



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 2021

No. 113

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 1, 2021, at 11 a.m.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 2021

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 29, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS R. SUOZZI 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.

GUN VIOLENCE RUINS LIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, "My husband was shot in the stomach

during a robbery attempt in front of our house. Gun violence ruined his life. He was left with grievous residual injuries that have put a huge dent in my family's finances, emotions, sense of security, and our well-being. My family has suffered a lot, but most especially my husband, who has suffered both impaired emotional and physical bodily function. He has so many medical issues as a result of his shooting. We have experienced pain and suffering like so many more families out there. There is horrible residual pain left behind by gun violence. We have become prisoners in our own home."

"My younger brother took his own life with a handgun he legally obtained. He had a long history of mental illness, and I disagreed with his ability to purchase a firearm for this very reason. If there had been better background checks in place, he may not have been able to purchase the firearm. I wish that these restrictions were in place. I want you to know that real stakes are involved in a simple issue like background checks. If universal background checks were in place, my little brother might still be alive."

"My fiancé's son, James, was shot and killed in 2018 after attending a get-together. He was not the intended target. He was a straight-A student in his senior year of high school, trying to decide if he was on his way to college or the Navy. But he didn't get a chance to make his choice. There were nearly 100 witnesses, but no arrest has been made."

"I am a trauma therapist working with young children who have been ex-

posed to violence. These children are under the age of 5. Through play, they have demonstrated their experience with the sounds of gunfire. Some have even seen deceased people outside their front door. There is even less funding provided to address the trauma that gun violence produces for the most vulnerable—our children—who are living in the most violent areas."

These are just a handful of the more than 700 stories about the devastating impacts of gun violence that my constituents have recently shared with me. Each of these stories is heartbreaking, and they highlight both the complexity and the far-reaching consequences of the gun violence epidemic.

Every single day in my district and communities across the country, children are traumatized by the sounds of unpredictable gunfire, the sight of blood on pavement, or more ambulance lights in their neighborhoods.

Families are becoming financially ruined by the cost of continued surgeries and therapy after being shot.

Grandparents write to tell me that their elementary school-aged grandchildren are scared to go and play outside for fear of being gunned down like their classmates and their neighbors.

When will enough be enough?

America's gun violence epidemic is a slow-motion massacre that is rapidly gaining speed. Just this weekend, 77 people were shot in Chicago, 77 people in just one city in just one weekend.

We must act now to stop the steady drip of daily gun violence. Mr. Speaker,

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3243

2020 was one of the deadliest gun violence years on record, and we are already on track to outpace those grim statistics. More than 21,000 people are dead in just the first 6 months of this year.

We need to step up to the plate and do something to protect our constituents.

We need to make straw purchasing and gun trafficking Federal crimes. We need to expand background checks. We need to support more evidence-based community violence prevention programs. We need to build opportunity for youth to get a good education and good jobs. We cannot go on letting mothers bury their children.

This week, we mark the end of Gun Violence Awareness Month. But for far too many families, there is no end to this month of awareness and advocacy. These families are painfully aware of the impacts of gun violence because they carry the weight of this epidemic with them every single day.

I rise to implore my colleagues to exercise some courage and responsibility by advancing gun violence prevention legislation.

MEANING OF INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a quick web search on the meaning of Independence Day will give you the dictionary definition: A day celebrating the anniversary of national independence.

For a nation built upon the foundations of freedom, such as the United States of America, there is much more to the meaning of Independence Day than can be described in a dictionary.

For Americans, Independence Day is about the people who have lived and died in the defense of freedom. Crispus Attucks, who was killed by British troops in the Boston Massacre, has long been honored as an American hero and the first casualty of the Revolutionary War. Mr. Attucks has proved to be the first in a long legacy of American heroes.

Each and every generation of Americans has had their share of men and women willing to pursue a more perfect realization of that most basic of human rights, freedom.

Freedom against tyranny was the primary motive during the Revolutionary War for our first President, George Washington, alongside the Founding Fathers, who designed the government for our new Nation and the troops who fought for its right to exist.

The great efforts of President Abraham Lincoln during the most trying time in our Nation's history, the Civil War, led armies of brave soldiers who fought not only for the reunification of the country but also the freedom of people held in slavery.

This noble fight was taken up not only by soldiers but by civilians who

worked in support of those in combat, such as Clara Barton, Army nurse and founder of the American National Red Cross.

Hundreds of thousands of young men lost their lives during the Second World War fighting fascism in Europe and around the world. Presidents Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry Truman, alongside generals including Eisenhower, Patton, and MacArthur, provided the leadership and strategy necessary to allow our soldiers to gain victory and preserve freedom.

As a nation, we have believed in and fought for freedom for so long that it can easily be taken for granted. This is a trap that we must be extra vigilant not to fall into. As President Reagan aptly stated, freedom "is not passed to our children in the bloodstream."

Pursuing freedom for over 200 years has been the result of a conscious choice, in each era, by every generation. We must continue to make that choice in this era and in this generation.

Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed that in my examples from the Revolutionary War, Civil War, and Second World War, I named politicians who served our soldiers and citizens. Make no mistake, it is the soldiers and the citizens of our Nation who do the work to preserve freedom. Therefore, it is the solemn duty of those of us who work in government to lead and represent the people so that they can continue to live in freedom.

I urge each and every government official, and especially my fellow Members of Congress, to make the choice to pursue freedom, as so many generations have before us. In this way, we honor the lives of past heroes such as Crispus Attucks and ensure freedom will be defended by future generations.

Mr. Speaker, that is the meaning of Independence Day that could never fit in a dictionary.

HONORING HEROES GORDON BEESLEY AND JOHNNY HURLEY

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 2021, the community of Arvada, Colorado, experienced a tragedy. In a matter of minutes, our community lost two heroes, with dozens of Arvada residents left stunned and horrified.

Arvada Police Officer Gordon Beesley was responding to a report of suspicious activity in Olde Town Arvada when he was ambushed and shot by a man who had immense hatred toward the police.

Minutes later, a Good Samaritan named Johnny Hurley intervened and shot the suspect, undoubtedly saving countless other lives. In a tragedy upon a tragedy, Hurley was then mistaken as the shooter, and he was killed.

Officer Gordon Beesley joined the Arvada Police Department in 2002 and

served in a number of roles for the department. He spent most of the year working as a school resource officer at local schools in our community, including Oberon Middle School, Lincoln Academy, and Excel Academy Charter School. During the summers, he often returned to patrol work, as he was doing last Monday in Olde Town Arvada.

Officer Beesley was a well-known and well-liked member of our community. His calm, gentle, and patient demeanor made a big difference in his day-to-day interactions with students, especially those students who needed it most.

In 2015, he was named employee of the year by the city of Arvada after the city learned Officer Beesley was riding his bike to school multiple times a week with a student who suffered from developmental delays and was not able to ride by himself.

Countless other stories have surfaced from students, his colleagues, and community members in the days following his death about the impact he had on their lives, big and small.

He was an accomplished drummer and singer who played in local Arvada bands Railbenders and Brethren Fast.

We will remember Officer Beesley's kindness and bravery and the approach he brought to life each and every day to "make someone feel special today."

Hearing gunshots, another hero stepped up to protect and defend the community, 40-year-old Denver resident Johnny Hurley. According to Arvada's chief of police, Johnny's actions were "decisive, courageous, and effective in stopping further loss of life."

Johnny's friends and family remembered him as an idealist and iconoclast and were not surprised to learn Johnny stepped up to defend his community in a time of need.

The loss of Johnny Hurley is tragic. I join the Arvada Police Department and our community at large in honoring his bravery for his actions that day, which undoubtedly saved lives.

Although we don't know all the facts, our hearts go out to the officer who mistook Mr. Hurley for the shooter.

This has been a difficult week for our community, including for members of the Arvada Police Department. Our heroes in uniform are charged with protecting our communities, and last week's shooting is a reminder of the dangers our police officers face each and every day across the country.

Olde Town Arvada is a close-knit community at the heart of Arvada. On a typical day, it is a busy, vibrant, cheerful part of town. Mr. Speaker, June 21, 2021, was a dark day for our community, and it is difficult for many of us to process it.

My deepest and heartfelt condolences go out to the families of Officer Beesley and Johnny Hurley and the entire Arvada community. Arvadans are resilient and strong. Together, we will get through this.

COMMONSENSE SOLUTIONS ON
INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that Congress must take action to improve our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. But, sadly, bipartisan negotiations have hit a roadblock, and the infrastructure legislation on the floor this week is a go-at-it-alone, my-way-or-the-highway bill.

Instead of focusing on traditional infrastructure, Democrats have chosen to prioritize the left's Green New Deal agenda. This bill includes an estimated \$276 billion for Green New Deal-related mandates, requirements, and programs. To put that into perspective, \$1 out of every \$2 spent by this legislation is tied up in Green New Deal goals.

Further, this bill reduces flexibility for States to meet their own unique infrastructure needs and fails to streamline major project reviews, which typically face a 6-year delay. To make matters worse, the spending increases proposed in this bill rely heavily on more deficit spending. There are no pay-fors, which will only further fuel inflation and increase the cost of goods like gas and food.

We need commonsense solutions that truly work to improve our roads, bridges, railways, and rural broadband. I am pleased to hear that there are bipartisan negotiations underway to achieve these goals, but this bill this week veers off the road and into a partisan ditch.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" later this week on H.R. 3684.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ANNE
SEATON

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Anne Seaton, who went to be with the Lord on April 23, 2021.

Anne was a pillar of the Sixth District of Virginia, but her light shone well beyond the valley.

Charitable at heart, Anne and the Mehnert family served as missionaries in Jamaica and hosted refugees from New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina to help provide comfort and aid to those afflicted.

In the valley, Anne was a passionate supporter of Grace Christian School and Wilson High School, as well as one who helped fundraise for the Waynesboro Symphony Orchestra.

Further, Anne was active in local politics, including the successful campaign of her husband Scott to the Augusta County Board of Supervisors.

Anne was the founder of the Republican Women of Greater Augusta and inspired many to get involved in the community.

Above all, though, it was Anne's family and her faith that defined her. A loving wife to Scott, mother to

Joscelyn Hodge and her husband Christopher, Phillip, Samuel, and Daniel, friend and daughter, Anne was a devoted follower of Jesus Christ and was a member of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church.

Anne has a grandchild due in December.

Anne not only believed in her faith, but she lived it as exemplified through her life's work.

Living through our faith is a lesson we can all learn from the late great Anne Seaton.

Anne is greatly missed and will not soon be forgotten.

RECOGNIZING AMHERST COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL
GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Amherst County High School girls softball team for winning this year's Class 4 State Championship.

It was a defensive game all around, and Amherst County's pitcher, Dylan McNerney, kept the Lancers in it with an incredible performance, striking out 10 batters.

With the game tied at zero at the end of regulation, it took extra innings for the Lancers to pull off a victory against the Hanover Hawks.

Before the final inning began, head coach Samantha Thacker told the team: "This is our time, this is our inning, we have got to stay settled and be patient," and they did just that.

In the top of the eighth, two errors by the Hawks put runners on base for Amherst County with one out.

When Kayleigh Combs stepped up to bat, she put the ball into play, and an overthrow allowed Cheyenne Wall to race home from third giving the Lancers a one to nothing lead. Soon after, a wild pitch brought Maegan Lloyd home adding another run to the board.

With a two to nothing lead heading into the bottom of the eighth, the Lancers were able to keep the Hawks scoreless, securing the team's first ever State softball title.

Congratulations to the players and coaches on a great season, they have earned it.

WATER ISSUES

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the importance of water and my concerns with the Biden administration's unnecessary overreach.

We use water to sustain ourselves; for industrial manufacturing; for swimming and recreation with our family and friends; to bathe; and to produce the most affordable, abundant, and safe food supply in the world.

Agriculture is the largest industry in Kansas' Big First District and across the State, so water conditions determine good or bad crop years, the amount of time livestock producers spend hauling water or moving cattle to land with a better pond, and ultimately, the kinds of foods that show up

on the grocery store shelves across the country.

In western and south-central Kansas, the Ogallala aquifer is the main source of water and represents the supply of one-third of the State of Kansas. The Ogallala covers about 175,000 square miles across eight States from South Dakota to Texas, making it the largest aquifer in the country and one of the largest in the world.

At the beginning of the 20th century, States began pumping water from the Ogallala to irrigate the land for agricultural production use. In arid climates like western Kansas, irrigation transformed the Dust Bowl ridden region into the incredibly productive land that we see today. On average, Kansas has about three million irrigated acres with nearly 2.6 million acres irrigated with water from the Ogallala and the rest of the High Plains aquifer. The Ogallala's groundwater is essential to our food supply, as it supports nearly one-fifth of all of the wheat, corn, cotton, and cattle produced in the United States.

In 2018, when I was Lieutenant Governor of Kansas, we worked with the Ogallala Water Coordinated Agriculture Project to hold the first ever Ogallala Aquifer Summit in Garden City and gathered stakeholders from the eight States covering the aquifer to discuss the need to conserve water and sustain the Ogallala region's agriculture productivity over the long-term, adapting new technologies and voluntarily reducing water waste.

Since then, producers like Lynn Goossen have made changes to their operations to reduce the amount of water they pump and protect Ogallala. Goossen Farms has shifted from irrigated corn to a wheat rotation, adapted conservation practices when applying fertilizer, and changed from flood to sprinkler irrigation. Understanding the depletion of the Ogallala caused Mr. Goossen to take on leadership within his Groundwater Management District and work with other producers to voluntarily use their water wisely.

Efforts at the State level in Kansas through Groundwater Management Districts have also supported the sustainable use of the Ogallala aquifer where districts work with communities to set their own water conservation goals and control measures; develop plans to reduce water withdrawals in a designated area; and continue using water in a manner that is economically viable. The research from the Northwest Kansas Technical College Water Technology Farm has helped producers like Tim Franklin in Sherman County. The Franklin family farm was early to enroll in a Water Conservation Area, and uses the technology developed and tested at Northwest Tech to help meet their water reduction goals.

These voluntary, locally led efforts to safeguard our water were supported during the Trump administration when they published a reasonable and clear definition of "waters of the United

States" in the Navigable Waters Protection Rule. This rule provided certainty for farmers and ranchers, and designated authority back to States to regulate their own waters after years of Federal overreach.

Unfortunately, President Biden has once again determined that the Federal Government knows best and announced his intent to review the rule, likely signaling a return to the Obama administration's WOTUS rule, which sought to Federally regulate every small stream, ditch or puddle of water. This announcement is especially frustrating as many western States currently face an extreme drought, leading to a severe water shortage for not only our agriculture producers, but also drinking water and hydroelectric energy generators. Further regulation adds insult to injury.

Producers and water users at the local level know their community best, which is why I joined several of my House colleagues on legislation that would codify the Navigable Waters Protection Rule and on a letter to President Biden stating our strong opposition to any return to the expanded Federal jurisdiction over waters around the country. I have also led legislation that would push back on executive overreach in our agriculture, energy, and natural resource sectors.

Our farmers and ranchers are the original conservationists and continually update practices to reduce water use and inputs so that they can continue to produce safe, affordable food while maintaining their water supply for generations to come. We must provide certainty regarding their local water rights and continue to stand in opposition to any overreaching regulations that threaten the livelihoods of Kansas farmers and ranchers.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES JACKSON FRENCH

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Charles Jackson French, a World War II hero with ties to Omaha who made one of the most underappreciated sacrifices in American military history.

The story of Charles Jackson French is an American story: One of courage, sacrifice, and hope. Charles, a Black man, was born in a racially segregated Foreman, Arkansas, on September 15, 1919. In 1937, Charles enlisted in the United States Navy. After completing his enlistment, he moved to Omaha, Nebraska, to be with family, but after the attack on Pearl Harbor, he reenlisted.

According to accounts, on September 5, 1942, Petty Officer First Class French was serving as a mess attendant in the racially segregated USS *Gregory*. As a Black man growing up in 1930's Arkansas, Charles lived in a time when segregation laws prohibited Black people

from swimming alongside White people in public pools and beaches, yet when the USS *Gregory* was attacked and sunk by Japanese gunfire off the coast of Guadalcanal, it was Petty Officer French who dove into the treacherous waters of the Pacific to save his fellow sailors who had been wounded.

Petty Officer French loaded 15 of his fellow sailors into a lifeboat and saved his injured comrades from drowning. However, Charles knew that they could not simply float to shores controlled by the Japanese where they would meet a fate worse than death. Prisoners were often tortured then executed. Military.com recounted how Charles tied a rope around his waist with the help of his shipmates and towed his fellow sailors through shark-infested waters for 8 long hours until they were finally identified and saved by an American landing craft.

In his book "Black Men and Blue Water" Chester Wright recounted his conversation with Petty Officer French who told him that when he and the raft full of survivors were rescued, persons aboard the ship told Charles to go "where the colored boys stay" while the crew tended to the wounded White survivors. Charles further shared that the sailors rescued by him told the crew: "He ain't going nowhere. He is a member of the *Gregory's* crew and he damned well will stay here with the rest of us."

Just like the sailors who stepped up at the time for French, it is our time to stand up and recognize with full measure the sacrifice and service of French, whose story has been underappreciated by the Navy and history. A real-life hero like Charles must be recognized by the military and the country that he devoted his life to.

In World War II, the Navy gave French a commendation letter. I have now asked the Navy to review and consider upgrading to a medal, and the Navy is reviewing this now.

Full recognition of U.S. Navy Petty Officer First Class Charles Jackson French is long overdue. We owe it to Charles, his family, and to the millions of Americans who learned from Charles' story.

Last Friday, I also introduced legislation to rename one of Omaha's post offices after Charles, and I am pleased that Representatives JEFF FORTENBERRY and ADRIAN SMITH have joined me in this effort to recognize a Nebraska hero.

Today, I call on the Navy, Congress, and the White House to recognize the service and sacrifice of Petty Officer First Class French so that all Americans, especially our Nation's future leaders and servicemembers, can be inspired by Charles' display of patriotism and sacrifice. But also, so the family of Charles can be comforted by the eternal gratitude of a Nation that Petty Officer First Class French so dutifully served. This three-decade veteran salutes him.

RECOGNIZING NORTH CAROLINA SWEET POTATO COMMISSION'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the North Carolina Sweet Potato Commission's 60th anniversary.

In 1961, six sweet potato producers chartered the commission to support growers and to maintain North Carolina's standing as a leading sweet potato producing State. They are now more than 400 sweet potato growers strong as well as packers, processors, and business associates who remain dedicated to supporting our State's prosperous sweet potato industry.

Since 1971, North Carolina has ranked as the number one sweet potato producing State in the U.S. with 65 percent of the Nation's sweet potato production. North Carolina sweet potato producers are family farmers who have been cultivating their land for generations growing many different crops. They work day and night, year after year to ship delectable, high quality, nutritious North Carolina sweet potatoes all across the country and the world.

Agriculture is the backbone of North Carolina's economy, and the sweet potato industry is absolutely critical to our food supply in North Carolina and in the country. It is not an understatement to say that the North Carolina Sweet Potato Commission has more than fulfilled its founding mission to strengthen our State's sweet potato production, and I congratulate them on their 60th anniversary.

May they have many more years of providing every American with one of our Nation's safest, nutritious, and might I add, delicious vegetables grown.

CONGRESS MUST AGGRESSIVELY ADDRESS THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, our national debt exceeds \$28.1 trillion. Congress year after year continues spending money with seemingly no regard for the debts we are pushing onto future generations. While it was necessary to spend a significant amount of money to get us through the COVID-19 crisis, we must now move aggressively to address the national debt, in my opinion, the most significant domestic threat that our country faces. And the sooner we take action the better.

□ 1030

Unfortunately, the current administration doesn't seem to feel the need to pursue fiscal restraint. President Biden's spending agenda is hurting families and small businesses across the country. Meanwhile, he has sent Congress a \$6 trillion budget request.

This additional spending will lead to even more inflation. The excessive spending Congress recently approved has already resulted in inflation. We

see it every day in the skyrocketing prices of goods. And if the President and Democrats in Congress get their way on major tax hikes, the economy and working families will be hurt even more.

Today, the American dollar is still king, which is how we can print and borrow money with seemingly little consequence. But huge debt-to-GDP ratios threaten that standing and could easily cause a significant decline in our standard of living.

Rampant inflation, which is really just a hidden tax, and a significantly devalued dollar could cripple our economy and easily lead future generations right back to the days of centuries before us.

Now, in contrast, the budget proposed by the Republican Study Committee for fiscal year 2022 balances the annual budget in 5 years by reducing spending and maintaining pro-growth policies. It is the most pro-life budget ever written, with 17 pro-life provisions included. It protects Second Amendment rights, secures our border, and offers real solutions to return our country to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Study Committee budget combats Washington's out-of-control spending and puts American taxpayers first. We should all be able to agree it is long past time to bring fiscal sanity to Washington.

SUPPORTING OUR PARTNERS IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation called the HOPE and ALLIES Act to support our interpreters in Afghanistan.

I can't tell you how important this is on a personal level to me. In 2012, I was hit by an IED blast. That IED went off because one of our interpreters stepped on a pressure plate. His name was Raqman. He was responding to a call, responding to do his job, like they do day in and day out. They never get a break. And he stepped on that IED, about 10 to 15 pounds of explosives, and it ripped off all four of his limbs right away. I couldn't see him because I was blinded by the blast, but I could hear him.

When someone gets hit by an IED—you have probably seen in the movies—you think they scream. But they don't scream. They don't have the energy to scream. It is more like a groan. It is the deepest kind of pain that you can imagine. And I will never forget that sound.

Before he was hit, he expressed to us that one of his dreams would be to come back to San Diego, California, enlist in the military, and become a Navy SEAL. That was the kind of patriotism that he had. He wasn't even a citizen. Imagine if our own citizens loved their country the way that these guys did.

And that story is not unique. Raqman later died, but that legacy lived on. These interpreters showed such dedication to the cause; it is unimaginable, really. And as military units rotate in and out, we get to go home, we see our families. The interpreters stay out there. It is just another day for them. Meanwhile, their families are under threat. They are receiving anonymous phone calls constantly, threatening their lives, calling them infidels all because they supported the United States.

Now we are about to leave them. This administration is not doing enough to make sure that they don't get left to die. I am confident this body will do what it can, but it takes this administration to actually do something now before this hasty retreat occurs and before thousands and thousands and thousands of interpreters and contractors are killed; and they will be killed. They absolutely will be killed. Their families will be killed. The threats have already come, and it will happen if we don't do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I call on this administration to do something about it. I call on the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security to get this process going, to expedite this process as quickly as possible. These people are heroes and they need to come to their new home here in the United States.

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 34 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 (Mr. LANGEVIN) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, in the aftermath of the disaster in Miami, Florida, we commend to Your care and protection the ongoing search and rescue efforts.

We fervently pray that You would deliver all those that are yet clinging to life beneath the magnitude of the wreckage. Preserve their spirits even as they struggle with overwhelming fear for their lives. Grant them a glimpse of hope—even a miracle—that they would soon emerge from the terrifying prison of panic and distress.

And for the families of the missing and the dead, give them comfort and strength as they wait for an answer or grieve their loss. Even as they cling

desperately to a photo or a memory, may they find a way to hold fast to their faith in You.

Guide and strengthen the rescue workers who face the daunting task of digging through the concrete rubble and the devastation that surrounds them. May they have fortitude of body to brave the dangers of this precarious structure and fortification of faith to endure the suffering they attend to.

On behalf of all of these we pray with the psalmist: In our distress, we call upon You O Lord; to You O God, we cry for help. Hear our voices. May our cries reach Your heavens.

In the strength of Your 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 Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WAGNER 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.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a tireless advocate for the most vulnerable. I continue to fight for the Born-Alive Act to mandate lifesaving care for abortion survivors. And I also am proud to support H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, which will permanently prohibit taxpayer funding for abortions by enshrining the bipartisan Hyde amendment into law. Sadly, both the Born-Alive Act and the Hyde amendment are under attack by my Democrat colleagues.

The Hyde amendment protects taxpayers from paying for abortions and has saved hundreds of thousands of lives.

No one should be forced to financially support the abortion industry. I stand with the majority of Americans who believe in this essential conscience protection.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

THE UNITED STATES-CANADA BORDER NEEDS TO SAFELY RE-OPEN

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, for 34 years my community of Buffalo, New York, and our Canadian neighbors in Fort Erie, Ontario, would mark the first week of July with the Friendship Festival.

This event that invites citizens of both countries to cross our shared border and celebrate with music, culture, food, and festivities highlights the strong and lasting bond between the United States and Canada.

There will be no cross-border celebration this year on Canada Day and Independence Day. Not due to the pandemic, but due to the failure of both countries to plan for a safe reopening of the U.S.-Canadian border.

For friends and families living along the northern border, crossing isn't an annual event, it is a way of life.

Vaccines provide the bridge that allows people to come together again.

We need leadership to open those bridges and let us reunite.

THE ORIGIN OF COVID-19 MUST BE INVESTIGATED

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a matter that is incredibly important to our national security, our public health knowledge, and preparing for the next pandemic.

It has been well over a year since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, and our country has closed down in the face of a public health crisis the likes of which we have not seen in decades.

And to this day, we still do not have a definitive answer regarding the origins of COVID-19. Getting to the bottom of how this virus originated and how it spread across the globe should be one of our top priorities in Congress.

Today, the Republican members of the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis will hold a forum to discuss the origins of this virus. This is not a partisan issue, and every Member of this body should want to know

where this virus came from and every member of the select subcommittee should be in attendance.

As I said earlier, finding the origins is important to our national security, public health knowledge, and preparing for the next pandemic.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

INFRASTRUCTURE SHOULD BE A PRIORITY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Joe Biden claimed a bipartisan agreement on infrastructure. On the surface this sounds like great news. Unfortunately, quickly following this new-found agreement, President Biden crushed the bipartisan bill by mandating wasteful Green New Deal borrowing, destroying jobs.

Improving America's infrastructure should be a priority and to delay it for partisan reasons is another insult to the American people. The President's voters are misled with an absurd interpretation of infrastructure.

This chaotic mentality has been exhibiting a reversal from the bipartisan President Biden promised when running for President. Dishonoring promises and undermining bipartisan negotiations, the administration should actually be focused on the needs of the American people instead of destroying jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we should never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JEFFERY ROBERT HALTER

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Jeffery Robert Halter. Not only was he my neighbor and a family friend, but he

was also a devoted husband to Kim, and director of constituent services for my congressional office. Additionally, Jeff was a loving father to Katherine Chelsey and Laura Leigh and supportive father-in-law to Andrew Smith and Austin Lowe.

Jeff was a proud Bowling Green, Kentucky, native. He graduated from Bowling Green High School in 1983 and attended Samford University School of Pharmacy where he graduated in 1989. As a prominent pharmacist and owner of two community pharmacies, Jeff served many patients in the local community and was always happy to help his customers. He was also a member of Broadway United Methodist Church.

Jeff's contagious laugh and kindness will be remembered by all who knew him. He loved the outdoors, but above all, he loved his family. In addition to his wife and two daughters, Jeff is survived by his parents, Charles Robert and Scottie Ann Halter; brother, Timothy Alan Halter; and many other loving family members. Jeff left a positive impact on our community and is greatly missed.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protect the sanctity of human life, especially the lives of the unborn.

The Hyde amendment has saved nearly 2½ million lives since its first inclusion in an appropriation bill in 1976.

This historically bipartisan amendment which prohibits the use of taxpayer dollars paying for abortion is supported by a majority of Americans.

H.R. 18, of which I am an original cosponsor, codifies the Hyde amendment and applies it to all government funding, cementing the protections for the most vulnerable Americans. This bill is called the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

CONGRATULATING MIKE McINTYRE

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

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Honorable Mike McIntyre, former Member of the House from 1997 to 2015

for his induction into the University of North Carolina's Order of the Golden Fleece, the oldest and highest honor society at UNC, where Mike received both a bachelor of arts and a juris doctorate.

After graduating from UNC law, Mike practiced as an attorney in his hometown of Lumberton until he was elected to Congress in 1996. During his 18 years representing Robeson County and other parts of southeastern North Carolina, Congressman McIntyre acquired a reputation for excellent constituent service and advocacy for rural communities, including his work on the Agriculture Committee and his co-authoring the landmark Tobacco Buyout legislation, as well as fighting for full Federal recognition of the Lumbee.

For Mike, country over party was not just a slogan, it was his approach to leadership. I am honored not only to carry on his work serving the rural southern Piedmont of North Carolina, but also to strive to emulate his example as I do so.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mike on this appropriate recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

A BILL FOR BAD OPTICS

(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, after the 5-month deployment of the National Guard around our U.S. Capitol, after the fact of the January 6 break-in, the bill has come due now of over half a billion dollars—\$521 million—for the thousands of troops to guard this Capitol.

This was, again, after the big break-in of January 6. Of course, had the decisionmakers on hand here at the Capitol with their security intel used ahead of time decided to employ just a handful of those troops, we wouldn't have had the January 6 situation happen. But they did not want the bad optics of armed troops standing in front here at that time.

So, instead, we got 5 months' worth of it with two rows of fence, razor wire, and the inability for the people to come visit their Capitol. So now we have months of those optics and a half-a-billion-dollar bill instead.

Mr. Speaker, if that bill doesn't get paid, now our National Guard will not be able to do their training and have their other readiness needs met because Congress hasn't paid the bill for what they did not want ahead of time—bad optics.

Instead, the taxpayers get the bad optics of that bill and a possibly decimated National Guard.

BIDEN BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, the Biden border crisis continues raging on our southern border. Cartels are getting rich, migrants are getting abused and assaulted, and Americans are becoming victims of crime.

With the record number of illegal aliens attempting to flood across our border, what has the Biden administration done?

Nothing.

For months now, the Biden administration has been denying this crisis exists; telling the American people there is no crisis; telling the American people the border is closed. But we all know better.

I saw it myself firsthand when I visited Del Rio, Texas, a place where every day, around 3:00 p.m., buses pulled up to the Mexican side of the border and unloaded hundreds of illegal aliens. They then waded through knee-high water of the Rio Grande and into our country. Once they arrive on the American side, they are promptly picked up by Border Patrol agents in air-conditioned vans, given a wristband, and away they go to a city near you.

