend the pause on student loan repayment by another 6 months, until March 2022. Even as the economy recovers, young people, borrowers with a load of debt, will struggle more than most to get back on their feet. Why not give them a little more breathing room?

I urge the Biden administration to extend the pause, and I will continue working with Senator WARREN on ways to provide even more comprehensive, life-changing student loan forgiveness—a policy, I believe, that will expand opportunity for millions, millions of young Americans.

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. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

RUSSIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, for the first time earlier this month, President Biden traveled to Europe. The primary purpose for this trip was to engage with some of America's closest friends and allies, but the agenda also included a one-on-one meeting with a staunch adversary, Vladimir Putin.

The President took office armed with a great deal of tough talk on Russia. He called his counterpart a ''killer'' and a ''KGB thug'' and warned he would ''pay [the] price'' for interference in U.S. elections. The world wondered whether this rhetoric would be underpinned by tough action. I certainly hoped it would.

Back in January, I made it clear that if the Biden administration was serious about ''imposing real costs on Moscow,'' it would ''find willing partners on Capitol Hill.'' But so far, there have been few encouraging signs for those of us who take Russia's threats very seriously.

Remember, after less than a week in office, President Biden agreed to Russian requests for a full 5-year extension of the New START Treaty, no strings attached. He gave it up for free, undermining our leverage to extract concessions in future negotiations.

Then, his administration rolled out a budget proposal that would cut investment in defense, in real terms—short-changing the modernization we need to keep pace with both Russia and China.

And 2 weeks ago, the President left for Europe, having already given the Kremlin two other gifts: a high-profile summit that experts predicted Putin would use to help legitimize his regime at home and abroad and a waiver of sanctions on the Russian-owned company behind a lucrative gas pipeline project.

So I will repeat for President Biden the same warning I offered to the previous administration: The Kremlin is

not our friend, and it is high time our actions started reflecting that.

Back home, of course, the Biden administration has proven it knows perfectly well how to crack down on energy pipeline projects when it wants to. In fact, on the day he left for Europe, the firm behind the Keystone XL Pipeline project announced that the President's revocation of its construction permit would be fatal. That is the end of it. What a striking image. The President of the United States heads overseas and meets with a major adversary whom he has handed a major geopolitical win, and here at home, the last nail goes in the coffin of the job-killing crusade against reliable North American energy that he said on day one was a priority.

It is a tale of two pipelines: the decisive rejection of thousands of American jobs here at home and the empowerment of America's adversaries abroad. And it is only the latest sign that the Biden administration's strategic priorities are simply out of order.

Recall, this administration rushed to rejoin a climate agreement that has failed to hold major signatories to their commitments on reducing emissions, even as the United States recorded multiple years of reductions on our own.

This administration made it harder to cap our abundant and domestic energy, even at the risk of greater reliance on imports from countries with lower environmental standards. And, of course, they proposed to squander years of accumulating economic pressure on Iran in exchange for no meaningful concessions on its nuclear ambitions or regional aggression.

So when President Biden elected to pass on another opportunity to check the influence of a major adversary, we had heard this story before.

Here in Congress, opposition to the completion of the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline has been vigorous and bipartisan. Last year's Defense authorization, which earned 84 votes here in the Senate, expanded the scope of sanctions against critical entities involved in its construction. We are talking about a project that would give Putin a new artery of influence in Western Europe and rob Ukraine of critical leverage over the way Russian energy currently flows throughout the region.

But, apparently, the Biden administration's own opposition to the project was just rhetorical. When the chips were down, the President used a waiver to avoid having to place sanctions on the biggest company behind the project and its CEO—a Putin crony. According to reports, his decision even overruled the objections of senior diplomats and the concerns of his very own Secretary of State.

Oddly enough, the administration's decision to snuff out union jobs in the energy sector here at home didn't seem to prompt as vigorous an internal debate. In fact, President Biden's Executive action to kill the Keystone XL has been followed by a steady stream of radical proposals that illustrate just how deep his administration is in thrall to the environmental fringe.

Under the guise of infrastructure, they pitched trillions of dollars in Federal spending, aligned so closely with most liberal interests in Congress that the authors—the authors—of the Green New Deal boasted President Biden's agenda had their manifesto's DNA all over it: unprecedented spending on electric vehicles, huge increases in funds for transit projects that disproportionately benefit blue States on the coast, and plans to pick winners and losers in the market for affordable, reliable American energy.

So American workers know what a thriving energy sector looks like. It is exactly what Republicans spent 4 years working to encourage here at home.

As a matter of fact, if you hit pause on Washington Democrats' radical climate rhetoric, you will notice that smart energy policy isn't limited by political stripe. For years, the liberal government up in Canada has recognized pipelines as a safe and efficient way to connect people with affordable, reliable energy and grow what is already the largest sector of United States-Canada trade. So it was hardly surprising to hear one Canadian official greet President Biden's decision to sink the Keystone XL Pipeline as ''an insult''—an insult—or to read that the Canadian firm behind the project is now pursuing legal action to recoup its investment.

So capitulation to our rivals, painful blows to our neighbors, legitimizing corrupt foreign leaders, and jamming hard-working Americans—whatever his motives, and despite his own rhetoric, the consequences of President Biden's actions are already clear.

It is not too late to impose real costs on Russia's pipeline windfall and provide serious, lethal support to Ukraine and other vulnerable States on the frontlines of Putin's aggression. It is not too late to get serious about the defense investment that bipartisan assessments say that we need—that we need—in order to compete with China and Russia. It is not too late to recommit to bipartisanship on infrastructure and on energy and show radical climate activists the door.

I hope the Biden administration changes courses sometime soon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, what is the weather like in Las Vegas? What is it like in Reno? I am not sure, but I will bet it is hot. And the reason I am sure that it is likely to be hot is the weather forecast.

I looked at that map, and it was solid red in the western half of the United States, with extreme high temperatures at a level never recorded. They said in the city of Seattle, there have only been a handful of times that they have had temperatures over 100 degrees in that city. It is going to happen again this weekend, at least that is the prediction. That is the weather forecast.

It is not just confined to the blue coastal States, as some call them. We have a drought in the Midwest. I hope it ends soon, but when it comes to corn country—Iowa, Illinois, Indiana—we are worried. I hope it doesn't happen, but it could, and we know it can happen soon. And then in the southeastern part of the United States, there are extreme storms—rains they haven't seen before.

I just say that after listening to the Republican leader describe the situation with the environment, wondering if he reads the papers or talks to people back home because extreme weather is happening all over the United States, and it isn't just in Republican areas or Democratic areas; it is virtually everywhere.

So when President Biden comes in and says: Shouldn't we do something about this for the good of our children and our grandchildren? Shouldn't we be willing to sacrifice a little bit? Shouldn't we be willing to change some if it means that they are going to have a planet that is worth living on—about 10 years ago, I started asking my farmers who come and visit me from Illinois a couple of questions. These are good people. They never vote for me, I know that, but I still like meeting with them. They are good people. They bring their wives. They dress up in their suits. They take it seriously. They are coming to Washington. This is before COVID–19, of course. And they would sit upstairs in my conference room. There would be about 20 or 30 of them from organizations like the Farm Bureau or the corn growers or the soybean growers. And I would say to them—this is 10 years ago—how many of you believe that what we are doing on Earth is changing the environment of the Earth we live on? I mean that our human activity is having something to do with it. And I would ask for a show of hands. And the response was, not one hand would go up.

And I finally said to them: Well, things are changing. What do you think is behind all of it? And one fellow said—and he did this seriously, and I believe he was speaking from the heart—he said: ''Senator, some years God sends me a drought; some years God sends me a flood; I got to deal with whatever God sends me.''

I respect him for that. That is his deep-hearted belief, and it is sincere.

But I think there is more to the story. And now when I ask these same farmers the same question, I get a different response. The Illinois corn growers, looking around, thinking something is happening here in this wonderful, bountiful State that I live in. The crops that are grown traditionally are not producing what they did traditionally, unless some hybrid seeds and other fertilizers are being used. There

are new weather conditions and it is changing every year and it is not getting better. It is getting dryer and hotter.

So when Joe Biden starts talking about the next generation of energy in America, I think about my granddaughter, ''Little Jo.'' I think about Jo, and I am wondering what kind of world she is going to live in and what I am going to do about it.

One thing that President Biden said was, we are moving toward electric vehicles. You would think that it was some Federal mandate that is bringing this on. But if you read the newspapers, you know it isn't. General Motors has accelerated the timetable to go to electric vehicles, Ford as well. They see the writing on the wall.

What we currently use for transportation will not be what we use in 10 or 15 years. It is going to change. We are going to move to electric vehicles for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is there are fewer emissions, greenhouse gas emissions.

The country of Norway just announced last week that over 50 percent of their vehicles are electric vehicles. If you had been there in the recent past, you see Teslas in every direction, electric vehicles in every direction.

I spoke to the Ambassador from Norway, and I said: How did that happen? How did you move to a point where more than half the vehicles in Norway are electric vehicles?

She said: Tax breaks. We gave them tax breaks. And all of a sudden, everyone had a new lifestyle with electric vehicles. And they think that protects them in the future or at least holds the possibility of reducing the pollution that they are dealing with, and I think they are right. So does Joe Biden. But when we get into an infrastructure debate with Republicans, the first thing they say is: Take electric vehicles off the table. We don't want to even talk about it. No subsidies, no encouragement for those.

Traditionally, we have been encouraging oil companies, with all sorts of tax breaks throughout their history, to continue to explore and grow in size and make a lot of money. But the notion of encouraging electric vehicles is somehow heretical to our friends on the Republican side. I think it is very shortsighted.

I think we should look at the obvious. I tell this story, and it is worth repeating. Six years ago, we had an auto plant in Normal, IL—yes, that is the name of it: Normal, IL. Six years ago, Mitsubishi closed their auto plant. There were more than 1,000 people working there, and there was that big sprawling complex just off of Interstate 55. Every time you took that interstate and looked out there, you thought: That is going to be there forever. That building is just going to deteriorate and be there forever.

Well, guess what. A year after they closed, the mayor of Normal, IL, whose name is Chris Koos—a wonderful mayor—called me and said: Senator, I think I have a buyer for the Mitsubishi plant.

I said: What kind of buyer?

He said: There is a man who wants to build electric vehicles. He came down and took a look, and he liked that plant. He said it was way too big for his purposes, but he is actually thinking of building electric vehicles in the old Mitsubishi plant.

Darned if it didn't happen. The company is called Rivian. They bought that plant, and they started building electric vehicles—just this month, officially, in production.

How many workers will they have? Up to 4,000, maybe even 5,000. Will they be able to use the whole plant? They are now building an addition to the plant. Is it a viable company? Is it going to last? Well, obviously Amazon thinks so because they have invested a billion dollars in Rivian. And the companies are coming from all around thinking this is the future.

So I say to the Senator from Kentucky, yes, there will be transitions in jobs, but there are job opportunities at Rivian and places just like that. Lion Electric is another company. It came in from Canada. They build electric buses. One of the things we are envisioning is moving toward electric schoolbuses across America. That is a big move. This is a company that builds them.

We need more just like it, and there are going to be good-paying jobs associated with it.

EVBox is a company out of the Netherlands, located in my State again. They build the charging stations.

Closing your eyes to the opportunities here is very shortsighted. Things are changing, and changing for the better. And because there is change, it doesn't mean it is bad for everybody. There are transitions, and we ought to help with educating people, preparing them for the new jobs.

But if you look around at this world and what is happening with the weather patterns and the environment, how shortsighted it would be for us to say to our kids and grandkids: Well, we had a chance back in 2021 to do something about it, but we decided it just might make people uneasy to think about that much change.

Well, I feel uneasy about the change that is coming if we do nothing. It is going to be a dramatic change for the worse for our kids.

VLADIMIR PUTIN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on another topic, this notion that Joe Biden is being pushed around by Vladimir Putin—the Senator who made that statement on the floor, or one just like it, has he ignored what happened over the last 4 years?

Every time the President of the United States, Donald Trump, would meet with Vladimir Putin, they would ask the translators to leave the room, the people from the intelligence agencies to leave the room, and they would just play pat-a-cake. I mean, we know what was going on there. There was some sort of political bromance between the President and Vladimir Putin.

I don't believe that is ever going to happen with Joe Biden. He is a realist. He made it clear that he went in that meeting with Putin to lay down the law in terms of infiltrating our elections in the future and the activities that we have seen in hacking and cyber crimes.

That is the kind of leadership we need in dealing with Vladimir Putin.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today I want to speak about two really highly qualified judicial nominees the Senate Judiciary Committee came up with through the White House.

The first is Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, who has been nominated to an Illinois seat on the Seventh Circuit. With her qualifications, temperament, and range of experience, she is outstanding.

She is the daughter of two judges. Her father, Raymond Jackson, is a Federal district court judge, and her mother, Gwendolyn Jones Jackson, is a retired State court judge.

She went to Princeton and then Yale Law School—not bad. She clerked for Judge David Coar on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District and for Roger Gregory on the Fourth Circuit.

After her clerkships, she worked in private practice, and then she made an interesting career decision, and not many people make it. She decided to stop practicing in the private practice of law and become a staff attorney at the Federal Defender Program for the Northern District of Illinois, representing people who couldn't afford counsel.

Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi spent 10 years as a Federal public defender. She defended hundreds of indigent clients at every stage of the legal process. She is a real lawyer. She knows that courtroom inside and out, and she knows the legal process as well.

Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi's experience and perspective on the criminal justice system will be an asset in the Seventh Circuit. If she is approved, she will be the second woman of color to be in that circuit. It is about time.

Her skills and legal expertise will be invaluable. She received a ''well qualified'' rating by the ABA.

She has a great temperament. One of our Senators on the Judiciary Committee tried to trap her with a question, seeing just whether she knew enough about the law. When it was all over, I think he was satisfied that she did.

She spoke to the fact that her mother taught her how important it is for judges to listen and for litigants to be heard. This is a fundamental principle

in our system of justice. She is going to devote her life to defending the rule of law in the future, as she has in the past. I really think she is going to be extraordinary.

The second nominee the Senate will vote on this week has my strong support as well, Judge Deborah Boardman, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.

She serves as a U.S. magistrate judge in the Maryland District Court. Like Jackson-Akiwumi, she has received a ''well qualified'' rating from the ABA. She, too, will bring diversity to the courts.

She spent 11 years as a Federal public defender herself. She is bringing a perspective which is often not found in these court cases with sitting judges. I have nothing against former prosecutors. I have named a lot of them to the bench. But we ought to have diversity in background, experience, and the like.

She has experience in private practice. She is a dedicated public servant, and I hope my colleagues will support her.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I watched television Sunday night with my wife. There was a movie called ''Selma.'' Oprah Winfrey had something to do with it because she was in it, and it was, as you might expect, a quality production.

It told the story of what happened in 1965 in Selma, AL. It showed the horrific images of Americans being beaten and brutalized in Selma for daring to protest peacefully. For what? For the right to vote.

Fewer people know about Turnaround Tuesday. That was the day, 2 days after Bloody Sunday, when many of the same people who had been beaten on the Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday went back to that bridge to make it plain that they were going to come back again and again until every right of every citizen to vote was secured. That was Turnaround Tuesday.

I had a lucky experience. The late John Lewis, who marched across that Edmund Pettus Bridge and almost gave his life in the process, took me, one foggy Sunday morning, for a walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and he told me what he remembered from that day.

I have seen pictures over and over again. There he is in his white raincoat, with a backpack, marching in the front of the line, and how he was bashed in the head by either a trooper or someone who came along trying to stop them from marching. He almost died as a result of it. It was something I will never forget. I feel blessed that I had that experience.

And then there was the vote on the floor yesterday. What a disappointment. Today, I want to say it is ''welcome back'' Wednesday. Welcome back to the fight to preserve voting rights that has never ended.

It didn't start on that bridge in Selma, and it won't end in this Chamber in Washington. This battle is going to continue because there are those people who know that if you want to control America politically, you have got to control those who vote.

We saw it after the Civil War, when we ended slavery and African Americans initially had an opportunity to vote and lead in Southern States. And then, sad to report, my political party, the Democratic Party at that time, was part of initiating the Jim Crow laws, which made it difficult, if not impossible, to vote.

And the battle was on, and it is being waged to this day, about whether or not African Americans have a right to vote. Make no mistake. When Republicans come to the floor and go through these long, elaborate explanations of why a coordinated effort by Republican legislatures in 20 different States is just good government, I think they know better. It is not good government, and it is not good for the people of those States, particularly if you are a minority.

Well, this fight to prevent billionaires from buying elections and root out corruption in government didn't end with that filibuster yesterday. Republicans succeeded in delaying this debate for a time, but they are not going to derail it. This is too important. Our democracy is on the line.

Five months ago—I am sure Madam President will never forget it, as I won't—a murderous mob—five people died—a murderous mob attacked this Capitol and tried to overturn the Presidential election.

Who sent them? Well, it is clear to me who sent them: a vain, self-pitying former President who couldn't accept defeat or the will of the American people. So Donald Trump created a Big Lie that the election was stolen. He used that lie to incite that mob to attack this Capitol. He continues to peddle the Big Lie from his exile at some country club.

Now the party that coddled that failed President when he was in power is weaponizing the Big Lie and using it to justify a relentless attack on voting rights across America.

Three weeks ago, Senate Republicans used the filibuster to kill a bill creating an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate who was behind this January 6 insurrection. They killed it with the filibuster, just as they tried to kill the voting rights bill yesterday. That filibuster is an echo, sadly, of how it has been used in the area of civil rights for as long as it has been in the Senate.

This Big Lie is metastasizing; it is growing. Instead of stopping it, Republicans are using all their leverage to prevent us from confronting it. The filibuster yesterday was day one of this fight. It wasn't the end of the story.

Welcome to day two. We mean to keep marching until we cross that bridge and stop this assault on our democracy and put an end to the Big Lie once and for all.

I yield the floor.

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 to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has been recognized.

DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, it seems that for the past month Senate Republicans have watched as our Democratic colleagues send up one partisan test balloon after another.

They threatened a battle over a so-called equal pay bill, which turned out to be chum in the water for the trial lawyers but really not much else. Then they, once again, threatened the Second Amendment, but they couldn't find a friend across party lines to join them in that fight. So that trial balloon was popped.

And who could forget their promise to bring the improperly named Equality Act to the floor for a vote? Well, that balloon didn't take flight either. And, yesterday, the Democrats' democracy-destroying election takeover bill almost survived, but it too came crashing back to Earth after failing to clear a procedural hurdle.

Still, they have made the most of their time over the past month, holding up their string of failures as evidence that it is the filibuster and not the radically partisan nature of their agenda that is thwarting their progress.

As the Republican leader said at the beginning of this month, it was an agenda that was designed to fail. It failed to bring them the power that they are craving to have over the lives of millions of Americans. It failed to kill the filibuster, and it certainly failed the millions of Americans who have been forced to watch, dumbfounded, as this circus played out in realtime on their television screens.

It was a complete waste of our time. It is what one of my Tennesseans said this weekend, talking about these trial balloons, talking about this lurch to the left—and Madam President, this was a friend of mine who is a Democrat—as he said, it was a complete waste of our time, the American people's time. He added: It was a complete waste of my dime—for the tax dollars that he sends to Washington, DC. He went on to say: Think about the problems you could have solved if you had been focused on making some progress instead of creating chaos.

Yesterday, the Commerce Committee held a hearing on achieving broadband resiliency. As you well know, this is one of the most important infrastructure problems that not only faces our committee but also faces this body. We had a great discussion, and I thanked Chairman LUJÁN for that hearing. But I can't help but wonder how much more progress we would have been able to make on this issue if the 14 million unserved rural Americans—yes, unserved; they have nothing—think about the progress we could have made if those 14 million unserved Americans had taken precedence in the minds and in the agenda of our friends across the aisle. It would have been great to focus on that.

Speaking of infrastructure, perhaps we could have focused more energy on giving the needed authority to our local officials so they can fix crumbling roads and bridges and getting regulations out of their way so they can go to work helping people get to work and helping children get back to school. Certainly, I know a few officials in Memphis who would love to see us start thinking long term about practical infrastructure support that doesn't include the Green New Deal fantasies that are favored by this White House.

The American people have noticed this lack of focus and this freewheeling attitude when it comes to spending taxpayers' money. When they look around, they see real need. There are businesses and families who are still struggling to pull themselves out of the ashes of the pandemic. Policies that are favored by the Democrats would be policies that would bankrupt their businesses, that would drive up the debt, and that would cause massive inflation. Tennesseans know these policies are not going to help them. What it does do is to frustrate them. Neither will the Democrats' continued failure to manage President Biden's border crisis.

In April, Customs and Border Protection apprehended 178,000 people attempting to illegally cross our border. Fourteen thousand of these were unaccompanied alien children. It is a record year for drug runners, for the cartels, for bootleggers, for human traffickers, and for sex traffickers. We caught the Department of Health and Human Services actually finishing the work of the cartels, trafficking many of those unaccompanied minors through the Chattanooga Airport without the knowledge or the involvement of local officials.