This happens tens of thousands of times every single day and there is no end in sight, not until we revert to Trump's policies.

DEFUND ABORTION

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because, as a proud pro-life advocate, I cannot stay silent as I watch the Biden administration chip away at the rights of defenseless unborn.

Democrats have been working over time with the Biden administration to roll back critical protections for the unborn so they can push radical pro-abortion policies, and their latest victim, it appears, is the Hyde amendment.

For over 40 years, the Hyde amendment has saved millions of lives by preventing the use of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. A recent poll from the Knights of Columbus indicates that 58 percent of Americans oppose the use of taxpayer dollars to support abortions. That number also includes 65 percent of Independents and 31 percent of Democrats.

If millions of Americans are against the use of tax dollars being used to support abortion, then why is Congress considering legislation that does just exactly that?

If this legislation were for the people, wouldn't we listen to them instead of

forcing American taxpayers to subsidize something that the majority of them are against?

Taking the life of an unborn child is simply unconscionable. I believe that we, as a governing body, have a responsibility to protect life at every stage, especially the defenseless unborn who are unable to advocate for themselves. We have no business using taxpayer dollars to fund abortions.

LAMPETER-STRASBURG SOFTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Lampeter-Strasburg High School softball team for winning the PIAA 5A Softball Championship earlier this month, with a 10-7 victory over Armstrong. This is the Pioneers' second State championship in just 3 years. This victory capped off a dominant 30-win season.

Through the halfway mark, the Pioneers were down 1 run entering the 5th inning, but after putting 5 runs on the scoreboard, including a 2-run home run from senior Cam Byler, the game was over as the Pioneers closed out to claim the championship.

Mr. Speaker, I extend congratulations to the team members for their success this season. It is a great credit to the players, their hard work, Head Coach Gene Charles, the entire coaching staff, that, for the past 3 years, the Pioneers have played in the championship game, bringing home the trophy this year and previously in 2018.

Mr. Speaker, our community is really proud of this truly outstanding accomplishment. We wish the graduating seniors best of luck in their future endeavors.

DEFEND NOT DEFUND THE POLICE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, crime rates spike when you give in to leftist demands and defund the police. It is as simple as that. Sadly, we are seeing this play out in major cities across the country.

The New York Times reports a sample of 37 U.S. cities saw an 18 percent increase in murders in the first 3 months of this year when compared to last.

Mr. Speaker, this rhetoric and policy is dangerous and, worst of all, it is responsible for the dismantling and demoralization of police departments across the country.

We have also seen the dramatic increase on a tax against law enforcement this year. Tragically, two of my constituents are among those who have recently been killed in the line of duty. We must have law and order and support our heroes who place their lives on the line to keep our communities safe.

In short, we must defend, not defund, the police.

INVEST IN AMERICA ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in a moment, we are going to hear the rule coming forward to support the INVEST in America Act.

I applaud my friend and colleague, PETER DEFAZIO, for his tireless efforts to bring Federal transportation policy into the 21st century.

Unlike past reauthorization bills, this legislation is centered around climate and equity. It makes historic investments in public transit and returns parity to the Federal share for transit and highways, while integrating bike-share and share micro-mobility into transit projects. It invests in Amtrak and high-speed rail, as well as biking and walking.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially encouraged by the newly created Reconnecting Neighborhoods Program, which will provide Federal funding for projects like Albina Vision in my community to rebuild underserved communities that have been negatively impacted by past transportation decisions.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this legislation, my community and communities across the country will be made safer with the incorporation of my Vision Zero legislation.

This is an unprecedented opportunity to deliver for our country, and we are ready to get this job done.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, right now, in Texas today, a little girl is being trafficked in human trafficking and sex trafficking. That is occurring. She is going to be put into the sex trafficking trade and be abused, and she is going to be done so because we have allowed cartels to have operational control of our border. That is true. These are the facts. We know these are the facts. It is happening every single day. We see it on the ground.

Yet the Vice President of the United States only found her way to go to El Paso as a pit stop on the way to Los Angeles, rather than actually meet with people in Texas to see what is actually going on in Texas.

We have no funding at all for the border, for ICE, for Border Patrol.

But you know what we have plenty of funding for?

Abortion. Taxpayer funding for abortion.

It is absolutely despicable the values that are being presented in the United

States House of Representatives and the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

(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 today to recognize this past Sunday, June 27, as National Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day; and June as National PTSD Awareness Month.

We must do more to defy the stigmas surrounding mental health. National Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month is intended to raise public awareness about issues related to PTSD, reduce the stigma associated, and to help ensure those suffering receive proper treatment.

Currently, about eight million people in the United States are struggling with PTSD. PTSD treatment is a crucial tool that helps many individuals, particularly our Nation's veterans, process, cope, and treat emotional and mental trauma.

While PTSD can develop among any individual who faces a traumatic experience, it is often common in our servicemen and -women. Many of our servicemembers return home with injuries and scars, but in some cases it is the invisible scars that hurt the most.

The Department of Veterans Affairs offers a variety of resources to help those suffering with PTSD. There are a wide variety of options, group meetings, individual meetings, meetings via telemedicine. This ensures our veterans can receive timely assistance wherever they may live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Nation's veterans for their service, and I encourage those struggling with post-traumatic stress disorder to pursue treatment.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2662, IG INDEPENDENCE AND EMPOWERMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3005, REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3684, INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 503, ESTABLISHING THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 504

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2662) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform now printed in the bill 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 Oversight and Reform 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 commit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part A 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 Oversight and Reform or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part A 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 Oversight and Reform 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 A 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. 3005) to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, 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 House Administration 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. 3684) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-8, modified by Rules Committee Print 117-9 and the amendment printed in part B 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) 90 minutes of debate, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; (2) any further amendments and amendments en bloc provided by subsequent order of the House; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 503) Establishing the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees.

SEC. 8. (a) At any time through the legislative day of Thursday, July 1, 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 28, 2021, or June 29, 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.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), 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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. 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 gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 504, providing for consideration of H.R. 2662, the IG Independence and Empowerment Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, makes in order six amendments, provides for en bloc authority, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 3005 under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 3684, the INVEST in America Act. The rule provides 90 minutes of general debate with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It combines the Rules Committee prints for the surface transportation and clean water provisions of the bill, self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman DEFAZIO, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule additionally provides for consideration of H. Res. 503, Estab-

lishing the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Finally, the rule provides the majority leader or his designee the ability to en bloc requested rollcall votes on suspension bills considered on June 28 or 29, and this authority lasts through July 1.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider a rule for four measures that address some of the most fundamental issues upon which Congress may act as we continually strive to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for all of us and our descendants.

In passing these three bills and in creating a select committee to investigate the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol, the U.S. House of Representatives is putting forward real solutions to repair our physical infrastructure, protect our systems of accountability, acknowledge our relationship with the past, and establish a shared understanding and plan to address the deep wounds inflicted upon this building, those who serve and protect here, our government, and our democratic Republic by the attack on the Capitol on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the Members and committees that worked on the bills we consider here today, in particular, the Herculean efforts by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Oversight and Reform Committee, and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Majority Whip CLYBURN, and Majority Leader HOYER for their leadership to remove symbols of hate from the Capitol Building.

Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that our Nation's infrastructure is in a shameful state of disrepair. For decades, we have heard a lot of talk about infrastructure while efforts to build and maintain the networks and systems on which we all rely have been grossly underfunded. Whether it be roads and bridges or ports and rail lines, year after year, we fail to muster the political will to properly fund infrastructure, and the consequences are increasingly dire.

My district, Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, is home to Philadelphia's airport, port, rail yard, and, as a key part of the Northeast Corridor, dozens of miles of interstate highways and passenger rail lines, as well as regional commuter and light rail lines that link Philadelphia and its suburbs.

True to its position, PA-05 sits as a transportation keystone to a vast interstate and international economic network. The problems facing my district's transportation infrastructure are not that different from those of other regions. Our infrastructure is

aging and, in some cases, beyond usable lifespan. It is heavily used, and State and local authorities don't have enough money to meet maintenance needs, much less to make investments in modernization, expansion, or other improvements. Anyone who travels our roadways knows that axle-bending, tire-rattling potholes are the norm.

Nationwide, the situation is no better: aging and inadequate electrical grids, shamefully deficient water infrastructure, 47,000 structurally deficient bridges. You can go to any congressional district and find a litany of projects in desperate need of funding.

We have heard lip service about infrastructure week for so long that it has become a sick national joke. We must act now.

While the U.S. has sat on its hands, our allies and adversaries around the world have forged ahead with advancements in transportation networks, from high-speed rail that puts ours to shame to building up broadband and 5G networks.

China spends 8 percent of its GDP on infrastructure. Our European partners spend 5 percent of their GDP on infrastructure. Here in the United States, we spend a meager 2.4 percent.

We are falling behind the rest of the world and, in doing so, failing to promote the general welfare of our citizens.

That is why I am proud to support this rule to pass the INVEST in America Act. This bill will provide over \$715 billion over the next 5 years to repair and improve our Nation's infrastructure. It will create good-paying jobs and lay the foundation for robust economic growth in the 21st century.

It will make record investments in roads, transit, and rails, allowing State departments of transportation to address maintenance backlogs and make forward-thinking investments in road safety, climate mitigation and resiliency, and low-income and underserved communities in our cities, suburbs, and rural areas.

It will help build out our Nation's EV infrastructure and help Americans shift to the next generation of clean energy vehicles. It will assist transit agencies in expanding service areas and adopting zero-emission vehicles, and it gives States funding to help prepare for the impacts of climate change and extreme weather.

This package also includes over \$160 billion for drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. Right now in the United States, there are millions of Americans who don't have access to clean drinking water or who aren't connected to a wastewater network. There is no excuse for that. The water provisions include much-needed funding to fully replace lead pipes throughout the country and strengthen water standards so the EPA can better address PFAS contamination.

These issues are vitally important to my district and others in southeastern Pennsylvania and across the country. I

commend the Energy and Commerce Committee for crafting this comprehensive water infrastructure package.

Lastly, I want to state my strong support for the Member designated projects included in the INVEST in America Act. I thank Chairman DEFAZIO for giving my colleagues and I, on both sides of the aisle, the opportunity to secure dedicated funding for important local projects in our districts and for instituting strong safeguards in this funding to prevent fraud and abuse.

The Member designated projects process allowed us to work with our State and local transit agencies and local governments to highlight high-impact transportation projects in need of funding.

I am proud that \$20 million for seven great projects in my district have been included in this bill, including redesign of dangerous rail crossings and upgrades to commuter stations, and perhaps most significantly, this bill includes a project I submitted with my Pennsylvania colleague (Mr. EVANS), to redesign Cobbs Creek Parkway, one of the most dangerous corridors in our region and the site of hundreds of crashes and multiple fatalities year after year. The redesign will make Cobbs Creek Parkway safer for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

Voting against this bill to invest in America is voting against jobs; it is voting against economic growth; it is voting against safety; and it is voting against making sure people have clean drinking water. Now is the time to tackle these issues, and so I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, also included in this bill is the IG Independence and Empowerment Act, a bill from the House Oversight and Reform Committee to overhaul and reform the legal powers and protections of our inspectors general.

Inspectors general are a vital part of our Federal institutions, ensuring that taxpayers and officials have an independent source of oversight and information to ensure government employees, from the interns to the President, are following the law and properly administering their duties.

For our government to function and be free of waste and corruption, to protect against fraud and impropriety, we need inspectors general who are empowered to act and who are protected from arbitrary, capricious, or personal attacks. But we saw, over the past 4 years, that there were critical flaws in the law that govern our inspector general programs. We saw that it was possible for an administration to undermine the independence of the inspectors general through unprecedented firings and denial of access to information.

A little over a year ago, the former President fired five Cabinet inspectors general over 6 weeks, with the announcements often coming on Friday nights when the Nation's attention was elsewhere.

The inspector general for Health and Human Services was fired for reporting accurately on the Nation's dire shortage of lifesaving PPE during the beginning of the pandemic. The State Department inspector general was fired for investigating then-Secretary Pompeo's use of government staff to run personal errands. And the Department of Transportation inspector general was fired for investigating suspicious grant awards to Kentucky, the State represented by the former Secretary's husband and the then-Senate majority leader. In other words, these inspectors general were fired for doing their jobs.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act will enact needed reforms to protect IGs from political firings, give them increased powers and resources to investigate waste and corruption, and increase accountability and transparency for the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. I strongly support the IG Independence and Empowerment Act and call on my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, the last bill in today's rule is long overdue. The bill would replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall and would remove the statues of individuals who voluntarily served in the Confederate States of America from display in the Capitol.

□ 1245

In Philadelphia, we have a street named after Chief Justice Taney and we have a Little League World Series Champion baseball team named after that street.

In 2020, following conversations about race and inclusiveness in America, the Taney Dragons Little League team decided to rename itself the Philadelphia Dragons saying that they cannot ignore the very real feelings that the name "Taney" engenders among members of our community, and that the new name will be inclusive, nondivisive, and also speak to our league's geography.

I say we follow the lead of our children on this issue. If they can do it, so can we. As we seek to form that more perfect Union and secure the blessings of liberty for all, we cannot accept the presence in this Capitol Building of Confederate icons, including the bust of the author of the Dred Scott decision or those who fought to protect slavery and wage war against the United States. Symbols of the Confederacy deserve to be in textbooks and museums, not venerated in the Capitol.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the creation of a select committee to investigate the January 6 attack on the United States Capitol Building where we stand. I am, and I think most of the public is, disappointed that the Senate failed to join in the establishment of a bipartisan commission to establish once and for all the facts about what happened on that day.

We had a bipartisan bill. Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KATKO of Homeland Security, through good-faith negotiations, were able to craft bipartisan legislation to create a commission to investigate the January 6 insurrection. Our Republican colleagues got everything they wanted in that bill, and yet, their leadership withdrew its support at the last moment and couldn't take yes for an answer.

Since our colleagues refused to approve a bipartisan commission, the House must move ahead with an investigation of the January 6 events and a select committee is our final avenue. We must investigate the causes and events that led to that attack. It is my sincere hope that the committee can dive into the facts and produce a cohesive narrative around January 6 and the events that preceded it and make recommendations that will prevent such horrors from ever being repeated again.

The January 6 attack on our Capitol was a crime, a crime against our government and a crime against the men and women who serve here, whether it was elected officials, congressional staff, or law enforcement. Period. It was an ugly, violent crime and crimes need to be investigated. Thousands participated and over 800 illegally entered the building.

Roughly 500 so far have been criminally charged by law enforcement. Some have pled guilty. But the fact-finding is not yet done. We need to know how organized they were and what their level of coordination was.

Despite the claims of some in this Chamber, we now know that many of these rioters were armed, which means that every single one of us and all of our staffs were in very real danger. Some of the rioters came to abduct the Vice President and the Speaker of the House and put them on trial. Some planned to take this building over and hold it until January 20 in an attempt to stave off President Biden's inauguration. Some just wanted to destroy things, and they did.

That, too, the intention of the rioters, needs to be probed. Some think Donald Trump incited this riot; some think he did not. New and wild claims have surfaced about who instigated the violence. Let's investigate that, too. Let's investigate everything connected to this horrible event honestly, unflinchingly, objectively, and without passion or prejudice, but let us not leave this crime unexamined.

If we are to come together as a Nation to unite behind our shared constitutional values, to ensure domestic tranquility and secure the blessings of democracy and liberty, we must do so from a shared understanding of reality.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that every member of this Chamber can find it in themselves to vote for this rule when it is considered on the floor. Our country cannot afford to wait longer on infrastructure. If we continue with business

as usual, our infrastructure deficit will continue to grow. Our roads and bridges will continue to deteriorate, and our national economy will be less vibrant and competitive as a result.

We need to pass the INVEST in America Act. Full stop. We also need to pass the IG Independence and Empowerment Act, and we need to remove racist icons from the Capitol. These repairs and reforms cannot wait, and so I hope that Congress can find the political will to expeditiously pass the bills considered under the rule today.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of four pieces of legislation: H.R. 2662, the inspector general reform bill; H.R. 3005, which requires the removal of certain Capitol statues; H.R. 3684, the Democrats' surface transportation reauthorization bill; and then H. Res. 503 which establishes a select committee to investigate January 6.

The first bill, H.R. 2662, reforms appointment requirements, authorities, and oversight of Federal inspectors general.

Republicans agree that reforms are necessary. We agree it is necessary to ensure that IGs have the tools they need to conduct robust investigation and oversight. In fact, there are several provisions in this bill that we introduced with Republicans as coauthors.

But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, rather than working toward a bipartisan solution, the majority once again chooses a partisan approach and rejected good-faith efforts from Republicans to craft a proposal that both sides agreed on. The bill before us today includes problematic language limiting a President's authority to remove an IG even when that IG has committed dereliction of duty of an important act.

Further, H.R. 2662 requires the President to name the first assistant as acting IG without any exceptions, even when that assistant may be implicated in the very same misconduct that led to the removal of the previous IG.

Lastly, the bill grants the authority to issue subpoenas for former Federal officials without providing the necessary protections to prevent abuses of this authority.

Mr. Speaker, without these problematic provisions, the IG reform bill could come to the floor with broad, bipartisan support. It is just an absolute shame though, I must say, it is not surprising that my colleagues across the aisle once again threw away an opportunity for bipartisanship simply to score cheap political points with their radical liberal base.

In keeping with that theme, the rule makes in order H.R. 3684, the Demo-

crats' retread of last year's Green New Deal. Only this time it is now disguised as infrastructure. Instead of working with Republicans to provide desperately needed infrastructure investment, House Democrats doubled down on the same mandates, the same restrictive policies, and the same social justice warrior priorities that failed to go anywhere last year.

This partisan package spends nearly \$548 billion on progressive priorities and programs while actually restricting new road and bridge construction. That is right. It actually restricts new construction of roads and bridges. When we talk about the money, like I said, it is about \$550 billion. That is an 11 percent funding increase over last year's bill and a whopping 79 percent increase over the bipartisan FAST Act, the last surface transportation reauthorization bill that was passed by this Chamber.

Alarming, but not surprisingly, this bill is not paid for. So then where does the money come from? Well, the answer is simple, deficit spending. Deficit spending which further fuels inflation and increases the cost of things like gas and food that all American families need. Simply put, every American will pay more for everything to meet the demands of the Democrat's far-left radical base.

You would hope that with a price tag like this, with an impact on American families like this, that the bill would actually provide for massive investment to fix our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges. But you would be wrong. H.R. 3684, puts climate and the Green New Deal above real infrastructure needs. In fact, up to \$1 out of every \$2 spent in this bill is tied up in Green New Deal mandates. This bill puts up roadblocks for transportation and also puts up roadblocks for transporting clean-burning, affordable LNG—obviously, liquefied natural gas—which is another blow to blue-collar workers already devastated by Joe Biden's war on American energy and his war on blue-collar workers.

In focusing on this radical far-left priority, the majority has failed to include the regulatory reforms necessary to address money-wasting permitting delays that currently plague critical infrastructure projects. Think about it. Right now, it takes 6 years on average just to break ground on major public projects; 6 years. An average of 20 to 30 percent of infrastructure project costs are lost to red tape. These costs are real money. This means that about \$164 billion in this bill would actually just be wasted on red tape and project delays.

But that is not even the most egregious example of wasteful spending in this legislation. This bill lifts a bipartisan ban and allows the Federal Transit Administration to spend money on art. That is right. According to liberals across the aisle, art is now infrastructure. America's taxpayer dollars are

hard at work in—clearly, newspeak liberal, or really newspeak on display—calling art infrastructure.

Finally, the bill favors big urban areas to the detriment of smaller rural communities like the ones I represent in southwestern Pennsylvania. H.R. 3684 prioritizes funding for urban transportation modes like transit and rail over roads and bridges that everyday Americans use. In fact, more money is given to electric vehicle charging stations than to the entire Rebuild Rural grant program.

I would also be remiss if I failed to point out that those very same electric vehicles cannot be built without critical minerals from China. China is, of course, the world's number one polluter. So where are the climate priorities? Where are the environmental priorities that my colleagues on the liberal side of the aisle claim they care about?

At the end of the day, the Democrats are prioritizing their fantasy of the Green New Deal over traditional concepts of actual infrastructure. My colleagues across the aisle, the Liberal Party, have chosen to bow down to the woke mob that they are terrified of. They have chosen to prioritize woke liberal yuppies over rural America and blue-collar workers that actually work for a living.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is really straightforward. It increases money for surface transportation. It focuses on hard infrastructure. We need to fix the basics and then we can improve and expand them. This bill does include money specifically directed to our rural areas, and the crack about urban yuppies is kind of crazy.

We know that in Pennsylvania, which both the gentleman and I represent, we know that we have businesses in western Pennsylvania that are losing money because of the state of our roadways. If you build a turbine in western Pennsylvania, in order to get it to the port in eastern Pennsylvania right now, those companies have to take an 800-mile detour because our roadways cannot support that turbine. So it is impacting their businesses.

It is increasing energy costs. It is wasting time. But these kinds of things affect businesses across our entire Commonwealth and across our entire country. So these are much-needed, overdue by decades, bipartisan neglect. This bill addresses some of those issues.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues across the aisle of some important facts.

For one, you can't make solar panels without mining, because you have to

mine critical minerals. You also can't make windmills without steel, and you can't make steel without mining coal. So that is just something to keep in mind.

Mr. Speaker, last month, CBP encountered more than 180,000 illegal immigrants at our southern border. That is a new 21-year high. Think about it. Last month, in 1 month, almost 200,000 illegal immigrants were at our southern border.

Many of these illegal immigrants are traveling from and through high-risk South and Central American countries where COVID-19 infection rates are skyrocketing. South America, in particular, has become a major COVID-19 hot spot with death rates eight times above the global average.

And yet, the Biden administration is considering ending Title 42, the public health authority that allows Customs and Border Patrol to quickly turn back migrants due to the dangers posed by highly contagious diseases. CBP heavily relies on Title 42 authority to expel adults and family units that illegally cross the border. In May of 2021, CBP expelled more than 100,000 individuals under Title 42.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the draconian shutdown measures from far-left Governors, including Pennsylvania's Tom Wolf, many States are still recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic. Ending Title 42 puts that fragile recovery at risk, especially at a time when powerful variants continue to pop up across the globe.

That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider my good friend's, Congresswoman YVETTE HERRELL, PAUSE Act. The PAUSE Act would provide for stringent enforcement of Title 42, and would prohibit HHS and DHS from weakening Title 42's implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with any 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, here to explain the amendment is the bill's author, my good friend, Congresswoman HERRELL. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. HERRELL).

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, we will amend the rule to immediately consider my bill, H.R. 471, the PAUSE Act, which will preserve and protect Title 42 health restrictions at the border.

The border is in flames, and this crisis is cruel, it is costly, and it is cowardice.

Biden's border crisis is harming my constituents and all Americans. The ranchers and the people who live in and

around the border cannot let their children play outside for fear of cartel gunmen. In the past, people along the border, on the American side, in my district, have been held at gunpoint. They have had vehicles stolen. Some have even been kidnapped.

The first duty of our Nation is to defend its border and its people. President Biden has been derelict in this duty, whether it be from the pandemic that continues or the violent criminals that cross our border in the dark of night.

Sheriffs are reaching out to me. Just like the Border Patrol, they, too, are overwhelmed. They are seizing record amounts of drugs, guns, smuggled people, and untold numbers of other illicit materials are getting past them, all because President Biden has put politics over the American people.

President Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, stated that 1,000 migrants a day was a crisis. Just in May, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 180,034 illegal immigrants along the southwest border, a 20-year monthly high. That amounts to 5,807 illegal immigrants per day in May. This is a crisis nearly six times greater than the threshold established by President Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security.

Title 42 is the only major Trump-era border policy left in place under the administration. It allows the Border Patrol to quickly expel illegal immigrants, sending them back across the border, instead of placing them in congregate facilities where outbreaks of COVID-19 and other variants are all but guaranteed.

Ending Title 42 would turn what is already a crisis into an unmitigated, uncontrollable, and undeniable catastrophe.

The pandemic continues to rage in Latin America. And Guatemala and Brazil are both currently around 90 percent of their peak weekly infection rates. And in the past months, CBP has encountered more than 170,000 migrants from those two countries alone.

Ending Title 42 now, while fewer than half of the American citizens are fully vaccinated, sends the message that all illegal immigration is more important than protecting Americans.

Despite the fact that Biden wants to let a flood of illegal immigrants into our country, he clearly believes a public health emergency still exists. President Biden has placed several COVID-19 travel bans on dozens of countries. And these bans remain in place, indicating he thinks the public health emergency is ongoing.

Speaker PELOSI has extended proxy voting in the House, stating there is an ongoing public health emergency due to COVID.

Mr. Speaker, if Vice President HARRIS had taken the time to listen to my constituents last week, instead of just talking to immigration activists at the El Paso airport, this administration would learn the effects of their failed

policies on our border communities. That is why I invited her twice to visit my district.

If she had cared to respond, she could have heard from the farmers, ranchers, community leaders, and residents of our border communities. She could have heard how the crisis is different between the gaps in the border wall than it is in major cities like El Paso. And she could have heard from the five county sheriffs in my district who wrote to me in support of keeping Title 42 in place.

This crisis is a double threat and places the security of our Nation and the safety of the American people at risk.

At minimum, however, we need to keep the last administration's appropriate use of Title 42 in place. That is what we could do today, if the previous question is defeated.

We must preserve Title 42 border restrictions until all local, State, and Federal Government restrictions end; until all State and Federal public health emergencies end; and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC—COVID-19 travel risk levels for Canada and Mexico have been reduced to Level 1.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. Please don't make the American people pay for the mistakes made at our border because of the failed policies of this administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have further speakers?

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Yes, I do.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, just another fact of life now. We cannot make an electronic vehicle without critical minerals. Unfortunately, due to the red tape that is put upon the mining industry by liberals across the aisle, we are now dependent on China for roughly 80 percent of our critical minerals. Simply put, we now cannot make an electric car without China.

Here to talk about another predicament that liberals across the aisle put us in is my good friend from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, and I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for articulating so well the state of our southern border, which is the direct result and the consequence of the rote incompetence of the current administration and my Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is the best I can put it.

Or, frankly, it is the purposeful use of the border for political purposes. Because there is nothing else that can explain what is actually happening at the

state of our border. That a political party would say that having cartels having operational control of our border, to the detriment of the well-being of the United States and its citizens; or the migrants who seek to come here, getting put into the human and sex trafficking trade, that somehow that should be seen as a compassionate position by my colleagues on the other side.

But I will tell you that it is a policy that is in the false name of compassion.

I note that Vice President HARRIS finally found her way to the border, although it was in a pit stop on her way to Los Angeles, taking 4 hours to stop in El Paso for a photo-op to go say hi to some Border Patrol en route to Los Angeles.

That is not the kind of visit that we have been talking about that is required of the President of the United States or his appointee, the Vice President, who is supposedly in charge of securing the border of the United States.

And I would note that this is real. That for those of us who go and spend time on the border and talk to ranchers getting overrun; talk to people getting harmed, getting broken into; high-speed chases in communities in south Texas; the massive amounts of opioids flowing into Texas and throughout the rest of our country; the number of migrants being abused in the human and sex trafficking trade, it is very real.

To the little girls who I have spoken to on the border and visited with, coming across the river at midnight, 1:00, 2:00 in the morning, and the dangers that they have been put into, I would ask my Democratic colleagues: Why don't they care?

Why don't my Democratic colleagues care about these migrants being abused and exploited by cartels?

Today, right now, as we speak, a child is on an interstate in Texas, heading to be put into child pornography and into the sex trafficking trade. As we speak in the people's House, it is happening, literally, at this moment.

Some amount of opioids is going into I-10, flowing over through Houston, throughout the rest of the southeast to be distributed throughout our country, heading west on I-10 to go out to the West Coast.

Why did Governor DeSantis send resources to Texas?

Because his State is getting overrun by opioid abuse that is coming through the southwest border.

We have a massively wide open border that is being exploited, and the reality of the situation is it is my Democratic colleagues who refuse to enforce the law. It is that simple.

Think, from October to December of 2020, in the previous administration, there were 185,000 expulsions made under Title 42, which the gentlewoman from New Mexico just discussed. That was 85 percent of all encounters. Think about that: 85 percent of the encoun-

ters we were able to expel under Title 42.

Compared to the Biden administration, since relaxing Title 42—not yet eliminating it, although that is allegedly coming—relaxing it, only 64 percent of encounters were enforced between February to April of 2021, leaving 289,000 expulsions under Title 42.

So what will happen when that additional 60 percent of people are taken in?

Border Patrol can't do their job, y'all. They can't. Border Patrol is overrun.

Our border is wide open between the ports of entry because the Border Patrol is processing people at processing centers in McAllen. The Vice President would know that if she hadn't missed the mark by 750 miles, landing her plane in El Paso instead of McAllen.

Tomorrow, 30 to 40 of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—to the best of my knowledge, zero, unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle—are going to the border to meet with Governor Abbott and former President Trump to talk about what is happening in McAllen, where the actual crisis exists.

My friend from Pennsylvania rightly noted that COVID still remains a major public health issue at the border, a risk for Americans and migrants. Latin America and the Caribbean have the world's highest death toll from COVID in proportion to its population, with 33 million reported infections and 1 million reported deaths.

Brazil leads the region. It leads the world in the daily average number of new infections reported. Colombia is reporting the highest rate of infections in South America. Guatemala is at peak. Honduras is at 86 percent of peak.

Border Patrol had 9,000 CBP employees test positive, and 32 CBP employees have died. As of March, 7.4 percent of tests given to UACs in the past year turned out to be positive, and multiple facilities have had positivity rates of 10 percent or higher. That is the reality of what is going on at the border.

Yet Title 42, the health code provisions that allow us to secure the border during a pandemic, during the spread of communicable diseases, is about to be jettisoned by the Biden administration, endangering the American people and endangering our Border Patrol.

We need to enforce the full Title 42 authority, and it is imperative for border and public health security. That is why we should defeat the previous question. We will amend the rule to immediate consideration of my friend from New Mexico's bill, H.R. 471, as amended, that will preserve existing border health protection measures intended to safeguard the citizens of our country.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, if my Democrat colleagues vote for the previous

question, which I expect that they will do, they are choosing to pursue a radical leftist environmental agenda that will harm Americans, that will harm Americans, rather than secure our border, which we are presenting as an option, for us to do our job in the people's House, to actually do our duty as the people's House to secure the border of a sovereign nation to the benefit of our people, of the State of Texas, our entire Nation as a whole, and the migrants who seek to come here.

That is the choice right now, ladies and gentlemen. It is a choice for this body. Choose to secure the border of the United States and make our country stronger, or secure a political agenda which has no hope of uniting this country and benefiting the American people.

The small businesses that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was talking about, let's talk about the small businesses that got crushed under COVID, crushed by the policies of this body and others, that were shutting businesses down to the tune of 100,000 businesses, forcing them to close.

Let's talk about the impact of our kids and schools and the masks being worn, and the mental health issues, and the cancer screenings that didn't occur because we had locked down and shut down our economy.

And, right now, let's talk about the damage being done to this country because of wide open borders with empowered cartels.

We should, right now, defeat the previous question so that we can amend it to do the work of the American people.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have additional speakers?

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I think I have one more speaker.

I am finding the argument a little bit hard to follow for my colleagues across the aisle because, as I understand it, it was a bad thing to shut down businesses in the U.S. to protect people when there was a virus rampant here. But we have to shut down the border because there is a virus rampant here. It is just a little hard to follow the logic sometimes.

If the gentleman is prepared to close, then I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, once again, this Chamber is considering legislation that could easily have passed with bipartisan support. If Democrats would stop appeasing their radical, progressive base and they would stop worrying about what whiny, spoiled millennials are saying on Twitter, if they decided they would finally try to approach their work here in some kind of bipartisan manner, then we could work for real solutions for real Americans that would help the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the lively debate today. I understand that there are some who have concerns with the rule and its underlying legislation, but these bills are vitally important to our country, and I am confident they would greatly benefit all of us.

We should be able to support robust infrastructure spending that meets our Nation's current needs. We should all support a vigorous corps of inspectors general who can weed out fraud, waste, and corruption in the Federal Government. We should all support removing symbols of hate from the Capitol. These should be easy bills for us all to get behind.

Lastly, I strongly support the creation of a select committee to investigate the January 6 insurrection and debunk the absurd theories and falsehoods that have infected our collective understanding of that day. While some of our colleagues may continue their denial, those of us in this Chamber who are committed to transparency and accountability and the well-being of the Nation can no longer afford to be held back by the sensitivities of those who put their fealty to the former President over their duty or obligation to the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the previous question.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 504

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9 Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 471) to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from lessening the stringency of, and to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from ceasing or lessening implementation of, the COVID-19 border health provisions through the end of the COVID-19 pandemic, 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 Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 471.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back 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. RESCHENTHALER. 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 214, nays 195, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—214

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

NAYS—195

Aderholt	Bergman	Burchett
Allen	Bice (OK)	Burgess
Amodei	Biggs	Calvert
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Cammack
Arrington	Bishop (NC)	Carl
Babin	Bost	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brooks	Cawthorn
Baird	Buchanan	Chabot
Balderson	Buck	Cheney
Barr	Bucshon	Cline
Bentz	Budd	Clyde

Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C.
Scott
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
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 (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence

Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
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—21

Banks
Bishop (GA)
Boebert
Brady
Brown
Carter (GA)
Cloud

Cooper
Fulcher
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Guest
Hartzler
Hice (GA)

□ 1346

Mrs. STEEL changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)
Bourdeaux
(Kuster)
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Carl (Joyce (PA))
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Clark (MA)
(Kuster)
Cohen (Beyer)
DesJarlais
(Fleischmann)
Fallon (Nehls)
Gallego (Gomez)
Garcia (IL)
(Gomez)
Garcia (TX)
(Jeffries)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Carbajal)
Grijalva
(Stanton)

Horsford
(Jeffries)
Hoyer (Trone)
Jackson Lee
(Butterfield)
Jacobs (NY)
(Garbarino)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kind (Connolly)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Leger Fernandez
(Jacobs (CA))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
McClain
(Bergman)
Meng (Jeffries)
Mullin (Lucas)

Napolitano
(Correa)
Owens (Curtis)
Payne (Pallone)
Rice (NY)
(Peters)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Steube
(Franklin, C.
Scott)
Strickland
(DelBene)
Timmons
(Wilson (SC))
Torres (NY)
(Jeffries)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)
Young (Joyce
(OH))

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

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. 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 197, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

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
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
Españillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (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
Sanchez
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
Suozi
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—197

Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C.
Scott
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
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 (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
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—15

Aderholt
Banks
Carter (GA)
Cloud
Cooper

Fulcher
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Guest
Hartzler

Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Moore (AL)
Norman
Rose

□ 1409

Ms. CHU changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)
Boebert (Gosar)
Bourdeaux
(Kuster)
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Carl (Joyce (PA))
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Clark (MA)
(Kuster)

Cohen (Beyer)
DesJarlais
(Fleischmann)
Fallon (Nehls)
Gallego (Gomez)
Garcia (IL)
(Gomez)
Garcia (TX)
(Jeffries)

Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Carbajal)
Grijalva
(Stanton)
Horsford
(Jeffries)
Hoyer (Trone)
Jackson Lee
(Butterfield)

Jacobs (NY)	McClain	Sewell (DelBene)
(Garbarino)	(Bergman)	Steube
Johnson (TX)	Meng (Jeffries)	(Franklin, C.
(Jeffries)	Mfume (Evans)	Scott)
Kind (Connolly)	Mullin (Lucas)	Strickland
Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	(DelBene)
(Stanton)	(Correa)	Timmons
Lawson (FL)	Owens (Curtis)	(Wilson (SC))
(Evans)	Payne (Pallone)	Torres (NY)
Leger Fernandez	Rice (NY)	(Jeffries)
(Jacobs (CA))	(Peters)	Wilson (FL)
Lieu (Beyer)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	(Hayes)
Lowenthal	Rush	Young (Joyce
(Beyer)	(Underwood)	(OH))

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES AND PASS CERTAIN BILLS AND AGREE TO RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 8 of House Resolution 504, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bills: H.R. 1500, H.R. 2471, H.R. 3261, H.R. 3283, and H.R. 3385, and agree to H. Res. 186 and H. Res. 402.

The Clerk read the title of the bills and the resolutions.

The text of the bills and the resolutions are as follows:

GLOBAL LEARNING LOSS ASSESSMENT ACT OF 2021

H.R. 1500

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 “Global Learning Loss Assessment Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Before the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (commonly referred to as “COVID-19”) pandemic began, 258,000,000 children were out of school globally, including 130,000,000 girls.

(2) Students already at a disadvantage before COVID-19 will experience greater learning loss, thereby worsening inequity and inequality.

(3) Approximately 90 percent of the world’s student population—over 1,600,000,000 children and youth—have had their education disrupted by school closure due to COVID-19.

(4) School closures lead to interrupted learning, poor nutrition, gaps in childcare, increased dropout rates, exposure to violence, and social isolation.

(5) Up to 24,000,000 children are at risk of dropping out of school permanently due to rising levels of child poverty associated with the pandemic.

(6) School closure and remote learning is especially burdensome on girls, who are frequently expected to shoulder more household chores and responsibilities and are more vulnerable to gender-based violence.

(7) During the Ebola epidemic, nationwide school closures in Sierra Leone in 2014 led to increased instances of sexual- and gender-based violence, teenage pregnancy, school dropout, and child labor for girls.

(8) More than 60 percent of national distance learning alternatives rely exclusively on online platforms but two-thirds of the world’s school aged children, or 1,300,000,000 children aged 3 through 17, do not have internet connection in their homes, and schools and local learning centers also frequently have inadequate internet connectivity. Eighty percent of students in sub-Saharan Africa lack such access, with an even higher rate for girls.

(9) Children and youth with disabilities are particularly vulnerable to the health, education, and socioeconomic consequences of the pandemic. As a further challenge, distance learning tools are not always acces-

sible to learners with disabilities or those with complex learning needs, especially in poorer and rural households.

(10) Before the COVID-19 pandemic, refugee children were twice as likely to be out of school as other youth, and school closures and a lack of access to distance learning tools threaten to make the education gap among refugee children even more severe.

(11) The economic downturn caused by the COVID-19 pandemic could lead to an education financing gap of \$77,000,000,000 in low- and middle-income countries over the next 2 years.

(12) The economic cost of school closures could be up to \$1,337 per student, which on a global scale equates to approximately \$10,000,000,000 in lost economic output over the coming generation.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States that United States-funded basic education programs operating in low- and middle-income countries should seek to—

(1) provide inclusive learning opportunities for students and teachers, especially for the most marginalized, including girls, children with disabilities, and previously out of school children;

(2) build local capacity and help countries strengthen their education systems, including opportunities for early childhood development;

(3) improve the availability, delivery, and quality of education services from early childhood through secondary education;

(4) improve equity and safety in education services; and

(5) support the return of children to school who have experienced interruptions in their education due to the COVID-19 pandemic and work to enroll previously out-of-school children and youth, particularly the most marginalized.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, acting through the Senior Coordinator for International Basic Education Assistance and in consultation with the Senior Coordinator for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on United States Agency for International Development basic education programs.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

(1) An assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on such basic education programs, including the magnitude of learning loss that will result from protracted school closures and the specific effects of school and learning space closures on marginalized children and youth, including girls, minority populations, displaced children, and those with disabilities.

(2) An assessment comparing academic outcomes of beneficiaries of United States Agency for International Development basic education programs, as practical and appropriate, between those that attend schools that remain closed or continue to operate remotely since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic and schools that have resumed in-person instruction.

(3) A description of the effectiveness, cost, accessibility, and reach of the most commonly used forms of distance learning in low- and middle-income countries and low-resource contexts.

(4) A description of efforts to pivot and adapt such basic education programs during the COVID-19 pandemic, including an over-

view of existing data on funding and programmatic focus disaggregated by gender, country, education level, and disability.

(5) An identification and description of any gaps in, or barriers to, reaching and educating marginalized populations, such as girls, children with disabilities, displaced children, or other children adversely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic with distance learning interventions.

(6) A description of the United States Agency for International Development’s plan and needed authorities and resources to prevent degradation of such basic education programs and to support, as necessary and appropriate, continued distance learning interventions, safe school reopenings, assessments of student learning levels, remedial and accelerated learning, re-enrollment campaigns for out-of-school children and youth, and education system strengthening and resilience-building efforts.

(7) An analysis of the coordination between the United States Agency for International Development and other actors in global basic education policy and programming to provide education during the COVID-19 pandemic, including partner organizations, faith based organizations, donors, and multilateral organizations.

(8) A description of opportunities to partner and support efforts to expand access to digital infrastructure, internet connectivity, and learning resources in areas that lack access to digital and remote learning infrastructure and resources, including rural and remote communities.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available to the public.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

HAITI DEVELOPMENT, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND INSTITUTIONAL TRANSPARENCY INITIATIVE ACT H.R. 2471

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 “Haiti Development, Accountability, and Institutional Transparency Initiative Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On January 12, 2010, a massive earthquake struck near the Haitian capital city of Port-au-Prince, leaving at least 220,000 people dead, including 103 United States citizens, 101 United Nations personnel, and nearly 18 percent of Haiti’s civil service, as well as 300,000 injured, 115,000 homes destroyed, and 1,500,000 Haitians displaced.

(2) The international community, led by the United States and the United Nations, mounted an unprecedented humanitarian response to the earthquake in Haiti. Through 2018, more than \$8,000,000,000 has been disbursed by donors. Since the 2010 earthquake, the United States Government has disbursed more than \$4,000,000,000 in recovery and development funding.

(3) On October 4, 2016, Hurricane Matthew struck southwestern Haiti on the Tiburon Peninsula, causing widespread damage and flooding and leaving 1.4 million people in need of immediate assistance. Recovery efforts continue more than four years later.

(4) Prior to both the 2010 earthquake and 2016 hurricane, Haiti registered among the

lowest in socioeconomic indicators and had the second highest rate of income disparity in the world—conditions that have further complicated disaster recovery and resilience efforts. As of November 2020, 4,400,000 people were in need of humanitarian assistance in Haiti.

(5) Since 2018, tens of thousands of Haitians have participated in popular demonstrations demanding accountability over government management of Petrocaribe resources. In early 2019, the Haitian superior court of auditors released a series of reports implicating high-level government officials in the misappropriation of funds.

(6) The United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner and the Human Rights Service jointly found a 333 percent increase in human rights violations and abuses against the rights of life and security in Haiti from July 2018 through December 2019. There were 131 violations in 2018 and 567 violations in 2019, including the shooting of at least five Haitian journalists covering the protests.

(7) Leading members of civil society have faced attacks, including Monferrier Dorval, a constitutional law expert and president of the Port-au-Prince bar who was killed on August 28, 2020.

(8) On November 13, 2018, according to the Haitian National Human Rights Defense Network, at least 71 people were killed and 18 people were raped in the Port-au-Prince neighborhood of La Saline.

(9) On December 10, 2020, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control designated former Haitian National Police officer Jimmy Cherizier, former Director General of the Ministry of the Interior Fednel Monchery, and former Departmental Delegate Joseph Pierre Richard Duplan pursuant to the Global Magnitsky Executive Order for being foreign persons responsible for or complicit in, or having directly or indirectly engaged in, serious human rights abuse for their connection to the La Saline massacre.

(10) Following the La Saline massacre, similar attacks have occurred in Port-au-Prince neighborhoods, including the November 2019 and August 2020 attacks on Bel Air, in which 24 people were killed and hundreds of families were displaced.

(11) Parliamentary elections scheduled for October 2019 did not take place, and since January 13, 2020, President Jovenel Moïse has ruled by decree. The United States and international community have urged President Moïse to limit the use of executive decrees during this period and have expressed concern over several decrees issued, including those creating the National Intelligence Agency and appointing three new judges to the Supreme Court outside of constitutional procedures. Haitian civil society organizations have denounced the president's use of decrees as an attempt to consolidate power.

(12) Due to institutional weakness and other challenges exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, Haiti's economy contracted by an estimated 4 percent in 2020 and inflation neared 20 percent. Although there has been no parliament in place since January 2020, the Haitian Government approved a budget on September 30, 2020. However, the delay prevented the International Monetary Fund and other multilaterals from disbursing millions in international assistance.

(13) In September 2020, President Moïse bypassed the Supreme Court to appoint a Provisional Electoral Council (CEP) by executive decree. Several civil society groups that traditionally participate in Haiti's electoral councils criticized the decision and have declined to be represented in the CEP.

(14) The Moïse administration lacks the credibility to oversee a proposed constitu-

tional referendum scheduled for June 2021, which legal experts consider unconstitutional.

(15) There are concerns that, given the lack of democratic checks and balances, the dispute over the credibility of the electoral council, and the deteriorating security situation, elections scheduled for September 2021 will not be free or fair. Additionally, the security situation remains volatile and on February 7, 2021, President Moïse alleged that a coup had been attempted against him leading to 23 arrests and the forced retirement of three Supreme Court judges.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to support the sustainable rebuilding and development of Haiti in a manner that—

(1) recognizes Haitian independence, self-reliance, sovereignty, democratic governance, and efficiency;

(2) promotes efforts that are led by and support the people and Government of Haiti at all levels so that Haitians lead the course of reconstruction and development of Haiti;

(3) builds the long-term capacity of the Government of Haiti, civil society in Haiti, and the private sector to foster economic opportunities in Haiti;

(4) fosters collaboration between the Haitian diaspora in the United States, including dual citizens of Haiti and the United States, with the Haitian Government and the business community in Haiti;

(5) supports anti-corruption efforts, promotes press freedom, and addresses human rights concerns, including through the enforcement of sanctions imposed in accordance with the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act on individuals implicated in human rights violations;

(6) respects and helps restore Haiti's natural resources, as well as strengthens community-level resilience to environmental and weather-related impacts;

(7) promotes the holding of free, fair, and timely elections in accordance with democratic principles and the Haitian Constitution;

(8) provides timely and comprehensive reporting on Haiti and the United States Government's goals and progress, as well as transparent post program evaluations and contracting data;

(9) promotes the participation of Haitian women and youth in governmental and nongovernmental institutions and in economic development and governance assistance programs funded by the United States; and

(10) does not provide support to facilitate the proposed June 2021 constitutional referendum, including through multilateral organizations.

SEC. 4. STRENGTHENING HUMAN RIGHTS AND ANTICORRUPTION EFFORTS IN HAITI AND HOLDING PERPETRATORS OF THE LA SALINE MASSACRE ACCOUNTABLE.

(a) SECRETARY OF STATE PRIORITIZATION.—The Secretary of State shall prioritize the protection of human rights and anticorruption efforts in Haiti by the following methods:

(1) Fostering strong relationships with independent civil society groups focused on monitoring corruption and human rights abuses and promoting democracy in Haiti.

(2) Supporting the efforts of the Haitian Government to identify persons involved in human rights violations and significant acts of corruption in Haiti, including public and private sector actors, and hold them accountable for their actions.

(3) Addressing concerns of impunity for the alleged perpetrators, as well as the intellectual authors, of the La Saline massacre.

(4) Urging authorities to continue to investigate attacks in the La Saline and Bel Air

neighborhoods from 2018 through 2021 that left dozens dead in order to bring the perpetrators to justice.

(b) BRIEFING.—

(1) ELEMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the happenings on November 13, 2018, in the Port-au-Prince neighborhood of La Saline, and its aftermath. The briefing shall include—

(A) an examination of any links between the massacre in La Saline and mass protests that occurred concurrently in the country;

(B) an analysis of the reports on the La Saline massacre authored by the United Nations, the European Union, and the Government of Haiti;

(C) a detailed description of all known perpetrators, as well as the intellectual authors, of the shootings;

(D) an overview of efforts taken by the Haitian Government to bring the perpetrators, as well as the intellectual authors, of the La Saline massacre to justice and to prevent other similar attacks; and

(E) an assessment of the ensuing treatment and displacement of the survivors of the La Saline massacre.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In the briefing required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall consult with nongovernmental organizations in Haiti and the United States.

SEC. 5. ACTIONS TO PROMOTE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND ASSEMBLY IN HAITI.

The Secretary of State shall prioritize the promotion of freedom of the press and freedom of assembly, as well as the protection of journalists in Haiti by the following methods:

(1) Advocating to Haitian authorities for increased protection for journalists and the press and for the freedom to peacefully assemble or protest in Haiti.

(2) Collaborating with government officials and representatives of civil society to develop and implement legal protections for journalists in Haiti.

(3) Supporting efforts to strengthen transparency in Haiti's public and private sectors, as well as access to information in Haiti.

(4) Supporting efforts to strengthen the capacity of independent journalists and increase access to resources for investigative journalism.

SEC. 6. ACTIONS TO SUPPORT POST-EARTHQUAKE, POST-HURRICANE AND POST-COVID-19 RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT IN HAITI.

The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), shall prioritize post-earthquake and post-hurricane recovery and development efforts in Haiti by the following methods:

(1) Collaborating with the Haitian Government on a detailed and transparent development plan that includes clear objectives and benchmarks.

(2) Building the capacity of Haitian-led public, private, and nongovernmental sector institutions in Haiti through post-earthquake and post-hurricane recovery and development planning.

(3) Assessing the impact of both the United States' and the international community's recovery and development efforts in Haiti since January 2010.

(4) Supporting disaster resilience and reconstruction efforts.

(5) Addressing the underlying causes of poverty and inequality, and improving access to health resources, clean water, food, and shelter.

(6) Assessing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on post-disaster recovery efforts and evaluating United States support to help

with pandemic response efforts in Haiti, including providing technical assistance and preventing other infectious disease outbreaks.

SEC. 7. REPORT.

(a) **REPORT CONTENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and other relevant agencies and departments, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(1) a strategy for carrying out the initiatives described in sections 4, 5, and 6, including established baselines, benchmarks, and indicators to measure outcomes and impact;

(2) an assessment of major corruption committed among the public and private sectors, and, as practical and appropriate, an assessment of corruption prosecutions investigated by the Haitian judiciary since January 2015;

(3) an overview of efforts taken by the Haitian Government to address corruption, including the Petrocaribe scandal, and corrective measures to strengthen and restore trust in Haiti's public institutions;

(4) a description of United States Government efforts to consult and engage with Haitian Government officials and independent civil society groups focused on monitoring corruption and human rights abuses and promoting democracy and press freedom in Haiti since January 2015;

(5) a description of the Haitian Government's response to civic protests that have taken place since July 2018 and any allegations of human rights abuses, including attacks on journalists;

(6) an assessment of United States security assistance to Haiti, including the United States support to the Haitian National Police and an assessment of compliance with section 620M of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d) and section 362 of title 10, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Leahy Laws");

(7) a description of the Haitian Government's efforts to support displaced survivors of urban and gang violence;

(8) an assessment of the impact of presidential decrees on the health of Haiti's democratic institutions and safeguarding of human rights, including reducing the authority of the Superior Court of Accounts and Administrative Litigation, promulgating an antiterrorism law, and establishing the National Intelligence Agency, as well as retiring and subsequently appointing judges to the Supreme Court of Haiti;

(9) a plan in collaboration with the Haitian Government on efforts to support development goals since January 2015, including steps taken to—

(A) strengthen institutions at the national and local levels; and

(B) strengthen democratic governance at the national and local levels;

(10) an analysis of the effectiveness and sustainability of United States-financed development projects, including the Caracol Industrial Park and supporting infrastructure;

(11) a breakdown of procurement from Haitian small- and medium-sized businesses and nongovernmental organizations by the United States and Haitian governments for development and humanitarian activities by year since 2015, and a description of efforts to increase local procurement, including food aid;

(12) a description of United States efforts taken since January 2010 to assist the Haitian people in their pursuits for free, fair, and timely democratic elections;

(13) quantitative and qualitative indicators to assess progress and benchmarks for

United States initiatives focused on sustainable development in Haiti, including democracy assistance, economic revitalization, natural disaster recovery, pandemic response, resilience, energy and infrastructure, health, and food security; and

(14) a risk assessment of conflict, instability, and violence in Haiti that includes information relating to—

(A) systemic patterns and causes of violence and subsequent impunity relating to massacres, death threats, kidnappings, armed attacks, and firearm-related violence, with analysis of the roles of the various actors and beneficiaries who play a part, including Haitian Government actors;

(B) gang activity and its role in the recent wave of kidnappings and the capacities of the police force to address the most serious manifestations of insecurity;

(C) the scope and role of criminal activity and its linkages to political forces, particularly leading up to elections; and

(D) implications of the lack of independence of Haiti's judicial system.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In preparing the report required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator shall consult with nongovernmental organizations and civil society groups in Haiti and the United States, as well as the Government of Haiti where appropriate.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall be made publicly available on the website of the Department of State.

SEC. 8. SUNSET.

(a) **REPEAL.**—The Assessing Progress in Haiti Act (22 U.S.C. 2151n; Public Law 113-162) is repealed.

(b) **TERMINATION.**—This Act shall terminate on December 31, 2025.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION H.R. 3261

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

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

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

REPEAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST H.R. 3283

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

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROMOTE PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

Effective on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East" (Public Law 85-7; 22 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.) is hereby repealed.

HONORING OUR PROMISES THROUGH EXPEDITION FOR AFGHAN SIVS ACT OF 2021 H.R. 3385

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 "Honoring Our Promises through Expedition for Afghan

SIVs Act of 2021" or the "HOPE for Afghan SIVs Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF MEDICAL EXAMINATION FOR AFGHAN ALLIES.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security may jointly issue a blanket waiver of the requirement that aliens described in section 602(b)(2) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) undergo a medical examination under section 221(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(d)), or any other applicable provision of law, prior to issuance of an immigrant visa or admission to the United States.

(b) **DURATION.**—A waiver issued under subsection (a) shall remain in effect for a period not to exceed 1 year, and, subject to subsection (g), may be extended by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Homeland Security for additional periods, each of which shall not exceed 1 year.

(c) **NOTIFICATION.**—Upon exercising the waiver authority under subsection (a), or the authority to extend a waiver under subsection (b), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the appropriate congressional committees.

(d) REQUIREMENT FOR MEDICAL EXAMINATION AFTER ADMISSION.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall establish procedures to ensure, to the greatest extent practicable, that any alien who receives a waiver of the medical examination requirement under this section, completes such an examination not later than 30 days after the date on which such alien is admitted to the United States.

(2) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien who receives a waiver of the medical examination requirement under this section shall be considered, at the time of admission to the United States, as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis.

(B) **REMOVAL OF CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall remove the conditional basis of the alien's status upon the Secretary's confirmation that such alien has completed the medical examination and is not inadmissible under section 212(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)(A)).

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date on which waiver authority under subsection (a) is exercised or such waiver is extended under subsection (b), as applicable, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the status of medical examinations required under paragraph (1), including—

(A) the number of pending and completed examinations; and

(B) the number of aliens who have failed to complete the medical examination within the 30-day period after the date of such aliens' admission.

(e) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and of the Senate;

(2) the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(f) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act may be construed to prevent the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary of Health and Human Services from adopting appropriate measures to prevent the spread of communicable diseases, including COVID-19, to the United States.

(g) **SUNSET.**—The authority under subsections (a) and (b) expires on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

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.

CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF TREVOR REED

H. RES. 186

Whereas United States citizen Trevor Reed is a resident of Granbury, Texas, and a United States Marine Corps veteran;

Whereas Trevor Reed traveled to Moscow to visit his girlfriend in May 2019;

Whereas Moscow’s Police Service detained Trevor Reed in August 2019;

Whereas Trevor Reed was accused of grabbing the arm of the police officer driving the vehicle and elbowing another officer while en route to the police station, causing the vehicle to swerve and therefore endangering the lives of the police officers;

Whereas the United States Embassy in Moscow has filed numerous diplomatic notes with the Russian Foreign Ministry regarding Trevor Reed being denied consular access, communications, medical treatment, family visitations, and other violations of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations;

Whereas Trevor Reed was not given food or water until approximately 72 hours after his initial arrest;

Whereas Trevor Reed was not given a medical evaluation of his injuries until 10 days following his arrest;

Whereas Trevor Reed’s defense team presented video evidence to the courts that disproves the police officers’ statements of supposed endangerment and wrongdoing;

Whereas Trevor Reed’s defense team was denied access to additional video evidence from inside the police vehicle and police station that had the potential to prove his innocence, the requests for all video recordings are documented, and the existence of the other videos was confirmed by police officials and investigators;

Whereas the police officers claimed emotional and physical damages, but did not sustain any visible injury, or claim any time missed from work, and the law considers the police officers victims;

Whereas the Constitutional Supreme Court of the Russian Federation and the Second Court of Cassation of General Jurisdiction concurred that Russian procedural law was violated in the way that Trevor Reed’s bail was revoked;

Whereas the United States Embassy in Moscow has filed complaints with the Russian Foreign Ministry regarding denial of communications with Trevor Reed;

Whereas during the trial, the defense counsel presented 59 minutes of traffic camera video from four traffic cameras, and senior Russian Government officials analyzed the video recordings and confirmed that the videos showed the police car—

(1) did not change direction or leave its lane;

(2) did not swerve; and

(3) did not stop or slow down;

Whereas witnesses following directly behind the police car in a private vehicle never witnessed any dangerous movement of the police car;

Whereas the two police officers changed their testimonies in writing, in their interviews, and at least three times during defense questioning, with final answers to the judge being “I don’t remember.”, causing court attendees and the judge to laugh;

Whereas the Investigative Bureau and Golovinsky District Court Judge Arnout denied Trevor Reed’s requests to investigate how his injuries occurred;

Whereas, on July 30, 2020, Golovinsky District Court Judge Arnout read a verdict that dismissed all defense evidence, witnesses, and government experts and only considered pieces of the police officers’ statements;

Whereas the judge sentenced Trevor Reed to 9 years in prison camp and was ordered to pay 100,000 rubles to each police officer for moral and physical injuries;

Whereas Trevor Reed had already been detained in Russia for one year at the time of the judge’s verdict;

Whereas a Consul representing the United States Embassy in Moscow attended all of Trevor Reed’s trial hearings;

Whereas the United States Ambassador to Russia, John Sullivan, upon Trevor’s sentencing, stated that the prosecution’s case and the evidence presented against Mr. Reed were “so preposterous that they provoked laughter in the courtroom”, the conviction and sentence were “ridiculous”, and “justice was not even considered”;

Whereas, upon appeal to the Moscow City Court, the Golovinsky District Court failed to provide Trevor Reed with translated copies of the court’s decision and trial transcripts per law; and

Whereas the appeal court returned the case to the Golovinsky District Court to review omissions and incorrect statements in the trial transcripts, and the official court audio recordings were reviewed by the defense and the corrections were certified by a third-party notarization firm, with the result being Judge Arnout refusing to include any corrections to the corrupted transcripts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately release Trevor Reed and all other prisoners arrested for political motivations;

(2) condemns the practice of politically motivated imprisonment in the Russian Federation, which violates the commitments of the Russian Federation to international obligations with respect to human rights and the rule of law;

(3) urges the United States Government, in all its interactions with the Government of the Russian Federation, to raise the case of Trevor Reed and to press for his release;

(4) expresses support for Trevor Reed, Paul Whelan, and all prisoners unjustly imprisoned in the Russian Federation;

(5) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to provide unrestricted consular access to Trevor Reed while he remains in detention;

(6) until Trevor Reed’s release, calls on the Government of the Russian Federation—

(A) to provide Trevor Reed any necessary medical treatment and personal protective equipment;

(B) to notify the United States Ambassador to Russia of any medical problems or complaints that arise during his detention; and

(C) to provide the United States Embassy in Moscow with full access to all of Trevor Reed’s medical records;

(7) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to respect Trevor Reed’s universally recognized human rights; and

(8) expresses support to the family of Trevor Reed and commitment to bringing Trevor Reed home.