Meanwhile, my Democratic colleagues are treating this humanitarian crisis as if it is nothing more than a logistics challenge. But perhaps if we had spent more time on this in the past month, we could have convinced them that until they get this crisis under control, they would have to admit, in this country right now, every town is a border town; every State, a border State. Just ask your local law enforcement. They will tell you. Perhaps they didn't want to put the time there because they had been busy putting a show on for the cameras and their friends on the left.

Tennesseans noticed what went on here this month. They are not happy about it. They have been reaching out. They don't have the luxury of playing political games. They don't have the spare resources to gamble on woke politics. They are trying to keep the doors of their businesses and their churches and their schools and their factories open.

We did a lot of talking this month, but the friends on the left chose not to take action to solve problems. I would encourage them to do a little soul-searching over the next couple of weeks and address the agenda that the American people would seek to have addressed.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 172, Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Jacky Rosen, John Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Raphael Warnock, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood 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 debate on the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, 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 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 247 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—48

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

The Democratic whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1652

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, last week, I told the story of a mother who received critical support from an organization called Life Span in Chicago after her daughter was sexually assaulted by the mother's husband. The services provided by Life Span were paid for by the Victims of Crime Act, VOCA.

This week, I want to tell you another story that is even more troubling, but it dramatizes the need for us to act today, this afternoon. I am going to use the name ''Sasha,'' not the real name of the woman involved. She is a mother of three kids, and she was living with a man who was unpredictable and dangerous.

He tried to kill her—not once but three times. He tried strangling her, and the third time, she passed out. When she woke up with the kids nearby, she knew that was it. She couldn't take it anymore. So she went to a hospital. She was scared to death. She heard about a group called Harbor House. Harbor House is basically a domestic violence survivors center.

I would tell my colleagues in the Senate, if you have ever visited a domestic violence survivors center and met with any of the victims, you will never forget it. I swear, you will never forget it. I can remember the first time I met with one of the victims in one of the shelters. She was crying. Her eyes were red, one eye was blackened, and she choked back the tears and told me the story of what she lived through. For some reason—and I am not a psychologist; I can't explain it—she blamed herself. And it happens so often.

What happens to these women who are the victims of domestic violence abuse? Where do they go? Some of them can't find anywhere to go and end up dying as a result of it. What happens to their kids who witness these acts of violence in the home when mom is getting strangled by this man? What happens to them? Well, luckily, we care enough in America to do something about it. Through VOCA and the Crime Victims Fund, we send money to Harbor House and Life Span and other agencies and say: Do your best. Help them put their lives back together again. Protect them.

Well, I want to fast-forward and tell you that 6 months after Sasha's experience, things are much better. She lives safely in an apartment. She still works with adult counselors and youth counselors to get herself and her kids through this, and she knows that she is not alone. These VOCA-funded advocates stepped into her life at just the right moment and saved her life. They may have saved the lives of her children too.

So when we cut back on funding for whatever reason, we are jeopardizing the services that I just described that are so critical.

With decreased VOCA funding—if we do nothing today, with decreased VOCA funding, Harbor House will have to cut its staffers, exactly the types of professionals who helped Sasha and her family.

The executive director said:

> If VOCA is cut, imagine being Sasha and having to go through all of that alone.

That is why we have to pass this bill. That is why it is so critical.

As I noted last week, VOCA passed in 1984 to establish the Crime Victims Fund. We can't even count the number of people who have been helped over the years. Three thousand applicants come through my State Attorney General's Office in Illinois, and every State has a similar story to tell of thousands of victims helped by service providers, victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking, and drunk drivers.

And the Crime Victims Fund doesn't receive a dime of taxpayers' dollars. How about that? What I just described for you doesn't come out of the Treasury. It is funded through criminal fines, penalties, forfeited bail bonds, and special assessments collected by the Federal Government.

Historically, most of the money comes from criminal fines, but in recent years, deposits have dropped off significantly. That is why we are here at this moment. They need help, and they need it now.

Monetary penalties from deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements are currently deposited in the Treasury instead of the fund. As a result, the shift has had a devastating impact on the fund. That is why a bipartisan, bicameral group of Members of Congress, working with advocacy organizations, have come up with this VOCA fix. Our bill would stabilize the depleted fund by redirecting monetary penalties from deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements to the victims and service providers who need the help.

The reduced deposits into the fund have already had a devastating impact. Victim assistance grants have been reduced by more than $600 million in this year. And more cuts are coming if we don't do something today.

Like Harbor House, advocates across the State and across the country are begging for help. We don't have any time to waste. Every day that goes by, we miss an opportunity to help replenish the fund and to put these services on the street.

So far this year, the fund has already missed out on a total of nearly $550 million in deposits that could be helping these agencies, and we are not even halfway through the year. That is why it is imperative that we pass this bill. The House already did it in March, 3 months ago—broad bipartisan support. Here in the Senate, we have a broad bipartisan coalition of Senators—36 Democrats and 21 Republicans. We all get it. We are all for crime victims. But we have been stopped because of an objection on the floor.

Let's end this today. Whatever the merits of any budgetary argument, for goodness' sake, lives are at stake here. Unfortunately, this objection about moving forward was made last week, and it probably will be made again today. It involves Senator TOOMEY's concern about a budgetary issue. It is a complicated issue about something called CHIMPs, for goodness' sake, which he can explain, and I am sure he will.

But after last week's argument on this, I went to the advocates who are telling us that we should send this money as quickly as we can and said: Is he right? Is this designed, without his amendment, so that this money will not go to the people who need it?

They said he is wrong. This is not going to happen.

Here is their statement: ''During floor remarks for the unanimous consent [last week], it was represented the VOCA Fix Act fails to correct certain structural issues that prevent the funds from reaching victims and their advocates. The premise of this statement—that these structural issues impact the distribution of VOCA funds to survivors and advocates—is not accurate.''

This is from the actual agencies themselves.

''While the use of CHIMPS (Changes in Mandatory Programs) as budget offsets continues to be a contentious issue, the claim that Appropriators hoard money rather than releasing it to victim service providers is false.''

Inaccurate and false.

''In reality, Appropriators have substantially decreased the size of the budget offset by releasing far more than the amount required by the proposed substitute, and the proposed substitute intended to restructure the entire appropriations process is incredibly controversial.''

In other words, we are going to dive into the deep end of the pool on budget process, budget rules, and budget regulation while people are literally drowning in violence—victims of domestic abuse.

For goodness' sake, isn't there a better time and place and a better group to hold hostage? It shouldn't be these domestic violence cases.

I yield at this point to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I won't speak long, but I wanted to echo the comments of our distinguished Judiciary chairman, because I have had a similar experience.

As we were going through COVID, I was hearing from our domestic violence groups in Rhode Island that two things were happening at once. Instances were going up. People were trapped together. It was very difficult to find sanctuary houses to go to, and the experience of domestic violence was soaring. And while that was going on, the funding coming into these agencies through VOCA was declining.

Now there is a pretty simple—well, first let me thank the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sojourner House, which provides sanctuary services, and Progreso Latino, which works in this space in our Latino community, for their great work. There are a lot of organizations in this space, and I want to start by appreciating them.

The problem has nothing to do with domestic violence or domestic violence victims as to the money. The problem is that more and more of these cases are resolved by deferred prosecution and nonprosecution agreements, but the funding for VOCA comes out of criminal sentences, criminal prosecutions. So because of that change in the way these cases are treated—which is actually a good thing, generally—the money is diverted, and, as a result, the Crime Victims Fund has reached its lowest level in 10 years.

The victim assistance grants in Rhode Island fell 50 percent—5–0 percent—cut in half from fiscal year 2016 to fiscal year 2021, from $7.6 million to $3.8 million, which means that many of these local organizations that put their heart and soul into protecting these victims at the worst time in their lives have to deal with 50-percent cuts.

This is simple. It will allow monetary penalties in those deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements to flow the same way they flow when traditional prosecutions take place.

This is endorsed across the board. This is as noncontroversial as you get—56 State and Territorial attorneys general, more than 1,700 local, Tribal, State, regional, and national advocacy, government, and law enforcement organizations.

Just this year, $545 million has been lost to the VOCA fund because we haven't corrected this. So I would echo my chairman's remarks and urge my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, to find another point of leverage, another fulcrum, for his efforts to solve unrelated problems, but let this problem be solved and let these victims be served.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1652, which was received from the House and is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have good news for my colleagues from Illinois and Rhode Island, and that is that the modification that I am suggesting to the unanimous consent request proffered by the Senator from Illinois is not complicated. It has nothing to do with budget rules, and, in fact, it is the simplest thing in the world.

Now, the Senator from Illinois wants to put more money and money from a new source into the Crime Victims Fund. I completely agree. I fully support it. I have liked this idea from the first time I heard of it, and I supported it.

But there is something that is important to note here. The Crime Victims Fund is a Federal Government account, and the Senator is very determined that more money go into that account.

So what do we disagree on? Well, it is very simple. The Senator from Illinois seems to be equally determined that there can be no requirement that the money actually come out of that account and go to crime victims and their advocates. That is the only thing that I want to do differently. It is to insist that money going into that account actually comes out and goes to the victims of crime and their advocates.

Now, if my concern that this money is not going to end up going where it is advertised to go is not valid, then, I don't know why my colleagues wouldn't agree to my very narrow amendment which, by the way, doesn't have a thing to do with budget rules. I don't attempt to change budget rules in this effort. We should change them, but this isn't where I am trying to do it. What I am simply trying to do is to make sure that the money that goes into the account—the increase, too—actually goes to where it is supposed to go, which is to the victims of crimes and their advocates.

So you have to ask yourself: Why would somebody oppose the proposal that this money actually be required to go to victims and their advocates? Why would somebody oppose that?

Maybe it is because there is some other place that some of this money is meant to go, and that is at the heart of this. See, under the ridiculous rules we operate under, if the money doesn't end up going to crime victims and their advocates, then, it frees up additional money to be spent on whatever anybody else wants to spend it on. The money that is withheld from the people who are supposed to get it, crime victims and their advocates, creates the opportunity to spend more on who knows what.

Now, would anyone actually do this or is this just a theoretical construct that I have made up? Well, let's take a look at the recent history. The fact is, since 2000, in the year 2000, over $80 billion that could have and should have gone to crime victims and their advocates was intentionally withheld so that more money could be spent in other categories.

What this chart shows is the amount of money year in and year out. It starts in 2000. You see these low bars. Well under a billion dollars was actually allocated to crime victims.

There was much more money going into those accounts—much more money—because, you see, how much going into the account isn't the only thing that matters. What is actually, ultimately, much more important is how much comes out of the account and goes to the crime victims. And only when I and some of my colleagues started raising hell about this—the dishonesty, the deception, the fact that the crime victims and their advocates weren't getting nearly what they were supposed to be getting—only then—this is the red line that represents when we started doing this—that is when the allocations started to change.

This graph represents the huge surge in funds that we have been sending to crime victims and their advocates in recent years because some of us were no longer willing to tolerate this and we were raising Cain about what had been going on.

Now, what I am simply trying to do is to prevent us from going back to what was routine around here, what was standard operating procedure, which was to deceive people, pretend that money was going to end up going to the Crime Victims Fund when everybody knew it wasn't.

Now, why would I be concerned that we might be going back in that direction? Well, I will tell you why. President Biden has been very instructive about this. In his budget that he released just months ago, he actually specifies that in his budget he wants money to be diverted from the crime victims fund, which is mentioned by name, and one other fund, so that more money can be spent on other purposes.

This is my concern. This isn't something that has been made up. This is President Biden in his budget asking us to go right back to what we used to do.

So, then, when I come down here and I suggest one modification to the very constructive idea that we add this settlement money to the fund, and the modification is that the money actually has to go to crime victims and their advocates, that is objected to. People are insistent that we not have a requirement that this money actually be allocated.

So someone might think that that is a pretty strong body of evidence that suggests that maybe all of this money isn't going to end up where it is supposed to go.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request to include my amendment, which is at the desk; that it be considered and agreed to; and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if you listen to this explanation, there is one thing missing and it is critical. There is a suggestion that this money for the Crime Victims Fund is being spent for another purpose. You never heard that, did you? It said it could be, maybe it will be, it might be—but it hasn't been.

Listen to what they say, these people in the advocacy groups are jealously watching every penny. They want every dollar, just as you do and I do. And what do they say about your argument?

The premise of your statement that these structural issues impact the distribution of the victims funds to survivors and advocates is not accurate. It goes on to say that the claim that appropriators hoard the money rather than releasing it to victims services is false. This is from the very agencies receiving the money.

Are they in on the deal, Senator?

I don't think so. They are desperate for these funds, and without them, they are going to have a serious cutback in services.

The proposed substitute intended to restructure the entire appropriations process is incredibly controversial, and you know it and I know it as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Yet you are tangling up this relief for the victims of crime, victims of domestic abuse, women who are seeking shelter and hospital care and trying to care for their children and what they are going through. You want to hold back on the possibility—the possibility—that somebody is going to spend this on something else, even though you have no proof that it has been done—none.

And the people who are the advocates for these groups are saying to you: What you are saying is inaccurate and false.

And you won't give it up.

I would suggest: Pick another target. Find some other group to make your budget point of order. Please don't take this out on these people who are in the most desperate situations in their life. This is not the time and place to raise this budget debate. I seriously hope that you will think about them for a moment.

I object to your modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. TOOMEY. Reserving the right to object, this is an amazing argument that the Senator from Illinois is making. He is saying: Don't worry. He would never do what the Senator from Pennsylvania is suggesting might happen and which, by the way, always used to happen, and, which, by the way, the President is asking us to do. We would never do it. Oh, but I will object to a requirement that the money actually go where we say it is going to go.

I think that tells us all we need to know. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2084

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, it has been a trying year for our Nation. Thankfully, the vaccine has brought so much hope and a semblance of normalcy back to the lives of many Americans.

As families and businesses in Florida and across the United States continue to work hard to recover from the devastation of COVID–19, travel is critical to get our economy fully reopened.

From the beginning of the pandemic, I encouraged everyone to wear a mask as we learned more about this virus, but now the science is clear that broad mask mandates aren't necessary. Unfortunately, the CDC has decided to buck the science when it comes to travel and is still requiring face masks on public transportation.

We have all heard the stories of how this mandate impacts families: a mother and her six children traumatized by being kicked off a flight after her 2-year-old daughter refused to wear a mask; a New Jersey couple forced to deplane because their 2-year-old wouldn't wear a mask; a Colorado mother and their family booted off a flight over fears their 3-year-old son, who has a disability, wouldn't wear a mask; an Orthodox Jewish family kicked off a flight because their 15-month-old baby was not wearing a mask.

You can't make this stuff up. It has made traveling with children nearly impossible. After a year of hardships and being apart from loved ones, these families were denied the ability to reconnect. It is awful and unnecessary. And I hear stories all the time about parents with young children deciding, I am not getting on an airplane because I know I will get kicked off or I might get kicked off.

And to make guidelines even more confusing, you are allowed to remove your mask to eat and drink. So why is it OK and totally safe to not have a mask while you eat a snack but dangerous to be unmasked any other time?

The CDC itself has been clear that mask mandates aren't needed. You don't have to wear a mask in a restaurant. You don't have to wear a mask in a hotel. You don't have to wear a mask at a school. You don't have to wear a mask in a stadium. So why is the CDC singling out airlines and public transportation? It doesn't make any sense.

This isn't a political argument. In fact, during our Commerce Committee markup of the surface transportation measure last week, both Democrats and Republicans expressed frustration at the continuation of the mask mandate. Republican and Democratic Governors and mayors across the country have followed the science and lifted mask mandates.

Just like the Federal Government should not be in the business of requiring Americans to turn over their vaccination records, the Federal Government should not be mandating citizens wear masks on public transportation.

That is why I introduced the Stop Mandating Additional Requirements for Travel, or SMART Act, which would revoke the Federal requirement for Americans to wear masks on public transportation. Americans should be free to make choices they feel are in the best interest of their own health and the health of their loved ones.

If someone wants to wear a mask, they are absolutely free to do so, but the government has no right to tell them what to do. If an airline or other private company decides it wants to implement a mask policy, so be it. This does not prohibit them from doing so.

I have been clear. Private companies should be able to make decisions that they feel are appropriate for their employees and their customers. And their customer gets to make a decision.

This bill is pure common sense, and I am glad to be joined today by my colleague from Utah, Senator LEE, and he will be speaking after I ask for the consent.

The science just doesn't support keeping the mask mandate in place. We have to listen to the science and work together to move America forward. I know Americans will do the right thing to stay safe, and I hope my colleagues join me in passing this important bill.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on HELP be discharged from further consideration of S. 2084 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, right now, experts at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are continuing to update their mask requirements based on the latest developments, including requirements related to travel. They need us to be reinforcing their science-based work to keep people safe, not overruling it.

We cannot pretend this pandemic is over. This virus is still spreading; it is still mutating; it is still costing lives; and it is still leaving survivors with long-haul symptoms. And the new Delta variant is more contagious, more likely to send people to the hospital, and already in our country.

We have made great progress on vaccinations, but there are still people who are not vaccinated, as well as people who cannot yet get vaccinated. We know masks remain a simple, effective way to protect everyone, especially in small crowded spaces—in an airplane, on a bus, or a train.

Getting rid of mask requirements for travel before the experts tell us it is safe to do so is not going to get people to their destinations any faster, and it is not going to end this pandemic any faster. Instead, it will draw things out. It will cost time, and it will cost lives. To get everyone safely through this pandemic, we need to listen to the experts and let them do their jobs; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I echo the remarks presented by my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Florida. I agree wholeheartedly with his analysis. I think it is unfortunate that we missed this opportunity to enact meaningful change today, change that is backed up by science.

It was in January of this year that the Centers for Disease Control ordered the mandatory use of masks on planes, trains, buses, and other modes of public transit of every kind everywhere across this country. If Americans failed to comply with this mandate, they risked being fined or even criminally prosecuted.

Six months later, the coronavirus continues with the CDC refusing to recognize its own research that the mandate is no longer defensible. It is now June. The vaccine has been made available for months, COVID cases are plummeting, and the country is anxious to return to the way things once were. The CDC has even said that vaccinated Americans don't have to wear masks and can get their lives back to normal.

More than 45 percent of Americans are now fully vaccinated. States are lifting their restrictions, and in restaurants, stores, and workplaces across the country, it is no longer required, mercifully, to wear a mask. If Americans still want to wear one, they can make that decision for themselves. They are free to do so. But the CDC's requirement that vaccinated individuals—even vaccinated individuals—

must wear masks on all forms of public transit now blatantly contradicts the Agency's own policies and the Agency's own scientific research. It needlessly promotes fear and plays politics with the lives of the American people, not to mention it has imposed absurd expectations and serious consequences on children and families, especially families with children trying to travel.

You see, after the January mandate, the CDC issued a corresponding mandate that exempted only children over the age of 2, in keeping with their original mask-wearing guidance, guidance that is among the most stringent in the world and, I would add, the most unrealistic in the world, when you consider that they require it up to and including children as young as 2 years old.

So what have been some of the results of this guidance? Parents have been kicked off and banned from flights if their small children refuse to wear a mask. For parents of kids with disabilities and many parents of especially small children, compliance has been nearly impossible.

We already know that children, especially young children, are unlikely to contribute to the spread of the virus. What we do not know, however, is what scientific studies, if any at all, the CDC happens to be relying on in reaching this guidance—in reaching the conclusions underlying this guidance.

In fact, several of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the Agency with this very question more than 2 months ago, on April 22, 2021. And now, more than 2 months later, we have yet to receive an answer. It is a very simple question, and we have yet to receive any shred, any semblance, any scintilla of an answer. I find that unacceptable.

If the CDC actually believes its own research, then it should act like it. And if it believes in the vaccines, the very vaccines on which we have spent billions of taxpayer dollars, then it should act consistently and instill confidence in the American people, rather than fear.

And with the vaccine now free and widely available, Americans should be able to weigh the cost of the options before them and choose for themselves whether to receive the vaccine, whether to wear a mask, or whether to take their own precautions free of any mandates imposed by their government.

But if the Federal Government is going to have a say in whether or not there should be a mandate, it should be up to Congress, the sole branch of the Federal Government empowered to enact law and, not coincidentally, the branch elected by and held most accountable to the people at most regular intervals. It should be up to this branch of government, the legislative branch, to enact such a mandate.

To the extent that the CDC issued this mandate, it did so using authority delegated to it from Congress. We, in Congress, did not pass the mask mandate, and we do not have to defer to those bureaucrats who did.

The science—the science shows that wearing masks should not be Federal law, and we should act accordingly. We should, moreover, give Americans some reason to want to be vaccinated. When there is light at the end of the tunnel and when they can see there is some tangible, immediate benefit to them getting vaccinated, they are more likely to do it. If they can safely enter a place of mass transit without a mask, if they choose to do so, many more people will choose to get vaccinated if we give them that benefit or if we at least allow the operators of those modes of transportation to allow people to do that.

We can assert our rightful authority and promote sound science and common sense by supporting the bill introduced by my friend and colleague, Senator SCOTT of Florida. We need this to pass. The American people have suffered through a very, very long COVID winter. It is time for them to be able to make their own choices. That is what we do best as Americans because we believe in freedom.

We also believe that whenever the coercive power of government, especially the coercive power of the Federal Government is exercised, it must do so with the authority of Congress. We should never tacitly acquiesce to the authority of overlords within a bureaucratic Agency who are elected by no one and ultimately accountable only to themselves.

We are in charge here. We make the law. We shouldn't blindly defer to anyone, certainly not the CDC when the CDC ignores its own science.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah for his comments. I want to thank his continued commitment always to make sure that we, Congress, handles everything we can. We don't defer constantly to the executive branch in making decisions that we should be making.

This is a simple example of why we should be making this decision. This is following the science, and I am actually shocked that my colleague from the State of Washington does not want to follow the science.

I don't understand why my colleague from the State of Washington wants government to be dictating things. Why do we want to dictate to Americans how to lead their lives? Why does she think that the government—why has the government lifted mandates in States all across the country but not—and why is the CDC fine with every place but public transportation? It just doesn't make any sense.

Americans will do the right thing. It is not our job to dictate, to tell them how to lead their lives. If someone wants to wear a mask, so be it. They should do it, but the government has no right to tell them that they have to wear a mask. If an airline or another private company decides it wants to implement a mask policy, have at it. We shouldn't prohibit them from wanting to do that, but we should not be dictating this.

So I am disappointed that my colleague from the State of Washington didn't go along, but I think it is important for us to always make sure we are doing the right thing for the American public and, right now, the right thing is eliminate the mask mandate on public transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of two critical nominations: Jen Easterly's nomination to be the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency—commonly referred to as CISA—within the Department of Homeland Security, as well as Robin Carnahan to be the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or GSA.

Our country is under attack. Nation-state actors and criminal organizations are relentlessly targeting our government, critical infrastructure, and key industries to infiltrate networks, steal information, conduct espionage, and demand ransom payments.

These cyber attacks pose a serious threat to our national security. As we saw from the SolarWinds hack, as well as the Colonial Pipeline and JBS ransomware attacks, cyber criminals are constantly looking to exploit cyber security vulnerabilities and find the weakest link. We must be vigilant about preventing these attacks, and we need a strong, coordinated approach from across the Federal Government to better secure America's networks. That means the Senate needs to confirm qualified cyber security nominees so that they can get to work immediately.

CISA is the lead domestic Agency for cyber security in the Federal Government. It is responsible for ensuring that Federal Departments and Agencies—our private sector critical infrastructure partners—and the American people have the resources to detect, to withstand, and to respond to cyber attacks. GSA provides a wide range of support to Agencies across the government. One of GSA's key functions is to provide funding and expertise to help Agencies both modernize and secure their IT systems and their networks. We need Senate-confirmed leadership at the top of these critical Agencies, and we need it today.

Ms. Easterly has served for over three decades in the Federal Government and the private sector.

Since 2017, Ms. Easterly has led the operations center for Morgan Stanley's cyber defense strategy. She was also a critical member of the Cyber Solarium Commission, which has made 80 recommendations for cyber deterrence, 25 of which have already become law.

Prior to joining the private sector, Ms. Easterly served as the Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Counterterrorism, the Deputy for Counterterrorism at the National Security Agency, and was instrumental in the design and creation of the U.S. Cyber Command.

On top of all of these incredible accomplishments, Ms. Easterly is a two-time recipient of the Bronze Star and retired from the U.S. Army after more than 20 years of service in intelligence in cyber operations.

Ms. Easterly is more than qualified for this position, and this body needs to confirm her nomination today to lead CISA.

Every day that this body delays confirming critical leaders like Ms. Easterly and Ms. Carnahan leaves our Federal system and our Nation vulnerable to cyber attacks. We have already seen the damage and the chaos from these attacks. The Colonial Pipeline attack disrupted the lives of millions of Americans, created fuel shortages, and saddled customers with high gas prices for weeks. The next major breach could be even worse.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ms. Easterly's nomination to lead CISA and to take on the vital mission of strengthening our defenses and fighting back against the persistent cyber attacks that threaten our Nation each and every day. Cyber security and strengthening our Federal networks are not partisan issues. Cyber attacks put each and every one of us at risk.

I would hope my colleagues will allow these nominees to be confirmed today so they can keep us safe.

With that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 176, Jen Easterly, of New York, to be Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security, and the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Reserving the right to object, I want to make one thing very clear. I am here today to ensure accountability to the American people.

I voted to support Ms. Easterly's confirmation in committee last week, and if Senator SCHUMER filed for cloture, like he has done for dozens of other nominees this year, I would vote to support her confirmation here on the Senate floor. This isn't about Ms. Easterly. This isn't about cyber security. Remember, we unanimously confirmed the National Cyber Director just last week.

I am here today because families in my State of Florida and across our Nation deserve accountability, and President Biden has shown a total lack of accountability when it comes to addressing the border crisis. That is why I announced last month that I would be holding all of President Biden's nominees for the Department of Homeland Security from being approved through our expedited process until he and Vice President HARRIS visit the border and they see for themselves the crisis their failed policies of open borders and amnesty have created.

I understand the White House has just announced that Vice President HARRIS will be visiting the border later this week. I hope that is true. The administration has made a lot of promises that they haven't kept, like not raising taxes, reopening schools quickly, being tough on Communist China—the list goes on and on.

Trust me, I am glad the Vice President seems to be taking my advice and finally listening to the American people. I truly hope that she gets down to the border to see the crisis firsthand that her administration and their failed policies have created.

I hope she meets with the National Border Patrol Council and hears from them what our brave CBP agents are going through every day to keep us safe.

I hope she meets with border community sheriffs who are responsible for keeping our families safe.

I hope she meets with ICE and CBP section chiefs so she can hear firsthand the impact on them.

I hope she takes an aerial tour, like I did, and sees the gaps in the wall.

I hope she sees where the lights and cameras are sitting powerless, without electricity, and unable to be used to monitor our border.

I hope she meets with families who have been the victims of trafficking and hears the horrific stories they have and what they have been through because of this crisis.

I hope she visits border communities that have been put in a position to house and care for the historic number of people illegally crossing our border.

I hope she talks with families who have tragically lost loved ones from the massive amounts of fentanyl that the cartels are moving across our border.

I hope she talks to the ranchers impacted by people illegally crossing their lands.

More than anything, I hope this isn't a political stunt. If she truly goes to see this crisis, I will lift all of my holds of DHS political nominees. It is that simple.

What is happening at the border is a crisis; there is simply no other word for it. It has been 3 months since I traveled to the southern border to see exactly how President Biden's open borders and amnesty policies are wreaking havoc. I took a tour with Governor Ducey. We did an aerial tour. What you see is a wall and then all of a sudden, these openings. They intentionally didn't put up the gates.

I remember my colleagues were saying: Oh, we don't need the wall. We have lights and cameras so they can monitor from someplace else.

They are out there; they are just not hooked up to electricity, intentionally. I mean, you can't make this stuff up.

It has been 3 months since I made clear that President Biden and Vice President HARRIS need to get to the border and see the crisis their administration has created. It has been 3 months since they pledged to visit the border. Since then, as you all know—you look at all the numbers—apprehensions at our southern border are at a record high. More than 180,000 illegal aliens tried to cross our southern border last month and were apprehended—the highest in 21 years. This is a crisis. It threatens our national security and the safety of American families. And we don't know how many people we didn't apprehend.

President Biden's immigration policies are putting unaccompanied minors at risk of human trafficking, violence, sexual abuse, and separation from their families. They are leading to an alarming increase in human trafficking and drug smuggling by cartels.

FBI Director Wray said this month that there is ''no question'' that cartel activity from Mexico is ''spilling over'' into the United States. We are seeing it here in Florida. I talk to sheriffs. What they are telling me is that unbelievable amounts of fentanyl are coming across the border and getting into our State, putting Florida families in danger. I was down at one lab, and they were telling me that two people died that week from fentanyl.

But instead of securing the border and finishing wall construction projects, President Biden is terminating all of the wall projects. Why would you be doing this?

The inaction by President Biden and Vice President HARRIS is inexcusable. I don't know what they are waiting for. Why can't they acknowledge that a secure border is the best thing for our Nation? If you talk to people around this country, they want a secure border. Why can't they stand up against the radical left and say that open borders are dangerous to American families?

Two weeks ago, the Vice President went to Guatemala and Mexico. While she was there, she was asked by Lester Holt when she was going to go to the border, and she laughed. I mean, this is not a laughing matter. This is a crisis, and people are dying because of this crisis. It should make all of us furious.

People are dying. Children are being exploited, and they are being abandoned in the desert. Earlier this week, two Ecuadorian children—two little girls, 3 and 5 years old—were dropped over a 14-foot section of the border wall. We all saw the pictures. They were abandoned there in the middle of the night, two innocent little girls, just 3 and 5 years old. Can you imagine how terrified they were? I mean, I

think of my daughters. I think of my grandchildren. We all do. We all think, how would our family deal with that? It just breaks your heart.

The Vice President claims the Vice President's trip down to Guatemala and Mexico was to talk about the root cause of immigration. I don't believe that. The Vice President's trip wasn't anything more than a poorly executed political stunt.

President Biden and Vice President HARRIS need to stop avoiding the crisis, stop laughing off this threat, get to the border, and take real steps. As I said, once they actually go to the border and actually see the crisis, I will lift my hold. This is all to make sure they go to the border. But as long as they refuse to help those risking their lives every day to keep us safe, as long as they refuse to visit the border and put an end to the humanitarian crisis they created, I am going to keep my holds on.

Those two little girls and all the people who have been trafficked—they deserve better. The millions of immigrants in our country going through a legal process—they deserve better. Our Border Patrol agents—they deserve better. All American families deserve better. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I would like to discuss Ms. Carnahan's qualifications further before asking for consent on her confirmation.

Ms. Carnahan has an extensive career spanning Federal and State government, as well as the private sector. During the Obama administration, she founded and led the State and Local Practice at 18F, a technology consultancy within GSA. In this role, Ms. Carnahan worked with State and local government agencies to improve and modernize their digital services. Prior to her tenure at 18F, Miss Carnahan served as Missouri's secretary of state, where she focused on modernizing IT infrastructure to improve service for hundreds of thousands of customers.

Ms. Carnahan is a nationally recognized government technology leader and in 2017 was named one of the Federal Government's Top Women in Tech.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ms. Carnahan's nomination to lead GSA.

From modernizing and securing Federal networks to strengthening supply chain security, GSA plays a critical role in bolstering our national security.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following nomination: Calendar 175.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robin Carnahan, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. 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; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

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

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, after months of unnecessary handwringing, Vice President HARRIS has finally announced that she intends to visit the U.S.-Mexico border.

She was, as you will recall, tapped by the President to lead the efforts to stem the current humanitarian crisis back in March. But 3 months in, she has spent more time trying to figure out how to support Central American countries than how to help American law enforcement and community leaders in Texas.

In the absence of any action from the administration—in fact, any acknowledgement of the crisis, at all—the humanitarian crisis has gotten nothing but worse. In March, the first month of her heading up the administration's response, there were 173,000 migrants that crossed our southern border. Then, in April, the number went up to 178,000 and, in May, 180,000 migrants. We are now on track to see the highest number of total yearly border crossings in two decades, according to the Secretary of Homeland Security, Mr. Mayorkas.

At the center of this crisis are unaccompanied children, who are brought to this country by cartels and human smugglers. We know that the migrant children endure a long and dangerous journey to our border, often arriving malnourished, abused, and in critical health. Some of the young girls even arrive pregnant, and we know that many of them have been sexually assaulted en route by these human smugglers who care nothing for their welfare. All they care about is the cold, hard dollar. I have talked to a number of these children and heard them retell their horrific stories about their journey from their home to our border.

Since January, since the time that President Biden and Vice President HARRIS were inaugurated, more than 65,000 unaccompanied children have entered our country with no parent and no adult guardian, an absolutely devastating figure. These children are then placed with sponsors in the interior of the United States—sometimes a family member, sometimes a complete stranger. Thirty days after these children are placed with their American-based sponsor, not necessarily even an American citizen, a full 20 percent of them don't respond to a phone call or a wellness check when a person associated with the U.S. Government knocks on the door. And we have no idea what happens to these children once they are lost to the system.

The Border Patrol's Rio Grande Valley Sector is the epicenter of this human crisis. Between October and April, that is where nearly half of all unaccompanied children were encountered. In the 3 months since the Vice President has been in charge of this crisis, I have visited the Rio Grande Valley Sector twice. I have spoken with law enforcement, elected officials, and nongovernmental organizations that try to be of assistance to the migrants while they are in the country, and a long list of other people who are trying to do everything in their power to manage this overwhelming number of humanity coming across our border.

On Friday, Vice President HARRIS won't get to speak with these men and women. Why is that? Well, she will be more than 1,000 miles away, down the border from the Border Patrol sector experiencing the worst of this crisis.

I know there are probably folks who are not from Texas who think that the whole border is exactly the same, but that is not true. I had the chance to travel to Tucson with Senator SINEMA, the Senator from Arizona, and I got a chance to observe how different the border is in the Tucson Sector from the Rio Grande Valley, which she traveled with me to see after we left Tucson. But since October, the Rio Grande Valley Sector has encountered nearly three times as many unaccompanied children as the El Paso Sector and more than seven times more family units.

The situation along the entirety of the U.S. border is challenging, to be sure, and El Paso has suffered during the crisis too, no doubt. Law enforcement, nongovernmental organizations, and community leaders in every border sector are struggling to manage the massive surge of migrants.

When asked why she hadn't visited the border yet, the Vice President said she wasn't interested in grand gestures. Yet here she is planning a trip in a way that reflects, again, that she doesn't really fully comprehend the magnitude of the crisis and where it really exists on steroids, which is in the Rio Grande Valley. It is not even fair to say that she is a day late and a dollar short. She is nearly 100 days late and 1,000 miles short.

By ignoring the Rio Grande Valley, the busiest Border Patrol sector along

the U.S.-Texas-Mexico border, the Vice President is shifting the focus away from the most serious problems of the crisis that she has failed to solve or even contribute any constructive ideas to. It won't surprise you to know that during my time in the Senate, because my State does have a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico, I have spent a lot of time listening to and learning from folks who live and work along our border. Our border is a beautiful part of our State, rich in a unique culture and a rich sense of community that you can't find in many parts of the country.

Through no fault of their own, these border communities are being overwhelmed by the sheer number of migrants crossing the border, and the local leaders are beyond frustrated with the failures of the Federal Government to live up to its obligation to provide security along an international border.

The President and Vice President have, I have to acknowledge, verbally encouraged migrants not to come to the United States. But those words mean nothing. They are hollow rhetoric indeed when somebody can simply pick up the phone and call a family member in the United States or watch the evening news and see how easy it is to make your way across the border, not to mention the fact that the human smugglers, the cartels who charge thousands of dollars per head, are whispering in their ear saying: We can get you across the border if you just pay us our fee.

The reality of the situation is we are nearing a breaking point, and the Vice President and President could see that if they were only willing to join me and others who would be more than happy to host them by visiting the Rio Grande Valley. The administration has wasted valuable time that could have been spent addressing the crisis.

This is a crisis in policy. This is not where building an additional physical barrier would stop many of these migrants. Some of that would, and the Border Patrol said it has a part to play, but the truth is many of these migrants are turning themselves over to law enforcement authorities. They are not running away because they have figured out the gaps in our law better than we have.

The administration has wasted valuable time that could have been spent addressing this crisis, and instead, it has just gotten worse. Now the question is, What are they going to do about it? If they are looking for ideas, I am happy to offer a suggestion.

There is already a grassroots plan out there that was built from the bottom up by Senators and Congressmen most familiar with this crisis. Last month, Senator SINEMA, the Senator from Arizona, and I introduced the Bipartisan Border Solutions Act, a straightforward, commonsense way to address this crisis. We have been proud to work with two House Members. The Presiding Officer knows Congressman CUELLAR from Laredo, TX, along with TONY GONZALES, who represents one of the biggest congressional districts contiguous to the U.S.-Mexico border, and they are our cosponsors in the House.

So a bipartisan, bicameral bill to address the very crisis that Vice President HARRIS and President Biden have been trying to avoid learning more about, at least until now—this legislation has the support, as I said, of Members of both parties and in both Chambers, as well as a diverse range of well-respected organizations. The U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the National Border Patrol Council, the National Immigration Forum, and more than a dozen other organizations support this legislation.

I would be more than happy to sit down with the President and the Vice President to discuss our bill, which includes the input of leaders who are dealing with the brunt of the crisis along the border. If the administration truly wants to address this crisis, they need to get serious about how to do so, and a photo op simply will not get the job done.

The Vice President, I think, would be well served and would be serving the people of this country well if she would visit the Rio Grande Valley and listen to the law enforcement, elected officials, NGOs, and other men and women who are doing their best to try to deal with this crisis without much help from the administration.

The administration has wasted too much time already. Now is not the time for another empty gesture.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF DEBORAH L. BOARDMAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon in support of the nomination of U.S. Magistrate Judge Deborah Boardman to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Maryland.

Judge Boardman was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee on June 10. I have recommended Judge Boardman, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN, to President Biden, and I strongly support her nomination. Judge Boardman was nominated to fill the future vacancy created when Judge Richard Bennett, appointed by President Bush in 2003, announced his intentions to take senior status upon the confirmation of his successor. President Biden nominated Judge Boardman for this position on March 30, and the Judiciary Committee held her confirmation hearing on May 12.

Shortly after the November 2020 Presidential election, I worked with Senator VAN HOLLEN to establish a judicial selection committee in Maryland. We used an open application process with public advertisement and communicated closely with the State, local, and specialty bar associations in Maryland. In particular, we sought out a highly qualified and diverse applicant pool.

Our committee interviewed everyone who submitted an application, which involved several dozen interviews. Senator VAN HOLLEN and I personally interviewed several finalists before making our recommendations to the White House.

I strongly agree with President Biden's request that Senators consider nominating individuals whose legal experiences have been historically underrepresented on the Federal bench, including those who are public defenders, civil rights and legal aid attorneys, and those who represent Americans in every walk of life. Judge Boardman fits that request.

Judge Deborah Boardman was born in Silver Spring, raised in Frederick, and lives in Baltimore. She received a B.A. from Villanova University. After graduating from college, she accepted a Fulbright scholarship to study in Amman, Jordan. She received her J.D. from the University of Virginia School of Law. After law school, she clerked for a Federal judge in the Eastern District of Virginia, known as the ''rocket docket'' for the speed of its caseload.

Judge Boardman brings tremendous experience to the courtroom as a sitting U.S. magistrate judge in Maryland since 2019, which is the same Federal judicial district in which she would become a district judge, if confirmed by the Senate. She already handles a heavy caseload in our Federal court.

As a magistrate judge, Judge Boardman presides over civil cases by consent of the parties, resolves civil discovery disputes, conducts settlement conferences, and presides over preliminary criminal proceedings. Additionally, she administers the District of Maryland's Social Security appeals docket.

In civil cases before her by consent of the parties, Judge Boardman rules on motions to dismiss, resolves discovery disputes, decides whether a case should proceed to trial, and presides over bench and jury trials. These cases have involved claims of unemployment discrimination in violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans With Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act; claims under 42 United States Code 1983, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; qualified and sovereign immunity defenses; and State law claims stemming from contract disputes and personal injuries.

As you can see, she has broad experience in regards to her tenure as a magistrate judge. She has previously served as the First Assistant Federal Public Defender of Maryland. During her 11-year tenure with the Federal Defender's Office, Judge Boardman represented individuals in both the Greenbelt and Baltimore courthouses that were charged with Federal crimes.

She also has experience in private practice, as she served as a litigation associate at Hogan Lovells, formerly known as Hogan & Hartson, in Washington, DC, from 2001 to 2008. During

those years, Judge Boardman worked exclusively on civil matters. She has experience both on the civil side and criminal side. She represented a wide range of corporate and individual clients in State and Federal courts. Specifically, she counseled insurance companies, universities, and healthcare and pharmaceutical companies, among others, in business and contract disputes.

As a fifth-year associate, the firm selected Judge Boardman to serve as the senior pro bono associate in its nationally recognized pro bono department. She managed the firm's largest pro bono cases full-time and appeared in Federal and State courts as the lead attorney in several of these pro bono cases.

She tried a wrongful eviction action before a DC jury. She was lead counsel on a 3-day evidentiary hearing on habeas corpus petitions in the circuit court for the city of Norfolk. She argued numerous discovery motions before the U.S. magistrate judge in the District Court for the District of Columbia in an unemployment discrimination class-action lawsuit.

The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave Judge Boardman its highest, unanimous ''well qualified'' recommendation after evaluating her integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament.