URGING THE ADMINISTRATION TO FACILITATE ASSISTANCE IN RESPONSE TO THE DEVASTATING IMPACT OF COVID-19 IN INDIA

H. RES. 402

Whereas in March 2021, a second wave of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (commonly referred to as “COVID-19”) infections began to surge in India, overwhelming health care workers, hospitals, and crematoriums throughout the country;

Whereas testing results indicate India is seeing more than 340,000 new daily infections and upward of 4,000 deaths a day, though public health experts believe case rates are higher;

Whereas cases have surged in neighboring countries such as Nepal and other countries in the area remain highly vulnerable to renewed spikes in cases;

Whereas the deadly COVID-19 outbreak in India is a global problem that requires a coordinated global response;

Whereas in the spring of 2020, when the United States was in the midst of a devastating spike in COVID-19 cases, India lifted its export ban on certain therapeutics in response to a request by the United States Government;

Whereas India’s pharmaceutical industry is a vital part of the global solution to the pandemic, especially for much of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and is the world’s biggest producer of COVID vaccines having exported 66.36 million doses to 93 countries, including to United Nations personnel and, accounting for over half of global vaccine manufacturing;

Whereas due to India’s critical importance in global vaccine supply chains, an increase in domestic vaccine demand as a result of the surge of COVID-19 cases within India is of global concern;

Whereas in response to the crisis in India, the Biden administration took quick action to deliver urgently needed supplies to India, including oxygen support, oxygen concentrators, personal protective equipment (PPE), raw materials for vaccine, rapid diagnostic tests, and therapeutics, and is a testament to the historic record of United States-India health cooperation dating more than seven decades;

Whereas the United States private sector has worked to generously support relief efforts in India including by working to deliver 1,000 ventilators and 25,000 oxygen concentrators to health care facilities across India;

Whereas many countries around the world have also sent medical assistance to India to help the country defeat this devastating wave of the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas as the United States vaccine supply for the American people is secured, it is important for the United States to continue to ramp up its efforts, working with the private sector and all possible partners, to expand vaccine manufacturing and distribution worldwide; and

Whereas United States support for India to help beat back this latest coronavirus wave is in the United States national interest as the pandemic will not end anywhere until it ends everywhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) urges the Administration to facilitate private, in-kind medical supply donations to India and deliver additional, urgently needed

medical supplies, including oxygen generator plants and a cryogenic oxygen tanker and containers;

(2) urges the Administration to facilitate assistance as needed to neighboring countries, including Nepal, that are facing the spread of COVID-19 and working with partners around the world to address the virus; and

(3) calls on the United States private sector and the Indian-American community to continue their unprecedented and generous efforts at procuring medical supplies for the Indian response during this time of need, building upon contributions to date, standing with the people of India as they collectively work to stem the spread of COVID-19.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 504, 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 and agree to the resolutions.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 46, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—366

Adams	Carl	Dingell
Aderholt	Carson	Doggett
Aguilar	Carter (LA)	Doyle, Michael
Allred	Carter (TX)	F.
Amodei	Cartwright	Dunn
Armstrong	Case	Emmer
Arrington	Casten	Escobar
Auchincloss	Castor (FL)	Eshoo
Axne	Castro (TX)	Españat
Bacon	Cawthorn	Evans
Baird	Chabot	Feenstra
Balderson	Cheney	Ferguson
Barr	Chu	Fischbach
Barragán	Cicilline	Fitzpatrick
Bass	Clark (MA)	Fleischmann
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Fletcher
Bentz	Cleaver	Portenberry
Bera	Cline	Foster
Bergman	Clyburn	Fox
Beyer	Cohen	Frankel, Lois
Bice (OK)	Cole	Franklin, C.
Billakis	Comer	Scott
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Gallagher
Blumenauer	Cooper	Gallego
Blunt Rochester	Correa	Garamendi
Bonamici	Costa	Garbarino
Bost	Courtney	García (CA)
Bourdeaux	Craig	García (IL)
Bowman	Crenshaw	García (TX)
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Gibbs
F.	Crow	Gimenez
Brady	Cuellar	Golden
Brown	Davids (KS)	Gomez
Brownley	Davis, Rodney	Gonzales, Tony
Buchanan	Dean	Gonzalez (OH)
Buck	DeFazio	Gonzalez,
Bucshon	DeGette	Vicente
Burgess	DeLauro	Gottheimer
Bush	DelBene	Granger
Bustos	Delgado	Graves (LA)
Butterfield	Demings	Graves (MO)
Calvert	DeSaulnier	Green (TN)
Cammack	DesJarlais	Green, Al (TX)
Carbajal	Deutch	Griffith
Cárdenas	Diaz-Balart	Grijalva

Grothman	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Guthrie	Manning	Schrier
Hagedorn	Mast	Schweikert
Harder (CA)	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Harshbarger	McBath	Scott, Austin
Hayes	McCarthy	Scott, David
Herrera Beutler	McCauley	Sewell
Higgins (NY)	McClain	Sherman
Hill	McClintock	Sherrill
Himes	McCollum	Simpson
Hinson	McEachin	Sires
Hollingsworth	McGovern	Slotkin
Horsford	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Houlahan	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Hoyer	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
Hudson	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Huffman	Meijer	Smucker
Huizenga	Meng	Soto
Jackson Lee	Meuser	Spanberger
Jacobs (CA)	Mfume	Spartz
Jacobs (NY)	Miller (WV)	Speier
Jayapal	Moolenaar	Stansbury
Jeffries	Mooney	Stanton
Johnson (GA)	Moore (UT)	Staubert
Johnson (LA)	Moore (WI)	Steel
Johnson (OH)	Morelle	Stefanik
Johnson (SD)	Moulton	Steil
Johnson (TX)	Mrvan	Steube
Jones	Mullin	Stevens
Joyce (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Stewart
Joyce (PA)	Murphy (NC)	Strickland
Kahele	Nadler	Suozzi
Kaptur	Napolitano	Swalwell
Katko	Neal	Takano
Keating	Neguse	Taylor
Keller	Newhouse	Tenney
Kelly (IL)	Newman	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (PA)	Norcross	Thompson (MS)
Khanna	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Kildee	O'Halleran	Timmons
Kilmer	Ocasio-Cortez	Omar
Kim (CA)	Owens	Titus
Kim (NJ)	Pallone	Tlaib
Kind	Panetta	Tonko
Kinzinger	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Kirkpatrick	Pascarell	Torres (NY)
Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Trahan
Kuster	Perlmutter	Trone
Kustoff	Peters	Turner
LaHood	Pfluger	Underwood
LaMalfa	Phillips	Upton
Lamb	Pingree	Valadao
Lamborn	Pocan	Van Duyne
Langevin	Porter	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Pressley	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Vela
Latta	Quigley	Velázquez
LaTurner	Raskin	Wagner
Lawrence	Reed	Walberg
Lawson (FL)	Reschenthaler	Walorski
Lee (CA)	Rice (NY)	Waltz
Lee (NV)	Rodgers (WA)	Wasserman
Lee (TX)	Rogers (AL)	Schultz
Leger Fernandez	Rogers (KY)	Waters
Lesko	Ross	Watson Coleman
Letlow	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Levin (CA)	Ruiz	Wenstrup
Levin (MI)	Ruppersberger	Westerman
Lieu	Rush	Wexton
Lofgren	Rutherford	Wild
Long	Ryan	Williams (GA)
Lowenthal	Salazar	Wilson (FL)
Lucas	Sánchez	Wilson (SC)
Luetkemeyer	Sarbanes	Wittman
Luria	Scalise	Womack
Lynch	Scanlon	Yarmuth
Mace	Schakowsky	Young
Malinowski	Schiff	Zeldin
Malliotakis	Schneider	
Maloney,		
Carolyn B.		

NAYS—46

Allen	Fitzgerald	Palazzo
Babin	Gaetz	Palmer
Biggs	Gooden (TX)	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Gosar	Perry
Boebert	Greene (GA)	Posey
Brooks	Harris	Rice (SC)
Budd	Hern	Rosendale
Burchett	Herrell	Rouzer
Clyde	Jackson	Roy
Crawford	Jordan	Sessions
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Tiffany
Davidson	Loudermillk	Van Drew
Donalds	Mann	Weber (TX)
Duncan	Massie	Webster (FL)
Estes	Miller (IL)	
Fallon	Nehls	

NOT VOTING—18

Banks	Good (VA)	Miller-Meeks
Carter (GA)	Guest	Moore (AL)
Cloud	Hartzler	Norman
Davis, Danny K.	Hice (GA)	Oberholte
Fulcher	Higgins (LA)	Rose
Gohmert	Issa	Williams (TX)

□ 1434

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bills were passed and the resolutions were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of H.R. 1500 was amended so as to read: “A bill to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on United States Agency for International Development basic education programs.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I was recorded as no, but meant to vote yes on rollcall No. 191.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)	Horsford	Napolitano
Boebert (Gosar)	(Jeffries)	(Correa)
Bourdeaux	Hoyer (Trone)	Owens (Curtis)
(Kuster)	Jackson Lee	Payne (Pallone)
Cárdenas	(Butterfield)	Rice (NY)
(Gomez)	Jacobs (NY)	(Peters)
Carl (Joyce (PA))	(Garbarino)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Johnson (TX)	Rush
Clark (MA)	(Jeffries)	(Underwood)
(Kuster)	Kind (Connolly)	Sewell (DelBene)
Cohen (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick	Steube
DesJarlais	(Stanton)	(Franklin, C. Scott)
(Fleischmann)	Lawson (FL)	Strickland
Fallon (Nehls)	(Evans)	(DelBene)
Gallego (Gomez)	Leger Fernandez	Timmons
García (IL)	(Jacobs (CA))	(Wilson (SC))
(Gomez)	Lieu (Beyer)	Torres (NY)
García (TX)	Lowenthal	(Jeffries)
(Jeffries)	(Beyer)	Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez,	McClain	(Hayes)
Vicente	(Bergman)	Young (Joyce)
(Carbajal)	Meng (Jeffries)	(OH)
Grijalva	Mfume (Evans)	
(Stanton)	Mullin (Lucas)	

TRANS-SAHARA COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 567) to establish an inter-agency program to assist countries in North and West Africa to improve immediate and long-term capabilities to counter terrorist threats, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 15, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—395

Adams Dingell Kim (CA)
 Aderholt Doggett Kim (NJ)
 Aguilar Donalds Kind
 Allen Doyle, Michael Kinzinger
 Allred F. Kirkpatrick
 Amodei Duncan Krishnamoorthi
 Armstrong Dunn Kuster
 Arrington Emmer Kustoff
 Auchincloss Escobar LaHood
 Axne Eshoo LaMalfa
 Babin Espallat Lamb
 Bacon Estes Lamborn
 Baird Evans Langevin
 Balderson Fallon Larsen (WA)
 Barr Feenstra Larson (CT)
 Barragán Ferguson Latta
 Bass Fischbach LaTurner
 Beatty Fitzgerald Lawrence
 Bentz Fitzpatrick Lawson (FL)
 Bera Fleischmann Lee (CA)
 Bergman Fletcher Lee (NV)
 Beyer Fortenberry Leger Fernandez
 Rice (OK) Foster Lesko
 Bilirakis Foxx Letlow
 Bishop (GA) Frankel, Lois Levin (CA)
 Blunt Rochester Franklin, C. Levin (MI)
 Boebert Scott Lieu
 Bonamici Gallagher Lofgren
 Bost Gallego Long
 Bourdeaux Garamendi Loudermilk
 Boyle, Brendan Garbarino Lowenthal
 F. Garcia (CA) Lucas
 Brady Garcia (IL) Luetkemeyer
 Brown Garcia (TX) Luria
 Brownley Gibbs Lynch
 Buchanan Gimenez Mace
 Buck Golden Malinowski
 Bucshon Gomez Malliotakis
 Budd Gonzales, Tony Maloney,
 Burchett Gonzalez (OH) Carolyn B.
 Burgess Gonzalez, Maloney, Sean
 Bustos Vicente Mann
 Butterfield Gooden (TX) Manning
 Calvert Gottheimer Mast
 Cammack Granger Matsui
 Carbajal Graves (LA) McBeth
 Cárdenas Graves (MO) McCarthy
 Carl Green (TN) McCaul
 Carson Green, Al (TX) McClain
 Carter (LA) Griffith McClintock
 Carter (TX) Grijalva McCollum
 Cartwright Grothman McEachin
 Case Guthrie McGovern
 Casten Hagedorn McHenry
 Castor (FL) Harder (CA) McKinley
 Castro (TX) Harris McNeerney
 Cawthorn Harshbarger Meeks
 Chabot Hayes Meijer
 Cheney Hern Meng
 Chu Herrera Beutler Meuser
 Cicilline Higgins (NY) Mfume
 Clark (MA) Hill Miller (WV)
 Clarke (NY) Himes Miller-Meeks
 Cleaver Hinson Moolenaar
 Cline Hollingsworth Mooney
 Clyburn Horsford Moore (UT)
 Clyde Houlihan Moore (WI)
 Cohen Hoyer Morelle
 Cole Hudson Moulton
 Connolly Huffman Mrvan
 Cooper Huizenga Mullin
 Correa Jackson Murphy (FL)
 Costa Jackson Lee Murphy (NC)
 Courtney Jacobs (CA) Nadler
 Craig Jacobs (NY) Napolitano
 Crawford Jayapal Neal
 Crenshaw Jeffries Neguse
 Crist Johnson (GA) Nehls
 Crow Johnson (LA) Newhouse
 Cuellar Johnson (OH) Newman
 Curtis Johnson (SD) Norcross
 Davids (KS) Johnson (TX) Nunes
 Davidson Jones O'Halleran
 Davis, Danny K. Joyce (OH) Obernolte
 Davis, Rodney Joyce (PA) Omar
 Dean Kahele Owens
 DeFazio Kaptur Pallazo
 DeGette Katko Pallone
 DeLauro Palmer Panetta
 DelBene Keller Pappas
 Delgado Kelly (IL) Pascarell
 Demings Kelly (MS) Payne
 DeSaulnier Kelly (PA) Pence
 DesJarlais Khanna Perlmutter
 Deutch Kildee Perry
 Diaz-Balart Kilmer

Peters
 Pfluger
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Ross
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Salazar
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spartz
 Speier
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Steel
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Stewart
 Strickland
 Suozzi
 Swalwell
 Takano
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiffany
 Timmons
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Drew
 Van Dwyne
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Yarmuth
 Young
 Zeldin

NAYS—15

Biggs
 Bishop (NC)
 Bowman
 Brooks
 Bush
 Gaetz
 Gosar
 Greene (GA)
 Massie
 Miller (IL)
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Porter
 Posey
 Rosendale
 Roy

NOT VOTING—20

Good (VA)
 Guest
 Hartzler
 Herrell
 Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA)
 Issa
 Jordan
 Moore (AL)
 Norman
 Rose
 Scalise
 Williams (TX)

□ 1457

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 189, "nay" on rollcall No. 190, "yea" on rollcall No. 191 and "yea" on rollcall No. 192.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE

RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)
 Boebert (Gosar)
 Bourdeaux
 (Kuster)
 Cárdenas
 (Gomez)
 Carl (Joyce (PA))
 Cawthorn (Nehls)
 Clark (MA)
 (Kuster)
 Cohen (Beyer)
 DesJarlais
 (Fleischmann)
 Fallon (Nehls)
 Gallego (Gomez)
 Garcia (IL)
 (Gomez)
 Garcia (TX)
 (Jeffries)
 Gonzalez,
 Vicente
 (Carbajal)
 Grijalva
 (Stanton)
 Horsford
 (Jeffries)
 Hoyer (Trone)
 Jackson Lee
 (Butterfield)
 Jacobs (NY)
 (Garbarino)
 Johnson (TX)
 (Jeffries)
 Kind (Connolly)
 Kirkpatrick
 (Stanton)
 Lawson (FL)
 (Evans)
 Leger Fernandez
 (Jacobs (CA))
 Lieu (Beyer)
 Lowenthal
 (Beyer)
 McClain
 (Bergman)
 Meng (Jeffries)
 Mfume (Evans)
 Mullin (Lucas)
 Napolitano
 (Correa)
 Owens (Curtis)
 Payne (Pallone)
 Rice (NY)
 (Peters)
 Ruiz (Aguilar)
 Rush
 (Underwood)
 Sewell (DelBene)
 Steube
 (Franklin, C.
 Scott)
 Strickland
 (DelBene)

Timmons
 (Wilson (SC))
 Torres (NY)
 (Jeffries)
 Wilson (FL)
 (Hayes)
 Young (Joyce
 (OH))

REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 504, I call up the bill (H.R. 3005) to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BASS). Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3005

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

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) While sitting in the United States Capitol, the Supreme Court issued the infamous *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision on March 6, 1857. Written by Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, whose bust sits inside the entrance to the Old Supreme Court Chamber in the United States Capitol, this opinion declared that African Americans were not citizens of the United States and could not sue in Federal courts. This decision further declared that Congress did not have the authority to prohibit slavery in the territories.

(2) Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's authorship of *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, the effects of which would only be overturned years later by the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, renders a bust of his likeness unsuitable for the honor of display to the many visitors to the United States Capitol.

(3) As Frederick Douglass said of this decision in May 1857, "This infamous decision of the Slaveholding wing of the Supreme Court maintains that slaves are within the contemplation of the Constitution of the United States, property; that slaves are property in the same sense that horses, sheep, and swine are property; that the old doctrine that slavery is a creature of local law is false; that the right of the slaveholder to his slave does not depend upon the local law, but is secured wherever the Constitution of the United States extends; that Congress has no right to prohibit slavery anywhere; that slavery may go in safety anywhere under the star-spangled banner; that colored persons of African descent have no rights that white men are bound to respect; that colored men of African descent are not and cannot be citizens of the United States."

(4) While the removal of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's bust from the United States Capitol does not relieve the Congress of the historical wrongs it committed to protect the institution of slavery, it expresses

Congress's recognition of one of the most notorious wrongs to have ever taken place in one of its rooms, that of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision.

(b) REMOVAL OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol.

(c) REPLACEMENT WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL.—

(1) OBTAINING BUST.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall enter into an agreement to obtain a bust of Thurgood Marshall, under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee considers appropriate consistent with applicable law.

(2) PLACEMENT.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall place the bust obtained under paragraph (1) in the location in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol where the bust of Roger Brooke Taney was located prior to removal by the Architect of the Capitol under subsection (b).

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS AND REMOVAL PROCEDURES FOR STATUES IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) is amended by inserting “(other than persons who served voluntarily in the military forces or government of the Confederate States of America or in the military forces or government of a State while the State was in rebellion against the United States)” after “military services”.

(b) STATUE REMOVAL PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION BY ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—The Architect of the Capitol shall identify all statues on display in the United States Capitol that do not meet the requirements of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131), as amended by subsection (a).

(B) REMOVAL BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall arrange for the removal of each statue identified by the Architect of the Capitol under subparagraph (A) from any area of the United States Capitol which is accessible to the public by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETURN OF STATUES.—A statue which is removed under this subsection and which was provided for display by a State shall be returned to the State, and the ownership of the statue transferred to the State, if the State so requests and agrees to pay any costs related to the transportation of the statue to the State.

(3) REPLACEMENT OF STATUES.—A State that has a statue removed under this subsection may replace such statue in accordance with the requirements and procedures of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) and section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 2132).

(c) STORAGE.—The Architect of the Capitol shall keep any statue removed under this section in storage pending the return of the statue to the State.

SEC. 3. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN OTHER STATUES AND BUSTS.

(a) CONFEDERATE STATUES AND BUSTS.—

(1) REMOVAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library, together with the Curator of the House of Representatives or the Curator of the Senate (as the case may be), shall remove all Confederate statues and Confederate busts from any area of the United States Capitol which is accessible to the public.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—

(A) CONFEDERATE STATUE.—In this subsection, the term “Confederate statue” means a statue which was provided by a State for display in the United States Capitol that depicts—

(i) any individual who served voluntarily at any time as a member of the Armed Forces of the Confederate States of America or of the military of a State while the State was in open rebellion against the United States; or

(ii) any individual who served as an official of the Government of the Confederate States of America or as an official of a State while the State was in open rebellion against the United States.

(B) CONFEDERATE BUST.—In this subsection, the term “Confederate bust” means a bust which depicts an individual described in clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (A).

(b) OTHER STATUES.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock, the statue of John Caldwell Calhoun, and the statue of James Paul Clarke from any area of the United States Capitol which is accessible to the public.

(c) STORAGE.—The Architect of the Capitol shall keep any statue or bust removed under this section in storage.

(d) EXCLUSION OF STATUES SUBJECT TO OTHER REMOVAL PROCEDURES.—This subsection does not apply with respect to any statue which is subject to removal under section 2.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, and any amounts so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

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

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. It directs the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Chief Justice Roger Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber with a bust of Justice Thurgood Marshall. It also directs the removal of statues and busts of individuals who served the Confederacy, and other white supremacists.

The United States Capitol is a beacon of democracy, freedom, and equality, visited by millions of people each year before COVID hit, and soon we hope to

be visited by millions of people again. What and who we choose to honor in this building must represent our values.

Chief Justice Taney, who, in the *Dred Scott* decision, declared that African Americans could never be citizens of the United States and had no constitutional rights, does not meet this standard; and neither do the white supremacists and Confederates we continue to honor with statues today.

Justice Taney's decision continued and permitted the expansion of slavery. Those who founded, served, and fought for the Confederacy were willing to spill American blood in defense of it.

In his infamous Cornerstone Speech, Confederate Vice President Alexander Stephens said that slavery and white supremacy were the cornerstone of the Confederacy.

There is no shortage of American figures like Justice Thurgood Marshall, the first African American to serve on the Supreme Court, more deserving of the honor of being displayed in our Capitol.

There are some who argue that this action is an attempt to erase and forget our history. Nothing could be further from the truth. We must never forget our Nation's shameful periods of slavery, segregation, and racism.

This is, instead, about who we choose to honor, who we choose to literally put on the pedestal and display as emblematic of our values.

We are just months removed from January 6, when a mob of insurrectionists looking to violently overturn a Presidential election stormed this very building. During that awful attack, the same Confederate flag carried into battle against the United States in the 19th century was again carried into battle against the United States and into this very Capitol.

It is long past time to remove from a place of honor in our Nation's Capitol the statues and busts of those who favored war against the United States in support of the so-called government founded on a cornerstone of racism and white supremacy.

Outside the Old Supreme Court Chamber, before you get to the Taney bust, you pass another sculpture, which depicts the figures of History and Justice. Today, we can demonstrate to the Nation and the world that we have learned from our history and we continue to pursue justice.

Put another way, we can follow the advice of the great American poet and civil rights activist Maya Angelou. This is what she said: “Do the best you can until you know better. Then when you know better, do better.”

Let us now show ourselves and the world that we are who we claim to be. Let us do better.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3005, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the chair of the House Administration Committee, for the opportunity to be here today.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 3005, but not because of the goals that it attempts to achieve. Many of us have been fighting for those same things. In fact, some of the comments that she made, you will find in my remarks about some of the people whose statues are here that I do not believe should be in this honored building, and I have fought for a long time to remove those. But I am in opposition to the process of which we are trying to impose to do this.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, Republicans and Democrats agree that racism, in any shape or form, is repugnant and must be denounced. I do intend to vote for this bill, as I did last summer, when Congress considered a similar measure.

It is interesting, however, that our colleagues across the aisle have only recently deemed the cause of removing statues worthy of immediate action. When you look at the facts, it is even more puzzling.

Since 1870, statues have been present in the United States Capitol, and Democrats retained a majority in the House 40 times since then. They have had ample opportunities to remove these statues that Members of their own party are responsible for placing in the Capitol in the first place, but have done nothing.

Again, the timing here is rather peculiar. After retaining the majority 40 times, one would think that if this were truly a pressing issue, they would have acted sooner.

For many years, I have advocated that North Carolina's statues of Charles Aycock and Zebulon Vance be removed based on their ties to the Confederacy. I have suggested that two statues of people that all North Carolinians and all Americans can be proud of be put in their place.

I am proud that the first Republican majority in North Carolina's Legislature in 140 years voted in 2015 to replace the Aycock statue with a statue of Reverend Billy Graham. Yet this request has been awaiting action by the Democrat-chaired Joint Committee on the Library for months. If they were truly concerned about removing these statues, they might be quicker to act on the requests to replace some of the very same statues.

I will look past the times the North Carolina Democrat Party used Governor Aycock's name in fundraising materials and the meetings they held in buildings that sported his name. Maybe today's vote is to compensate for the decades of inaction under a Democrat-controlled House of Representatives. We will let the American people decide.

Republicans are always open for a spirited debate on this issue, and I am

confident that we can find common ground.

While I plan to support this legislation and recognize its underlying intent, this is an issue that is way past its due date.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, before yielding to the gentleman from North Carolina, I would like to correct the record. The Joint Committee on the Library organized last Wednesday. Until last Wednesday, the Joint Committee was chaired by Senator ROY BLUNT of Missouri, a Republican Senator, and I have now been chair for 6 days and hope to act promptly on the North Carolina matter.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), the distinguished chair of the Election Subcommittee in the House Administration Committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, let me first thank the chair for her leadership and friendship on our committee.

Madam Speaker, just a little bit of history. I want to take you back to 1860. President Lincoln won the general election in 1860 by winning 18 of 29 States.

Madam Speaker, the 11 States that Lincoln failed to carry were slave-holding States. These States were fearful that Lincoln would find a way to end slavery and deprive slave owners of their free labor. Eleven Southern States immediately seceded from the Union, forming the Confederate States of America. The CSA elected its leadership, they printed a currency, and they set up a military.

At Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861, the CSA took military action against the United States of America. For the following 4 years, more than 600,000 Americans lost their lives on the battlefield, including Black Union soldiers. This was not a war between the States; it was a war against the United States by 11 Southern States, including my State.

When the Union finally won the war and both sides buried their dead, 4 million slaves were granted their freedom by the passage and ratification of the 13th Amendment.

In 1864, each State was granted the privilege to donate two statues of deceased persons to be displayed in this Capitol that depict the history of their State. These statues are now known as the National Statuary Hall Collection.

Approximately 10 of these statues depict men who volunteered to fight against the United States in the Civil War. All of these statues were donated many decades after the Civil War. Like many other statues around the country honoring members of the Confederate States of America, particularly those erected in the South, these 10 statues were not donated and installed in the Capitol until the 1900s, during the height of the Jim Crow era.

Many Americans see these statues and the timing of their placement to intimidate Black Americans and to

perpetuate the notion of white supremacy. We must not continue to honor these combatants by allowing their images to be displayed in this Capitol.

The bill before us today, Madam Speaker, identifies several other statues for removal that are not part of the collection, including the bust of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, who authored the 1857 Supreme Court decision of Dred Scott that ruled that slaves could not be considered citizens and that Congress did not have the ability to ban slavery. This opinion, Madam Speaker, is regarded as possibly the Supreme Court's worst decision of all time, and the 7-2 decision was a major factor contributing to the Civil War.

Another bust not a part of the National Statuary Hall Collection is for Vice President John Breckinridge, 1856 to 1859. In 1860, Breckinridge ran for President on the Southern Democratic ticket and he lost. During the Civil War, Breckinridge served in the United States Senate, from Kentucky, but became a traitor and enlisted in the Confederate military and assigned to the Army of Mississippi, achieving the rank of Major General. And it gets worse. He was expelled from the United States Senate. Jefferson Davis then appointed him as Secretary of War. After the war, he fled the country for several years.

Madam Speaker, this statue must also be removed.

I ask my colleagues to answer the summons of our time by voting to remove these statues from the Capitol of the United States of America.

□ 1515

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

Madam Speaker, as I stated earlier, you will find that many, if not all, on this side of the aisle will agree with most of the comments, if not all the comments, that are made by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I think we need to go back and look at where we have been as a nation and where we are going. A lot of what we put into this building should reflect not only our history but our values as a nation.

That is why I, in the past, have advocated very strongly for certain statues to be removed. I think it is important now that we have both parties looking at this.

As my colleague from North Carolina mentioned, Taney and the Dred Scott decision, I think it was during a time period when Democratic President Andrew Jackson nominated his bust to be put in the Capitol here today.

Now, it can't be overstated how much this body and this country condemn the institution of slavery. I believe, as a whole, this Nation has done that and continues to do that.

In fact, when I was in the Georgia legislature, I realized that Georgia was the sole State of the former Confederacy that had not officially condemned the act of slavery nor had condemned its participation in slavery

during these dark periods of our Nation. So, I introduced legislation called the Freedom Resolution, which would formally acknowledge the ills, the hatred, and this dark period of our Nation that our government, our State government, the State that I love, was actually engaged in.

That was a very painful time in our history, but we learned from that history. I don't think anyone wants to forget that time period, else we will repeat that in some shape, form, or fashion.

As I said, it is important that the statues that we have here reflect the values of this Nation. In fact, I was very vocal many times in the past over one of Georgia's two statues here, Alexander Stephens. To say he was a racist was an understatement. As was mentioned, his "Cornerstone Address," as we read it today, is just wrought with the idea that all men are not created equal.

In fact, he was very condemning of Thomas Jefferson and George Washington. He even went as far as illustrating that they were insane because of our founding documents being built upon a false premise, and that false premise was the idea that God created all of us equal. He went on to say that God didn't create us equal. He went on to say that White people were superior and that that is why we have the institution of slavery, and it should be preserved.

Those are not ideas that are commensurate with what we believe in this Nation. But it was during a time period where many of the Old South, Democrat-led houses and senates and statue commissions, were trying to hold on to those old ideas and principles that our party—the party of emancipation was brought up, Abraham Lincoln. We have been opposed to these ideas. We totally wrapped our arms around this idea that all men are created equal, that we are all given equal opportunity, that all life is important, that everyone is created in the eyes of God, and that this government exists to protect those freedoms and those liberties.