As Judge Boardman said at her confirmation hearing, she is the daughter of the American Revolution on her father's side and a first-generation American of Palestinian descent on her mother's side. Her father was born in New York and was drafted to serve in the U.S. Army in the Vietnam war and then went on to be a successful businessman. Her mother was born in Ramallah, a Palestinian city in the West Bank. She immigrated to the United States in the 1950s with her parents and eight brothers and sisters when she was just 13 years of age. She spoke no English. When she began attending public school in suburban Maryland, she then learned, of course, English and went on to a successful career as a beautician.

Judge Boardman has testified that her parents taught her the value of hard work, the importance of education, the value of family, and the need to be generous to those who are less fortunate in life.

In my discussions and meetings with Judge Boardman, I have some impressions that stand out from her as a person. She is fully committed to public service through her diverse professional career as a lawyer, law firm partner, public defender, and now a U.S. magistrate judge. She regards being a sitting judge as the ultimate and highest calling of public service in the legal profession. She wants to inspire the public's confidence in the judiciary and to hear parties' concerns compassionately, while upholding her duty to fairly apply the law. Now as a U.S. magistrate judge, Judge Boardman has told me she understands the absolute importance of adjudicating disputes neutrally and fairly.

She clearly has the temperament for this position. She has told me that she is naturally curious and tries to avoid making assumptions.

Judge Boardman shared with me that her internal compass directed her toward service. Judges are first and foremost public servants, but they hold certain powers over individuals' lives. She understands that. In her view, a district court judgeship is much more than achievement; it is a serious public responsibility which requires a judge to put the public first as they uphold the rule of law.

Numerous individuals wrote to me on Judge Boardman's behalf, including several sitting judges, law firm associates, and colleagues from her service in the public defender's office. They unanimously praise Judge Boardman's courtroom skills as a litigator, in particular praising her courtroom presence, sharp legal and analytical skills in both written and legal advocacy, and her high level of professionalism, excellent temperament, and unfailing courtesy to all parties.

As a person, I have repeatedly been told by those who know her well that Judge Boardman is the best kind of person to be a judge. She is smart, patient, kind, and tough when she needs to be. She is a hard worker. She sees all sides of an argument and is always fair and professional in her treatment of others.

I was delighted to recommend the nomination of Judge Boardman to President Biden, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN. Judicial nominees must meet the highest standard of integrity, competency, and temperament. Judge Boardman will safeguard the rights of all Marylanders and all Americans, uphold the Constitution and rule of law, and faithfully follow the judicial oath to do equal right to the poor and to the rich. I am confident that Judge Boardman will serve the people of Maryland very well once she is confirmed.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the confirmation of Judge Boardman, who is an outstanding judicial nominee from Maryland. She is already a sitting U.S. magistrate judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, where she has served with district judges. I look forward to her continued public service to Maryland and to the Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

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

RETAIN ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, last year, the Federal Communications Commission approved an application by Ligado Networks to repurpose the Federal spectrum in a way that will drastically interfere with GPS and satellite communications. This a big deal. There are so many people who understand this situation. There is a list of companies behind us that grows every day. Almost every company in America that you know of or have heard of—their name is on this list.

The decision that was made will threaten GPS and satellite communications reliability for millions of Americans who depend on it. The reliability of GPS and satellite communications is necessary for safety of life operations, national security, and economic activity.

I am going to pause here for a minute to drive home what this actually means for every American because people don't know this. They don't know how important GPS is. Yet there is not an American I can think of by description who isn't using it every day. So if something happens to it, there is a serious problem. Here are some of the day-to-day activities that would be difficult when experiencing GPS interference from Ligado.

A big one—using your credit card or your debit card. When you are making a purchase or using an ATM, our financial systems rely on GPS timing in order to work.

Another one—making a phone call. Cell phone networks rely on GPS to synchronize cell towers so calls can be passed seamlessly. If they experience interference, your call could be dropped when moving from one tower to another.

Another one that people are not aware of and don't expect is energy, whether that is filling up your tank with gas at the pump or electrical grids to light our homes. We rely on GPS timing to safely operate underground pipelines and our electricity grid.

Farmers and ranchers—this is something that a lot of people are not aware of, but they depend on GPS and satellite communications when planting crops, applying fertilizer, and during harvesting operations to move large and critical machinery with precision.

Working out—a lot of people don't. I don't as much as I used to, but a lot of people do. They say that one-fifth of the population, 20 percent of the population, of all Americans, use a fitness tracker or a smartwatch. The majority have used GPS to count steps to track distance. We all know that. You see them out there every day. They depend on GPS.

Taking a flight—I have been involved in aviation for over 70 years now and had occasion with three friends to fly around the world in 1991 using GPS. At that time—it may have been the first—the equipment I used was a Trimble TNL 2000. Trimble is one of the big GPS companies. I was using one, the TNL 2000. At that time, that may have been—we are checking to see—the first time that had been used for private

aviation, flying all the way around the world. Again, that is GPS, and that was 1991.

Driving around right now, each day, countless Americans rely on Google Maps, Waze, Apple Maps, and any other navigation system to get them from point A to point B. While no one hopes to ever need a firetruck or an ambulance or the 9–1-1 operators, the EMS, they use GPS on a daily basis.

There is more—weather forecasting, the movement of goods on our highways, surveying maritime harbors, channels, and everything else. The list goes on and on.

How do we know that Ligado will cause interference? The FCC told us when they approved the Ligado order. I will read that now because people need to understand. I guess you could say we were warned.

The FCC said in their document—that was the document they used on their approval order. They said:

> Ligado shall expeditiously repair or replace as needed any U.S. Government GPS devices that experience or are likely to experience harmful interference from Ligado's operations.

That is a quote. That is what they said. That is what the FCC said at that time.

Over 21 organizations and companies and industries filed petitions for reconsideration after the order was released, documenting the damage they would face from the Ligado interference. This thing right behind me is now up to 82; it was 78 this morning. The list goes on and on. You can hardly think of a corporation in America that isn't on this list. So it is something that is a very serious problem and widespread.

Here is one way to put the interference into perspective. Because GPS signals travel from satellite in space, by the time those signals get to Earth's surface, they are low power. Because the FCC order allows Ligado to repurpose spectrum to operate a terrestrial-based network, Ligado's signals on Earth's surface will be much more powerful than GPS, causing substantial and harmful interference.

While the FCC required Ligado to repair damage to Federal Agencies that results from the interference, congressional action is needed because the FCC's Ligado order fell short in two important ways.

First, the order did not provide an adequate description of costs to the Federal Agencies that would result from Ligado's interference.

We took bipartisan steps to correct this last year in the NDAA.

The NDAA is the largest bill of the year. I happen to have been for several years the chairman of this thing. The NDAA is the national defense authorization bill. It does all the things that we do in the military. So that is the bill we are talking about.

We included in that bill a provision directing the Department of Defense to produce an estimate of damages and costs associated with the harmful interference to GPS. We also directed DOD—Department of Defense—and the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an independent technical review of the harmful interference that Ligado can cause.

Secondly, the FCC failed to require that Ligado bear the costs of interference in State governments or pay for interference to devices owned by individual users. Now, we are talking about all Americans out there now—not just government, not State government, not Federal government, but everyone else, these individual users. I talked already about how many ways we rely on GPS in everyday life. None of that would be protected from interference under the existing Ligado order.

That is why I am introducing legislation—it is a long name, but I am going to say it anyway. It is called the Recognizing and Ensuring Taxpayer Access to Infrastructure Necessary for GPS and Satellite Communications Act, 2021. Got that? All right. I call it the RETAIN Act. That is a little more accurate and easy to understand.

My legislation ensures that Federal Agencies, State governments, and all others negatively impacted by the actions of a private actor are not left holding the bag when it comes to costs, the amount of money it would cost to rectify, and, worse, aren't put in a position where they have to push the costs onto the American consumers.

Why is this legislation necessary? Reliable GPS and satellite communications are important to everyone in the world and drive much of the Nation's economy. That is why I am going to ask my colleagues to embrace, endorse, and cosponsor this legislation. Otherwise, others may be forced to pay for damage that is done by the system.

Anyway, I am going to ask our colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation. If we don't do this and something happens, then it will be paid for not by those responsible parties but by the taxpayers.

With that, 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.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam 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 New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I rise for the 14th time to call for every Senator to have the opportunity to consider and cast their vote on the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act, which would ensure that servicemembers who have been subject to sexual assault and other serious crimes get the justice they deserve.

For nearly a decade, the DOD has argued that removing convening authority from command, as our bill does, would undermine military readiness and good order and discipline. But yesterday, our Secretary of Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin endorsed the Independent Review Commission's recommendation that sexual assault and related crimes be moved from the chain of command to trained military prosecutors.

It is historic. It is historic that we have, for the first time ever, a Secretary of Defense agreeing that good order and discipline does not rest on a commander deciding whether a case goes forward or not.

But we have to remember that the limited changes he endorsed come from a panel that was only asked to look at one type of crime. They were specifically asked to look at ways to solve the problem of military sexual assault and harassment. They drilled down on those issues of sexual assault, sexual harassment, domestic violence, and child abuse, and they agreed that all of those crimes must be taken out of the chain of command and put in the hands of specialized, highly trained military prosecutors. They see no conflict with making those changes and retaining command control.

I remind my colleagues the mission we are tasked with is larger than the mission that the IRC was tasked with. Our job is to provide our servicemembers with a military justice system that is worthy of the sacrifices they make for our country every day. That is why our bill addresses the fundamental flaw in the military justice system that puts the fate of our servicemembers in the hands of commanders who often know both the accuser and the accused and are not trained lawyers.

Our reform draws a bright line and moves all serious crimes, which can lead to serious consequences, to independent military prosecutors.

Secretary Austin's endorsement of the IRC's reforms makes it clear that he understands what we understand—convening authority is not necessary for maintaining command control or

for maintaining good order and discipline. Right now, 97 percent of commanders maintain good order and discipline without having convening authority for general court-martial. Only 3 percent, level 06 and above, have that unique authority.

Our allies have drawn a similar bright line. They decided that in their military, serious crimes should be taken out of the chain of command and given to trained prosecutors. They have told us, through letters and testimony, that they saw no diminution in command control or good order and discipline.

Good order and discipline rests not on the commander's ability to act as judge and jury but on their ability to do their job of instilling a culture of respect between servicemembers and instilling a command climate where these types of actions aren't tolerated.

There is no reason to continue to subject servicemembers to a system where commanders, rather than trained military prosecutors, are deciding which cases go to trial. We must move decisions about whether to move forward on cases dealing with serious crimes to the most qualified, most highly trained person. That would be trained military prosecutors. That is all that our bill does. That is what the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act does.

In addition to having a filibuster-proof support in the Senate, this is now a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation. This morning, I stood with Congresswoman SPEIER, Speaker PELOSI, Congressman TURNER, and a bipartisan group of Members in the House as they introduced this version of the legislation. The bipartisan support we have in the House includes Republicans with years of military service—former JAGs, former commanders. We had a general from the Republican Party stand up and support that bill this morning.

Not only do they understand the importance of having a military justice system that is impartial and highly trained but also the importance of command and what their role is. We have a great deal of bipartisan support.

This type of bipartisan, bicameral support is rare. It speaks to the importance of this reform, the importance of us meeting our obligation to provide oversight of our military, and the importance of serving those who serve our country in uniform.

This morning, we were also joined by the sisters of Vanessa Guillen. Her youngest sister Lupe talked about what happened to Vanessa. She said: ''The system that we have now failed my sister, [and] it's up to us to change [it].''

To change the system that failed Vanessa, moving just sex crimes out of the chain of command would not be enough. She was murdered. We must move all serious crimes, including murder, to independent, impartial military prosecutors.

This morning, Lupe said: ''Someone will always have to suffer for someone to care—but that stops now and it stops with us.''

It is time for us to do the job right, to prove Lupe right. Our servicemembers, as Secretary Austin said, deserve nothing less.

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. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FILIBUSTER

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, earlier this week—in fact, yesterday—the Senate Democrats attempted an unprecedented power grab in the Senate that, in my view, clearly would have affected the sanctity of our elections and violated our Constitution.

S. 1 was one of the most monstrous bills I have seen during my time in Congress, and it certainly didn't meet my standard of doing things that are constitutional.

In doing so yesterday, the Senate Democrats underscored for me something I thought I knew well, and they reaffirmed it, and that is the importance of maintaining the legislative filibuster, the 60-vote threshold for legislation.

I am sorry we went down the path of changing the rules for judges, then for the Supreme Court, and now, potentially, for legislation. Sixty votes is a good thing. Sixty votes allow—people say they want us to work together—60 votes require us to do that. In the absence of 60-vote rule, everything becomes political. In the absence of 60-vote rule, there is no certainty.

A party in power, one that has the majority of the Senate, the President—the election changes, and there is a new majority, and then we change what we just passed 2 years before. There is nothing good for job creation and economic security. There is nothing good for families and trying to figure out what is next in their life when the law can change every time a new, a different party has the majority in the U.S. Senate and House or there is a new President.

My view is that what happened yesterday was not by design. As a matter of fact, the vote, among others, was designed to fail in order to pressure Democratic Senators into altering the rules of the Senate and render this place a majority-run institution.

Democrats achieved control—the voters gave them control of both Chambers of the Congress and the White House—and are convinced that they have a mandate to erode the governing norms of the Senate. By my count, the Senate stands at an evenly divided, 50–50, and the majority, by a slight number, Democrats have in the House of Representatives. Surely, this is hardly a mandate for a radically progressive agenda, much less changing the threshold for which minority rights are protected and bipartisan cooperation is promoted.

Should the legislative filibuster meet its demise at the hands of this Senate because Democrats decide on a majority vote, that the rules that have been in place for decades should be changed overnight on a whim, the august U.S. Senate will be condemned to a partisan spectacle.

The idea that everything should be decided by one vote means that everything here becomes political and that the American people become even more partisan. If every vote in the U.S. Senate—every outcome—is determined by one person, then politics become the passion of the American people by necessity. The 60-vote rule is designed to moderate both sides of a question, to bring us together, to pull us to the middle in something that is more acceptable to the American people than anything we might decide if we could decide it on our own, Republican or Democrat. It means that every citizen would feel the need to lobby us.

The normal course of life becomes much more about politics. While politics is important to the country and while it is important for the American people to be engaged, they send us here to make decisions. That 60-vote rule allows us to make decisions that are more acceptable to them so they can spend their lives living their lives, not worrying about what, on any given day, the U.S. Senate might pass.

I don't think the motivation by the Senate Democrats is what it may seem to some. The suggestion is that we can't seem to pass any legislation here. I read this week in the Wall Street Journal an editorial, an op-ed piece, by Mike Solon and Bill Greene, and this was a comment that stood out to me:

> The movement to end the filibuster is less about a Senate that doesn't work than it is about a socialist agenda that doesn't sell.

The idea that everything is decided on the margin of one means that we become politics, that politics rules in this country. The freedoms and liberties that the American people enjoy every day because they can rely on not radical change but modest change—on improvements day by day, not improvements overnight—means that we have a different country. We certainly would have a different Senate, but a consequence of having a different Senate means America is not what it is today.

Again, I say this in a way that would, I hope, remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: I stand ready to work on many issues on which we can bring ourselves together. I hope this week—tomorrow, today—that we learn there is an infrastructure agreement, a bipartisan agreement. This isn't a belief that I have the ability to dominate the agenda of the U.S. Senate or that one party should. It is a reminder that America is better when we work together and that eliminating the 60-vote

rule, ending the filibuster, changes America for the worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote proceed immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON BOARDMAN NOMINATION

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

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—48

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

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). 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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 128, Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Michael F. Bennet, Sheldon Whitehouse.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 249 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—47

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my State proudly calls itself the Land of Steady Habits. Some people in Connecticut think it is kind of a funny thing to be proud of—being resistant to change—but honestly, in the Northeast, in the crucible of America, we know there is real value to consistency and tradition.

A nation as unique as ours—multicultural, democratic, ever expanding in scope and ambition—we probably can't hold together unless there is some agreement between all of our different peoples about the expectations that we have for each other in the conduct of our national business. Without tradition, our Nation's defining dynamism, it might break us.

Yes, it is wildly old-fashioned to hold town meetings, where every citizen has to show up on one particular day, to make decisions about how you spend money or what rates you pay in taxes, but that way of governing, created in New England some four centuries ago, is still the method of decisionmaking in many of our towns. It may not be the most efficient means of government, but tradition matters. It helps to hold us together as a country.

I know and appreciate the value of consistency. I don't deny it. So earlier this week, I read with interest an opinion piece, penned by one of my friends in the Senate Democratic caucus, making the argument that amongst the most important reasons to preserve the 60-vote threshold in the Senate is to advance the value of consistency and tradition in American politics.

I was glad to read it. I am proud of my colleague because for too long, the punditry and the activists have had near exclusive domain over the debate about the wisdom of changing the rules of this body. So it has been strange, given how much this place means to the 100 of us who serve here, that we have mostly left the dialogue over its future to those who don't work inside this Chamber every day.

Yes, right now, there is a disagreement amongst Senate Democrats and between the majority of Senate Democrats and the majority of Senate Republicans about how the Senate should operate, but there is no merit in hiding this dispute. There is no valor in letting others define the terms that lay out the conflicting arguments, which I readily submit are compelling on both sides. So let's have the debate. Let's have it right here. No more shadowboxing. The stakes, I would argue, are too important.

Let me start here. The argument to keep the 60-vote threshold, to guarantee policy consistency or to uphold Senate tradition, is downright dangerous because this argument essentially prioritizes consistency over democracy.

At the very moment when Americans have less faith than ever before that this place has the capacity to implement the will of the people, the 60-vote threshold is a slap in the face of majoritarianism, which is the bedrock principal of American democracy, the idea that the majority of people get to

decide the direction of this country—not elites, not oligarchs, like in other nations; people, regular people.

To say that Americans can have an election, choose leaders of a particular view, and then watch while the rules of democracy deliberately stop the voters' will from being enacted is to thumb our noses at the American electorate—at the very moment when they are actively considering whether American democracy has anything left to offer them.

My colleague argues quite powerfully that the requirement to achieve 60 votes to pass legislation in the Senate guards against rapid policy change, giving several examples, including education and environment policy and voting rules as areas where danger might lie if one majority imposed the policy in one Congress that would be undone by the next. I want to walk us through this argument.

My first approach might be to postpone the harder question of whether or not to value consistency over democracy and to simply accept for a moment the prioritization of consistency and tradition. I do so knowing that our Founding Fathers also prioritized consistency.

In Federalist 9 and 10, Hamilton and Madison discuss what they call the problem of factions. Madison says that a faction is ''a number of citizens, whether amounting to a minority or majority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, adverse to the rights of other citizens.'' Now, notice here that Madison doesn't really care whether the faction represents a minority or majority of citizens; he simply defines it by its cause's malevolence. This was and still is tricky business—rich White men defining for everybody else what cause is righteous and which cause is wicked. But our Founding Fathers built a system of government to make rapid policy change—even change supported by the majority of voters—very, very hard to implement.

Now, how do they do this? I want to lay this out because if you do care about preventing rapid policy shifts, it is important to understand why the 60-vote threshold isn't necessary, is overkill given all the other barriers our system has to prevent rapid policy shifts.

First, our Founding Fathers established a bicameral legislature as opposed to a unicameral parliamentary system. That meant that no change could be implemented until two different legislative bodies agreed to the exact same text.

Second, they layered on top of that bicameral legislative structure a unitary President with the power to veto that legislation.

Third, they put in place an unelected body, the Supreme Court, that could invalidate any statutory changes that conflicted with the Constitution.

Fourth, they put the House and the Senate and the Presidency all on overlapping, conflicting election schedules, guaranteeing that it would be 100 percent possible for the voters to sweep out all elected officials and replace them with a new slate all at one moment.

Fifth, the Founders built a few supermajority requirements but only for selective occasions: treaties, impeachments, constitutional amendments—the stuff that could last forever. The Founding Fathers did want extra consensus around that.

All of that design has lasted. It is still with us today.

There are other parts of the original design intended to protect the value of consistency to protect against the danger of faction that have not lasted. The Founders also believed that only White men should vote and that citizens shouldn't be trusted to directly select the Members of this body. That is all history because for all of the anti-faction design that we have kept, we changed just as much, and all of that change has moved in only one direction—toward more majoritarian democracy.

Why? Well, because as our grand experiment—the American experiment—matured, we saw proof of concept. The people could be trusted to govern themselves. They could choose leaders who were more able, more honest, more effective than any King or Queen, any Sultan or Emperor. So we extended the franchise universally. We directly elected the Senate.

As America expanded, the new States out West gobbled up even more democracy. The West decided to not just elect legislators but judges, prosecutors, dog catchers and commissioners. Majoritarian rule became addictive, and our country grew and it demanded more and more of it.

That brings us to the 60-vote threshold. The 60-vote threshold in a country built on the strength of direct democracy stands out like a sore, rotting thumb—this anti-majoritarian drain clog designed intentionally to stop the majority of Americans from getting what they want from government.

Proponents of existing Senate rules say that in the name of bipartisanship or tradition or consistency of policy, we should purposefully frustrate the changing will of the electorate. But why? Why not trust voters? For instance, voters elected a President and a Congress in 2008 that promised to enact a system of universal healthcare. It just so happened that at that moment, for the first time in 40 years, there were 60 votes for the party of that view in the Senate, so a universal healthcare law was passed.

But why should it not be up to the voters and not politicians to review the efficacy of a major policy change like that and, if they so choose, elect leaders to rescind or revise it? I don't want the ACA repealed, but I am deeply uncomfortable that a 60-vote threshold robs from voters that decision.

This preference for policy consistency, intentionally blind to the merits of policy over direct democracy, is particularly insidious at this moment in American history, first because the 60-vote threshold is being used in a very, very different way today than it has anytime prior in our Nation's history.

Up until the 1970s, cloture votes were almost nonexistent in the Senate. Legislative filibusters were used in those days mostly by racist southern White Senators to stop civil rights bills. Beginning in the seventies, that tactic became more widely employed but was still used sparingly.

Consider this. In 1994, our colleague Senator FEINSTEIN forced a vote on one of the most controversial of all proposals that come before this body—a ban on assault weapons. It received fewer votes than the Manchin-Toomey background check bill did 30 years later. Senator FEINSTEIN's proposal got 52 votes; Manchin-Toomey got 54 votes. But the assault weapons ban became law while the background checks bill did not. Why? Because in 1994, many important votes, even the assault weapons ban, were allowed to proceed on a majority-vote basis. Not so by 2013.

I could make the argument that it was Republicans who started this rapid escalation of the use of the 60-vote threshold, but who really cares? It doesn't matter because today both parties use it almost without exception in a way that looks radically different from the way the tactic was utilized half a century ago.

I would argue that if you want to do an overview of the history of the 60-vote threshold, it doesn't tell a story of the value the Senate places on consistency. No, it is the opposite. Watching the way the tactic has been used so differently over time, it demonstrates the value the Senate places on change in practice and tradition. Reforming this rule would, frankly, just pay heed to this reality.

The second danger of valuing consistency over democracy at this moment lies in the signal that it sends to an American public that is in, frankly, no mood for the choices of the elites to be continually substituted for their own collective judgment.

Right now, Americans are in kind of a revolutionary mood, and for good reason. More Americans today than at any time in recent history see themselves on the precipice of financial and sometimes spiritual ruin. They are done with economic and political elites jealously protecting the status quo. And the election of Donald Trump, although revealed by time to be a false prophet, was an unmistakable foot stomp by an electorate tired of being taken for granted.

So why on Earth would our message, amidst this growing populist tempest, be to tell voters that rules in the Senate are required to protect them from their own bad judgment, to take from them, purposely, the ability to change policies whenever and however they wish?

I submit to you that today, right now, this replacement of popular will by anti-majoritarian rule-rigging could destroy us. Today more than ever, voters want to know that their vote counts every election. And continuing to give minorities here in the Senate power to stop change is dangerously disconsonant with the current political mood of this country. Take power away from the American people at your peril.

Finally, on this question of the value we should place on consistency, I want to raise the problem of the city firehouse. Firehouses are places that value consistency and tradition. Firefighters spend a lot of time in close quarters together. When that alarm rings, they are required to work together in precise and disciplined unison to get out the door in seconds in order to save lives and property. Practices change in a firehouse but carefully and through consensus decision making. Keeping everybody together matters when the stakes are so high.

But what would happen if inside that firehouse, a sizable group of firefighters decided one day that the mission of the department should no longer be to put out fires but maybe, instead, just to let them burn a little? Wouldn't then the value of consensus decision making become a little less important? If you were a homeowner, wouldn't you want to make sure that the firefighters who still wanted to fight fires were setting the rules and not the guys who are OK with the houses in the neighborhood burning down?

I know this is a crude analogy, but to value consistency or tradition above everything else, I think you have to be pretty certain that everybody in your club, everybody on your team is guided by the same foundational goal.

In the case of the U.S. Senate, our goal, our endgame has always been simple: the preservation of American democracy, the belief that every American should have a say in who governs, and the persons whom they choose and no one else should be seated in power.

We have had fights—often vicious in nature—over the course of our Nation's history over how fast we should expand the vote, how quickly we should reform our Constitution to allow for more direct democracy. But never before has one party actively advocated for the lessening of democracy. Never before has one party openly advocated for candidates who receive the smaller share of the vote to be made President of the United States.

In the last year, a democratic Rubicon has been crossed by one party, and we can't ignore this devastating blow to our Nation. You cannot value consistency in practice when a large faction of your group's members don't believe in the underlying mission of your organization any longer. The firehouse can't just keep doing the same things it always does year after year for the sake of consistency or tradition or consensus when two or three of the members who hop on the firetruck when that alarm sounds aren't intending to actually put out the fire when they arrive at the building.

Giving Republicans a veto power over legislation when they no longer believe in the same way the Democrats do or Republicans used to in the sacredness of the vote is to risk the voluntary destruction of our democracy.

Consistency as a value has merit. It does. But in this business, consistency is often put on an unhealthy pedestal. What is the value of being consistent when all of the circumstances around you are changing? Where is the strength in sticking to your position when everything around you is in metamorphosis? When democracy itself is being attacked in a brutal, coordinated, unprecedented volley of blows, what is the good of holding to a position just for the sake of being consistent if the primary consequence is to simply green light the assault to continue?

Consistency and tradition and bipartisanship—they matter but not at the expense of democracy, not in a moment when millions of voters are questioning the wisdom of American democracy because no matter whom they elect, nothing seems to change, and not when one party has increasingly abandoned the joint project to which all Members of this body swore an oath as a condition of our membership.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I know Senator MARSHALL is ready to speak, and I apologize for delaying him with my rather long remarks.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF CALVERT CITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for 150 years, Calvert City has been a central hub of the Jackson Purchase, serving as a focal point for pioneers, farmers, and railroaders from all over western Kentucky. The town's enduring legacy is a tribute to the enterprising demeanor of those trailblazing Kentuckians who first called the Purchase home. In recognition of Calvert City's sesquicentennial, I am privileged to join this vibrant Kentucky community in celebrating 150 years of Bluegrass heritage.

Calvert City started off as nothing more than a depot alongside the Paducah & Elizabethtown Railroad, but quickly blossomed as settlers spread west into the Jackson Purchase to profit from the region's fertile soil and easy access to the Tennessee, Cumberland, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers. By the time the Kentucky Dam was completed nearby in 1944, bringing jobs and hydroelectric power to the region, the town was a flourishing center of commerce. Today, Calvert City is home to numerous advanced chemical manufacturing facilities and continues to play a critical role in western Kentucky's economy.

In recognition of Calvert City's pioneer spirit, the town is celebrating 150 years of history with 150 events throughout the calendar year. These ceremonies are made especially poignant by the passing of Mayor Lynn Boyd Jones this January. He had dreamed about Calvert City's 150th anniversary since the town's centennial 50 years ago and was an early planner of this year's festivities.

As Kentucky emerges from the COVID–19 pandemic, the celebration will be a uniquely joyous tribute. All aspects of Calvert City's storied history will be on display, from railroad cars, to an auto show, to events at Oak Hill, the original home of town founder Potilla Calvert.

I want to give special thanks to the Calvert City civic leaders who made this year's sesquicentennial celebration possible. It is through their hard work and dedication that the town continues to prosper, so many years after its founding. On behalf of the Senate, I share our congratulations with every Calvert City family and join them in honoring 150 years of proud Kentucky traditions.

LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of LGBTQ Pride Month of 2021. For more than 50 years, Pride Month has offered us a chance to celebrate lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer—LGBTQ—Americans and to reflect upon the progress that our Nation has made in how we treat this community in law, policy, custom, and everyday life. It also is an opportunity to redouble our efforts to end enduring discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

President Biden promptly issued a Presidential proclamation recognizing June of 2021 as Pride Month. With the authorization of Secretary of State Antony Blinken, U.S. diplomatic missions around the world are displaying the pride flag as a clear visual representation of American values. On the very first day of his administration, President Biden issued an executive order on preventing and combating discrimination based on gender identity or sexual orientation. This decision has already driven new policies at the agency level making an important difference in real people's lives, from protecting transgender individuals seeking safe shelter to reversing the

Trump-era ban that prohibited transgender people from serving in the military. It is clear that LGBTQ Americans can count on the Biden-Harris administration to do everything possible to champion fundamental human rights on their behalf.

The bad news is that while we see progress at a Federal level, the Human Rights Campaign assesses that 2021 is the worst year in terms of State-level anti-LGBTQ legislation in recent history. Governors have signed 17 anti-LGBTQ bills into law, already exceeding the 15 anti-LGBTQ laws passed in 2015, which held the previous record in recent history. There are even more bills waiting Governors' signatures or veto override votes. Most of these bills shamefully target transgender children. These bills and laws are untethered from trends in real public opinion. Recent polling from Gallup finds that support for same-sex marriage is at a new high of 70 percent of all Americans. A PBS/NPR/Marist poll published in April revealed that two-thirds of all Americans oppose legislation to ban transgender student athletes from joining sports teams that match their gender identity, a number that barely changes across partisan lines.

The American people clearly agree with the principle expressed in President Biden's executive order: ''All persons should receive equal treatment under the law, no matter their gender identity or sexual orientation.'' It is as simple as that.

When it comes to human rights, civil rights, and being treated with dignity and respect, everybody in this country, regardless of where they live, should receive equal treatment. The House of Representatives passed the Equality Act in February to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in education, employment, housing, credit, Federal jury service, public accommodations, and with regard to receiving Federal financial assistance. These protections build upon and align with the Supreme Court's landmark decision 1 year ago in Bostock vs. Clayton County, which affirmed that the sex discrimination prohibition in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 also applies to discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. That ruling states, ''it is impossible to discriminate against a person for being homosexual or transgender without discriminating against that individual based on sex.'' We still urgently need to pass the Equality Act, however, to apply this interpretation to all areas of civil rights law and to apply protections against discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity to a broader scope of entities. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the legislation and will work to advance it this Congress.

As Harvey Milk said, ''It takes no compromise to give people their rights. It takes no money to respect the individual. It takes no political deal to give people freedom.'' This Pride Month, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in supporting the Equality Act to ensure that we protect the human and civil rights all Americans. Our government should do all it can to promote equality, compassion, and empathy—not discrimination, bigotry, and hate.

CONFIRMATION OF KIRAN ARJANDAS AHUJA

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Kiran Ahuja to serve as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. Mrs. Ahuja is highly qualified and has a deep commitment to public service that will serve her well as the Director of OMB. I am confident that she has the skills to rebuild the civil service and restore protections for civil servants that were rolled back by the Trump administration.

Mrs. Ahuja spent her childhood travelling across the South with her parents as they worked to provide desperately needed mental health services to underserved communities. After graduating from Spelman College and the University of Georgia School of Law, Mrs. Ahuja began her career in public service as a civil rights attorney at the Department of Justice. She went on to lead the White House Initiative for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and then serve as the Chief of Staff for OPM as it responded to a data breach that exposed the personal information of millions of Federal employees and contractors.

Kiran Ahuja will be tasked with leading OPM as it faces a new set of challenges. After 4 years of attacks by the Trump administration on the protections at the core of our merit-based civil service system, OPM needs a leader who understands that Federal workers serve our country, not the individual or political party currently occupying the White House.

OPM is an independent Federal agency tasked with a vital mission: ensuring that the Federal workforce delivers top-notch service to the American people. The next OPM Director must recognize, as President Biden and Mrs. Ahuja do, that union organizing and collective bargaining are in the public interest and that these rights are vital safeguards to protect the merit system principles of the civil service. The next OPM Director must also work to attract new talent to Federal agencies that have lost valuable expertise and modernize OPM's outdated information technology systems. I am confident that Mrs. Ahuja has the skills and knowledge to meet these challenges and to carry out the agency's mission.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAL LEARY

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a Maine legend who will soon be leaving his post after nearly a half century of diligent, inquisitive journalism that has kept our State's citizens better informed. At the beginning of July, Mal Leary will sign off for the final time from Maine Public Broadcasting, concluding a 45-year career during which he became one of the most trusted voices in Maine media.

When listeners heard Mal's distinctive Maine rasp come across the airwaves, they knew they were getting the straight news from a model journalist. His integrity and intelligence came through in every story, diving into the policy details in a measured, well-reasoned way that did not betray a bias toward any ideology, political party, or elected officials. Most importantly, every time you finished listening to a Mal story, you knew more about your community and your State than you did just a few moments before.

Mal wasn't only held in high esteem by listeners. I can tell you from personal experience that when Mal is in a room, elected officials notice his presence. He loomed large among the Maine press corps, and his ability to unravel and explain a complicated policy question was only matched by his political instincts. While others, including legislators, were focused on the questions of the day, Mal would look two or three steps down the road to anticipate the pitfalls facing any given proposal. I learned quickly that I always needed to have my facts straight before I talked to Mal Leary.

His innate understanding of both policy and policymakers made Mal's interviews one-of-a-kind. I would often start a conversation with him, expecting to discuss the issues of the day, only to be questioned on an issue that wouldn't come up for another few months or review a legislative hearing from 3 weeks prior. Refusing to be a prisoner of the moment, he always looked at the big picture, and, critically, he made sure that the elected officials he covered did the same.

Maine will be poorer without Mal Leary roaming the State capitol, but he is leaving the Maine press corps in good hands that he had a part in training. A fountain of institutional knowledge, Mal was always generous with his time and his experience, filling in young reporters on the historical context behind long-gestating problems or making sure folks were up to speed on legislative procedures. This next generation of reporters have each grown by absorbing Mal's wisdom, working to compete with him, or a combination of the two, so although he may be leaving for greener pastures, his lessons and influence will remain.

I find a bit of irony in these remarks because even as I attempt to honor Mal, I sense that he will have some discomfort taking the compliment. The definition of a model reporter, Mal wasn't focused on befriending his subjects or accumulating personal accolades; he was always dead set on getting to the truth and bringing that

truth back to the people of Maine. That is why he is so beloved by all—OK, by most—even when he was asking hard questions; at the end of the day, Mal always told the story straight. He was always fair.

I have long believed that journalists are people we, the public, hire to tell us about priorities that we don't have time to attend to ourselves; instead, we rely on friends to give us the scoop. That is exactly who Mal was for thousands across Maine—a friend, who filled them in on the latest goings-on in Augusta, Washington, and everywhere in between. As our friend rides off into the beautiful sunsets of Maine, I want to express to him my best wishes and Maine's enormous gratitude for his work to make our State better.●

TRIBUTE TO ISAIAH LEE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Isaiah Lee, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Isaiah is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Northwestern College in Orange City, IA, where he is majoring in political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Isaiah for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING FROM JUNE 22, 2021

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be Assistant Attorney General, dated June 22, 2021.

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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 983. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1374. An act 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.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 983. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1374. An act 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; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2185. A bill to reauthorize certain Bureau of Reclamation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2186. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 2187. A bill to establish the ''Biomedical Innovation Fund'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2188. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Stigmatization, Criminalization, and Ongoing Exclusion and Inequity for LGBTQ Servicemembers and Veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 2189. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy to certain veterans with traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2190. A bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain postgraduation scholarship grants from gross income in the same manner as qualified scholarships to promote economic growth; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2192. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits be calculated using the value of the low-cost food plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 2193. A bill to ensure that an employment relationship is not established between a franchisor and a franchisee if the franchisor engages in certain activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2194. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Coastal Program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to work with willing partners and provide support to efforts to assess, protect, restore, and enhance important coastal areas that provide fish and wildlife habitat on which Federal trust species depend, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 2195. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog, and other commonly spoken languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 2196. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to expand the list of categories of essential travel into the United States at land ports of entry along the United States-Canada border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LUJÁN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2197. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for States that provide Medicaid coverage for telehealth services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2198. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to give the Department of Education the authority to award competitive grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk students in middle school and high school in developing cognitive and social-emotional skills to prepare them for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KING, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2199. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a voluntary Cyber Sense program to test the cybersecurity of products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 2200. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a research, development, demonstration, and deployment program to improve the efficiency, increase the durability, and reduce the cost of producing hydrogen using electrolyzers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 2201. A bill to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 2202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 283. A resolution reaffirming the importance of the United States to promoting the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 65

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 65, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 79

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 79, a bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 247

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 247, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector.

S. 576

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls''.

S. 697

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 699, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to codify maternity care coordination programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 870

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 870, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program.

S. 1021

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1021, a bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every person, and for other purposes.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) 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. 1251

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill 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.

S. 1396

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1396, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish State and Indian Tribe grants for community colleges and grants for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Minority-Serving Institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1543

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1543, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide best practices on student suicide awareness and prevention training and condition State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and tribal educational agencies receiving funds under section 520A of such Act to establish and implement a school-based student suicide awareness and prevention training policy.

S. 1806

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1806, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend tax incentives for biodiesel and renewable diesel.

S. 1820

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1820, a bill to increase the number of landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1872, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1930

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1930, a bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 to clarify that citizens of the

Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau who are lawfully residing in the United States are eligible for certain Federal public benefits.

S. 1990

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1990, a bill to establish processes to control inflationary pressures and the Federal debt, during Federal debt emergencies.

S. 2011

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2011, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor the contributions of all those whose efforts led to the successful development of life saving vaccines to combat the novel coronavirus.

S. 2037

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII to strengthen ambulance services furnished under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 2065

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2065, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 2081

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2081, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2166

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 220

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 220, a resolution calling upon the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2198. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to give the Department of Education the authority to award competitive grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk students in middle school and high school in developing cognitive and social-emotional skills to prepare them for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2198

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 ''Mentoring to Succeed Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to make assistance available for school-based mentoring programs for at-risk students in order to—

(1) establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs;

(2) assist at-risk students in middle school and high school in developing cognitive and social-emotional skills; and

(3) prepare such at-risk students for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce.

SEC. 3. SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING PROGRAM.

Part C of title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 136. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING PROGRAMS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AT-RISK STUDENT.—The term 'at-risk student' means a student who—

''(A) is failing academically or at risk of dropping out of school;

''(B) is pregnant or a parent;

''(C) is a gang member;

''(D) is a child or youth in foster care or a youth who has been emancipated from foster care, but is still enrolled in high school;

''(E) is or has recently been a homeless child or youth;

''(F) is chronically absent;

''(G) has changed schools 3 or more times in the past 6 months;

''(H) has come in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past;

''(I) has a history of multiple suspensions or disciplinary actions;

''(J) is an English learner;

''(K) has one or both parents incarcerated;

''(L) has experienced one or more adverse childhood experiences, traumatic events, or toxic stressors, as assessed through an evidence-based screening;

''(M) lives in a high-poverty area with a high rate of community violence;

''(N) has a disability; or

''(O) shows signs of alcohol or drug misuse or abuse or has a parent or guardian who is struggling with substance abuse.

''(2) DISABILITY.—The term 'disability' has the meaning given the term for purposes of section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401(3)).

''(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term 'eligible entity'—

''(A) means a high-need local educational agency, high-need school, or local government entity; and

''(B) may include a partnership between an entity described in subparagraph (A) and a nonprofit, community-based, or faith-based organization, or institution of higher education.

''(4) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term 'English learner' has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

''(5) FOSTER CARE.—The term 'foster care' has the meaning given the term in section 1355.20 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(6) HIGH-NEED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'high-need local educational agency' means a local educational agency that serves at least one high-need school.

''(7) HIGH-NEED SCHOOL.—The term 'high-need school' has the meaning given the term in section 2211(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6631(b)).

''(8) HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS.—The term 'homeless children and youths' has the meaning given the term in section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a).

''(9) SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING.—The term 'school-based mentoring' means a structured, managed, evidenced-based program conducted in partnership with teachers, administrators, school psychologists, school social workers or counselors, and other school staff, in which at-risk students are appropriately matched with screened and trained professional or volunteer mentors who provide guidance, support, and encouragement, involving meetings, group-based sessions, and educational and workforce-related activities on a regular basis to prepare at-risk students for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce.

''(b) SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs that—

''(A) are designed to assist at-risk students in high-need schools in developing cognitive skills and promoting social-emotional learning to prepare them for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce by linking them with mentors who—

''(i) have received mentor training, including on trauma-informed practices, youth engagement, cultural competency, and social-emotional learning; and

''(ii) have been screened using appropriate reference checks and criminal background checks;

''(B) provide coaching and technical assistance to mentors in each such mentoring program;

''(C) seek to—

''(i) improve the academic achievement of at-risk students;

''(ii) reduce dropout rates and absenteeism and improve school engagement of at-risk students and their families;

''(iii) reduce juvenile justice involvement of at-risk students;

''(iv) foster positive relationships between at-risk students and their peers, teachers, other adults, and family members;

''(v) develop the workforce readiness skills of at-risk students by exploring paths to employment, including encouraging students with disabilities to explore transition services; and

''(vi) increase the participation of at-risk students in community service activities; and

''(D) encourage at-risk students to set goals and plan for their futures, including making plans and identifying goals for postsecondary education and the workforce.