But there were those in the Democrat-controlled Southern States who wanted to hold on to the old ideas, those ideas that Alexander Stephens espoused. That is why, in Georgia, the Democrat-led commission wanted to poke their finger in the eyes of the Federal Government, and they nominated or placed as statues these people who held ideas different than what we hold as a party over here, what we hold as a nation today.

My opposition to this bill isn't because of the goal that we are trying to achieve, but it is the way that the majority continues to skirt procedure in this body for the second consecutive Congress. This bill was rushed to the floor without a hearing or a markup in the Committee on House Administration.

I am sure we will hear from my colleagues on the other side that Repub-

licans are insincere in our opposition to slavery and dragging our feet when it comes to removing these statues. In fact, it was a Republican, a good friend of mine in the State legislature, Scot Turner, who in 2020 introduced legislation that he knew I supported, and I came out publicly supporting, to remove Stephens' statue and replace it with a statue of Martin Luther King, Jr.

The States have begun to take action. As we talked about, North Carolina has already taken action to remove their statues and replace them. But I am very concerned about this committee.

In fact, the Joint Committee on the Library, the committee responsible for facilitating the removal of statues approved by State legislatures, was only organized last week. Now, this is 6 months from the start of the 117th Congress. I have been on the Joint Committee on the Library, and I was very excited the first year I was appointed to the Joint Committee on the Library because, as a fan of the Library of Congress, I thought this would be a great opportunity to participate in preserving the history and heritage of this Nation.

But of the three terms that I have been on the committee, from my recollection, the committee has only met three times, and that was an organizational meeting each time. It is hard to do your work when you don't even get together to do the work.

The lack of urgency to organize the committee is reason for enough concern. Even more disappointing is our failure to address several approved statue replacement requests from State legislatures.

In October 2015, the State of North Carolina began the process of switching out the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock with the Reverend Billy Graham. Now, this passed the North Carolina House 71-28, a bipartisan vote, and in the Senate, 44-0, a unanimous vote in the North Carolina Senate. Yet, we still have not taken action on approving that for a man who definitely had a very strong impact not only on civil rights but on our Nation as a whole, who we so respect that his body laid in the rotunda not too long ago. Yet, we still have not been able to move on getting that done, as well as several other States.

I believe that we need to focus our efforts on changing this process because I think it would mean a whole lot more, a whole lot more to this body as well as to the American people if the States who originally put those statues in here were the ones that now asked that they would be removed. I think that would be much more appropriate than this body taking action. If we reformed our process to make it where the States could actually do it, it would mean a whole lot more to the future of our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, before yielding, I just want to note, for purposes of clarifying the historical record, that the Republicans of the 19th century and the early 20th century bear almost no resemblance to the Republican Party of today. Similarly, the Democratic Party bears no resemblance to the Democratic Party of the 19th and early 20th centuries. They are the same parties in name only.

In the 19th century, the Republicans were generally the party of the northerners, and the Democrats were the party of the South, and that has switched.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank Madam Chair for her leadership on this very important issue.

The point that she makes is interesting because, actually, in terms of the 14th Amendment, when Black Americans were given the right to vote, it was the Republicans who were the votes to make that happen, and the Democrats, to a person, voted against it. So, her point is well taken. Now, we are in a fight to protect that right to vote, but we will have that conversation another day. Today, we are here for a very specific purpose.

Madam Speaker, this weekend, we observe the birth of our Nation, the Fourth of July, when Americans joyfully celebrate the birth of America's independence and the blessings of liberty.

As we do so, we solemnly recognize that those blessings have been denied to so many throughout our Nation's history out of sheer bigotry and racism.

This holiday, while a celebration, is also an opportunity to take steps to right the wrongs of history, starting here, right here in the U.S. Capitol.

That is why, today, we are again passing legislation to remove statues of Confederate officials and other advocates of bigotry and removing them from the U.S. Capitol.

As I have said before, the Halls of Congress are the very heart of our democracy. The statues that we display should embody our highest ideals as Americans, expressing who we are and who we aspire to be as a nation.

Monuments to men or people who advocated cruelty and barbarism to achieve such a plainly racist end are a grotesque affront to those ideals. They are an homage to hate, not heritage. They must be removed.

I thank Leader STENY HOYER, who has been advocating this for a long time and took charge and worked with Whip JIM CLYBURN, Congressional Black Caucus Chair JOYCE BEATTY, Chair BENNIE THOMPSON, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congressman G. K. BUTTERFIELD, who we just heard from, and the Chair. Madam Speaker, I

thank you and the others for your leadership.

This action builds on actions taken last Juneteenth when, using my authority as House Speaker, I ordered the removal of four portraits of past Speakers from the Capitol who traitorously served in the Confederacy.

Among the Confederate statues in the Capitol that we are addressing today are Jefferson Davis and Alexander Stephens, president and vice president of the Confederacy, respectively, both of whom were charged with treason against America.

This legislation also removes from the Old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol the bust of Justice Roger Taney, a defender of slavery and the author of the 1857 Dred Scott ruling, one of the most horrific stains on our Nation and the Court's history. Mr. HOYER has been particularly interested in removing Justice Taney.

Removing these statues will not erase this stain or that of other racist acts in our history, nor will it erase the racism that exists in our country today. But it is an important and necessary step.

How can we seek to end the scourge of racism—including by passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which the Chair has championed—when we allow the worst perpetrators of that racism to be lauded in the Halls of Congress?

Congress has the opportunity and the obligation to make meaningful change. Let us lead by example.

The Taney bust will be replaced by a tribute to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, an icon of equality and champion of justice in America.

I am very proud of Justice Marshall's Baltimore roots, as a native Baltimorean, and I am happy that our Baltimore airport is named for him.

Justice Thurgood Marshall's words, uttered nearly 30 years ago, must be our inspiration. He said: "America must get to work. . . . We must dissent from the indifference. We must dissent from the apathy. We must dissent from the fear, the hatred, and the mistrust."

He went on further to say: "We must dissent because America can do better, because America has no choice but to do better."

His words were later echoed by our Baltimore brother Elijah Cummings, who said: "We are better than this."

Madam Speaker, we can do better, for the children. I urge a strong bipartisan vote on this important step to do better, to right the wrongs of history, and to move our Nation toward a future of justice. I do so with gratitude for all of the champions who have brought us to this important day. I urge a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my good friend and the leader of the Republicans here in the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, you have been a dear friend for a long

time. You have been in my office, and you sat on the couch. I sat across, in the chair. And you know the portrait that hangs in my office, a portrait of Abraham Lincoln. I am proud that he was the first Republican President of the United States. I am proud of the action that he took in a defining time of our Nation. The greatest challenge ever to our Constitution was the Civil War, by long and by far.

□ 1530

The bill we are voting on today we voted on before. I supported it then, and I support it now.

But let me state a simple fact: All the statues being removed by this bill are statues of Democrats. Madam Speaker, as I heard the Speaker talk earlier about removing the four portraits of Speakers in the hall, the same answer goes for that, as well. They were all Democrats.

What is interesting is the statues that need to be removed were sent to the Capitol by States that were a majority controlled by Democrats sent to a House that had a majority controlled by Democrats accepting of these statues.

I think the bill should go further. Maybe it is time the Democrats change the name of their party. They may be desperate to pretend their party has progressed from the days of supporting slavery, pushing Jim Crow laws or supporting the KKK.

But let's be honest, at any place at any time if those fundamentals rest somewhere, we cannot let them.

Let's go through some of the words and actions of a few Democrats. Just a few years ago then-Vice President Joe Biden praised Democrat Senator Robert Byrd. He was an "exalted cyclops" of the Ku Klux Klan. In his eulogy for Byrd he said: "For a lot of us, he was a friend . . . mentor . . . and guide."

Another leading Democrat who praised Byrd at the time was Speaker PELOSI. She called Byrd a friend, a great person, and a great American patriot.

Madam Speaker, today the Democratic Party has doubled down on what I consider this shameful history by replacing the racism of the past with the racism of the critical race theory.

They continue to look at race as the primary means of judging a person's character. We saw this just last week. Senate Democrats voted to confirm one of President Biden's appointees who said: "We must do everything in our collective power to realize Dr. Kendi's vision for America."

Let me be clear about what that vision is. Kendi, the author of "How to Be an Antiracist" proposed in his book that the solution to past discrimination is present discrimination. Now that is what the person who is now in charge of the personnel of the entire Federal Government is endorsing. And this divisive vision isn't confirmed or just confined to one person or department.

The Navy included Kendi's book on its official reading list for sailors and the Department of Education has praised the debunked "The 1619 Project," citing it as an example of what should be taught to our children.

Critical race theory is the governing ideology of what we are now finding in the Biden administration. By advocating for it Democrats continue to fuel hatred and division across the country.

I agree with Senator TIM SCOTT: America is not a racist country.

America must reject critical race theory for the simple reason: State-sponsored racism is wrong and always will be.

It was wrong when it was segregated lunch counters of Jim Crow, and it was wrong when it was segregated classrooms of critical race theory.

Madam Speaker, many times I wonder what would America have looked like had Abraham Lincoln not been assassinated? Malice towards none. What would America have looked like had the agreement to remove the Federal troops from the south because Joseph Rainey was elected to Congress, and Jim Crow laws were passed by Democrat-controlled offices in the south?

Our Nation was built on a unifying vision from the beginning. As Lincoln said, we are conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that we are all equal.

I will vote for this bill today, just as I voted for it before, but, Madam Speaker, if we have not learned anything, we should not divide our Nation based on race.

I applaud the Democrats for standing up, removing Democrat statues from Democrat-controlled majorities sent to a Democrat majority House that accepted them. It is about time. But, Madam Speaker, to continue along in a critical race theory where you would teach an individual that they are right or wrong based upon the color of skin goes against everything that we are voting about today.

Madam Speaker, you know my heart, and I know yours. There are times we might disagree on philosophy or how best to run a government, but we never disagreed by judging somebody by the color of their skin.

And I hope we take this moment and this opportunity as we promised before to strive to be a more perfect Union.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip. We are so lucky to have as our whip someone who started his public service as a fighter for civil rights. Like our colleague, the late John Lewis, our whip put his life on the line for civil rights and for voting rights.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

I listened pretty intently to the minority leader talking about theory, a principle upon which a set of practices

are made. That is what a theory is. We are not here today to talk about theory.

Today, we are talking about some actions, some practices that were made. We are talking about moving to make this Nation more perfect. And one of the ways you do that is by recognizing and admitting that we have a very spotted history when it comes to race.

I met my late wife in jail protesting practices that were based upon our skin color. Racial inequities, that is what this is all about.

One of the statues in this building sent up here by my State, South Carolina, is a statue of John C. Calhoun. John C. Calhoun is not here because he defended the southern States during the Civil War. We talk about those generals all over this place.

John C. Calhoun died in 1850, more than a decade before the Civil War started. So why is he here? Why did South Carolina send his statue up here for us to honor? Simply because he was this Nation's foremost proponent of slavery. So much so until Yale University from which he graduated took his name off the college that they celebrated him with. Clemson University, which he was one of the founders of, took his name off of his Honors College. Charleston, South Carolina, where he is buried took his statue down overnight. People went to bed around 11 o'clock at night looking at the statue, and when they got up at 6 o'clock the next morning, it was gone because South Carolina has done everything they can to get beyond those principles advocated by John C. Calhoun.

But his statue is here. And I want to thank the Speaker for moving that statue to some place out the eyesight of any school child coming up here. I always call this Hall "America's classroom." And we ought to be teaching in this Hall that which is wholesome about the country.

This is a great country. Nobody denies that. I don't call this a racist country. I do say that this country has on occasion, too often for my taste, tolerated racism. That is a fact. And nobody can deny that fact.

Last time this bill came before this body, over 70 of my Republican friends voted for it. I would hope we could do a little better today.

Madam Speaker, I close by reminding my friend, most of us who studied history, we know when the Republican Party came into being. We know when the Democratic Party came into being; it happens to be an older party than the Republican Party. So I understand all of that. But we also know that in 1948, when Hubert Humphrey spoke at the 1948 Democratic Convention against segregation, Strom Thurmond, the Democrat, left the party, came back. And in 1964 when Democrats came together and decided that they were going to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Strom Thurmond, the Democrat, left the Democratic Party, be-

came a Republican, and took all of those segregationists with him into the South Carolina Republican Party. The South Carolina Republican Party built itself on the Confederate battle flag.

Those are facts of history. We can't deny those facts, and we won't try to. We try to do whatever we can to do what George Santayana admonished us to do; learn the history and gather lessons from that history or we run the risk of repeating that history. What we should do today is relegate these statues to the dust bin of history.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the very passionate words that we have heard here today. And as I said in the beginning, we on this side of the aisle not only agree, but we have been advocating for these very things for quite some time.

In fact, as far as Georgia's statue, I have advocated in times past for the removal of Alexander Stephens' statue—it has been on several occasions that I have spoken about this—and let me just share with you this one idea, this principle, the criticism that he made of our Founders, because he believed that our founding documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were inherently flawed. This is what Stephens said. "The prevailing ideas entertained by him," meaning Jefferson, "and most of the leading statesmen at the time of the formation of the old Constitution"—talking about the Constitution we have today because he was advocating for the Confederate Constitution—"were that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically." And we agree with that.

What he is saying is the flaw of our Founders was that they believed this idea that all men are created equal, and they put that in our founding documents.

The reason I bring that up today is because of something that the minority leader said, which is that under critical race theory they are teaching that our founding documents were the opposite, and more that they were what Alexander Stephens was saying they were, that they are flawed, that they teach racism. But Alexander Stephens was taking the opposite approach, and he says they weren't teaching racism, that is why they are flawed.

This is why I have advocated a long time for the removal of Stephens' statue. In fact, as I was speaking about this at one time, my family and I received a threat from the Ku Klux Klan in Georgia, because I adamantly believe that we are all created equal and we are all given the same opportunities in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

□ 1545

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, in her opening remarks, the gentle-

woman quoted Maya Angelou earlier. And since Maya Angelou spent her childhood in my district in Arkansas, I wholeheartedly agree with the words of Maya Angelou that we can do better.

But I am not convinced that H.R. 3005 is actually doing better. Madam Speaker, this bill would remove all statues from the U.S. Capitol of individuals who voluntarily served in the Confederate Army or, it appears, who are now otherwise deemed by Democrats as racist and unfit for any type of honor.

One of the statues named for removal is James Paul Clarke, a Democrat from Arkansas, who served as a U.S. Senator and the 18th Governor of Arkansas. His statue was placed in the Capitol by Democrat majorities in both the Arkansas House and Senate.

The Speaker might be interested to learn that the Republican Arkansas State legislature voted in 2019 to replace James Paul Clarke and its other statue, which depicts Uriah Rose. Speaker PELOSI is already familiar Uriah Rose. You see, last year, on June 10, Speaker PELOSI sent a letter to the Joint Committee on the Library requesting it remove 11 statues which depict Confederate soldiers and officials, which she says involves Uriah Rose.

Uriah Rose was an Arkansas attorney, who was a founder and two-time president of the American Bar Association. Uriah Rose also founded the Rose Law Firm in Little Rock, at which Hillary Clinton began her legal career and became the firm's first female partner.

The Speaker will be pleased to know that neither Uriah Rose nor James Paul Clarke were commissioned into the Confederate Army. Uriah Rose never fought for the Confederacy, and James Paul Clarke was 7 years old when the Civil War began.

However, following the established procedures for placing statues in the Capitol, Arkansas has recognized racist beliefs held at least by the Democrat Governor and Senator James Clarke and, in 2019, began the process of replacing our two statues with those who have made significant, meaningful contributions to Arkansas and our Nation: Country music legend Johnny Cash and civil rights activist Daisy Bates.

Madam Speaker, every State can follow that process. Many have and many are. Daisy Bates was a civil rights activist who was an unstoppable force during the desegregation of Arkansas, and I am proud that Arkansas chose her as one of the statues to replace James Paul Clarke and Uriah Rose.

Daisy Bates was instrumental in securing safe entry into Little Rock Central High School for the "Little Rock Nine" in September of 1957, one of the first high schools in Arkansas to integrate following the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision in 1954.

Arkansas has been working with the Architect of the Capitol and the Joint Committee on the Library to replace these statues for 2½ years, complying with every step in the process.

H.R. 3005 also names other statues, such as Charles Brantley Aycock, a Democrat from North Carolina who did not serve in the Confederate Army, but has racist ties, who North Carolina has been trying to replace with Reverend Billy Graham since 2015.

This bill naming statues that are in the process of being replaced is nothing more than what I believe is an attempt by Democrats to prematurely thwart the authority of States in order to claim the moral high ground for themselves. If Democrats were serious about cleansing the U.S. Capitol of statues depicting those with racist views, Speaker PELOSI would insist the Joint Committee on the Library make it a top priority to work with Arkansas and North Carolina to expedite the replacement of these statues that are already in process.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentlewoman is going to work to see the Billy Graham statue is quickly added, and I ask that she does the same for Arkansas statues of Johnny Cash and Daisy Bates.

Madam Speaker, we don't need a do-nothing messaging bill from Democrats. We don't need another nanny-state mandate from House Democrats telling States what they need to do. What we need is a get-something-done attitude and real leadership, and these statues will be gone out of the Capitol.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, just a note of the process. In fact, Arkansas is now selecting an artist to develop the Bates statue that has to be approved before we can proceed. Meanwhile, even though they want to get rid of that statue, it stays here. If we pass this bill, the statue will be gone while Arkansas pursues a replacement.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my colleague, a member of the Committee on House Administration, and a scholar and former constitutional law professor.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her great leadership on this.

Madam Speaker, it is one thing to remember the Nation's Confederate traitors. It is another thing to glorify them. It is time to stop glorifying white supremacy in black robes and Confederate traitors who defected from the Union and took up arms against the United States.

Now, I represent Frederick County, Maryland, where Justice Taney lived. The city of Frederick, 5 years ago, took down their statue of the man who wrote the Dred Scott opinion, which found that an African American could never be a citizen within the meaning of Article III of the Constitution, and in which he wrote: "Blacks have no rights which the White man is bound to respect."

In the name of original intent, Justice Taney transformed our Constitution into a White man's compact. He disgraced the Supreme Court. It would take the Civil War, the Reconstruction amendments, and the civil rights movement to dismantle the white supremacist constitution.

Now we are going to replace him with a great Marylander, who has stood the test of time, Justice Thurgood Marshall, who was one of the architects of the legal strategy to dismantle Jim Crow and to replace Plessy v. Ferguson.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, Justice Marshall argued the White primary line of cases: Smith v. Allwright and Terry v. Adams. He argued Brown v. Board of Education. He became the first African-American Supreme Court Justice.

As for all the other Federal officeholders who took an oath to support our Constitution but then defected to the Confederacy and waged insurrection and rebellion against the United States, they were banned by Section 3 of the 14th Amendment from ever serving in public office again, at the Federal level, at the State level, or at the local level.

Why should they occupy a position of honor and reverence in this building?

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, prior to the organizing of the current Joint Committee on the Library, Ranking Member RODNEY DAVIS and I sent a letter to the Joint Committee on the Library to demand immediate action on North Carolina's pending request to replace the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock with the statue of Reverend Billy Graham.

So far, the request has been ignored, but I can only assume it was because it would impede the ability to do what we are doing here today. But I am encouraged by the chair's commitment to act on that very quickly.

I would also say that this isn't an isolated case. There are currently eight States with pending requests, including Arkansas, Florida, Missouri, Kansas, North Carolina, Nebraska, Utah, and Virginia.

In fact, Georgia has just introduced in this last session a new piece of legislation to remove Stephens' statue with that of the late Representative JOHN LEWIS, which is receiving bipartisan support. In fact, the Republican Speaker of the House is the top cosponsor of that legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I will have to admit that when I first got this job and walked through Statuary Hall, I was kind of surprised at some of the people who are honored there. In particular, Alexander Stephens was one that kind of jumped out at me.

And right before the end of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln talked about malice towards none and charity for all. And I think that charity for all was being a little abused when people like Alexander Hamilton Stephens got their statue down there.

Be that as it may, there is another part of this bill that is put before us. We have talked about the Dred Scott decision. I am going to talk a little bit about Roe v. Wade and a history of Roe v. Wade that I think a lot of people don't know about. I get this history in part from an article put out by Planned Parenthood and in part from a book written by Bob Woodward.

Obviously, Roe v. Wade could be described as the most significant court decision in that it legalized abortion, and we have 60 million fewer Americans than we would have if this decision had not happened.

However, a change was made in that decision as they were debating it, upping that 60 million figure a little bit higher because a decision was made at the end to go from allowing abortions at 3 months to allowing abortions all the way until viability—late-term abortion.

The author of that decision, Justice Blackmun, was just going to go 3 months, and he got a letter put out by Thurgood Marshall, who wanted it to be much higher.

I can't tell you exactly how many abortions past 3 months we have had in this country, but it is probably over 5 million. And that was because Thurgood Marshall was in the right or wrong position—however you want to look at it—to go from 3 months to making America one of seven countries in the world where they allow abortions so late. And of those countries includes North Korea, Vietnam, Red China—not countries you want to be associated with.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, if this bill becomes law and we walk through there, we are going to see Thurgood Marshall—or at least I will always look at him as the guy who weighed in and felt after abortion was largely illegal in this country for its first 200 years, the guy who kind of put the foot on the gas and legalized late-term abortion and put the United States in with those other six countries.

Madam Speaker, for that reason, I am going to vote against this bill today. And, hopefully, someday in America, the Roe v. Wade decision and putting the United States in the position in which even 6- or 7-month-old

babies can have their lives taken away, hopefully that will eventually end.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the great Thurgood Marshall won 29 of 32 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States of America. He was eminently qualified then and he is now, and this is a proper thing for us to do.

I want to close with this: If Judge Taney and his cohorts had their way, there would be no person of color in this building today.

Madam Speaker, if they had their way, you would not be at that podium.

Madam Speaker, I stand with Mr. HOYER. I am grateful for what he has done, and I will vote for this legislation. Its time has long since come, and we are doing the right thing. Dr. King reminded us, "the time is always right to do that which is right."

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, it is refreshing to know that there is so much we actually do agree on in this Chamber, because the things that my good friend from Texas just said, we agree on, and we have agreed on since Abraham Lincoln was the President.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my good friend, who is also the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and my friend on the Committee on House Administration for running this debate for our side.

Madam Speaker, despite its flaws, I intend to vote for the underlying bill. But, nevertheless, I rise to highlight several points the majority has failed to address.

It has been 6 years—6 years—since the people of North Carolina, through their elected State legislature, requested on a bipartisan basis to replace the State statue of Charles Brantley Aycock, a former Democrat Governor of that State, who supported segregation and white supremacy.

The people of North Carolina have requested to replace the statue with a sculpture of the late Reverend Billy Graham, a worthy North Carolinian respected and beloved by millions.

Even the Speaker of the House has had many kind words for Reverend Graham, only the fourth American ever to lie in honor in the U.S. Capitol.

□ 1600

In a press release dated February 21, 2018, the Speaker said in part the following: "Reverend Graham's leadership and firm partnership with the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.,

were vital in the fight for civil rights in the South. His counsel to U.S. Presidents, regardless of party, brought grace and humility into our politics."

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the entire press release.

PELOSI STATEMENT ON THE PASSING OF THE
REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM

(February 21, 2018, Press Release)

SAN FRANCISCO—Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi issued this statement today on the passing of the Reverend Billy Graham:

"Today, millions around the world grieve the loss of the Reverend Billy Graham. His clarion message of fellowship and faith lifted and inspired countless members of the Christian community.

"Reverend Graham's leadership and firm partnership with the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. were vital in the fight for civil rights in the South. His counsel to U.S. Presidents, regardless of party, brought grace and humility into our politics. In moments of crisis, from terrorist attacks to horrific natural disasters, Americans roiled by tragedy and turmoil looked to Reverend Graham for solace.

"May it bring comfort to William, Nelson, Virginia, Anne, Ruth and the entire Graham family that so many around the world share in their sorrow at this time."

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I agree with the Speaker's remarks. Reverend Graham was vital in the fight for civil rights in the South.

So, today, I ask: Why are we still having this conversation 6 years later? Why do the Democrats continue to delay States' efforts, like North Carolina and Arkansas, to replace the statues in question that are currently at the Capitol? Why do Democrats delay action, keeping these statues of known racist Democrats in this building?

Democrats have done nothing on any statue for the past 6 months, leaving statues of segregationists, known racists, and other Confederate Democrats in our Capitol.

As an aside, we know this process shouldn't take this long. Kansas, which has no statues in question in the underlying bill, has been waiting 22 years to put a statue of Amelia Earhart in the Capitol.

Just yesterday, the chair of the Joint Committee on the Library, a Democrat, signed the paperwork in about 30 seconds when pressed on it, despite waiting over 6 months to organize the Joint Committee on the Library this Congress.

It is clear that the Democrats could move these requests along at any time but instead are actively continuing to delay the process.

In an effort to speed up this process, I offered an amendment yesterday at the Rules Committee that very reasonably would have addressed these delays and would have required the Joint Committee on the Library to act within 30 days of receiving any actionable items on statue replacement. Thirty days, come on.

Democrats ruled it out of order. I believe that is because they wanted to vote on this bill. Each of the statues in question represents a known racist who

was a Democrat from the past. The majority party is anxious to erase their discriminatory history from the Capitol with this action.

So, let's have the vote. Let's have a vote on this Democrat bill intending to remove Democrat statues.

Madam Speaker, my constituent Abraham Lincoln is buried in my district, the 13th District of Illinois, the first Republican President of our great Nation. I am proud to represent that history. I stood on this floor debating and supporting this bill in the last Congress, and I will support it again.

But please, Madam Speaker, please, please encourage the Democratic majority to help us reform this broken process that has delayed and delayed and kept statues of known Confederates, known racists, who happen to be Democrats in the past, in this Capitol.

Let's work together. Let's get this done. Let's stop playing games.

And let's actually open the Capitol again. It is kind of interesting and ironic that no one can see these statues because the Capitol is closed.

What are we doing to establish a plan to reopen our Capitol for our Nation to actually share in this history, to share in the history of Abraham Lincoln, to share in the history of our country, to share in the special building that we get the chance to walk in and work in while it remains closed?

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to reform this broken process. Madam Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak today, and I intend to vote for this bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). The gentlewoman has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3005 to remove the bust of Chief Justice Roger Taney and Confederate statues from public display in the U.S. Capitol Building.

The people's House can never truly be for the people if it is lined with tributes to those who fought to continue the enslavement of Black people in this country.

My ancestors built this building. Imagine how they would feel knowing that, more than 100 years after slavery was abolished in this country, we still paid homage to the very people who betrayed this country in order to keep my ancestors enslaved.

Imagine how I and other African Americans and people of color feel walking through Statuary Hall, knowing that there are monuments to people who supported, embraced, and fought for the breakup of our country.

We are not trying to erase our history. We must confront our past when

we talk about who we should honor in this building.

Should we honor the man who wrote the Supreme Court ruling that African Americans can't be citizens? Or should we honor the man who got the Supreme Court to rule that separate but equal cannot be equal? Should we honor a legal architect of slavery? Or should we honor a legal architect of the civil rights movement?

When I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the Democratic Party, I wonder if you are aware of the whole history of the civil rights movement, where Black people and other people of color fought to enter the Democratic Party. And when people objected to our participation, and when people objected to our right to vote, those people left the Democratic Party and joined the Republican Party. We are extremely aware of our history of racism in the Democratic Party.

Part of our history as Americans is that we criticize our country. We don't just honor the nice stories of our history, but we honor and embrace all of our history. And we fight for a more perfect Union. Fighting for a more perfect Union for people of color meant fighting to enter the Democratic Party.

It is my hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will go back to that history of the Republican Party that you honor and fight for the right of all Americans to vote.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I am glad to be back.

Madam Speaker, I have been out for 2 weeks, and now that I have a new knee, I am good for another 20 years. That is what they tell me. They guarantee me that.

Madam Speaker, when I brought this bill to the floor just about a year ago, I referred to our Capitol Building as a sacred space for democracy, a symbol around the world of democracy. The intervening months have shown us, in ways we could not have imagined then, just how true that statement was and is.

Sadly, we in this House, our colleagues in the Senate, all who work here, experienced on January 6 a wrenching reminder of how democracy demands our eternal defense and vigilance. We watched our temple of democracy defiled by a violent mob of insurrectionists. For many of us here, that was a watershed moment, seeing such evils pervade the halls of the American Capitol.

However, Madam Speaker, for African Americans, who have been serving here, working here, and visiting here for many decades, that sense of defilement of this sacred space is all too familiar for them.

Our colleague, the former speaker of the California Assembly, KAREN BASS, made that clear when she spoke. When they see individuals like John Calhoun, Charles Aycock, and James Paul Clarke celebrated in stone and bronze in these halls, they are reminded that, for so much of our history, the leaders and leading institutions of our government and country did not view them as equal or, at times, even human.

When they enter the solemn Old Supreme Court Chamber and stare into the cold marble eyes of Roger Brooke Taney, they are reminded that, at one time, the highest court in our land declared that Black lives did not matter.

Mr. Speaker, we ought not be surprised when our fellow citizens of color raise signs that say: No, America, Black lives do matter. That is somewhat what this debate is about.

In the infamous 1857 Dred Scott decision written by Justice Taney, a distinguished citizen of Maryland revered in his time for his intellect and his accomplishments, Taney, in this terrible decision, quoted the Declaration of Independence, which all of us quote so often: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." Today, we would say all men and women are equal, irrespective of color.

But this Dred Scott decision ought to teach us a lesson today. It ought to humble us today. When people around us say, "Boy, that is the right decision," because it happens to be the decision of the moment, not a decision of history.

Beneath those lines, Taney wrote these: "The general words," that is, that all men are created equal, "The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family." Hear me, colleagues. This is Taney speaking in a decision where he is about to say Black lives do not matter.

He said, however, that it "would seem to embrace the whole human family," not divided by color or gender or nationality or religion, the whole human race. And he went on to say: "And if they were used in a similar instrument at this day would be so understood." I want you to think about that.