''(2) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section for a period not to exceed 5 years.

''(3) APPLICATION.—To receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application that includes—

''(A) a needs assessment that includes baseline data on the measures described in paragraph (6)(A)(ii); and

''(B) a plan to meet the requirements of paragraph (1).

''(4) PRIORITY.—In selecting grant recipients, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that—

''(A) serve children and youth with the greatest need living in high-poverty, high-crime areas, or rural areas, or who attend schools with high rates of community violence;

''(B) provide at-risk students with opportunities for postsecondary education preparation and career development, including—

''(i) job training, professional development, work shadowing, internships, networking, resume writing and review, interview preparation, transition services for students with disabilities, application assistance and visits to institutions of higher education, and leadership development through community service; and

''(ii) partnerships with the private sector and local businesses to provide internship and career exploration activities and resources; and

''(C) seek to provide match lengths between at-risk students and mentors for at least 1 academic year.

''(5) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may use such funds to—

''(A) develop and carry out regular training for mentors, including on—

''(i) the impact of adverse childhood experiences;

''(ii) trauma-informed practices and interventions;

''(iii) supporting homeless children and youths;

''(iv) supporting children and youth in foster care or youth who have been emancipated from foster care, but are still enrolled in high school;

''(v) cultural competency;

''(vi) meeting all appropriate privacy and confidentiality requirements for students, including students in foster care;

''(vii) working in coordination with a public school system;

''(viii) positive youth development and engagement practices; and

''(ix) disability inclusion practices to ensure access and participation by students with disabilities;

''(B) recruit, screen, match, and train mentors;

''(C) hire staff to perform or support the objectives of the school-based mentoring program;

''(D) provide inclusive and accessible youth engagement activities, such as—

''(i) enrichment field trips to cultural destinations; and

''(ii) career awareness activities, including job site visits, informational interviews, resume writing, interview preparation, and networking; and

''(iii) academic or postsecondary education preparation activities, including trade or vocational school visits, visits to institutions of higher education, and assistance in applying to institutions of higher education; and

''(E) conduct program evaluation, including by acquiring and analyzing the data described under paragraph (6).

''(6) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the end of each academic year during the grant period, an eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report that includes—

''(i) the number of students who participated in the school-based mentoring program that was funded in whole or in part with the grant funds;

''(ii) data on the academic achievement, dropout rates, truancy, absenteeism, outcomes of arrests for violent crime, summer employment, and postsecondary education enrollment of students in the program;

''(iii) the number of group sessions and number of one-to-one contacts between students in the program and their mentors;

''(iv) the average attendance of students enrolled in the program;

''(v) the number of students with disabilities connected to transition services;

''(vi) data on social-emotional development of students as assessed with a validated social-emotional assessment tool; and

''(vii) any other information that the Secretary may require to evaluate the success of the school-based mentoring program.

''(B) STUDENT PRIVACY.—An eligible entity shall ensure that the report submitted under subparagraph (A) is prepared in a manner that protects the privacy rights of each student in accordance with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly referred to as the 'Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974') (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

''(7) MENTORING RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SERVICE COORDINATION.—

''(A) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall work with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to—

''(i) refer grantees under this section to the National Mentoring Resource Center to obtain resources on best practices and research related to mentoring and to request no-cost training and technical assistance; and

''(ii) provide grantees under this section with information regarding transitional services for at-risk students returning from correctional facilities and transition services for students with disabilities.

''(B) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall, to the extent possible, coordinate with the Corporation for National and Community Service, including through entering into an interagency agreement or a memorandum of understanding, to support mentoring and community service-related activities for at-risk students.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2027.''.

SEC. 4. INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES STUDY ON SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Education, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall conduct a study to—

(1) identify successful school-based mentoring programs and effective strategies for administering and monitoring such programs;

(2) evaluate the role of mentors in promoting cognitive development and social-emotional learning to enhance academic achievement and to improve workforce readiness; and

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of the grant program under section 136 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, as added by section 3, on student academic outcomes and youth career development.

(b) TIMING.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall submit the results of the study to the appropriate congressional committees.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—REAFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROMOTING THE SAFETY, HEALTH, AND WELL-BEING OF REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 283

Whereas June 20 is observed as ''World Refugee Day'', a global event to acknowledge the courage, resilience, and determination of individuals and families who are forced to flee their homes due to persecution;

Whereas December 14, 2020, signified 70 years since the founding of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

Whereas July 28, 2021, is the 70th anniversary of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, signed in Geneva on July 28, 1951, which defines the term ''refugee'' and outlines the rights of refugees and the legal obligations of states to protect them;

Whereas, in 2020, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—

(1) there were more than 82,400,000 forcibly displaced people worldwide, the worst displacement crisis in recorded history, including 26,400,000 refugees, more than 48,000,000 internally displaced people, and 4,100,000 people seeking asylum;

(2) on average, 1 out of every 95 people worldwide was a refugee, an internally displaced person, or a person seeking asylum;

(3) 11,200,000 people were newly displaced due to recent conflict or persecution;

(4) 68 percent of the world's refugees came from Syria, Venezuela, Afghanistan, South Sudan, and Burma;

(5) 2,600,000 Afghan refugees were displaced worldwide, making them one of the world's largest and longest-running displaced populations;

(6) more than 50 percent of the population of Syria, at least 13,500,000 people, were displaced, either across the international border or within Syria, which represents the largest displacement crisis in the world today;

(7) children accounted for 30 percent of the world's population but 42 percent of all forcibly displaced people, millions of whom were unable to access basic services, including education; and

(8) 86 percent of all refugees were hosted by developing nations, and less than 1 percent of vulnerable refugees in need of resettlement had the opportunity to resettle because sufficient numbers of places do not exist;

Whereas refugees are major contributors to local economies and served as critical frontline health professionals and essential workers combating the COVID–19 pandemic worldwide;

Whereas the United States has an obligation to provide humanitarian protection to refugees, as well as interpreters, translators, and others in Afghanistan who served alongside United States and NATO troops, diplomats, and development workers;

Whereas the United States supports the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to increase protection for LGBTQI+ refugees overseas and to support global resettlement of LGBTQI+ refugees; and

Whereas the United States Refugee Admissions Program, which was established over 40 years ago, is a lifesaving solution crucial to global humanitarian efforts, strengthens global security, advances United States foreign policy goals, supports regional host countries, and assists individuals and families in need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of millions of refugees, including the education of refugee children and displaced persons, who flee war, persecution, or torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) recognizes those individuals who have risked their lives working, either individually or for nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to provide lifesaving assistance and protection for people displaced around the world;

(3) underscores the importance of the United States Refugee Admissions Program as a critical tool for the United States Government to strengthen national and regional security and encourage international solidarity with host countries;

(4) calls upon the Secretary of State and United States Ambassador to the United Nations to—

(A) continue providing robust funding for refugee protection overseas and resettlement in the United States;

(B) uphold the United States international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance, and restore its leadership role in the protection of vulnerable refugee populations that endure sexual violence, human trafficking, persecution and violence against religious minorities, forced conscription, genocide, and exploitation;

(C) work in partnership with the international community to find solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(D) continue supporting the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to advance the work of nongovernmental organizations to protect refugees regardless of their country of origin or religious beliefs;

(E) continue to alleviate pressures on frontline refugee host countries that absorb the majority of the world's refugees through humanitarian and development support; and

(F) respond to the global refugee crisis by meeting robust refugee admissions goals; and

(5) reaffirms the goals of ''World Refugee Day'' and reiterates the strong commitment of the United States to protect the millions of refugees who live without material, social, or legal protections.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I have 8 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 Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 3 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 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY

The Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 2021

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 24; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1251, the Growing Climate Solutions Act, under the previous order; further, that all time on the bill expire at 11 a.m.; that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote, with all provisions of the order remaining in effect; that upon disposition of S. 1251, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Jackson-Akiwumi nomination, with all postcloture time expiring at 1:45 p.m.; finally, that if the nomination is confirmed, 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.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be two rollcall votes starting at 11 a.m. and one vote at 1:45 p.m.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MARSHALL and Senator BROWN.

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

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. I ask unanimous consent to use two scientific models as props during my speech.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, it seems like every week, we get a new update on the timeline for the origin of the COVID–19 virus. This week, we learned that in October of 2019—October 2019—that over 1,000 soldiers from over 100 countries had gathered in Wuhan, China, for a military Olympics, if you will.

Then what we learned is that, several weeks after that event, many of our own athletes and our own military personnel became ill, as well as folks from other countries. We went back further and talked to some of those soldiers. They told us that Wuhan, China, looked like a ghost town during that event. A town of over 11 million people looked like a ghost town.

What I am frustrated about is that the CDC has not investigated this, that the military has not investigated it, and that, during the proper times, we could have tested their antibodies. When we learned of this, maybe, perhaps, in March or in April, they probably still had antibodies. Even today, we could investigate it, but we need

the FDA to do its job as well. We need the FDA to pass a T-cell test so we can go back and see if these soldiers who became ill after this event—to see if, indeed, this was from the COVID–19 virus.

Certainly, the timeline, by all accounts, is going backward every month, but I think it is time to update the American public, too, on what I feel are the lab origins of this virus. Certainly, this is just a theory, but I think we need to look into and discover and talk more about the biological origin of this virus.

This is a model of COVID–19, the virus that has killed millions of people across the world. It looks very much like the original SARS virus, with an exception, and that exception is a protein spike. The protein spike that I am talking about is composed of two units. We will call those two units S–1 and S–2, and this is a model of that COVID–19 protein spike. It is very special. It is very unique.

Let's talk about the S–1 spike just for a second. The S–1 spike looks very similar—it looks exactly like viral gain-of-function research that was conducted between a lab in North Carolina and with Dr. Shi, the ''bat lady'' from the Wuhan Institute of Virology. That S–1 spike sticks to lung cells like glue. Again, this is NIH-funded research, the North Carolina lab, and the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

What we did is we took the basic, original SARS virus, and we slapped a protein spike on it that made it stick to human cells like glue. Think of it as being like a key in a lock. Think about, if you have a human cell as the lock, that there needs to be a special key. So they invented a special key that would impact and go into only human cells. That was done in about 2015, but then, after that, things go dark. We don't know what happened, but, somehow, this COVID–19 virus has another part of this protein spike, and we will call it the S–2 unit.

The theory is that, in the Wuhan Institute of Virology and, possibly, in the Wuhan CDC Lab, further research was done. They developed a special part of this spike—again, the S–2 unit. This is what is so special about it: It has what we call a furin cleavage site. The furin cleavage site is—and don't take it from me; take it from Nobel Laureate Dr. David Baltimore.

Dr. Baltimore said that the furin cleavage site with its double arginine codon—and I am paraphrasing here—is the smoking gun for the lab origin of the virus in that this double arginine codon just doesn't occur in nature and that only human cells have the ability to use that furin cleavage site and break this into two separate units. That is what allows this virus to dump its genetic material into human lung cells and replicate.

As a physician, as a person who has studied virology a bit, this protein spike just doesn't look like it comes from nature. Everything about it would suggest that it was made in a laboratory. It is just too mean. It is too angry. It is just too perfect. It is too infectious. The unique thing about it is, though some would make us believe that this virus comes from bats, this virus doesn't like bats.

It only took American scientists and Chinese scientists 4 months to discover the origin of the original SARS virus, that it came from a bat and then it went to another animal, an intermediate host. It only took us 4 months to discover that virus. The MERS virus, on the other hand, it took us about 9 months. Here we are 18 months later, and we don't have any type of an intermediate host. All of the mapping that we are seeing points to this virus being made in a laboratory.

Now, the Wuhan lab could disprove me. They have the data to prove me wrong, but I am afraid that the data is now gone. It is gone forever—most likely destroyed—unless, of course, we can find it in a cloud somewhere.

It is outrageous that a comprehensive investigation on the origins of COVID–19 has still not been carried out. Now, I am proud that this body passed a resolution that Senator GILLIBRAND and I put together that calls for a transparent investigation of the COVID–19 outbreak, mandated by the World Health Assembly. It unanimously passed this body, and that resolution demands a full and transparent investigation to include the United States and our allies and our partners around the world.

Now, it is time for the Senate to do our job. It is time for the Senate to fully investigate the origins of this virus as well. It would be utterly irresponsible to suffer through the worst pandemic in a century and not have the origins fully investigated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

REMEMBERING JAMES TIMOTHY ''MUDCAT'' GRANT, JR.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week, America lost a baseball legend, a pioneer in civil rights, Jim ''Mudcat'' Grant.

He joined the Cleveland Indians in 1958. He spent 14 years in the Major Leagues. I remember watching him play when I was a kid growing up in Cleveland in the 1960s.

Cleveland has been, more than any other franchise, perhaps, a pioneer for change in baseball. Cleveland had the first Black player in the American League, Larry Doby, Hall of Famer. He came into the league only about 2 months after Jackie Robinson integrated the National League. Cleveland had the first Black manager, Hall of Famer Frank Robinson. Cleveland also had ''Mudcat'' Grant, who refused to be silent in the face of segregated hotels and racist slurs and discrimination from management.

Grant was an accomplished singer with a beautiful voice. He organized the singing group ''Mudcat and the Kittens'' to make up the income he was denied that other players had, that White players had, in advertising and endorsements. Companies wouldn't hire a Black player. They toured the country during the off-season, performing with Johnny Carson and in places a little less known.

I remember Grant in later years serving as an announcer for Cleveland Indian games with a southern drawl that was unmistakable.

He didn't just use that voice, though, for entertainment or commentating on plays; he used it to speak out for civil rights.

During the national anthem at one game, predating Colin Kaepernick, Mudcat Grant—in the 1960s, before civil rights and voting rights had passed this Congress, he said this during the national anthem. He said:

> This land is not free. I can't even go to Mississippi and sit down at a lunch counter.

A Major League Baseball player.

In 1958, he and his White teammate Gary Bell roomed together for away games, becoming the first time—players, in those days, when they were paid less than management, charged less, whatever, players roomed together. Two players would room together. Gary Bell and Mudcat Grant were the first Black and White roommates in the major leagues in 1958.

While running for President, Senator John F. Kennedy invited Mudcat Grant to breakfast. Grant didn't hold back. He talked openly with Senator Kennedy, with the future President, about the poverty he grew up in, the racism he endured every day—this was 1960—as a Major League Baseball player.

Of course, it wasn't only his activism we remember Mudcat Grant for. We know his talent on the field. He was Minor League's Rookie of the Year in 1954, only 7 years after baseball was integrated.

In 1965, he was the first Black player to win 20 games in the American League. He should have been the first, but listen to this: For years, major league managers conspired to prevent Black pitchers from becoming 20-game winners. That almost doesn't make sense.

Well, Grant said some catchers would tell the hitters, the opposing hitters, while they were catching, what was coming because they didn't want you to do well as a pitcher.

Other managers, when a player was reaching—a pitcher was getting close to 20 games, other managers sat the player down so he couldn't win 20 games as a Black man.

After Black players pass away, we often hear about how they were among the underappreciated talents of the game. That is not a coincidence. In addition to being a singer, Grant was also a writer. He published a book in 2007 called ''The Black Aces.'' It is about the great African-American pitchers. Part of his project is to tell more stories about Black players and to teach

more people about the history of baseball integration.

It is the kind of stories we need to tell more often. Our country is richer, as the Presiding Officer representing Arizona knows—the country is richer when we tell people's stories.

Let's honor James Timothy Grant, Jr., by telling his story, by heeding his words. In his great poem ''Life,'' James Timothy Grant Jr. wrote:

Life is like a game of baseball, you play it every day. It isn't just the breaks you get, but the kind of game you play.

James ''Mudcat'' Grant, rest in peace.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:48 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 24, 2021, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

KATHLEEN S. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE. (NEW POSITION)

CELESTE ANN WALLANDER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ROBERT STORY KAREM.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

DAVID M. UHLMANN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE SUSAN PARKER BODINE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SHARON L. CROMER, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE GAMBIA.

TROY DAMIAN FITRELL, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA.

MARC OSTFIELD, OF PENNSYLVANIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY.

KENNETH LEE SALAZAR, OF COLORADO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES.

JULIANNE SMITH, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

C.B. SULLENBERGER III, OF TEXAS, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

CYNTHIA ANN TELLES, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

DAVID M. PROUTY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2026, VICE WILLIAM J. EMANUEL, TERM EXPIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

GUY T. KIYOKAWA, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION), VICE MELISSA SUE GLYNN, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ANTHONY J. COTTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD G. ADAMS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHRISTOPHER J. MAHONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN D. SKLENKA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23, 2021:

THE JUDICIARY

DEBORAH L. BOARDMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

ROBIN CARNAHAN, OF MISSOURI, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN REMEMBRANCE OF OTTIE MOORE

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, it is with deep sadness but great respect that I take this time to remember one of my constituents, Ottie Jackson Moore, Sr. of Bowling Green, Virginia.

Mr. Moore passed away on Monday, May 31, 2021 after nearly a century of life. Ottie Moore honored his country with a long career of service first with the United States Army, and then seven-terms as Caroline Counties Sheriff. His life was an example of commitment, dedication, and service from which all of us would be wise to emulate.

When Ottie was not working, he was spending his time improving the community in any way he could. He served as President of the Virginia Sheriffs' Association, advised the Virginia Assembly in passage of legislation to advance local law enforcement and was a founding member of the Board that led to the creation of the Rappahannock Regional Training academy in 1977.

In addition to his life of leadership in the military and local law enforcement, Ottie was known as a family man and valuable member of the community. Along with his wife Dana Moore,—together they raised a daughter Mary and son ''Jack'' and worshipped as members of the Bowling Green Methodist Church.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring Mr. Ottie Moore, Sr. and in thanking the Moore family for his incredible sacrifices, devotion, and service to our Nation; words cannot express our gratitude. On behalf of America's First District, we say thank you.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COLONEL HOUSTON T. ''TERRY'' HAWKINS, RET. USAF

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Colonel Houston T. ''Terry'' Hawkins, who made his trip home on June 14, 2021, with his wife, Martha Butts Hawkins by his side.

Born in Seneca, South Carolina, Colonel Hawkins was known by his friends and family as ''Terry.'' In 1959, Terry graduated from Seneca High School with honors and went on to further his education at Clemson College, which is now known as Clemson University. There, he was a member of the ROTC program and graduated with a B.S. in Chemistry in 1963. Following his graduation, he was stationed at Wright Patterson Air Force Base (AFB) in Dayton, Ohio. While on leave, he asked Martha Butts on a date, which began a beautiful and lifelong love. The two were married on October 3, 1965, and later welcomed two beautiful daughters into the world. He was a devoted disciple of Christ and a member of the White Rock Baptist Church.

In 1967, Terry was stationed at Kadena Air Base in Okinawa, Japan to serve in the Vietnam War. After returning home to the U.S., Terry and Martha moved to several different locations as he rose through the ranks within the United States Air Force (USAF). Terry was later promoted to Lieutenant Colonel which brought his family to the Washington, D.C. area where he completed three consecutive assignments. Terry became the leader of the Defense Intelligence Agency's Nuclear Energy Division from 1979 to 1983. After, he served as the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Air Force Nuclear Matters, then transferred to the Defense Nuclear Agency in 1987. Finally, Terry joined the Los Alamos National Laboratory where he served our great nation for 30 more years. Terry received numerous awards and recognitions throughout his career, most notably the Chief Justice Earl Warren Medallion awarded by the CIA. He will be laid to rest on June 23, in his hometown of Seneca.

Reflecting on the life of Colonel Hawkins, I am reminded strongly of the verse John 15:13: ''Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends.'' From a young age, Colonel Hawkins selflessly and nobly served his country. I am proud of the leadership and service Colonel Hawkins showed.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to serve the Third District of South Carolina and to honor the lives of patriots like Colonel Hawkins. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends during this time.

JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, and Chairman MCGOVERN, I thank the Committee for today's markup of H.R. 1320/S. 475, Juneteenth National Independence Day Act, the companion to H.R. 1320, the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act, which I introduced in the House and has over 166 members as sponsors.

Earlier this week the CBC; led by myself and Congressman TORRES of New York, held a Special Order, on Juneteenth and so many of my CBC colleagues commemorated this historically significant day for all Americans, but especially African Americans.

Juneteenth is as significant to African Americans as July 4 is to all Americans because on that day, June 19, 155 years ago, General Gordon Granger, the Commanding Officer of the District of Texas, rode into Galveston, Texas and announced the freedom of the last American slaves; belatedly freeing 250,000 slaves in Texas nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

When General Granger read these words of General Order No. 3 set off joyous celebrations of the freedmen and woman of Texas:

> ''The people of Texas are informed that in accordance with a Proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of rights and rights of property between former masters and slaves, and the connection therefore existing between them becomes that between employer and hired laborer.''

Juneteenth was first celebrated in the Texas state capital in 1867 under the direction of the Freedmen's Bureau.

Juneteenth remains the oldest known celebration of slavery's demise, commemorating freedom while acknowledging the sacrifices and contributions made by courageous African Americans towards making our great nation the more conscious and accepting country that it has become.

As the Nation prepares to celebrate July 4th, our national day of independence, it is a time to reflect on the accomplishments of our nation and its people.

I want to thank the Members of the House for their bipartisan support of this annual Juneteenth Resolution, which has 214 cosponsors, of which 202 are original sponsors.

General Granger's reading of General Order No. 3 ended chattel slavery, a form of perpetual servitude that held generations of Africans in bondage in the United States for two-hundred and forty-eight years and opened a new chapter in American history.

Recognizing the importance of this date, former slaves coined the word ''Juneteenth'' to mark the occasion with a celebrations the first of which occurred in the Texas state capital in 1867 under the direction of the Freedmen's Bureau.

Juneteenth was and is a living symbol of freedom for people who did not have it.

Juneteenth remains the oldest known celebration of slavery's demise.

It commemorates freedom while acknowledging the sacrifices and contributions made by courageous African Americans towards making our great Nation the more conscious and accepting country that it has become.

The celebration of Juneteenth followed the most devastating conflict in our country's history, in the aftermath of a civil war that pitted brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor and threatened to tear the fabric of our union apart forever that America truly became the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, ''Freedom is never free,'' and African American labor leader A. Phillip Randolph often said ''Freedom is never given. It is won.''

Truer words were never spoken.

We should all recognize the power and the ironic truth of those statements, and we

should pause to remember the enormous price paid by all Americans in our country's quest to realize its promise.

Juneteenth honors the end of the 400 years of suffering African Americans endured under slavery and celebrates the legacy of perseverance that has become the hallmark of the African American experience in the struggle for equality.

The poet Langston Hughes reminds us in his famous poem, ''Mother to Son,'' life in America for African Americans ''ain't been no crystal stair.''

The post-bellum period in America was marked by violence and terrorism against African Americans as they sought to make real the promises of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Nowhere was the reign of terror to which they were subjected more horrific than the 1921 Tulsa-Greenwood Race Massacre, which occurred a century ago this past May 31 through June 1.

Tulsa's Greenwood District was known as ''Black Wall Street,'' and was the most prosperous African American community in the United States.

The Greenwood community with a population of over 10,000 Black people had stores that sold luxury items, 21 restaurants, 30 grocery stores, a hospital, a savings and loan bank, a post office, three hotels, jewelry and clothing stores, two movie theaters, a library, pool halls, a bus and cab service, a nationally recognized school system, six private airplanes, and two black newspapers.

But on May 31st of that year, the 35 city blocks of Greenwood went up in flames, at least 300 Black persons were murdered and more than 800 were injured; it is estimated that not less than 9,000 were left homeless and destitute.

The message of the Tulsa Race Massacre was clear to Black America: ''Stay in your place. Do not attempt to accumulate and bequeath wealth or own property. Remember your history in America is as chattel property.''

If they were still alive, the domestic terrorists of the mob in Greenwood would see their evil reenacted—and then followed by a similar attempt to cover it up and foster collective amnesia—a century later in the siege and desecration of the hallowed halls of the U.S. Capitol, the 'Citadel of Democracy'.

It should not be overlooked that the source of the January 6 white mob's irrational anger, hatred, and violent reaction was that Black Americans voted in overwhelming numbers in Atlanta, Detroit, Milwaukee, Philadelphia, and other enclaves to oust the most pro-White supremacy President since the Civil War.

Some might ask ''Why dwell on the past? Let us forget unpleasant things and move on into the future.''

My answer is to quote the great southern writer William Faulkner: ''The past is never dead. It is not even the past.''

The hatreds, prejudices, resentments, and white supremacy that Black Americans witnessed and suffered in Greenwood a century ago are not dead; they are not even past.

So my message to the descendants of the survivors and victims of slavery, America's Original Sin, is to keep fighting for justice, to never be silent, to affirm the truth, and seek accountability.

In his famous Second Inaugural Address, President Lincoln spoke of the profound moral debt owed for ''all the wealth piled by the bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil,'' and that the Civil War was the judgment of the Lord, which was ''true and righteous altogether.''

That debt remains to be paid, which is why African Americans have always peacefully petitioned the government for the redress of its grievances.

As the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King said at the 1963 March on Washington:

> ''In a sense, we have come to our Nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir.
>
> ''This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
>
> ''It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked 'insufficient funds.' But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we have come to cash this check—a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.''

In recent years, a number of National Juneteenth Organizations have arisen to take their place alongside older organizations—all with the mission to promote and cultivate knowledge and appreciation of African American history and culture.

Juneteenth celebrates African American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures.

But it must always remain a reminder to us all that liberty and freedom are precious birthrights of all Americans, which must be jealously guarded and preserved for future generations.

I am pleased to see this important legislation before this Committee on the eve of it becoming law.

IN RECOGNITION OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE PAUL MITCHELL

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize former Michigan Representative Paul Mitchell. He served Michigan's 10th District from 2017 until his retirement at the beginning of this year. After being diagnosed with Stage IV renal cancer this month, he recently underwent multiple surgeries in addition to starting immunotherapy treatment. Even though my heart hurts for Paul and his family, I know he is courageous and brave, and I know he will fight through this illness.

Representative Mitchell served on numerous committees, including on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the House Committee on Armed Services. As a member of Congress, Representative Mitchell was a champion for Michigan's families and small businesses, as well as a strong advocate for our armed forces and strengthening our national security.

As a colleague and a friend, Representative Mitchell has always been a man of principle and has been committed to working with others for the betterment of this nation. He's crossed party lines to work on police reform and joined the bipartisan fight to keep Michigan's Great Lakes safe and clean for all. In his last term as a Member of Congress, he notably stood up for democracy during the 2020 election even when it was an unpopular position for him to take. His bravery will be a part of his legacy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking former Representative Paul Mitchell for his leadership and service. I join the entire Michigan delegation in sending our colleague Paul Mitchell and his family strength and love as he begins treatment and conveying our many thanks to the team at Henry Ford Health System for their continued care.

IN MEMORY OF PATRICIA O'SULLIVAN SRAMEK

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of Patricia O'Sullivan Sramek, a lifelong resident of Long Beach, California, an outstanding person, and a dear personal friend. Patti passed away suddenly in her home on June 16, 2021.

She is survived by her husband Nicholas, her children David and Bridget, her daughter-in-law Mary, her grandchildren Eleanor, Abraham, Ingrid and Levi, and her brother Patrick Burke. She was a sister-in-law to Debbie, Hilda and Kathy. She was a loving aunt to Patrick, April, Tom, Tracy, Alex and Carla. She was predeceased by her parents Patrick O'Sullivan and Marguerite (Margie) O'Sullivan.

Patti was born in 1942 in Long Beach, California. She grew up in West Long Beach, where she lived with her family, and attended Poly High School. She met her future husband Nick, whose family lived half a mile away on Delta Avenue. On July 27, 1968 they were married in a small ceremony at St. Lucy's Parish and their reception was held on a rainy afternoon in her parents' backyard—she always noted that the rain was good luck. She and Nick moved to North Carolina where he was enlisted in the United States Army at Fort Bragg. In August 1970 and September 1976, she and Nick welcomed their children into the world at Long Beach Memorial Hospital.

Patti held many jobs in her life including making milkshakes at Tom's Burgers on Santa Fe Avenue as a teenager and sewing pockets on pants in a factory in Sanford, North Carolina. She was a champion for the communities of the West Side and served as a Field Deputy for the City of Long Beach's Seventh Council District for many years. She was known for driving the neighborhood daily to spot sidewalks and streets that needed repairs and to visit with neighbors. Along with her brother Burke, Patti helped care for her aging parents Pat and Margie prior to their passing. She later retired and welcomed her four

grandchildren in succession—Ella, Abe, Ingrid and Levi. She was a devoted and beloved grandmother who was known simply as "GG".

Patti was a towering beauty, a one-in-a-million woman, and a force of nature. She was famous for her ability to strike up a conversation with anyone and everyone she crossed paths with. She loved a good martini, big sunglasses, Frank Sinatra, art museums and beautiful gardens. As COVID-related restrictions began to lift, she daydreamed about traveling the English and Irish countryside. She would say that in her life she was most proud of her 52-year marriage, motherhood, and the fierce love she held for her family. She will be greatly missed, but her family takes comfort that she has joined her mother and father whom she adored.

EXTENSION OF MANAGEMENT PLANNING DEADLINE FOR NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS DESIGNATION UNDER THE 2019 DINGELL ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduced a bill to extend the statutory deadline for submitting a management plan for the six National Heritage Areas designated under the John D. Dingell Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–9).

Current law directs the local coordinating entity for each National Heritage Area to submit a management plan to the National Park Service within three years of the date of enactment: March 12, 2022. However, due to the COVID–19 pandemic, many of the local coordinating entities need additional time to finalize their management plans, including completing a robust public engagement process not possible during much of 2020.

As Deputy Secretary of the Interior during the Clinton Administration, I know that local coordinating entities for National Heritage Areas need sufficient time to prepare effective management plans that reflect substantial public feedback. The John D. Dingell Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act of 2019 (Public Law 116–9) included the House sponsor of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Act, of which I sponsored with Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D–CA). More time will allow California's first and the other newly designated National Heritage Areas to conduct greater public engagement, preform fulsome tribal consultations, and complete all necessary field work to ensure these new National Heritage Areas are set up for success.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representatives MCKINLEY (R–WV), SMITH (D–WA), SCHRIER (D–WA), KILMER (D–WA), JAYAPAL (D–WA), GRIJALVA (D–AZ), and STRICKLAND (D–WA) for their support as original cosponsors. I look forward to working with Natural Resources Chairman RAÚL GRIJALVA to ensure this critical piece of legislation becomes law.

RECOGNIZING FORMER DIRECTOR OF THE NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND PREPAREDNESS JARED MAPLES ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. KIM of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor former Director of the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness Jared Maples on his retirement.

Director Maples retirement from public service is much deserved. Prior to working at New Jersey's Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness, Director Maples served his country for over a decade at the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the U.S. Department of Defense.

As Director of the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security, Jared Maples committed himself to making life safer for all residents of New Jersey. He led New Jersey's counterterrorism efforts, and cybersecurity efforts and served as a critical link in New Jersey's COVID–19 response. Director Maples was a staunch advocate for the interfaith community and worked hard to ensure that they remained safe from bias crimes. I was honored to participate on numerous events with Director Maples and found him to be an individual who truly cares about the safety and well-being of all residents in my district and throughout New Jersey.

I commend Director Maples for his work, and I know I speak on behalf of my constituents when I say congratulations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRANK J. MRVAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, regrettably, I was not able to vote on June 22, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 173, and YEA on Roll Call No. 174.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. THOMAS JAMES OSBORNE

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Thomas James Osborne, beloved husband, father, grandfather, friend, community leader, and sports enthusiast.

Tom was born January 5, 1956, in St. Cloud, Minnesota, to Irene and Bill Osborne. Tom was the third of eight children. He graduated from high school from Central High School in Billings, Montana in 1974. At a young age, he developed a love for adventure, sports, and the great outdoors. Tom received a basketball scholarship to Eastern Montana College (now Montana State University—Billings) and earned a bachelor's degree in Physical Education, graduating in 1978.

Tom founded the Big Sky State Games, an Olympic-style sports festival in Montana, and served as the executive director from 1985 to 1993. In addition, he served as the executive director of the National Congress of State Games from 1993 to 2003 and assisted in the creation of the States Games of America. Tom also served as a member of the U.S. Olympic Committee Board of Directors from 1996 to 2000.

Tom met his wife, Amy (Tompson), during a fly-fishing class in Billings in 1995. Tom and Amy began dating, and he immediately started a careful pursuit for her heart and the hearts of her children, Ellie and Ben. After five years, they were married on November 3, 2001, in Midland, Texas, and became a family.

In 2003, Tom and his family began a new adventure, moving to Colorado Springs so that Tom could join Colorado Springs Sports Corporation as the president and CEO. It didn't take long for Tom to find his footing in the Pikes Peak region. He quickly worked to bring various sporting events to Colorado Springs, including the Warrior Games, Pikes Peak Airstrip Attack, premier cycling events, youth sports programs, and much more, including the Labor Day Lift Off. In addition, Tom served as the Chairman of the Pikes Peak International Hill Climb for over a decade and was a member of the World Arena Board of Directors.

Tom and Amy were members of the Pauline Chapel at The Broadmoor, attending the interdenominational service. Much of Tom's work coincided with non-profits across the community, helping people in all situations, including troubled youth and veterans, to find respite care and comfort in sports and the great outdoors. When asked about his relationship with the Lord, Torn would say, "Me and Jesus, (crossing his fingers) we're good."

Tom is described by his wife Amy, and his many co-workers, as the kindest, most supportive, humble, ambitious dreamer they have ever known. He had an extensive network of friends, staff, and community who often found themselves in awe of Tom's ambition and vision. A few words that Tom scribbled inside of a book cover sum up his life perfectly, "Bars are meant to be raised," and indeed, he raised them.

Tom is survived by his beloved wife of nearly 20 years, Amy; children: Ellie (Cameron) Kuehn and Ben (Kassy) Haughton; grandchildren: Charlie Rose and James Bridges; siblings: Doug (Jan) Osborne, Pat (Kathi) Osborne, Jeanne (Larry) Fritz, Mary (Michael) Andres, Cathy (Mark) Johnson, Jan (Doug) Grotiz, Will (Tina) Osborne; and many nieces, nephews, cousins, and in-laws.

Tom leaves a legacy in which no stone went unturned and no mission unconquered. Because of his ability to dream big, countless children and adults have a life-long passion for sports and athletics, many of whom made a career out of these passions. The lasting impact of his influence in the sports and outdoors community of the Pikes Peak region will endure and benefit many generations to come.

RECOGNIZING LOU SPIOTTI

HON. JOSEPH D. MORELLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, rise today in recognition of Mr. Lou Spiotti as he retires from an outstanding career as the Athletic Director at the Rochester Institute of Technology, a career spanning four decades of unwavering commitment to his student-athletes both on and off the field.

Mr. Spiotti arrived at RIT in 1974 as head football coach, after six years he was chosen to lead the athletic program. Under his leadership, RIT athletics experienced unprecedented success and growth. From an original fifteen programs, Mr. Spiotti oversaw the expansion to twenty-four programs totaling well over 600 student-athletes and staff. During his forty-one-year tenure, RIT secured forty-one Division III conference championships—including ten consecutive league titles by the men's lacrosse program and women's basketball playing in three straight NCAA Tournaments. Mr. Spiotti's decades of service make him the longest-tenured intercollegiate athletic director in the nation—a remarkable accomplishment.

Academic success was always as important to Mr. Spiotti as athletic success. During his career, the athletic department's cumulative grade point average regularly exceeded that of the overall student body. Additionally. Mr. Spiotti spearheaded multiple athletic facility upgrades including the completion of the 4,300 seat Gene Polisseni Center. For his body of work as a leader, coach, and administrator Mr. Spiotti has earned the respect and admiration of the RIT community. He leaves behind a culture of integrity, character, and class.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that you join me in extending congratulations on Mr. Spiotti's well-deserved retirement and in expressing our appreciation for his years of service to the RIT community.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF DELOS ''DEE'' ORAN CIRCLE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 2021

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great American and lifelong friend, Dee Circle.

Dee died peacefully at home in Rancho Mirage, California, on May 20, 2021. He was predeceased by his father, mother, sister, and grandson, Taylor. Dee leaves behind his loving wife, Candace, daughters Lori (Gil Solon), Jenny (Dermot Cronin), and Jamie, grandchildren Ryan, Tommy and Lily, and his brother Dick Circle.

Delos Oran Circle was born in Selah, Washington, on August 20, 1938, to Gracia Fern Lancaster and William Oran Circle. He had two older siblings, Dick and Sharon, and spent his childhood in Washington. After high school he joined the Coast Guard and moved to northern California. He was a Peninsula resident for over 50 years.

In 1974, Dee married Candace Lee Edmondson and their flower girl was my daughter, Karen. They had two daughters, Jennifer Dee and Jamie Leigh. Dee was a successful real estate loan broker and developer in the San Francisco Bay area. He was an avid golfer and sports fan, cheering on his beloved Warriors, 49ers, and SF Giants, and never missed a minute of The Masters. Dee was Jenny's No. 1 fan as she played basketball through college.

In 2003, Dee and Candy retired to the desert and built a home at PGA West. Dee was a loving husband, father, grandfather, brother and friend. He was kind, generous and funny, and was always the biggest personality in the room surrounded by friends.

Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of this good man. Dee Circle lived a purposeful life by being a loving family man, a loyal friend, a patriot and a man of integrity. He will be sorely missed by all those who had the good fortune to know him and he will always be remembered as a true blessing to each of us.

JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, the Chair of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, and the principal sponsor in the House of the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of S. 475, the Senate companion to the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act for my bill H.R. 1320 introduced on February 25, 2021, which establishes June 19 as a federal holiday.

Research by the Library of Congress looking back to the beginning of the Congress's existence as a legislative body could find no bill that sought to make Juneteenth a federal holiday, prior to the bill I introduced on June 18, 2020.

I have introduced the Juneteenth resolution annually since 2013.

In 2020, the resolution received 214 sponsors in the House of Representatives.

This surge in support let me know that the nation was ready for a new holiday and therefore I introduced H.R. 7232, the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act which received 158 sponsors in the 116th Congress.

Senator Doug Jones and Senator EDWARD MARKEY contacted my office seeking to introduce a Senate companion.

Later ED MARKEY'S staff reached out to collaborate on a Senate version of my Juneteenth Holiday bill and ultimately introduced the Senate version of the bill, which followed the text of H.R. 1320.

I applaud the U.S. Senate for passing S. 475/1320, Juneteenth National Independence Day Act, companion legislation to H.R. 1320, which I introduced to make Juneteenth a federal holiday to commemorate the end of chattel slavery, America's Original Sin, and to celebrate the perseverance that has been the hallmark of the African American struggle for equality.

I thank Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts for contacting my office with his request to introduce the Senate companion to H.R. 1320 for this Congress, and to my senior senator, Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas for his steadfast support of the Juneteenth holiday over the years, and others who spearheaded this effort in the Senate, and Senate Majority Leader SCHUMER for his support and for using his legislative skills to ensure the bill was voted on and passed.

Madam Speaker, the process that has brought us to this day has been bipartisan, bicameral, cooperative, and constructive beginning with my collaboration in the 116th Congress with former Senator Doug Jones of Alabama and Senator CORNYN of Texas to coordinate the introduction and cultivate the necessary support for the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act.

That partnership has continued through the 117th Congress with the addition of Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts as the lead Democratic sponsor in the Senate.

The bipartisan H.R. 1320, the House version of S. 475/H.R. 1320, is sponsored by 166 Members from all regions of the country, including two of my Republican colleagues from Texas, Congressman VAN TAYLOR and Congressman RANDY WEBER.

Madam Speaker, now it is time for the House of Representatives to act swiftly and bring to the floor, vote on, pass the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act, and send it to the desk of President Biden for signature.

With the President's signature, the federal government will join 47 states in recognizing as a holiday Juneteenth, the day that has been celebrated by African Americans for 156 years and has been called rightly as 'America's second Independence Day.'

Let me extend on behalf of all of us who have labored to pass this important legislation our deep appreciation to the House leadership, particularly Majority Leader HOYER, for their support which paved the way for the House last year to pass by unanimous consent H. Res. 1001, the resolution I introduced recognizing Juneteenth Independence Day.

As I have said many times, Juneteenth is as significant to African Americans as July 4 is to all Americans because on that day, June 19, 155 years ago, General Gordon Granger, the Commanding Officer of the District of Texas, rode into Galveston, Texas and announced the freedom of the last American slaves; belatedly freeing 250,000 slaves in Texas nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

When General Granger read these words of General Order No. 3 set off joyous celebrations of the freedmen and women of Texas:

> ''The people of Texas are informed that in accordance with a Proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of rights and rights of property between former masters and slaves, and the connection therefore existing between them becomes that between employer and hired laborer.''

Juneteenth thus made real to the last persons living under the system of chattel slavery, of human bondage, the prophetic words of President Abraham Lincoln delivered November 19, 1863, at Gettysburg 'that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people,

by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.'

Juneteenth was first celebrated in the Texas state capital in 1867 under the direction of the Freedmen's Bureau and remains the oldest known celebration of slavery's demise, commemorating freedom while acknowledging the sacrifices and contributions made by courageous African Americans towards making our great nation the more conscious and accepting country that it has become.

As the nation prepares to celebrate July 4th, our Nation's independence day, it is a time to reflect on the accomplishments of our nation and its people.

The celebration of Juneteenth followed the most devastating conflict in our country's history, in the aftermath of a civil war that pitted brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor and threatened to tear the fabric of our union apart forever that America truly became the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Juneteenth honors the end of the 400 years of suffering African Americans endured under slavery and celebrates the perseverance that has been the hallmark of the African American experience in the struggle for equality.