I want you to think about it, colleagues, with humility. Frankly, I want those who argue for the originalist point of view to think of that. Taney thought of that. And he thought, in his day, in 1857, the whole human family would be covered by "all men are created equal."

But notwithstanding that belief, he did not so rule because he was mired in the past, and the progress of those some 90 years had alluded him because he went on to say: But "the enslaved African race were not intended to be included and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this Declaration." An originalist.

The Founders were human. They were extraordinary humans, but they were human. Their environment shaped their thoughts, as they do ours.

Taney's words were used by the Confederacy during the Civil War to justify the creation of a regime built to sustain the enslavement of African Americans in perpetuity, with no possibility of recognizing their humanity.

□ 1615

Even though Taney said that in 1857, that would have been the popular definition of all men are created equal, Blacks and Whites alike.

And those words have been used ever since by bigots and white supremacists to justify segregation, racial violence, and discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my fellow colleagues that we must not allow the author of those words to hold a place of honor in our Capitol. That is why I introduced this legislation along with Representative BARBARA LEE; my dear friend of over a half a century, JIM CLYBURN; Representative KAREN BASS, former Speaker of the California Assembly; Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON from Mississippi; and Representative G. K. BUTTERFIELD a North Carolina former Supreme Court Justice; and the present chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY from Ohio.

Because this building, this sacred space, this temple of democracy has been defiled for too long. We owe it not to forget history. We must learn from history. But we ought not to honor that which defiled the principles for which we think we stand and for which I think we do stand.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to remove those symbols of slavery, segregation, and sedition from these Halls. How recently we saw, remembered the savage genocide in Tulsa just a few weeks ago, justified in the minds of many, I am sure, that these, after all, were not men who were created equal. They were not children created in the image of God. And therefore, some rationalized the taking of their lives because, after all, their lives did not matter, and therefore, no one was prosecuted, no one was held accountable.

As I said, Roger Brooke Taney was from my State of Maryland, and I acknowledge, as I was growing up as a kid in the late 1950s in high school and then in college in the 1960s, my party was the segregationist party. And my party decided that we did not want to be that party and that there was not a home for segregationists in the Democratic Party. That is a decision we made consciously, knowing full well the cost and that is why Lyndon Johnson said when he signed one of the civil rights bills: We may have just given up the South.

In our State capital of Annapolis, Mr. Speaker, we removed the statue of Chief Justice Taney, the highest ranking Marylander in the Federal Government in history. It had stood there when I was sworn in as a member of the State Senate. And when I listened to Governor Agnew give his State of the Union, it was on the site of the

Roger Brooke Taney statue on the east front of our Capitol.

If you turn and walk west through the Capitol of Maryland, you will come out on a park. It is the Thurgood Marshall Park, a testament to the progress and enlightenment that occurred from Taney to Marshall in our State.

The decision to remove Taney's statue was long overdue, but as the gentleman from Texas said Martin Luther King said: It is never too late to do the right thing. And this, today, is the right thing. It reflects our growth as a State as we have confronted the most difficult parts of our history and it will reflect our growth as we recognize it here, as we did overwhelmingly when we passed this last year. Over a third of my Republican colleagues joined the Democratic colleagues in saying Black lives do, in fact, matter.

Those who say we shouldn't teach about slavery or that we should sweep it under the rug or that we should skip over the lines in our Constitution that reference it, do a disservice to our understanding of America's greatness.

JIM CLYBURN, our whip, a civil rights hero in his own right, likes to quote de Tocqueville saying that America's greatness is not that it always does the right thing. America's greatness is that it is willing to correct its wrongs. We are great because we approach our past with humility and openness. And we are great because we continue to protect our democracy through more inclusion, more tolerance, more justice, more equality, that all men and women, irrespective of artificial distinctions or real distinctions, are equal in the eyes of our Constitution and of our laws.

That is why Democrats and Republicans came together earlier this month to make Juneteenth a national holiday, overwhelmingly, a handful voting against that, in an articulation of our principles today, not yesterday. That was Roger Brooke Taney's great blindness. That is why I believe we can take this important step together today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House once again to join me in passing this legislation, to remove these statues and bust of Chief Justice Taney from the Capitol. Not to forget them. Not to say they weren't part of history, but they are not deserving of our honor. Not because we want to erase history but because we are determined to confront it.

As a Marylander, proud of steps we have taken in Annapolis, I believe that Justice Thurgood Marshall would be a far better ambassador for the greatness of American democracy and for our State of Maryland than Roger Brooke Taney. Where Roger Brooke Taney represents the worst of American justice and racism, Thurgood Marshall represents the best of justice and equality. He deserves to be honored in this Capitol for his trailblazing career and lifelong dedication to civil rights and equal justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues, not as Republicans and Demo-

crats, but as Americans who believe we are a special, exceptional country because we lift up the individual and we protect the 1 against the 99 if the 1 is right. That is the essence of America. And even though they did not live it out perfectly, they articulated the perfection of all men are created equal. And endowed not by the Constitution, not by the laws of Congress, not by the majority vote of their fellow citizens, endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights.

That is what this vote is about today, and I urge my colleagues, vote "yes" for America, vote "yes" for its principles that are so respected properly around the world.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, to the gentlewoman from California, I am prepared to close if she is. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Well, the other speakers we are expecting I think are caught up in a long appropriations markup, so you may proceed. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the members of the North Carolina delegation that was written to the Joint Committee on the Library encouraging them to move quickly on their request to replace the Aycock statue with that of Billy Graham.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
Washington, DC, June 29, 2021.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson,
Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.
Hon. AMY KLOBUCHAR,
Ranking Member,
Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

CHAIRPERSON LOFGREN AND RANKING MEMBER KLOBUCHAR: We write today to encourage the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library's (JCL) expeditious approval of the North Carolina General Assembly's request to replace the State's current statues in the National Statuary Hall Collection. Since 2015, North Carolina has worked to replace one of its current statues, which depicts Charles Brantley Aycock, an individual associated with white supremacy, with one of the late Reverend William Franklin "Billy" Graham, Jr. Despite North Carolina's diligent efforts in coordination with the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) and past Joint Committees on the Library, the statue of Aycock remains.

On October 2, 2015, the North Carolina General Assembly passed Session Law 2015-269; HB 540, "An Act Requesting the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress to Approve the Replacement of the Statue of Charles Brantley Aycock in National Statuary Hall with the Statue of the Reverend William Franklin "Billy" Graham, Jr." This legislation passed the North Carolina House with bipartisan support and passed the North Carolina Senate unanimously.

In February 2018, North Carolina Governor Roy Cooper and Lieutenant Governor Dan Forest sent letters to the AOC in support of the General Assembly's request.

On July 29, 2020, the North Carolina Legislature's Statuary Hall Selection Committee unanimously approved the design of the Rev. Graham statue.

According to the AOC, North Carolina's request continues to await JCL approval to proceed to step five of the ten-step replace-

ment process. Now, over six months into the 117th Congress, JCL's delayed organization continues to hinder North Carolina's wishes to remove a white supremacist's statue from the Capitol.

We implore the JCL to honor the will of the people of North Carolina by moving immediately to complete its work on North Carolina's request and to stand ready to assist as needed in order to ensure the State's wishes are finally realized without further delay.

Sincerely,

PATRICK MCHENRY.
VIRGINIA FOXX.
RICHARD HUDSON.
TED BUDD.
DAVID ROUZER.
DAN BISHOP.
GREGORY F. MURPHY, M.D.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the official 10-step Architect of the Capitol statue removal and replacement process.

This process was established in the 2000 omnibus and further defined in 2014 and requires coordination between the State, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Joint Committee on the Library. All requests for statue replacements begin in State legislatures and is then communicated to the Architect of the Capitol who then manages the communication of the request to the JCL for approval through the process.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
January 2014.

PROCEDURE AND GUIDELINES FOR REPLACEMENT OF STATUES IN THE NATIONAL STATUARY HALL COLLECTION

The creation of the National Statuary Hall Collection was authorized by the United States Congress in 1864 to allow each State to provide two statues of notable citizens for display in the United States Capitol. The Joint Committee on the Library of Congress has oversight of the collection, and, under the committee's direction, the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) is responsible for the reception, placement, and care of the statues.

In accordance with legislation enacted in 2000, "Any State may request the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress to approve the replacement of a statue the State has provided for display in Statuary Hall" under two conditions:

(A) the request has been approved by a resolution adopted by the legislature of the State and the request has been approved by the Governor of the State, and

(B) the statue to be replaced has been displayed in the Capitol of the United States for at least 10 years as of the time the request is made, except that the Joint Committee may waive this requirement for cause at the request of a State.

Steps in the Procedure

1. Responsibilities of the State. The State legislature enacts a resolution that identifies the statue to be replaced, names the individual to be newly commemorated and cites his or her qualifications, selects a committee or commission to represent the State in selecting the sculptor, and directs the method of obtaining the necessary funds to carry the resolution into effect. Expenditures for which the State is responsible include the cost of paying the sculptor for designing and carving or casting the statue; designing and fabricating the pedestal; transporting the statue and pedestal to the United States Capitol; removing and transporting the replaced statue; temporarily erecting the new statue on its pedestal in the location approved for the unveiling ceremony; certain

expenses related to the unveiling ceremony; and any other expenses that the State commission may find it necessary to incur.

2. Request to Replace a Statue. A duly authorized State official, typically the governor, shall submit to the Architect of the Capitol a written request to provide a new statue, a description of the location in the State where the replaced statue will be displayed after it is transferred, and a copy of the applicable enacted State legislation authorizing the replacement. The Architect of the Capitol will review the request for completeness and will forward it to the Joint Committee on the Library.

3. Joint Committee on the Library Action. The Joint Committee on the Library will approve or deny the request.

4. Agreement Regarding Replacement. If the request is approved by the Joint Committee on the Library, the Architect of the Capitol will formalize an agreement with the State to guide the process. The agreement consists of the State's commitment to follow the guidelines for the design and fabrication of statues (see below) and to take responsibility for any cost related to the design, construction, transportation, and placement of the new statue; the removal and transportation of the statue being replaced; and any unveiling ceremony. The agreement is between the Architect of the Capitol and the State. If the State authorizes a commission, foundation, or other entity to act upon its behalf in subsequent parts of the process, the governor must so notify the Architect of the Capitol in writing.

5. Approval of Maquette. The State or its representative shall submit to the Architect of the Capitol, for review and final approval by the Joint Committee on the Library, photographs of the maquette from all four sides and the proposed dimensions of the completed statue.

6. Approval of Full-Size Clay Model and Pedestal Design, Including Proposed Inscription. The State shall submit to the Architect of the Capitol, for review and final approval by the Joint Committee on the Library, photographs of the model from all four sides, dimensions, engineering drawings of the pedestal, the anticipated weight of the completed statue and pedestal, and the text of any proposed inscriptions. Any structural, safety, and design concerns will need to be addressed before final approval.

7. Approval of Completed Statue, Cast in Bronze or Carved in Marble, and Completed Pedestal. The State shall submit to the Architect of the Capitol, for review and final approval by the Joint Committee on the Library, photographs of the completed statue and pedestal from all four sides, dimensions, the final weight, and the text of any inscriptions.

8. Ceremony and Program. The holding of an unveiling ceremony is optional. Permission to use the Rotunda or Emancipation Hall must be granted by concurrent resolution of the Congress, and legislation by the Congress is required to authorize printing of the proceedings at government expense. The State may contact its delegation in Congress for assistance and for introduction of the required legislation.

Although no law requires the Congress to accept statues by formal resolution, it is recommended that acceptance of the statue by the Congress be included in the legislation introduced for the use the Rotunda or Emancipation Hall for the unveiling ceremony.

The State must arrange the program for the ceremony with the Speaker of the House, who will ensure that congressional participation is bipartisan and bicameral and that the program concludes in a reasonable time. The Architect of the Capitol provides support for any unveiling ceremony.

9. Statue Removal/Installation and Ownership Transfer. The State must arrange for a rigger approved by the Architect of the Capitol to remove the replaced statue and install the replacement statue in the location of its unveiling. This work must be coordinated with the Architect of the Capitol.

The replaced statue must be removed shortly before the new statue is brought into the Capitol. Before the replaced statue is removed, a document transferring ownership of that statue from the federal government to the State will be signed by the designated State official.

10. Permanent Location. The permanent location for the replacement statue will be approved by the Joint Committee on the Library. The National Statuary Hall collection is located in several areas of the Capitol: National Statuary Hall (the Old Hall of the House), the Rotunda, the second-floor House and Senate corridors, the Hall of Columns, the Crypt, and the Capitol Visitor Center.

The Architect of the Capitol will make recommendations for placement of the new statue with the least possible disruption to previously placed statues while maintaining a harmonious arrangement. To assist in developing this recommendation, the agency's structural engineer will determine whether the floor in any proposed location can safely support the weight of the statue. If the replacement statue is suitable in weight and dimensions, it will normally take the place of the replaced statue. If not, the Architect of the Capitol will, upon the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library and with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as requested, relocate statues within the Capitol.

If necessary, after the statue has been unveiled, the Architect of the Capitol will be responsible for moving it to the permanent location approved by the Joint Committee on the Library.

Guidelines for Replacement Statues

The guidelines below are provided for reference only; they may be modified in particular cases by the Joint Committee on the Library. Images of the one hundred statues now in the collection are available at the Architect of the Capitol website (www.aoc.gov).

Subject. The subject of the statue must be a deceased person who was a citizen of the United States and is illustrious for historic renown or for distinguished civic or military services. Statues may represent only one individual (ruling adopted by the Joint Committee on the Library at meeting of March 13, 1950). Statues should represent the full length.

Material. The statue must be made of marble or bronze. Replacement statues made of the same material as the replaced statue are preferred. Materials from domestic sources, including, as applicable, sources in the territories and possessions of the United States, are preferred.

Pedestal. To reduce weight, the Architect of the Capitol recommends that the pedestal be made of a hollow steel frame faced in granite or other stone or be made of bronze. It is recommended that the pedestal be designed and constructed with a removable panel (usually in the back) to allow access to attachment bolts. The pedestal design, dimensions, and weight must be submitted to the Architect of the Capitol for review.

Inscriptions. Inscriptions on the pedestal should include the name of the State and of the individual represented. The preferred option is that inscriptions be carved. Alternatively, they can be raised or cast on a bronze plaque. It is traditional and preferred that inscriptions be simple and that they appear only on the front of the pedestal. The proposed inscription should be submitted for

review and approval by the Joint Committee on the Library as part of the pedestal design.

Size and Weight. In general, the figure in the replacement statue should be over life size, with a height between seven and eight feet, and the total height, including the pedestal, no greater than eleven feet. Within that size range, the combined weight of a bronze statue and its pedestal should not exceed 5,000 pounds; a marble statue and its pedestal should weigh no more than 10,000 pounds.

Patina and Coating. For bronze statues, the selected patina and coating must be easily maintained and repaired. Formulas for the patinating and coating materials must be provided to the Architect of the Capitol for use during future maintenance.

Other Considerations. The statue and pedestal should not be a potential source of safety hazards. They should not have any protruding or sharp element that could cause harm or be an obstacle for persons in the building.

Relevant Legislation

The law creating National Statuary Hall is the act of July 2, 1864 (2 U.S.C. §2131) (formerly 40 U.S.C. 187), which established that each State had the right to donate "statues, in marble or bronze, not exceeding two in number for each State, of deceased persons who have been citizens thereof, and illustrious for their historic renown or for distinguished civic or military services"

This law was modified in 2000 by Sec. 311 of H.R. 5657 (included by reference in H.R. 4577) and established as law by P.L. 106-554, which provides that "Any state may request the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress to approve the replacement of a statue the State has provided for display in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States" 2 U.S.C. §2132.

Supervision and direction of the collection are assigned to the Architect of the Capitol by the act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 147), 2 U.S.C. §2131.

With the approval of the congressional Joint Committee on the Library, the Architect of the Capitol is responsible for the reception and location of the statues in this collection, first established by H. Con. Res. 47, agreed to February 24, 1933, and included in P.L. 106-554. 2 U.S.C. §2132.

Excerpt From Public Law 106-554

Sec. 311. (a)(1) Any State may request the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress to approve the replacement of a statue the State has provided for display in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States under section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 187).

(2) A request shall be considered under paragraph (1) only if—

(A) the request has been approved by a resolution adopted by the legislature of the State and the request has been approved by the Governor of the State, and

(B) the statue to be replaced has been displayed in the Capitol of the United States for at least 10 years as of the time the request is made, except that the Joint Committee may waive this requirement for cause at the request of a State.

(b) If the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approves a request under subsection (a), the Architect of the Capitol shall enter into an agreement with the State to carry out the replacement in accordance with the request and any conditions the Joint Committee may require for its approval. Such agreement shall provide that—

(1) the new statue shall be subject to the same conditions and restrictions as apply to any statue provided by a State under section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 187), and

(2) the State shall pay any costs related to the replacement, including costs in connection with the design, construction, transportation, and placement of the new statue, the removal and transportation of the statue being replaced, and any unveiling ceremony.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to permit a State to have more than two statues on display in the Capitol of the United States.

(d) (1) Subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library, ownership of any statue replaced under this section shall be transferred to the State.

(2) If any statue is removed from the Capitol of the United States as part of a transfer of ownership under paragraph (1), then it may not be returned to the Capitol for display unless such display is specifically authorized by Federal law.

(e) The Architect of the Capitol, upon the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library and with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as requested, is authorized and directed to relocate within the United States Capitol any of the statues received from the States under section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 187) prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, and to provide for the reception, location, and relocation of the statues received hereafter from the States under such section.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I have a document which is the chart of every State's request that is currently in the process of getting a statue replaced.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a timeline of the Joint Committee on the Library's organization for this Congress, including the minutes of the first JCL organizing meeting.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2021.
Submission for the Record

TIMELINE OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS
ON THE LIBRARY ORGANIZATION FOR THE
117TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

On January 3, 2021, the 117th Congress had its opening day.

On April 16, 2021, the House of Representatives passed H. Res. 321, Electing Members to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing.

On May 26, 2021, the U.S. Senate passed S. Res. 244, A resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

On June 23, the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library gavelled into session around 4:00 p.m.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to the Joint Committee on the Library Chair LOFGREN requesting organization consideration of North Carolina's statue and reopening of the U.S. Botanic Garden.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2021.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson, Committee on House Administration,
Washington, DC.

CHAIRPERSON LOFGREN: More than six months have passed since the start of the 117th Congress, and it is our understanding that the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library (JCL) will officially organize next week. We are looking forward to the JCL's

first official action this year as there are pressing issues before the Joint Committee demanding our immediate attention.

We encourage the following items be considered as some of the JCL's first orders of business:

Reopening of the U.S. Botanic Garden (USBG). The Joint Committee's delayed organization has directly affected the public's access to one of the Capitol campus' main attractions, the U.S. Botanic Garden, which to this day remains closed awaiting permission from the JCL to re-welcome visitors. We must take up this matter of business immediately, as the USBG's reopening plans and executive leadership team have informed oversight stakeholders of the campus' readiness for safe and immediate reopening.

Consideration of the request by the State of North Carolina. The State of North Carolina is anxiously awaiting JCL's action on its request for the removal and replacement of one of the state's contributions to the National Statuary Hall Collection. Already years into this process, the request is awaiting JCL approval and the Architect of the Capitol is ready to partner with us to move the process along.

As members of the Joint Committee, we stand ready to get to work, while upholding the long tradition of bipartisanship and bicameralism. As the incoming Chairperson, we encourage you to add the above items to the agenda of the JCL's first organizing meeting so that we can begin to address these pressing issues.

Sincerely,

RODNEY DAVIS,
Ranking Member,
Committee on House Administration.
BARRY LOUDERMILK,
Member,
Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I have a readout from the House Rules Committee meeting on H.R. 3005 recorded June 28, 2021, at which time the Joint Committee on the Library chair, ZOE LOFGREN, announced her approval of the Kansas longstanding request to update their contribution to be a statue of Amelia Earhart, and I thank the Congresswoman LOFGREN for taking that direction.

Madam Speaker, I have the official collection of correspondence from the State of Kansas to the Architect of the Capitol that informs them where Kansas is in the 10-step replacement process.

Madam Speaker, that process began 22 years ago in 1999, and I thank you for your indulgence with that.

Madam Speaker, I just want to reiterate that there is much that was said here today that we are in agreement with. Something that the esteemed majority leader said I think needs to be reemphasized and is again the reason why I have adamantly fought to replace the statue of Stephens, the Georgia statue of Alexander Stephens, because of his criticism of our Founders.

His criticism was that they truly believed those ideas that were written in our Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. In fact, he said that that was the flaw of our Nation.

That is why they rebelled against this Nation; that we should go back to those original principles and have people here that honor the idea that God

in His infinite ability, created all of us and He created us all with value, equal value regardless of skin color, regardless of age, regardless of any other factor; that we are all created in His divine wisdom and given life, and life can be so abundant if we just hold on to these ideas and principles. And those statues that we have in this Capitol should reflect those values, and I can think of no one that reflects those values more than the Reverend Billy Graham.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the General Assembly of North Carolina bill requesting that the statues be replaced.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH
CAROLINA SESSION 2015

HOUSE BILL 540—RATIFIED BILL

An act requesting the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress to approve the replacement of the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock in National Statuary Hall with a statue of the Reverend William Franklin "Billy" Graham, Jr.

Whereas, in 1864, Congress established National Statuary Hall in the Old Hall of the House of Representatives in the United States Capitol, and authorized each state to contribute to the Hall two statues that represent important historical figures of each state; and

Whereas, North Carolina currently has statues on display in the National Statuary Hall Collection of former governors Zebulon Vance and Charles Brantley Aycock given by the State in 1916 and 1932, respectively; and

Whereas, in 2000, Congress enacted legislation authorizing states the ability to request that the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approve the replacement of a statue the state had provided for display in Statuary Hall; and

Whereas, William Franklin "Billy" Graham, Jr., was born on November 7, 1918, to William Franklin Graham and Morrow Coffey Graham, and was reared on a dairy farm in Charlotte, North Carolina; and

Whereas, Billy Graham attended the Florida Bible Institute from 1937 to 1940, graduating 1940, and was ordained to the ministry in 1939; and

Whereas, Billy Graham served as pastor of The Village Church in Western Springs, Illinois, from 1943 to 1945; as a member of Youth for Christ International, where he ministered to young people and military personnel from 1945 to 1950; and as President of Northwestern Schools, a liberal arts college, Bible school, and theological seminary, from 1947 to 1952; and

Whereas, after World War II, Reverend Graham preached throughout the United States and Europe and attained international prominence as an evangelist through a series of crusades that began in 1949; and

Whereas, since 1950, Reverend Graham has conducted his ministry through the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association (BGEA), reaching multitudes of people by means of a weekly radio program, "Hour of Decision"; a newspaper column, "My Answer"; televised crusades; articles published in "Decision" magazine; and evangelistic films produced and distributed by World Wide Pictures and now reaching millions through the BGEA Web site and the Billy Graham Library in Charlotte; and

Whereas, over the years, Reverend Graham has preached to live audiences of nearly 215 million people in more than 185 countries and territories and has preached to an estimated 2.2 billion people through television and technology; and

Whereas, Reverend Graham has been a renowned humanitarian and philanthropist, providing financial assistance to victims of disasters, as well as collecting and distributing clothing to those in need all around the world over the years; and

Whereas, Reverend Graham has counseled 12 Presidents and has participated in nine presidential inaugurations; and

Whereas, Reverend Graham has also counseled world leaders and has participated in many historic occasions, and has been called upon as the "nation's pastor" during times of national crisis. He spoke at the National Cathedral service in Washington, D.C., three days after the 9/11 attack in 2001, as the nation and world watched and listened. Five presidents, including George W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George H.W. Bush, Jimmy Carter, and Gerald Ford, and their wives were in the audience; and

Whereas, in 2012, Reverend Graham was listed on the "The Ten Most Admired Men in the World List" for the 56th time. He was first selected in 1955. According to the latest list, Reverend Graham was tied as Number 3 with Mitt Romney, George W. Bush, and Pope Benedict XVI behind President Barack Obama and Nelson Mandela; and

Whereas, admired and beloved by both Christians and non-Christians, Reverend Graham continues to inspire the world with his good works; and

Whereas, there have been many great North Carolinians, but few have impacted the world more than Billy Graham; and

Whereas, it is appropriate to honor Reverend Graham's life and works by placing his likeness in the National Statuary Hall Collection for display in the United States Capitol; Now, therefore,

The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts:

Section 1. The General Assembly requests that the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approve the replacement of the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock in the National Statuary Hall Collection currently on display in the United States Capitol with a statue of the Reverend William Franklin "Billy" Graham, Jr.

Section 2. The General Assembly requests that the Honorable Pat McCrory, Governor of the State of North Carolina, extend to the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress his approval of the General Assembly's request to replace the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock in the National Statuary Hall Collection currently on display in the United States Capitol with a statue of the Reverend Franklin "Billy" Graham, Jr.

Section 3.(a) There is created the Statuary Hall Selection Committee (the "Committee").

Section 3.(b) Membership—The Committee shall be composed of seven members, as follows:

(1) Four members appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be a representative of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, or the Association's designee.

(2) Three members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Section 3.(c) Terms; Chairs; Vacancies; Quorum.—Members shall serve terms of four years. The Committee shall have two co-chairs, one designated by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and one designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, from among their appointees. The Committee shall meet upon the call of the co-chairs. Vacancies shall be filled by the appointing authority. A quorum of the Committee shall be a majority of the members.

Section 3.(d) Duties.—The Committee shall do the following:

(1) Select a sculptor to create a statue of the Reverend Franklin "Billy" Graham, Jr.,

to be placed in the National Statuary Hall Collection and review and approve the plans for the statue.

(2) Identify a method of obtaining the necessary funds needed to pay for all of the following:

a. The sculptor for designing and carving or casting the statue.

b. The design and fabrication of the pedestal.

c. The transportation of the statue and pedestal to the United States Capitol.

d. The removal and transportation of the replaced statue.

e. The temporary placement of the new statue in the Rotunda of the Capitol for the unveiling ceremony.

f. The unveiling ceremony.

g. Any other expenses that the Committee determines are necessary to incur.

Section 3.(e) Compensation; Administration.—Members of the Committee shall receive subsistence and travel allowances at the rates set forth in G.S. 120-3.1, 138-5, or 138-6, as appropriate. The Committee may contract for consultants or hire employees in accordance with G.S. 120-32.02. The Legislative Services Commission, through the Legislative Services Officer, shall assign professional staff to assist the Committee in its work. Upon the direction of the Legislative Services Commission, the Directors of Legislative Assistants of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall assign clerical staff to the Committee. The expenses for clerical employees shall be borne by the Committee.

Section 3.(f) Reports; Termination.—The Committee shall make an interim report to the 2016 Regular Session of the 2015 General Assembly and an annual report thereafter until the Committee has completed the duties set out in subsection (d) of this section, at which time the Committee shall terminate.

Section 4. The Secretary of State shall transmit a certified copy of this act to the members of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress and North Carolina's congressional delegation.

Section 5. This act is effective when it becomes law. In the General Assembly read three times and ratified this the 21st day of September, 2015.

Approved 10:23 a.m. this 2nd day of October, 2015.

TOM APODACA,
Presiding Officer.
PAUL STAM,
Presiding Officer of the House of
Representatives.
PAT MCCRORY,
Governor.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Just a couple of clarifications because I think it may be confusing to the general public hearing about what is really a rather arcane process for States to add and remove statues.

The Joint Committee on the Library ultimately approves it, but the process is driven by the States, the Architect of the Capitol does all of the heavy lifting, looking at the statues, making sure that the replacement statue meets the engineering requirements and the like. I would just like to note that until last Wednesday, Senator ROY BLUNT was chair of the Joint Committee on the Library, and I have been chair of the Joint Committee on the Library now for 6 days.

□ 1630

In that time, I actually have approved the reopening of the Botanical Gardens. I have approved the replacement of the Kansas statue that I received the letter on Friday. And I have just received the information on North Carolina, and I plan to work on that very hard and, hopefully, very promptly get a decision.

So I don't think that speaks to undue delay in the 6 days that I have been chair of the Joint Committee on the Library.

I do think it is important that we take the step to remove these Confederates and segregationists and proslavery statues from our Statuary Hall. In some cases, States have either started the steps to remove them. But while that process is ongoing, these individuals are on a pedestal. And we cannot forget our history, but we don't have to put segregationists and proslavery historical figures on a pedestal. We don't honor them, although we do remember them.

So let's adopt this measure to deal with those statues.

But there is another thing. There are situations such as the statue of Justice Taney that were not sent here by any State, and only we can remove them expeditiously. We have said, and we have heard from people more eloquent than I about why Justice Taney should not be honored.

In 1865, a few years before the Taney bust was ultimately commissioned, the Senate debated it. They debated whether to commission the bust of Justice Taney for the Supreme Court room. And during that debate, Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts said this: "I object to that; that now an emancipated country should make a bust to the author of the Dred Scott decision. Judgment is beginning now; and an emancipated country will fasten upon him the stigma which he deserves."

Now, it may have taken longer than Senator Sumner envisioned, in fact, 156 years to attach the stigma that belongs to Justice Taney, but we will attach that stigma today if we pass this bill.

In closing, I just want to say that all of us are here for a few years. Some longer, some shorter, but we are just here for a little slice of history. And I feel fortunate that my little slice of history allowed me to be here the same time as the late John Lewis. I can almost imagine him standing here on the floor. How fortunate I am to have served with him. And how fortunate I am to serve with our majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, who put his body on the line to fight against segregation and to fight for voting rights. They are leaders of our country. I am proud to serve with them. Let's show how much we honor them by voting for this bill.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Chair LOFGREN for her leadership. I'd

also like to thank our Speaker, our Majority Leader, our Whip, Mr. CLYBURN, Chairwoman BEATTY, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, and Congressman BUTTERFIELD for moving this legislation forward with the urgency that it requires.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3005, which will remove shameful monuments to slavery, segregation, and white supremacy from the U.S. Capitol. In 2017, in the wake of the white nationalist rally in Charlottesville, I introduced the Confederate Monument Removal Act to remove all statues of people who voluntarily served the Confederacy from the Capitol building, so thank you for including this in this current bill. Venerating those who took up arms against the United States to preserve slavery is an affront to the human dignity of all Americans.

These painful symbols of bigotry and racism have no place in our society and certainly should not be enshrined in the U.S. Capitol. Following our historic vote on Juneteenth, it is past time for Congress to stop glorifying the men who committed treason against the United States to keep African Americans in chains.

The movement to honor Confederate soldiers was a deliberate act to rewrite history and diminish the role of slavery in the outbreak of hostilities between the North and the South. The Confederacy sought to uphold the institution of slavery and maintain a racial hierarchy that brutalized and oppressed Black people. This ideology of white supremacy led to the rise of Confederate memorials in the 20th century. Most Confederate statutes were erected during periods of extreme civil rights tension, not in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War. Placed in public spaces, they were testaments to the enduring notion of white supremacy and used to push back against the movement for equality for African Americans. They are symbols of white supremacy and hatred, not Southern heritage. They don't belong here in the U.S. Capitol.

We are in a critical moment to act. The removal of Confederate statues from the U.S. Capitol is an important step in confronting our nation's painful legacy of slavery, racism, and oppression. As a descendant of enslaved Africans, I support this bill and I ask for an 'aye' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

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

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

IG INDEPENDENCE AND EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 504, I call up the bill (H.R. 2662) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978, 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 504, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2662

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 “IG Independence and Empowerment Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INSPECTOR GENERAL INDEPENDENCE

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Amendment.

TITLE II—CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Change in status of Inspector General offices.

Sec. 203. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General.

TITLE III—VACANCY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL POSITIONS

Sec. 301. Vacancy of Inspector General positions.

TITLE IV—COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Additional information to be included in requests and reports to Congress.

Sec. 403. Availability of information to members of Congress regarding certain allegations of wrongdoing closed without referral.

Sec. 404. Semiannual report.

Sec. 405. Additional reports; rules of construction.

Sec. 406. Membership of Integrity Committee.

Sec. 407. Requirement to refer allegations of wrongdoing against Inspector General to Integrity Committee.

Sec. 408. Requirement to report final disposition to Congress.

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Additional authority provisions for Inspectors General.

TITLE VI—INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL

Sec. 601. Short title.

Sec. 602. Investigations of Department of Justice personnel.

TITLE VII—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS

Sec. 701. Short title.

Sec. 702. Office of Inspector General whistleblower complaints.

TITLE VIII—NOTICE OF ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Sec. 801. Notice of ongoing investigations when there is a change in status of Inspector General.

TITLE IX—COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY APPROPRIATION

Sec. 901. CIGIE appropriation.

TITLE X—NOTICE OF REFUSAL TO PROVIDE INSPECTORS GENERAL ACCESS

Sec. 1001. Notice of refusal to provide information or assistance to Inspectors General.

TITLE XI—ENHANCEMENTS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL TRAINING

Sec. 1101. Short title.

Sec. 1102. Enhancements to Inspector General Training.

TITLE XII—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

Sec. 1201. Determination of budgetary effects.

TITLE XIII—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 1301. Severability.

TITLE I—INSPECTOR GENERAL INDEPENDENCE

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Independence Act”.

SEC. 102. AMENDMENT.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(b)—

(A) by striking “An Inspector General” and inserting:

“(1) An Inspector General”;

(B) by inserting after “by the President” the following: “in accordance with paragraph (2)”;

and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The President may remove an Inspector General only for any of the following grounds (and the documentation of any such ground shall be included in the communication required pursuant to paragraph (1)):

“(A) Documented permanent incapacity.

“(B) Documented neglect of duty.

“(C) Documented malfeasance.

“(D) Documented conviction of a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

“(E) Documented knowing violation of a law or regulation.

“(F) Documented gross mismanagement.

“(G) Documented gross waste of funds.

“(H) Documented abuse of authority.

“(I) Documented inefficiency.”;

(2) in section 8G(e)(2), by adding at the end the following: “An Inspector General may be removed only for any of the following grounds (and the documentation of any such ground shall be included in the communication required pursuant to this paragraph):

“(A) Documented permanent incapacity.

“(B) Documented neglect of duty.

“(C) Documented malfeasance.

“(D) Documented conviction of a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

“(E) Documented knowing violation of a law or regulation.

“(F) Documented gross mismanagement.

“(G) Documented gross waste of funds.

“(H) Documented abuse of authority.

“(I) Documented inefficiency.”.

TITLE II—CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Protection Act”.

SEC. 202. CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OFFICES.

(a) *CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OFFICES.*—Paragraph (1) of section 3(b) of

the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,” after “is removed from office”;

(2) by inserting “, change in status,” after “any such removal”; and

(3) by inserting “, change in status,” after “before the removal”.

(b) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Section 8G(e)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,” after “office”;

(2) by inserting “, change in status,” after “any such removal”; and

(3) by inserting “, change in status,” after “before the removal”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. PRESIDENTIAL EXPLANATION OF FAILURE TO NOMINATE AN INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3349d the following new section:

“§3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General

“If the President fails to make a formal nomination for a vacant Inspector General position that requires a formal nomination by the President to be filled within the period beginning on the date on which the vacancy occurred and ending on the day that is 210 days after that date, the President shall communicate, within 30 days after the end of such period, to Congress in writing—

“(1) the reasons why the President has not yet made a formal nomination; and

“(2) a target date for making a formal nomination.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3349d the following new item:

“3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any vacancy first occurring on or after that date.

TITLE III—VACANCY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL POSITIONS

SEC. 301. VACANCY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3345 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if an Inspector General position that requires appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to be filled is vacant, the first assistant of such position shall perform the functions and duties of the Inspector General temporarily in an acting capacity subject to the time limitations of section 3346.

“(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if for purposes of carrying out paragraph (1) of this subsection, by reason of absence, disability, or vacancy, the first assistant to the position of Inspector General is not available to perform the functions and duties of the Inspector General, an acting Inspector General shall be appointed by the President from among individuals serving in an office of any Inspector General, provided that—

“(A) during the 365-day period preceding the date of death, resignation, or beginning of inability to serve of the applicable Inspector General, the individual served in a position in an office of any Inspector General for not less than 90 days; and

“(B) the rate of pay for the position of such individual is equal to or greater than the min-

imum rate of pay payable for a position at GS-15 of the General Schedule.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any vacancy first occurring with respect to an Inspector General position on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY TRANSPARENCY

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Integrity Committee Transparency Act of 2021”.

SEC. 402. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN REQUESTS AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)(B)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, the length of time the Integrity Committee has been evaluating the allegation of wrongdoing, and a description of any previous written notice provided under this clause with respect to the allegation of wrongdoing, including the description provided for why additional time was needed.”; and

(2) in paragraph (8)(A)(ii), by inserting “or corrective action” after “disciplinary action”.

SEC. 403. AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS REGARDING CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING CLOSED WITHOUT REFERRAL.

Section 11(d)(5)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an allegation of wrongdoing made by a member of Congress that is closed by the Integrity Committee without referral to the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee to initiate an investigation, the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee shall, not later than 60 days after closing such allegation, provide a written description of the nature of the allegation of wrongdoing and how the Integrity Committee evaluated the allegation of wrongdoing to—

“(aa) the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives;

“(bb) the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(cc) a member of the House of Representatives who has the support of any seven members of the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; or

“(dd) a member of the Senate who has the support of any five members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

“(II) REQUIREMENT TO FORWARD.—The Chairperson of the Integrity Committee shall forward any written description or update provided under this clause to the members of the Integrity Committee and to the Chairperson of the Council.”.

SEC. 404. SEMIANNUAL REPORT.

Section 11(d)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended to read as follows:

“(9) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—On or before May 31, 2022, and every six months thereafter, the Council shall submit to Congress and the President a report on the activities of the Integrity Committee during the immediately preceding six-month periods ending March 31 and September 30, which shall include the following with respect to allegations of wrongdoing that are made against Inspectors General and staff members of the various Offices of Inspector General described under paragraph (4)(C):

“(A) An overview and analysis of the allegations of wrongdoing disposed of by the Integrity Committee, including—

“(i) analysis of the positions held by individuals against whom allegations were made, including the duties affiliated with such positions;

“(ii) analysis of the categories or types of the allegations of wrongdoing; and

“(iii) a summary of disposition of all the allegations.

“(B) The number of allegations referred to the Department of Justice or the Office of Special Counsel, including the number of allegations referred for criminal investigation.

“(C) The number of allegations referred to the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee for investigation, a general description of the status of such investigations, and a summary of the findings of investigations completed.

“(D) An overview and analysis of allegations of wrongdoing received by the Integrity Committee during any previous reporting period, but remained pending during some part of the six months covered by the report, including—

“(i) analysis of the positions held by individuals against whom allegations were made, including the duties affiliated with such positions;

“(ii) analysis of the categories or types of the allegations of wrongdoing; and

“(iii) a summary of disposition of all the allegations.

“(E) The number and category or type of pending investigations.

“(F) For each allegation received—

“(i) the date on which the investigation was opened;

“(ii) the date on which the allegation was disposed of, as applicable; and

“(iii) the case number associated with the allegation.

“(G) The nature and number of allegations to the Integrity Committee closed without referral, including the justification for why each allegation was closed without referral.

“(H) A brief description of any difficulty encountered by the Integrity Committee when receiving, evaluating, investigating, or referring for investigation an allegation received by the Integrity Committee, including a brief description of—

“(i) any attempt to prevent or hinder an investigation; or

“(ii) concerns about the integrity or operations at an Office of Inspector General.”.

SEC. 405. ADDITIONAL REPORTS; RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—

“(A) REPORT TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Integrity Committee shall submit a report immediately whenever the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee becomes aware of particularly serious or flagrant problems, abuses, or deficiencies relating to the administration of programs and operations of an Office of Inspector General. The report shall be sent to the Inspector General who leads the Office of Inspector General at which the serious or flagrant problems, abuses, or deficiencies were alleged.

“(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Inspector General of the Office identified by the Integrity Committee shall submit any such report to the House Committee on Oversight and Reform and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs within seven calendar days from the time the Inspector General receives the report together with a report by the Inspector General at the Office identified by the Integrity Committee containing any comments such Inspector General deems appropriate.

“(15) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information which is—

“(i) prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of law;

“(ii) required by Executive order to be protected from disclosure in the interest of national defense or national security or in the conduct of foreign affairs; or

“(iii) a part of an ongoing criminal investigation.

“(B) PROVISION OF REPORT TO REQUESTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Subject to any other provision of law that would otherwise prohibit disclosure of such information, the information described in subparagraph (A) may be provided to any Member of Congress upon request of the Member.

“(16) PROHIBITED DISCLOSURES.—The Integrity Committee may not provide or otherwise disclose to Congress or the public any information that reveals the personally identifiable information of an individual who alleges wrongdoing to the Integrity Committee under this subsection unless the Integrity Committee first obtains the consent of the individual.”.

SEC. 406. MEMBERSHIP OF INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.

Section 11(d)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) The individual appointed under subparagraph (C).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) APPOINTMENT OF FORMER INSPECTOR GENERAL TO COMMITTEE.—

“(i) APPOINTMENT.—The Chairperson of the Council shall appoint an individual who prior to the date of such appointment served as an Inspector General (as that position is described in section 3(a) and section 8G(a)(6)), and who has upheld the highest standards of integrity and professionalism while serving and since leaving service as an Inspector General, as determined by the Chairperson, to serve as a member of the Committee unless no such individual is available or willing to serve as a member of the Committee at the time of the appointment.

“(ii) INITIAL TERM.—The individual appointed under clause (i) shall serve at the pleasure of the Chairperson of the Council for a 2-year term.

“(iii) ADDITIONAL TERM.—The Chairperson of the Council may reappoint the individual appointed under clause (i) to serve at the pleasure of the Chairperson of the Council for an additional term not to exceed 2 years.

“(iv) COMPENSATION.—

“(I) SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE DESIGNATION.—The individual appointed under clause (i) shall be considered a special government employee pursuant to section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code.

“(II) COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—An individual appointed under clause (i) may not receive compensation at a rate in excess of the rate of basic pay for level IV of the executive schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, and any such individual, while engaged in the performance of their duties away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of such title for persons engaged intermittently in the Government service.

“(III) ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—The Chairperson of the Council may accept volunteer services from the individual appointed under this subparagraph without regard to section 1342 of title 31, United States Code.

“(IV) PROVISIONS RELATING TO REEMPLOYMENT.—

“(aa) The Chairperson of the Council may reemploy annuitants.

“(bb) The employment of annuitants under this paragraph shall be subject to the provisions of section 9902(g) of title 5, United States Code, as if the Council was the Department of Defense.”.

SEC. 407. REQUIREMENT TO REFER ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING AGAINST INSPECTOR GENERAL TO INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 11(d)(4) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the heading, by striking “REQUIREMENT” and inserting “ALLEGATIONS AGAINST STAFF MEMBERS”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) ALLEGATIONS AGAINST INSPECTORS GENERAL.—An Inspector General shall refer to the Integrity Committee any allegation of wrongdoing against that Inspector General.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 11(d)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “(4)(C)” and inserting “(4)(D)”.

SEC. 408. REQUIREMENT TO REPORT FINAL DISPOSITION TO CONGRESS.

Section 11(d)(8) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by inserting “contemporaneously with the submission of the report under clause (ii),” before “submit”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and other congressional committees of jurisdiction,” after “Integrity Committee”.

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “IG Subpoena Authority Act”.

SEC. 502. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

“SEC. 6A. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.

“(a) TESTIMONIAL SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.—In addition to the authority otherwise provided by this Act and in accordance with the requirements of this section, each Inspector General, in carrying out the provisions of this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the provisions of the authorizing statute), is authorized to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses as necessary in the performance of the functions assigned to the Inspector General by this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the functions assigned by the authorizing statute), which in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, such subpoena shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate United States district court. An Inspector General may not require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of any Federal employee or employee of a designated Federal entity, but may use other authorized procedures.

“(b) LIMITATION OF DELEGATION.—The authority to issue a subpoena under subsection (a) may only be delegated to an official performing the functions and duties of the Inspector General when an Inspector General position is vacant or when the Inspector General is unable to perform the functions and duties of the Office.

“(c) PANEL REVIEW BEFORE ISSUANCE.—

“(1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—

“(A) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL BY SUBPOENA PANEL.—Before the issuance of a subpoena described in subsection (a), an Inspector General shall submit a request for approval to issue a subpoena to a panel (in this section, referred to as the ‘Subpoena Panel’), which shall be comprised of three Inspectors General of the Council

of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, who shall be designated by the Inspector General serving as Chairperson of the Council.

“(B) PROTECTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—The information contained in the request submitted by an Inspector General under subparagraph (A) and the identification of a witness shall be protected from disclosure to the extent permitted by law. Any request for disclosure of such information shall be submitted to the Inspector General requesting the subpoena.

“(2) TIME TO RESPOND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Subpoena Panel shall approve or deny a request for approval to issue a subpoena not later than 10 calendar days after the submission of such request.

“(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR PANEL.—If the Subpoena Panel determines that additional information is necessary to approve or deny a request submitted by an Inspector General under paragraph (1)(A), the Subpoena Panel shall request such information from the Inspector General and shall approve or deny the request submitted by the Inspector General under paragraph (1)(A) not later than 20 calendar days after the submission of the request under such paragraph.

“(3) DENIAL BY PANEL.—If a majority of the Subpoena Panel denies the approval of a subpoena, that subpoena may not be issued.

“(d) NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Subpoena Panel approves a subpoena under subsection (c), the Inspector General shall notify the Attorney General that the Inspector General intends to issue the subpoena.

“(2) DENIAL FOR INTERFERENCE WITH AN ONGOING INVESTIGATION.—Not later than 10 calendar days after the date on which the Attorney General is notified pursuant to paragraph (1), the Attorney General may object to the issuance of the subpoena because the subpoena will interfere with an ongoing investigation and the subpoena may not be issued.

“(3) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA APPROVED.—If the Attorney General declines to object or fails to object to the issuance of the subpoena during the 10-day period described in paragraph (2), the Inspector General may issue the subpoena.

“(e) GUIDELINES.—The Chairperson of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall prescribe guidelines to carry out this section.

“(f) INSPECTOR GENERAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Inspector General’ includes each Inspector General established under this Act and each Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act.

“(g) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of this section shall not affect the exercise of authority by an Inspector General of testimonial subpoena authority established under another provision of law.”;

(2) in section 5(a)—

(A) in paragraph (21)(B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (22), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

“(23) a description of the use of subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses authorized under section 6A.”; and

(3) in section 8G(g)(1), by inserting “6A,” before “and 7”.

TITLE VI—INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Access Act”.

SEC. 602. INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL.

Section 8E of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—
 (A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and paragraph (3)”;
 (B) by striking paragraph (3);
 (C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and
 (D) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”; and
 (2) in subsection (d), by striking “, except with respect to allegations described in subsection (b)(3).”

TITLE VII—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Enhanced Whistleblower Engagement Act”.

SEC. 702. OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS.

(a) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION COORDINATOR.—Section 3(d)(1)(C) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “, including employees of that Office of Inspector General” after “employees”; and

(2) in clause (iii), by inserting “(including the Integrity Committee of that Council)” after “and Efficiency”.

(b) COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY.—Section 11(c)(5)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “, allegations of reprisal,” and inserting the following: “and allegations of reprisal (including the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures and allegations of reprisal that are internal to an Office of Inspector General)”.

TITLE VIII—NOTICE OF ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SEC. 801. NOTICE OF ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(h) Not later than 15 days after an Inspector General is removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred to another position or location within an establishment, the acting Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a list of all audits and investigations being conducted, supervised, coordinated by the Office at the time the Inspector General was removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred.”.

(b) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(3) Not later than 15 days after an Inspector General is removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred to another position or location within an designated Federal entity, the acting Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a list of all audits and investigations being conducted, supervised, coordinated by the Office at the time the Inspector General was removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred.”.

TITLE IX—COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY APPROPRIATION

SEC. 901. CIGIE APPROPRIATION.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 11(c)(3) of the Inspector General Act of

1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any funds available in the Inspectors General Council Fund established under subparagraph (B), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, to carry out the functions and duties of the Council under this subsection.”.

(b) REMOVING COUNCIL FUNDING FROM INDIVIDUAL INSPECTOR GENERAL BUDGET REQUESTS.—Section 6(g) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “, and any resources necessary to support the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. Resources necessary to support the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency shall be specifically identified and justified in the budget request”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—
 (A) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” after the semicolon;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and
 (C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of receipt by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency of an appropriation for the Council to carry out the functions and duties of the Council under section 11 of the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App. 11), as amended under this section.

TITLE X—NOTICE OF REFUSAL TO PROVIDE INSPECTORS GENERAL ACCESS

SEC. 1001. NOTICE OF REFUSAL TO PROVIDE INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE TO INSPECTORS GENERAL.

Section 6(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) If the information or assistance that is the subject of a report under paragraph (2) is not provided to the Inspector General by the date that is 30 days after the report is made, the Inspector General shall submit a notice that the information or assistance requested is being unreasonably refused or not provided by the head of the establishment involved or the head of the Federal agency involved, as applicable, to—

“(A) the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the establishment involved or the Federal agency involved, as applicable;

“(B) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; and

“(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.”.

TITLE XI—ENHANCEMENTS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL TRAINING

SEC. 1101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Training Enhancement Act”.

SEC. 1102. ENHANCEMENTS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL TRAINING.

Section 11(c)(1)(E) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting “and establish minimum standards and best practices for training to ensure all Inspectors General receive training to carry out the duties, responsibilities, and authorities under this Act and on emerging areas of the law of relevance to Inspectors General and the work of their offices as identified by the Council” after “Inspector General”.

TITLE XII—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 1201. 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, sub-

mitted 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.

TITLE XIII—SEVERABILITY

SEC. 1301. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act (or the application of that provision to particular persons or circumstances) is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional the remainder of this Act (or the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances) shall not be affected.

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 Oversight and Reform or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on H.R. 2662.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to urge strong, bipartisan support for my bill, H.R. 2662, the IG Independence and Empowerment Act.

The work of inspectors general, who conduct independent oversight of Federal agencies, continues to be a remarkable investment for American taxpayers. For every dollar we spend on IGs, we get \$17 back. And this return could be even higher if we gave IGs additional tools, which is exactly what this bill would do.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act is a package of critical reforms to protect IGs from political retaliation and obstruction. I want to thank Leader HOYER for his support and work on this bill, as well as all the other cosponsors of the legislation.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act also has the support of 14 good government groups. They wrote that the reforms in this legislation “have been crafted to address problems with inspector general independence and authority long raised by Congress, civil society, and our inspectors general. We strongly urge Congress to pass this legislation to empower our independent watchdogs to serve the public even more effectively.”

This bill would enhance the independence of IGs in several ways. Most importantly, it would protect IGs from being fired simply for doing their jobs. The bill would only allow an IG to be removed for a documented cause, based on a defined list of nonpartisan reasons, such as a knowing violation of

the law, abuse of authority, or gross mismanagement.

These removal protections come from a bill I introduced last year, after the previous administration bullied, sidelined, and retaliated against multiple IGs.

Last April and May, in six short weeks, President Trump fired or sidelined four IGs and acting IGs who were simply doing their jobs.

On April 3, intelligence community IG Michael Atkinson was fired after he provided a whistleblower complaint to Congress about President Trump's now infamous call with Ukrainian President, part of the conduct for which he was impeached by this body.

On April 7, President Trump removed Glenn Fine as Acting Defense Department IG, which blocked IG Fine from serving as chair of the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee, a committee I helped create in the CARES Act to oversee trillions of dollars in Federal spending in response to the coronavirus pandemic. IG Fine was simply doing his job.

On May 15, President Trump removed Mitch Behm as the Acting Transportation Department IG and replaced him with an agency insider. Mr. Behm was investigating Secretary of Transportation Elaine Chao at the time.

And, finally, that same day, President Trump fired State Department IG Steve Linick, who, at the time, was investigating Secretary of State Mike Pompeo for abuse of power and misuse of resources, and replaced him with a political crony.

All four of these IGs were just following the law and the facts, yet they faced blatant retaliation. This is just plain wrong.

President Trump's actions struck at the heart of why we have IGs, to provide independent oversight and a check on executive branch waste, fraud, and abuse.

No President should be allowed to retaliate against an IG for simply doing their jobs, and the IG Independence and Empowerment Act would ensure that IGs are protected from this kind of retaliation.

In a letter to congressional leadership after the IG firings by Mr. Trump, nine former IGs wrote and said: "Forcing inspectors general to choose between doing their jobs with integrity and keeping their positions is not an acceptable model of governance and oversight. We therefore urge you to pass for-cause removal protections for all IGs."

In addition, the IG Independence and Empowerment Act would ensure temporary, acting IGs are independent and qualified by requiring the acting IG to be the deputy IG in the same office, or another senior official from the IG community if there is no deputy. This would protect against the appointment of acting IGs with conflicts of interest or who are acting as political appointees.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would further bolster IG

independence by requiring notification to Congress before an IG is pushed aside and placed on non-duty status so that we in Congress can support the independence of IGs.

The bill would also empower IGs by granting them the authority to subpoena nongovernment witnesses to provide testimony. In many investigations, testimony from nongovernment witnesses is essential. So providing IGs with this authority is often the only way to root out fraud or other wrongdoings.

In 2016, our former colleague, Mark Meadows, supported a similar provision and highlighted that bill's procedural safeguards, which are essentially the same in the bill we are considering today.

He stated: "This bill provides the expanded authority that the IGs have asked for, but with safeguards in place to make sure that they protect against the possibility that an IG's investigation would interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation, or do other harm."

□ 1645

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would also close a loophole that prevents the Department of Justice IG from initiating investigations into professional misconduct by DOJ attorneys.

This bill balances enhanced authorities and independence with new accountability and transparency measures for IGs.

For example, the bill contains the bipartisan Integrity Committee Transparency Act, which would require greater transparency from the CIGIE Integrity Committee, the body Congress set up to investigate IGs.

Supporting IG independence has long been a bipartisan issue. Congress must act now to protect and empower IGs so that they can perform the duties Congress has entrusted to them without being retaliated against.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the IG Independence and Empowerment Act and continue the bipartisan tradition of protecting and strengthening IGs.

To my Republican colleagues who may say these efforts are about attacking President Trump, I would respond with this: Joe Biden is the President now.

I am supporting good governments reforms under a Democratic administration because I believe in accountability no matter who the President is and what party they come from.

We are talking about the future. This is about safeguarding taxpayers' money and protecting the integrity of our government.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support these critical reforms as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, through their work, inspectors general help improve government efficiency and effectiveness. Their nonpartisan audits and investigations work to root out waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in all Federal agencies. In fact, the Committee on Oversight and Reform and IGs have this common mission, but IGs occupy a unique spot within the Federal Government. They have a responsibility to their respective agency and to Congress through the notice requirements.

When the political parties of the executive branch and Congress are different, political fights can understandably erupt. Unfortunately, this has recently led to a politicization of IG investigations.

That takes us to today's bill. Many provisions in this bill are a step in the right direction to empower IGs to conduct robust oversight. However, I remain concerned about some of the provisions in this bill.

Title I in this bill would unnecessarily constrain the President's ability to remove an IG, shifting the delicate balance between the executive branch and Congress. Maintaining the current balance would enable Congress to use its own oversight authority if it believes there is wrongdoing by the President or an agency head in the removal of an IG.

Next, in title III, the majority has proposed to dramatically limit who can be appointed as an acting inspector general if the IG has voluntarily left office or been removed. In doing so, this hinders the President's ability to appoint an IG with whom they have confidence.

While there are legitimate concerns about IGs serving at multiple agencies, this provision goes too far in limiting the President's authority over a subset of executive branch employees.

Finally, I have serious concerns with title V, the provision authorizing an inspector general to issue testimonial subpoena authorities to compel testimony from former Federal employees.

While it may be helpful for IGs to investigate certain allegations of misconduct, it also provides IGs with a tool that can be easily abused for political purposes. For example, this authority would enable new Biden-appointed inspectors general to subpoena former Trump administration officials under the guise of any investigation, regardless of the real purpose for the investigation.

Finally, this provision does not provide the necessary protections for former Federal employees who may be subjected to the legal fees of dealing with a subpoena, instead forcing them to pay for counsel to defend against and respond to these subpoenas. Without meaningful protections to ensure that testimonial subpoena authority would not be used to seek out political retribution, I cannot support this provision.

Rooting out waste, fraud, abuse, mismanagement, and misconduct is one of

the most important jobs of this committee, and inspectors general serve on the front lines with us in this mission. We must ensure that all of our inspectors general have the tools they need to conduct robust oversight of their respective agencies.

That is why committee Republicans offered multiple amendments at the markup to address these concerns but still empower our IGs. We again offered compromise amendments at the Rules Committee yesterday, but my Democrat colleagues have only allowed one of these amendments to be made in order.

I am hopeful that Democrats will take the opportunity to pass a major bipartisan bill by adopting this amendment. If they choose to continue down their partisan path, I hope my Democrat colleagues can stop the repeated attacks on the Trump administration.

Instead, we should focus on ensuring our inspectors general are focused on and equipped to conduct robust oversight over agency operations and spending.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House, an important leader on this legislation, and a steadfast leader on this and on so many issues before this body.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Chairwoman MALONEY's leadership on this issue and so many other issues to protect the citizens, protect consumers, protect voters, and protect, frankly, those who stand up and say there is wrongdoing.

I heard the remarks of the ranking member, and I appreciate his thoughtfulness. But as I was listening to him, I am thinking: How do you make sure that somebody is not cowed by a President, any President, who is prepared to take adverse action without cause against somebody because he or she does not like the investigation they are undertaking?

As the gentleman may know, and as my colleagues may know, I urged a rule that we adopted in this House which said that it is a violation of our rules to out a whistleblower. We have put whistleblower protections in, but unfortunately, when we had whistleblowers come forward most recently, they were attacked and attempted to be outed, which would have subjected them, obviously, to the adverse consequences against which we tried to protect them in the legislation that we passed on whistleblowing. So, I see some analogy between these two.

I thank Vice Chairman GOMEZ, Chairman CONNOLLY, Chairman LYNCH, and Representatives PORTER and LIEU for working on this legislation and supporting this legislation. I was proud to introduce it with the chair of the committee and proud to support it.

Madam Speaker, Americans deserve the highest standards of ethics, trans-

parency, and accountability from their government. Federal agencies and officials work for the people, and they must be accountable to the people. That is why the previous administration's assault on the independence of inspectors general was so alarming.

This is not an attack on a specific administration. As the gentlewoman and chair of the committee has pointed out, we have a Democratic President now, so this is going to bind him. It is not going to bind his predecessors. If anything, it is certainly not anti-Biden, but it is to say: President Biden, we respect you, but we want to have inspectors general who have the confidence they can move ahead without fear of retribution.

Former President Trump removed or replaced, as has been pointed out, the inspectors general from the Departments of Defense, State, Health and Human Services, and Transportation. What kind of a check and balance is that, if a President can simply say, "I don't like what you are doing. I am removing you"? I would suggest none, with all due respect to my friend.

These watchdogs must be able to act independently and be free from political pressure or threats to their careers. It seems to me that is a very commonsense, rational judgment to make. That is what this is about.

We introduced our bill to address the challenge exposed by the actions of the prior administration, that is true. But that has not been the only administration that has acted to undermine inspectors general.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation today. It will build on the provisions that I pushed to include in the House Rules Committee, as I pointed out in January, which protects Federal whistleblowers by making it a violation of House rules for Members to reveal their identities.

Those who come forward to reveal misconduct or violations of the public trust need to be heard and must be protected from threats of retaliation. If that is not the case, it will undermine the very objective that we seek in creating IGs. They need to know that they can go to inspectors general or to Congress under strong whistleblower protections.