But as the poet Langston Hughes reminds us in his famous poem, 'Mother to Son,'' life in America for African Americans ''ain't been no crystal stair.'

The post-bellum period in America was marked by violence and terrorism against African Americans as they sought to make real the promises of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

General Granger's reading of General Order No. 3 ended the remaining vestiges of the system of chattel slavery, a form of perpetual human bondage that held generations of Africans in captivity in the United States for two-hundred and forty-eight years and opened a new chapter in American history.

Recognizing the importance of this date, former slaves coined the word ''Juneteenth'' to celebrate the occasion, the first of which occurred in the Texas state capital in 1867 under the direction of the Freedmen's Bureau.

Juneteenth was and is a living symbol of freedom for people who did not have it.

Juneteenth remains the oldest known celebration of America's freedom from slavery.

I commemorates freedom while acknowledging the sacrifices and contributions made by courageous African Americans in the quest to make our more perfect.

The celebration of Juneteenth followed the most devastating conflict in our country's history, in the aftermath of a civil war that pitted brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor and threatened to tear the fabric of our union apart forever that America truly became the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, ''Freedom is never free,'' and African American labor leader A. Phillip Randolph often said ''Freedom is never given. It is won.''

Truer words were never spoken.

We should all recognize the power and the ironic truth of those statements, and we should pause to remember the enormous price paid by all Americans in our country's quest to realize its promise.

In recent years, a number of National Juneteenth Organizations have arisen to take their place alongside older organizations—all with the mission to promote and cultivate knowledge and appreciation of African American history and culture.

I am reminded that the first legislation introduced in Congress recognizing Juneteenth occurred a quarter century ago, in 1996, when H.J. Res. 195 was introduced by Congresswoman Barbara Rose Collins of Michigan and I have introduced similar legislation annually since the 109th Congress.

So it has been a long road we have travelled to get to this day, even longer that the 15-year journey taken to pass the bill making the Birthday of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. a national holiday.

Juneteenth celebrates African American freedom, and in so doing celebrates America's history and promise, while encouraging selfdevelopment and respect for all cultures.

But it must always remain a reminder to us all that liberty and freedom are precious birthrights of all Americans, which must be jealously guarded and preserved for future generations.

In conclusion, I wish to take a moment to salute two of the unsung heroes who helped bring us to this day: the late Texas State Representative Al Edwards and nonagenarian Opal Lee, known affectionately as the ''Grandmother of Juneteenth.''

In 1852, Frederick Douglass famously asked: ''What to the slave is the 4th of July?''

In 2021, we can reply that it is the beginning of the American Promise that would be fulfilled and made real for all Americans, including the descendants of slaves, on June 19, 1865, 'Juneteenth Day.'

That is why we celebrate Juneteenth and that is why I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R 1320/S. 475, the ''Juneteenth National Independence Day Act.''

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 24, 2021 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4707–S4733

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2185–2202, and S. Res. 283. **Pages S4727–28**

Growing Climate Solutions Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, June 24, 2021, 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, under the previous order of Tuesday, June 22, 2021; provided further that all time on the bill expire at 11 a.m.; that there be two minutes for debate equally divided prior to each vote with all provisions of the order of Tuesday, June 22, 2021 remaining in effect; that upon disposition of S. 1251, Senate continue consideration of the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, post-cloture, with all post-cloture time expiring at 1:45 p.m. **Page S4731**

Jackson-Akiwumi Nomination: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit. **Pages S4723–25**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 249), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4723**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Robin Carnahan, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services. **Page S4718**

By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 248), Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland. **Pages S4711–18, S4723**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 247), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S4712**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Kathleen S. Miller, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Celeste Ann Wallander, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

David M. Uhlmann, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Sharon L. Cromer, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of The Gambia.

Troy Damian Fitrell, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea.

Marc Ostfield, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay.

Kenneth Lee Salazar, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the United Mexican States.

Julianne Smith, of Michigan, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador.

C.B. Sullenberger III, of Texas, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Cynthia Ann Telles, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Costa Rica.

David M. Prouty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2026.

Guy T. Kiyokawa, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Enterprise Integration).

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

2 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general. **Page S4733**

Messages from the House: **Page S4727**

Measures Referred: **Page S4727**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4728–29**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4729–31**

Additional Statements: Pages S4726–27

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S4731

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—249) Pages S4712, S4723

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:48 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 24, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4731.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CATTLE MARKETS

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine markets, transparency, and prices from cattle producer to consumer, after receiving testimony from Justin Tupper, St. Onge Livestock, St. Onge, South Dakota, on behalf of the United States Cattlemen's Association; Mark Gardiner, Gardiner Angus Ranch, Ashland, Kansas; Glynn T. Tonsor, Kansas State University Department of Agricultural Economics, Manhattan, Kansas; Dustin Aherin, Rabobank, Chesterfield, Missouri; and Mary Hendrickson, University of Missouri College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources, Columbia, Missouri.

APPROPRIATIONS: DOE AND NNSA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Department of Energy, including the National Nuclear Security Administration, after receiving testimony from Jennifer Granholm, Secretary, and Charles P. Verdon, Acting Under Secretary for Nuclear Security and Acting Administrator for the National Nuclear Security Administration, both of the Department of Energy.

APPROPRIATIONS: VA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 and 2023 advance appropriations requests for the Department of Veterans Affairs, after receiving testimony from Denis McDonough, Secretary, and Jon J. Rychalski, Assistant Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, both of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS: FBI

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after receiving testimony from Christopher A. Wray, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Department of the Treasury, after receiving testimony from Janet L. Yellen, Secretary, and Noel Andres Poyo, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Community and Economic Development, both of the Department of the Treasury; Andy Anderson, Bank of Anguilla, Rolling Fork, Mississippi; and Joseph Haskins, Jr., Harbor Bankshares Corporation, Baltimore, Maryland.

RECENT RANSOMWARE ATTACKS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity concluded open and closed hearings to examine recent ransomware attacks, after receiving testimony from Mieke Eoyang, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Cyber Policy, Major General Kevin B. Kennedy, USAF, Director of Operations, United States Cyber Command, and Rear Admiral Ronald A. Foy, USN, Deputy Director for Global Operations, Joint Staff, all of the Department of Defense.

CHILD CARE

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a hearing to examine the role of child care in an equitable post-pandemic economy, after receiving testimony from Fatima Goss Graves, National Women's Law Center, Rachel Greszler, The Heritage Foundation, and Abby M. McCloskey, McCloskey Policy LLC, all of Washington, D.C.; Betsey Stevenson, University of Michigan Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, Ann Arbor; and Bernadette Akum Ngoh, Trusted Care Family Day Care Home, West Haven, Connecticut.

AVIATION INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Aviation Safety, Operations, and Innovation concluded a hearing to examine aviation infrastructure for the 21st century, after receiving testimony from Danette Bewley, Tucson Airport Authority, Tucson, Arizona; Sean Donohue, Dallas Fort Worth International Airport, and Paul Cullen, Southwest Airlines Co., both of Dallas, Texas; Paul Rinaldi, National Air Traffic Controllers Association, AFL–CIO (NATCA), Washington, D.C.; and Benjamin M. Miller, RAND Corporation, Arlington, Virginia.

NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing 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'', after receiving testimony from Senator Ernst and Representative Golden; Michael A. Caldwell, Acting Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities, and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Jennifer Eberlien, Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Jennifer Hunter, York River Wild and Scenic Study, York, Maine; and Andrea Malmberg, Bunchgrass Land and Livestock, Union County, Oregon.

CLEAN ENERGY

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy concluded a hearing to examine existing programs and future opportunities to ensure access to affordable, reliable, and clean energy for rural and low-income communities, after receiving testimony from Alejandro Moreno, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy for Renewable Power, Office of the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; Brian Kealoha, Hawai'i Energy/Leidos, Honolulu; and Mac McLennan, Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., Grand Forks, North Dakota.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine building a successful foundation for Native communities' infrastructure development, after receiving testimony from Anthony Rodman, Executive Director, White House Council on Native American Affairs; Jason Freihage, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Management, Indian Affairs; David Flute, South Dakota Department of Tribal Relations Secretary, Pierre; William Aila, Jr., Department of Hawaiian Home Lands Chairman, Kapolei; Janet Davis, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Nixon, Nevada; Anthony Walters, National American Indian Housing Council, Washington, D.C.; Carol Gore, Cook Inlet Housing Authority, Anchorage, Alaska; and Godfrey Enjady, National Tribal Telecommunications Association, Chandler, Arizona.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing 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, who was introduced by Senators Warren and Markey, Christine P. O'Hearn, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, who was introduced by Senators Menendez and Booker, and Helaine Ann Greenfeld, of Maryland, who was introduced by Senators Leahy and Hirono, and Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP POLICIES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and Border Safety concluded a hearing to examine immigration and citizenship policies for United States military service members, veterans, and their families, after receiving testimony from Senator Duckworth; Margaret D. Stock,

Cascadia Cross Border Law Group, Anchorage, Alaska; Ryan Crocker, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C.; and Howard Bailey, Jamaica.

VETERANS LEGISLATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 372, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services that they received was below the standard of care, S. 539, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the use of video cameras for patient safety and law enforcement at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 544, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate one week each year as ''Buddy Check Week'' for the purpose of outreach and education concerning peer wellness checks for veterans, S. 612, to require the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide certain information to medical center staff and homelessness service providers of the Department regarding the coordinated entry processes for housing and services operated under the Continuum of Care Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, S. 613, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy and to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary to provide service dogs to veterans with mental illnesses who do not have mobility impairments, S. 727, to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, S. 796, to codify maternity care coordination programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 887, make certain improvements relating to the supply chain of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 951, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, S. 1040, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include veterans of World War II, S. 1198, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and expand the Solid Start program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 1220, 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, S. 1280, to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to certain members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, S. 1319, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain information publicly available on one internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 1467, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a series of clinical trials on the effects of cannabis on certain health outcomes of veterans with chronic pain and post-traumatic stress disorder, S. 1863, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve access to health care for veterans, S. 1875, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a deadline of 180 days for the filing of claims for payment for emergency treatment furnished to veterans, S. 1965, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to improve long-term care provided to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 2041, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enforce the licensure requirement for medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 2102, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide mammography screening for veterans who served in locations associated with toxic exposure, and S. 2172, 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, after receiving testimony from Mark Upton, Acting Assistant Under Secretary of Health for Community Care, Gerard Cox, Assistant Under Secretary for Health for Quality and Patient Safety, Clifford Smith, Deputy Director, Office of Mental Health Operations, Theresa Gleason, Director, Clinical Science Research and Development Service, all of the Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Joy J. Ilem, Disabled American Veterans, Kathryn Monet, National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, and Mario Marquez, The American Legion, all of Washington, D.C.

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: 38 public bills, H.R. 4074–4111; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 491–496 were introduced. **Pages H3079–82**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3083–84**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Gomez to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3011**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:42 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3016**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:07 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. **Page H3024**

Suspending the Rules and passing bills en bloc: Pursuant to section 11 of H. Res. 486, Representative McGovern made a motion to suspend the rules and pass the following bills en bloc, and therefore the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions would be vacated to the end that all such motions would be considered as withdrawn: H.R. 482, H.R. 704, H.R. 961, amended, H.R. 1314, H.R. 2571, amended, H.R. 2679, amended, H.R. 2694, H.R. 2922, amended, H.R. 3182, H.R. 3239, H.R. 3241, amended, H.R. 3273, H.R. 3752, H.R. 3841, S. 409, and S. 1340, by a yea-and-nay vote of 325 yeas to 103 nays, Roll No. 177. **Pages H3026–52**

Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act of 2021: The House passed 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 180. **Pages H3052–67**

Pursuant to the Rule, 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 H. Rept. 117–71, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill. **Page H3052**

Agreed to:

Rodney Davis (IL) amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–71) that requires the Secretary of the Department of Labor and the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to conduct a study to determine the number of older adult women who may have been adversely impacted by age discrimination as a motivating factor in workplace discrimination or employment; requires the report to be submitted to Congress and made publicly available within one year and would require a recommendation on best practices to combat gender and age discrimination in the workplace; and **Pages H3064–65**

Scott (VA) en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–71: Brown (No. 1) that requires the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to submit yearly reports to Congress on the number of age discrimination claims brought under this Act; and Williams (GA) (No. 3) that Commissions a report analyzing any disparities that individuals who face discrimination in employment based on characteristics protected under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 combined with one or more intersectional characteristics protected under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, or the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 face in pursuing relief from discrimination under the mixed motive evidentiary standard (by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 178). **Pages H3060–62, H3065**

Rejected:

Scott (VA) en bloc amendment No. 2 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–71: Allen (No. 2) that sought to require a GAO study on whether the Supreme Court's decisions in the Gross and Nassar cases have discouraged age discrimination charges and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 retaliation charges and whether the success rates of age discrimination and Title VII retaliation court cases have decreased following the Supreme Court's decisions in Gross and Nassar; and Foxx (No. 5) that sought to strike the provisions allowing mixed-motive retaliation claims (by a yea-and-nay vote of 182 yeas to 243 nays, Roll No. 179). **Pages H3062–64, H3065–66**

H. Res. 486, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2062), (H.R. 239), and (H.R. 1443) and the joint resolutions (S.J. Res. 13), (S.J. Res. 14), and (S.J. Res. 15) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 205 nays, Roll No. 176, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 175. Pursuant to section 10 of H. Res. 486, H. Res. 485 was considered adopted. **Pages H3017–26**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3024–25, H3025–26, H3051–52, H3065, H3065–66, and H3066–67.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

Committee Meetings

A HEARING TO REVIEW THE EFFICACY OF THE FARM SAFETY NET

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing entitled ''A Hearing to Review the Efficacy of the Farm Safety Net''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FISCAL YEAR 2022 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Fiscal Year 2022 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense''. Testimony was heard from Lloyd J. Austin III, Secretary, Department of Defense; and General Mark A. Milley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Fiscal Year 2022 Budget''. Testimony was heard from Marcia Fudge, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

EXAMINING PATHWAYS TO BUILD A STRONGER, MORE INCLUSIVE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled ''Examining Pathways to Build a Stronger, More Inclusive Retirement System''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a 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''. H.R. 2467 was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 3291 and H.R. 3293 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a 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''. H.R. 2689, H.R. 3948, H.R. 3958, and H.R. 3968 were ordered reported, as amended.

COVID–19 IN THE MENA REGION: ADDRESSING THE IMPACTS OF THE PANDEMIC AND THE ROAD TO RECOVERY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism held a hearing entitled ''COVID–19 in the MENA Region: Addressing the Impacts of the Pandemic and the Road to Recovery''. Testimony was heard from Carla E. Humud, Analyst in Middle Eastern Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S EFFORTS TO DEEPEN U.S. ENGAGEMENT IN THE CARIBBEAN

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, Migration and International Economic Policy held a hearing entitled ''The Biden Administration's Efforts to Deepen U.S. Engagement in the Caribbean''. Testimony was heard from Laura Lochman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; Barbara Feinstein, Acting Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Heide Fulton, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State.

BUILDING THE COAST GUARD AMERICA NEEDS: ACHIEVING DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN THE SERVICE

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Building the Coast Guard America Needs: Achieving Diversity, Equity, and Accountability within the Service''. Testimony was heard from Admiral Karl L. Schultz, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee began a 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''.

EXAMINING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S SPENDING PRIORITIES AND THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR BUDGET 2022 PROPOSAL

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Examining the Department of the Interior's Spending Priorities and the President's Fiscal Year Budget 2022 Proposal''. Testimony was heard from Deb Haaland, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

AN EPIDEMIC CONTINUES: YOUTH VAPING IN AMERICA

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy held a hearing entitled ''An Epidemic Continues: Youth Vaping in America''. Testimony was heard from Senator Durbin and Janet Woodcock, M.D., Acting Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

A REVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2022 BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR NASA

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''A Review of the President's Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Proposal for NASA''. Testimony was heard from Bill Nelson, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

PRIORITIZING SMALL UNDESERVED AND RURAL BUSINESSES IN THE SBIR/STTR PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Underserved, Agricultural, and Rural Development held a hearing entitled ''Prioritizing Small Undeserved and Rural Businesses in the SBIR/STTR Programs''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FEMA'S PRIORITIES FOR FY22 AND BEYOND: COORDINATING MISSION, VISION, AND BUDGET

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled ''FEMA's Priorities for FY22 and Beyond: Coordinating Mission, Vision, and Budget''. Testimony was heard from Deanne Criswell, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Central Intelligence Agency Budget Hearing''. Testimony was heard from William J. Burns, Director, Central Intelligence Agency. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

BUSINESS MEETING

Joint Committee on the Library: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 117th Congress.

BUSINESS MEETING

Joint Committee on Printing: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 117th Congress.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2022 for the Navy and Marine Corps, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration on atomic energy defense activities in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2022 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 9 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine bipartisan bills to increase access to housing, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jennifer L. Homendy, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, Karen Jean Hedlund, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, and Robert Cornelius Hampshire, of Michigan, Christopher A. Coes, of Georgia, and Carol Annette Petsonk, of the District of Columbia, each to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the infrastructure needs of the U.S. energy sector, western water, and public lands, including an original bill to invest in the energy and outdoor infrastructure of the United States to deploy new and innovative technologies, update existing infrastructure to be reliable and resilient, and secure energy infrastructure against physical and cyber threats, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the role of natural and nature-based features in water resources projects, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Sarah Bianchi, of Virginia, to be Deputy United States Trade Representative (Asia, Africa, Investment, Services, Textiles, and Industrial Competitiveness), with the rank of Ambassador, Jayme Ray White, of

Washington, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Middle East, Labor, and Environment), with the rank of Ambassador, and Melanie Anne Egorin, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, 10:30 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. 65, to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, S. 1061, to encourage the normalization of relations with Israel, the nominations of Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Organization Affairs), Larry Edward Andre, Jr., of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Somalia, Maria E. Brewer, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Lesotho, Tulinabo S. Mushingi, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, Elizabeth Moore Aubin, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Eugene S. Young, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, Christopher John Lamora, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cameroon, Todd D. Robinson, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs), and Daniel J. Kritenbrink, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (East Asian and Pacific Affairs), all of the Department of State, and other pending calendar business, 11 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 807, to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings, S. 818, to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings, and the nominations of David H. Chipman, of Virginia, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, Ur Mendoza Jaddou, of California, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, Margaret Irene Strickland, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico, Eunice C. Lee, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Veronica S. Rossman, of Colorado, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, and David G. Estudillo, Lauren J. King, and Tana Lin, each to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, 9 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, markup on the Fiscal Year 2022 Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, markup on the Fiscal Year 2022 Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 12 p.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Department of Defense's Fiscal Year 2022 Budget'', 10:30 a.m., 210 Cannon and Zoom.

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining the Policies and Priorities of the U.S. Department of Education'', 10:15 a.m., Zoom.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Empowered by Data: Legislation to Advance Equity and Public Health'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment, and Cyber; and North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly, joint hearing entitled ''NATO 2030: A Celebration of Origins and an Eye Toward the Future'', 10 a.m., Webex.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Advancing and Protecting LGBTQI+ Rights Abroad'', 1 p.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Elections, hearing entitled ''Voting in America: A National Perspective on the Right to Vote, Methods of Election, Jurisdictional Boundaries, and Redistricting'', 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth and Webex.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship, hearing entitled ''Oh, Canada! How Outdated U.S. Immigration Policies Push Top Talent to Other Countries'', 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Leading by Example: The Need for Comprehensive Paid Leave for the Federal Workforce and Beyond'', 10 a.m., Zoom.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled ''Plastic Waste Reduction and Recycling Research: Moving from Staggering Statistics to Sustainable Systems'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Regulations, hearing entitled ''CMMC Implementation: What It Means for Small Businesses'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing entitled ''President Biden's Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Request: Agency Policies and Perspectives (Part I)'', 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3967, the ''Honoring Our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2021'', 2 p.m., HVC–210 and Zoom.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''National Security Agency Budget Hearing'', 9:30 a.m., HVC–304 Hearing Room. This hearing is closed.

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Rethinking Congressional Culture: Lessons from the Fields of Organizational Psychology and Conflict Resolution'', 11 a.m., 2167 Rayburn and Zoom.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, June 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of S. 1251, Growing Climate Solutions Act.

At 11 a.m., Senate will vote on or in relation to Lee Amendment No. 2119; followed by a vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended.

Upon disposition of S. 1251, Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation thereon at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, June 24

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 239—Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act. Consideration of H.R. 1443—LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act. Consideration of 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''. Consideration of 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''.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E682
Duncan, Jeff, S.C., E681
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E684
Garamendi, John, Calif., E683
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E681, E684
Kim, Andy, N.J., E683
Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E683
Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E682
Morelle, Joseph D., N.Y., E684
Mrvan, Frank J., Ind., E683
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E681

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.