House Democrats, and I hope House Republicans, will renew the faith in government and ensure that it works for the people. We are determined to protect and strengthen government accountability.

I hope all of us, in a bipartisan way, will repair this very critical principle of accountability for the people of this country.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ), the vice chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the IG Independence and Empowerment Act.

This comprehensive legislation would ensure inspectors general have the tools needed to conduct thorough investigations without fear of political retaliation.

Many of these reforms have had strong bipartisan support for years, in particular, my bill, the IG Subpoena Authority Act. This provision grants IGs the authority to subpoena testimony from former employees and contractors as a tool to better uncover waste, fraud, and abuse. Currently, the absence of such authority hinders the ability of OIGs to conduct complete oversight in matters of corruption and injustice.

I know my Republican colleagues claim this authority has no protections from abuse, but that simply is not true. This bill includes safeguards to ensure that this authority is not abused by requiring that an IG must have a subpoena approved by a panel of three other IGs.

Additionally, I understand my Republican colleague may introduce an amendment that would strike the subpoena authority provision from this bill today. I find this interesting and confusing because the IG Subpoena Authority Act was first introduced in the 115th Congress by Republican Congressman Steve Russell with the support of then-Chairman Towns and Ranking Member ISSA, and it passed the House by unanimous consent.

This bill has not changed substantially since the 115th Congress. What has changed is the political context in which we are trying to pass this reform. If a reform was good for government then, it is a reform that is good for government now. Nothing has changed.

Madam Speaker, we need to make sure that the IG Subpoena Authority Act is included and passed today. That will help strengthen the integrity and maintain the accountability in our Federal agencies.

I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for its inclusion in the IG Independence and Empowerment Act. It is a step forward for good government, and I strongly encourage an "aye" vote.

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

□ 1700

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Oversight Committee.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, the Inspector General Independence and Empowerment Act protects our Nation's government watchdogs.

Inspectors general are independent officials responsible for preventing and detecting waste, fraud, and abuse. They safeguard the interests of taxpayers and weed out corruption. We need stronger protections to prevent biased or unqualified acting inspectors general from assuming these vital roles.

I championed such measures in my Accountability for Acting Officials Act, and I am proud to say they are included in the chairwoman's bill. These provisions would forbid dual-hatting, serving as both a political appointee and an acting inspector general at the same agency. This conflict of interest compromises the independence of the inspector general's work.

American taxpayers fund these agencies. They deserve to know that those agencies are working on their behalf. They deserve inspectors general who will fight to protect their dollars and our government's integrity.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Inspector General Independence and Empowerment Act.

I thank Chair MALONEY for her leadership on government integrity, including this important bill.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her amendment, her hard work on this bill, and her leadership on the subcommittee and committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2662, the IG Independence and Empowerment Act. I want to thank the chairwoman of the committee for her leadership, especially in bringing forward this important legislative package to bolster the independence and protection of oversight of Federal inspectors general while holding them more accountable to Congress and the American people at the same time.

Our Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing in April that highlighted the need for this legislation. At the hearing, we discussed how the former President, Mr. Trump, exploited statutory loopholes repeatedly to attack Federal IGs, firing well-respected IGs for investigating policies of political allies he liked.

President Trump also appointed political agency officials to serve as acting IGs, this double-hatting Ms. PORTER just talked about. This legislation would address that. We cannot allow these actions to be repeated.

IGs are unique in the Federal Government, serving to root out waste, fraud, abuse, and gross mismanagement. They report both to the executive and legislative branches of government. This bill bolsters IGs on both fronts.

Importantly, the bill ensures the President or an agency head can remove an IG only for documented cause, and I think that is a very important new standard. This measure will ensure that IGs can be removed when appropriate and cannot be removed simply because they speak truth to power.

I authored two additional provisions included in this legislation. The first,

the Integrity Committee Transparency Act, is a bipartisan provision I drafted with my ranking member, Mr. HICE. This provision would codify and enhance administrative reporting reforms at the Integrity Committee. Just this week, we saw how important that can be.

It would also require the Integrity Committee to report immediately any particularly serious and flagrant problems, abuses, or deficiencies at the Office of Inspector General to the IG of that office.

Importantly, the provision also expands the membership of the Integrity Committee to include a former inspector general, increasing acumen and accountability and some distance.

These are critical measures necessary in the wake of cases in which the Integrity Committee has sometimes fallen short in its reporting to this body, to the Congress. In one recent allegation of wrongdoing, it took nearly 4 years for the Integrity Committee to complete its investigation, and employees at that office continued to struggle under an IG who conducted herself with clear negligence. That case got resolved today with the announcement that that IG is going to retire.

IGs cannot afford to be poor leaders, nor can we afford to have them be poor leaders. They must be model Federal employees if their credibility and integrity are to be trusted.

We also champion title VII of this bill, the Enhanced Whistleblower Engagement Act. This provision requires OIG employees to undergo whistleblower training, mandates engagement between a designated whistleblower coordinator and the Integrity Committee, and requires CIGIE to identify best practices for the timely and appropriate handling of alleged reprisals within an OIG.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, this measure is nearly identical to a bipartisan provision in the Senate crafted by Republican Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa.

In addition to these provisions, the bill includes several other important measures to bolster the independence of our nonpartisan watchdogs. This bill is an important bill in reasserting the independence, accountability, and transparency of IGs. They are a critical part of making this government work and rebuilding American trust in its government.

I thank the distinguished chairwoman for her leadership in bringing this bill before us. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, first, I would

like to recognize the hard work of the chairman of the subcommittee. He authored two proposals that were included in the bill and was a major leader on it. I thank Mr. CONNOLLY.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Oversight Committee and a member of the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chair MALONEY for her wonderful leadership of the Oversight Committee.

I rise in support of H.R. 2662, the Inspector General Independence and Empowerment Act.

The inspectors general are a remarkable innovation in American Government that have saved us untold billions of dollars and checked the corrupt abuse of power by people controlling Federal departments. They are essential to our ability to legislate as the Article I branch and to do meaningful oversight over the executive branch of government.

That is true in general, but it is especially true when we have a President like Donald Trump who categorically refused to recognize congressional subpoenas, blocked members of his administration from coming to testify before Congress in an unprecedented way, and generally refused to cooperate with congressional factfinding at all.

When a President refuses to cooperate with the legislative branch, when he obstructs Congress at every turn, the IGs are our only source of information. It is imperative that we protect our inspectors general's independence and their impartiality so they will not be reduced to the level of being Presidential sycophants who are party loyalists.

The Supreme Court has recognized the importance of IG independence, noting that it is "vital to effectuating Congress' intent and maintaining an opportunity for objective inquiries into bureaucratic waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement."

This bill will ensure that the IGs have the tools that they need to conduct thorough investigations on behalf of the American people, and it will protect them from unjust political retaliation.

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

Madam Speaker, I am excited to listen to the enthusiasm from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their newfound passion for oversight. The Republicans on the Oversight Committee have been asking for many hearings on many different areas of potential oversight, potential waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in the Federal Government. But thus far, in this new Congress, my friends on the other side of the aisle have only been interested in oversight of the previous administration.

I am getting really excited for the taxpayers of America because I feel like, today, I am hearing that my friends on the other side of the aisle are interested in ensuring that there is good government, that we have transparency.

One thing that I would like to mention in this bill is that the Oversight Committee is responsible for oversight, and we want to work with the inspectors general. We have a lot of agreement in this bill, and I will talk about that during my closing remarks. But I do believe there is the potential for us to compromise and have a bipartisan bill that actually might have a chance to become law down the hall.

But I hope that this newfound enthusiasm for oversight will carry over, and we can do what the Oversight Committee is supposed to do and not rely as heavily on unelected bureaucrats.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my dear friend and colleague, for having great enthusiasm for oversight and combating waste, fraud, and abuse. I would respectfully offer to him that the best way to conduct that is to give the power to the IGs to conduct legitimate investigations. What we have seen is that when there comes a legitimate investigation, they are often moved aside, fired, or retaliated against.

So, I welcome the gentleman's enthusiasm. I hope he will join with me in supporting giving the power to IGs to conduct legitimate investigations of waste, fraud, and abuse.

As I said in my opening remarks, for every dollar we spend on IGs, we get back \$17, really hundreds of millions of dollars back from their oversight and work.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman, as he knows from our hearings, there are many provisions in this bill that are bipartisan, several that Mr. CONNOLLY just mentioned that we were working on. I look forward to working with him and passing this bill.

It should be bipartisan. Oversight and accountability should be bipartisan. I hope the gentleman joins us in voting for this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Armed Services Committee. She also serves on the Oversight and Reform Committee and is the co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, the history of whistleblowing dates back to the founding of this country. The Continental Congress was committed to making sure that whistleblowers would have a voice. Last year alone, \$2.2 billion was saved by the taxpayers because of whistleblowers in our government.

The April massacre of IGs was an unprecedented power play by the President, a ruthless President who somehow thought they worked for him. They don't work for him. They didn't work for him. They work for the American people, and that is why, since the founding of this country, we have been so committed to it.

Today's legislation will protect IGs from retaliation and increase their independence, ensuring they operate free from political interference. Those complaints that those IGs were looking at were brought to them by individuals. It was a political move by the President to fire them.

I am interested that my colleague on the other side of the aisle was concerned about the costs of being represented by counsel when someone who is a Federal employee is called in to testify. Maybe we can work on a bill to make sure that every Federal employee has that benefit. No one talked about that when Ambassador Yovanovitch was called in to testify or National Security Advisor Fiona Hill or Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, all of whom had to pick up the tab for the attorneys representing them.

Last month during a hearing before the Oversight Subcommittee on Government Operations, the current Chair of the Council of the Inspectors General, Inspector General Allison Lerner, testified that while they offer multiple trainings for IGs, the trainings are not mandated.

I believe, without mandated training, it is impossible to ensure that IGs are operating at the highest level and are well-equipped to carry out their duties, so I am pleased that my amendment requiring minimum standards and best practices for training IGs has been included in this bill.

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

□ 1715

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, JACKIE SPEIER, for her tremendous work on this bill, and one of the major provisions was a bill of hers that was incorporated into it.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), a newly elected Member from the great State of North Carolina and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the Inspector General Independence Act. Inspectors general are vital to the integrity, efficiency, and efficacy of our Government. It is crucial that they operate free from political influence.

This critical legislation includes a bipartisan bill I introduced, the Inspec-

tor General Access Act, which grants the inspector general of the Department of Justice the authority to investigate misconduct by DOJ attorneys.

The DOJ inspector general is currently the only Federal inspector general without this authority. This is simply unacceptable.

DOJ attorneys wield a tremendous amount of power, including the ability to make life and death decisions. It is crucial that these attorneys are held to the highest level of professionalism, and that their actions and conduct are subject to independent oversight.

For this reason, I wholeheartedly support the Inspector General Independence Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Just a couple of things I want to make sure that everyone understands with respect to this bill. This bill is a combination of 10 different bills. Republicans support seven of the 10 bills. Seven of the 10 bills we could pass pretty close to unanimously in this Chamber that would strengthen the IGs and not hamper a President's ability to terminate an IG that may not agree with their ideology.

No one in Congress would hire a staffer that adamantly opposed their ideology. No one in the private sector would have a staffer be a spokesperson or an employee that fundamentally disagreed with the direction that person wanted to lead their company. And the same should be true with the President of the United States.

With respect to President Trump's termination of inspectors general, I want to mention a couple of terminations that the President did. President Trump removed the Intelligence Community Inspector General Michael Atkinson because he flaunted strict whistleblower procedures to provide the Ukraine whistleblower report to Chairman SCHIFF.

Now, we support good government. We want to protect whistleblowers. We want to encourage whistleblowers to come forward. ADAM SCHIFF did more to damage prospective whistleblowers than any Member of this body. And the IG was complicit with him in that. That was a rightful termination by President Trump.

Acting Inspector General Christi Grimm purposely released an outdated and misleading report claiming there were shortages of medical equipment at hospitals which was found to be entirely inaccurate and likely was politically motivated. That is why President Trump terminated her.

So there are examples of a President rightfully terminating an inspector general, and I don't think that this bill is the right path to move forward. This is overlegislating.

We are passing a lot of bills out of this Chamber that are dead upon arrival in the Senate. When we pass a bill that has bipartisan support, that makes a difference in the Senate. We

could achieve that, and I have an amendment that goes a long way towards making this bill bipartisan.

So with respect to oversight, I think the American people are upset over COVID-19. Speaker PELOSI created a Select Committee on the Coronavirus Crisis, which is a subsidiary of the House Oversight Committee, we share the same staff. We have been asking for hearings on the origins of COVID-19 and had no response, no luck from my friends across the aisle, so we had a hearing today. We had a forum. And it was very productive. And I think the people of America appreciated that. That is oversight.

So our committee can go a lot further with respect to oversight, and I think that we could come to a bipartisan compromise to strengthen the IGs without politicizing the IGs, without hampering a President's ability to get rid of a bad IG.

I strongly oppose this bill. I hope through the amendment process it can get better, that it can pass in a bipartisan manner, and we can strengthen the IGs, and we can send a message to the Senate that we have a bipartisan bill that you should take up and President Biden can hopefully sign into law.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Independence is the bedrock principle of inspectors general, and this legislation would protect and enhance their critical work.

As I mentioned earlier, this legislation has the support of several non-partisan, good government groups, including the Project on Government Oversight, the Government Accountability Project, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and many, many others. It also contains several bipartisan bills that are part of the overall inspector general reform bill. I ask that the support letters from the good government groups be included in the RECORD.

JUNE 28, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations write to express our support for the IG Independence and Empowerment Act (H.R. 2662) and to urge you to vote for this critical legislation.

Our federal inspectors general (IGs) identify and investigate waste, fraud, and abuse within the executive branch. The importance of their work cannot be overstated. Executive branch officials and Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle rely on oversight conducted by inspectors general to inform their policy-making. These watchdogs continually return substantial savings for taxpayers. In fiscal year 2020 alone, inspectors general identified potential savings of approximately \$53 billion. And perhaps most importantly, inspectors general investigate and expose abuses of power that may infringe on constitutional rights.

If enacted, this legislation would address critical weaknesses in laws that have limited the effectiveness and threatened the independence of these watchdogs.

For example, most inspectors general lack the authority to compel former agency officials, subcontractors, or subgrantees to co-

operate with IG investigations. This has limited the ability of our watchdogs to effectively review federal programs for waste and fraud and to investigate federal employees accused of misconduct. The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would address this by giving inspectors general the authority to compel testimony from former agency officials, subcontractors, or grantees where that testimony would be relevant to ongoing investigations.

Another weakness is that the president can fire these watchdogs and replace them with unqualified or conflicted individuals, exposing the work of these offices to unnecessary political interference. The public and Congress depend on inspectors general to ensure our federal agencies are functioning effectively, but these watchdogs must be confident they will not be fired for doing that job well. As nine former inspectors general recently wrote to Congress, "Forcing inspectors general to choose between doing their jobs with integrity and keeping their positions is not an acceptable model of governance and oversight." The IG Independence and Empowerment Act places reasonable limits on when a president can remove an inspector general and who can serve in the event of a vacancy, and will further insulate the critical oversight offices from politics.

There are many other critical reforms in this comprehensive legislation that have been crafted to address problems with inspector general independence and authority long raised by Congress, civil society, and our inspectors general. We strongly urge Congress to pass this legislation to empower our independent watchdogs to serve the public even more effectively.

Sincerely,

Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW), Common Cause, Demand Progress, Government Accountability Project, Government Information Watch, Mainers for Accountable Leadership, National Security Counselors, Open The Government, Project On Government Oversight (POGO), Protect Democracy, Public Citizen, Stand Up America, Taxpayers for Common Sense, The Digital Democracy Project.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The reforms we are considering today are only one part of the work Congress needs to prevent future Presidents from abusing power. I also strongly support the broad Protecting Our Democracy Act, which Chairman SCHIFF has spearheaded, and I look forward to that bill's consideration very soon.

I do want to say that the Select Committee on the Coronavirus Crisis, unlike the description from my good friend and colleague, has held 15 hearings of oversight. They have disclosed and recovered millions of dollars of illegal spending or corrupt spending. There is a hearing tomorrow, which will be the 16th hearing of the committee, and we welcome you to join us at that subcommittee hearing if you so wish.

The inspector general community just, in general, has been attacked in recent years. By passing this IG Independence and Empowerment Act, Congress would send a strong message in the strongest terms that no administration, regardless of President or party, can bully or retaliate or act against an IG when the IG is doing

their job. They can only be removed for just cause, such as violating the law or gross mismanagement.

In passing this legislation, we will be strengthening our democracy, and we will send a strong message that Congress supports accountability and an effective government.

I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill. It should be a bipartisan bill.

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

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

Each further amendment printed in part A of House Report 117-74 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 504, 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 Oversight and Reform or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part A of House Report 117-74, 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 Oversight and Reform 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 OFFERED BY MRS.

CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 504, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 printed in part A of House Report 117-74, offered by Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE OF IOWA

Page 6, after line 16, add the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 103. REMOVAL OR TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REASONS FOR REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 102, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "reasons" and inserting "substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,"; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates

to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under paragraph (1), the written communication required under that paragraph shall—

“(A) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and
“(B) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.”.

(b) REASONS FOR REMOVAL OR TRANSFER FOR DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “reasons” and inserting “substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under paragraph (2), the written communication required under that paragraph shall—

“(A) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and

“(B) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. BOURDEAU OF GEORGIA

Page 34, line 1, strike “and” and insert “.”.

Page 34, line 3, insert “,” and on the use of and process for the suspension or debarment of persons for eligibility for Federal contracts” after “Council”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF LOUISIANA

Page 34, after line 3, insert the following (and amend the table of contents and redesignate the subsequent titles accordingly):

TITLE XII—EQUITABLE PAY FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL

SEC. 1201. EQUITABLE PAY FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL.

Section 3(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting after “3 percent” the following: “or the rate of pay that is equal to the highest rate of basic pay of any other employee of the Office of such Inspector General, whichever is higher”.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI OF NEW JERSEY

Page 7, line 4, strike “OFFICES” and insert “OFFICE”.

Page 7, line 13, strike “ENTITIES” and insert “ENTITY”.

Page 7, after line 21, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CERTAIN CHANGES IN STATUS.—

(1) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICE.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 102(1), is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “If” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), if”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the President may submit the communication described in paragraph (1) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

“(A) the President determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

“(B) in the communication, the President includes—

“(i) a specification of which clause the President relied on to make the determination under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

“(4) The President may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (1) unless the President—

“(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

“(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the President relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.”.

(2) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “If” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), if”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the head of a designated Federal entity may submit the communication described in paragraph (1) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

“(A) the head determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

“(B) in the communication, the head includes—

“(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

“(4) The head may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (1) unless the head—

“(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

“(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.”.

Page 7, strike line 22 and all that follows through line 24 and insert the following:

(d) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to removals, transfers, and changes of status occurring on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Page 29, line 20, strike “ESTABLISHMENT” and insert “OFFICE”.

Page 30, line 10, strike “is” and insert “, as amended by section 202(c)(2), is further”.

Page 30, line 12, strike “(3)” and insert “(5)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 34, after line 3, insert the following (and amend the table of contents and redesignate the subsequent titles accordingly):

TITLE XII—REPORT

SEC. 1201. GAO REVIEW AND REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall—

(1) conduct a review that evaluates the effectiveness of the processes of the Integrity Committee of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, and the processes of Offices of Inspector General, respectively, for ensuring that Inspectors General—

(A) are held accountable through the investigation of allegations of wrongdoing, including allegations of misconduct, abuse of authority, or other malfeasance, that are made against such Inspectors General; and

(B) meet relevant standards for integrity and independence;

(2) identify recommendations with respect to—

(A) enhancing accountability for Inspectors General; and

(B) ensuring that Inspectors General meet relevant standards for integrity and independence; and

(3) issue a report—

(A) on the results of the review required by paragraph (1); and

(B) that contains any recommendations identified under paragraph (2).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, the amendment offered by Congresswoman CINDY AXNE would increase transparency when an inspector general is removed.

This amendment would require the President or independent agency head to provide Congress a detailed case-specific explanation when firing an IG.

The amendment would also require the President or independent agency head to provide to Congress the findings from an inquiry that led to the IG's removal.

These requirements would enhance IG independence in addition to the critical for-cause removal protections already in the bill.

The amendment offered by Congresswoman CAROLYN BOURDEAUX would enhance training requirements for inspectors general.

This amendment would ensure that IGs are trained in an important aspect of their oversight work over Federal contractors.

The suspension and debarment process provides an essential tool to hold Federal contractors accountable for waste, fraud, and abuse.

Federal procurement law and the suspension and debarment processes are highly complex, and it is important that all IGs are well-versed on these issues.

This training will help make IGs even more effective and efficient and could lead to more taxpayer savings.

The amendment offered by Congressman TROY CARTER would ensure IGs are paid at an equitable level with senior staff in their office.

Through an unintended consequence in current law, IGs are sometimes paid less than the senior staff in their own offices. This inequity could lead to difficulty in attracting the most qualified people to be IGs.

This amendment would add language to current law providing that IGs have to be paid at least the same rate of pay as the highest paid employee in the IG's office.

This simple change would help ensure that IGs are paid what they deserve for the critical work they perform.

□ 1730

The amendment offered by Congressman TOM MALINOWSKI would balance notification to Congress with the need to address an immediate threat.

The base bill would require that the President or an independent agency head would notify Congress at least 30 days before placing an IG on non-duty status.

This amendment would make an exception to that requirement if any delay in that placement would mean a threat to people, property, or an ongoing investigation.

This amendment would give the President or agency head flexibility in the case of a documented threat, while ensuring Congress is notified of any change to an IG status in advance whenever possible.

And, finally, an amendment offered by Congressman RITCHIE TORRES, which would provide a needed review of all processes to ensure IGs are held accountable.

This amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to review existing processes for investigating allegations of IG wrongdoing, including the processes of the CIGIE Integrity Committee. The results of this review would provide Congress with critical information to know how well these processes are working and how to improve them, if needed.

IGs provide a critical check on waste, fraud, and abuse in the government, and their own conduct must be above reproach.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this commonsense package of amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendments en bloc.

Madam Speaker, some of the amendments in the proposed package attempt to be helpful and improve the bill, but most are just Band-Aids attempting to cover up flawed provisions.

For example, one amendment attempts to paper over the flaws in title I by expanding the requirement for the President to provide his or her rationale to Congress detailing why an IG was removed.

Yes, understanding the President's rationale for removing an IG is very important to Congress. This amendment, however, fails to address the fundamental issue in the section, specifically limiting the reasons for an IG's removal or transferred to only nine constraining reasons.

Another provision in this package seeks to amend title II, but title II already passed earlier this Congress as a standalone bill by voice vote under suspension. This amendment to title II would undermine that broadly supported bill by creating an easy-to-abuse loophole for a President to remove an IG immediately, rather than waiting the 30 days for Congress to review the required notice of removal.

My Democrat colleagues have stated constantly that the goal of their legislation is to ensure that it is incredibly difficult to remove an IG, yet they support an amendment that would gut this and allow our President to circumvent the will of Congress. This is what hap-

pens when the majority decides to go it alone rather than seeking to work together to craft strong bipartisan legislation.

This bloc of amendments is the perfect analog for this legislation—many good provisions mixed with a few poison bills, which undermine the intent of the legislation as a whole. Therefore, I must ask my colleagues to vote against this package of amendments.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER), one of the newest members of our caucus. He serves on the Committees of Transportation and Infrastructure and Small Business.

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her incredible leadership on this very critical and important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because I support this bill and the commonsense amendment that I have for it. I thank the chairwoman for her incredible hard work on this important issue.

Inspectors general play a key role in our government. They provide transparency and accountability into government programs and spending. They help prevent waste and fix mismanagement and abuse.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would ensure that they have the autonomy and the authority to do their jobs without political interference. My amendment is simple and in line with the goals of the bill. It would ensure that the inspector general is paid commensurate to their task.

Currently, IGs make less money than some of their senior advisers. I think the person with the most responsibility should be paid accordingly. If we want the best people to work these important jobs, we need to make sure that their pay matches their role. My amendment would fix an unintended consequence of current law and strengthen IG offices so that they can better carry out their essential work.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I support all of the en bloc amendments, including Mr. CARTER's, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

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.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 117-74.

Mr. COMER. Madam 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:

Page 4, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 6, line 16.

Page 9, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 10, line 10.

Page 22, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 27, line 14.

Redesignate and renumber the remaining titles and sections and amend the table of contents accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, this amendment strips out the three provisions of this legislation that do not have bipartisan support in order for the IG Independence and Empowerment Act to move forward with the full support of the U.S. House. Both sides of the aisle can then come back to the table to fix the remaining provisions in a manner that addresses concerns on both sides of the aisle.

Specifically, my amendment strikes title I, which would artificially constrain the President from removing or reassigning an IG to one of nine specific reasons listed in the provision.

As drafted, title I would have the effect of prohibiting a President from removing an IG who is acting in bad faith and undermining a duly elected President's policies in a purely partisan manner.

My amendment also strikes title III, which strictly limits who the President could name as the acting inspector general to the "first assistant." This provision does not include any commonsense exceptions, creating unintended consequences.

For example, it could elevate an individual to acting IG who may be engaged in the same misconduct which caused the original IG to have been removed.

Lastly, my amendment strikes title V of the bill, which grants inspectors general the authority to issue subpoenas to compel the testimony of former Federal officials, including political appointees.

While I support granting IGs testimonial subpoena authority, the current provision lacks necessary safeguards and could result in it being used in a politically abusive manner.

Madam Speaker, I support the goals behind these provisions, as well as the other seven titles of the bill, which

have strong bipartisan support. However, my amendment addresses the problematic language in these three sections. That is why I ask my Republican and Democrat colleagues to pass this amendment to enable us to negotiate a bipartisan solution for the inspector general community that can be signed into law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this amendment would absolutely gut the bill. The amendment would strike the bill's key protection for inspectors general against political retaliation by eliminating the protection that would only allow an IG to be removed only for a legitimate cause. Not for political retaliation, not because a President doesn't like what they are doing or an investigation that they have started, but only for mismanagement or illegal acts for cause.

We saw last year how unlimited authority can be abused when President Trump bullied and retaliated against two IGs who were investigating his administration, including when he fired the State Department IG. These protections are constitutional.

Last month, the Independent Congressional Review Service released an analysis of congressional authority to limit the removal of IGs and concluded that for-cause removal restrictions "appear to be a constitutionally permissible means of encouraging independence for most IGs."

Madam Speaker, this amendment would also gut the protection in the bill against the appointment of acting IGs with a clear conflict of interest. The amendment would strike a requirement that acting IGs come from an Office of Inspector General. The Council of Inspectors General for Integrity and Efficiency requested this reform, proposed by Republican Representative PORTER, as one of its top legislative priorities in order to "enhance the independence of OIGs."

We saw serious abuses during the last administration. In both the Department of Transportation and the Department of State, President Trump named political appointees within the agency to serve as the acting IG overseeing the same agency.

Finally, this amendment would strip from the bill an important reform that would allow IGs to issue a subpoena to require individuals outside of the Federal Government to provide testimony, if needed, for an investigation. This has long been a priority for inspectors general to allow thorough and complete investigations.

Madam Speaker, multiple IGs have reported that Trump administration officials, including Jeff Sessions, have

refused to cooperate with investigations. No Federal employee should be able to simply avoid and escape accountability by leaving government and saying, "I just no longer will testify or participate in finding the truth."

These provisions were passed by the Committee on Oversight and Reform and the House in 2018, in a Republican-led bill, and contained carefully crafted compromises struck by Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member Cummings years ago.

Madam Speaker, this legislation provides procedural safeguards to ensure that subpoena authority is not abused and it does not interfere with ongoing investigations. For example, the bill will require an inspector general to obtain the approval of a panel of three other inspectors general in order to issue a subpoena for testimony.

A few IGs, including the Department of Defense IG, already have this authority. The language I authored and that the Congress passed on a bipartisan basis, the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee was provided testimonial subpoena authority when it was created as part of the CARES Act last Congress.

There are many instances of former officials and nongovernment employees avoiding IG interviews going back over a decade. For example, IGs were unable to interview retired agents in the "Fast and Furious" investigation, and nongovernment witnesses to the Carter-Page FISA warrant investigation.

This has never been a partisan issue before. In fact, the underlying bill had many, many bipartisan pieces. So in a letter to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, Department of Justice Inspector General has also come out against this.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

□ 1745

Amendments En Bloc Offered by Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc, printed in part A of House Report 117-74, 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 gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 184, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—184

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

NOT VOTING—27

Arrington	Guest	Miller (IL)
Banks	Herrell	Moore (AL)
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Norman
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Pfluger
Crist	Issa	Rose
Fulcher	Jackson	Roy
Gallagher	Johnson (LA)	Tiffany
Gohmert	Long	Weber (TX)
Good (VA)	Meeks	Williams (TX)

□ 1814

Messrs. FEENSTRA, COLE, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Babin (Nehls)	Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)
Boebert (Gosar)	(Kuster)	(Jeffries)
Bourdeaux	Cohen (Beyer)	Grijalva
(Kuster)	Fallon (Nehls)	(Stanton)
Cárdenas	Gallego (Gomez)	Horsford
(Gomez)	Garcia (IL)	(Jeffries)
Carl (Joyce (PA))	(Gomez)	Jackson Lee
Cawthorn (Nehls)		(Butterfield)

Jacobs (NY)	Lowenthal	Sewell (DelBene)
(Garbarino)	(Beyer)	Steube
Johnson (TX)	McClain	(Franklin, C. Scott)
(Jeffries)	(Bergman)	Strickland
Kind (Connolly)	Meng (Jeffries)	(DelBene)
Kirkpatrick	Mullin (Lucas)	Timmons
(Stanton)	Napolitano	(Wilson (SC))
Lawson (FL)	(Correa)	Torres (NY)
(Evans)	Owens (Curtis)	(Jeffries)
Leger Fernandez	Payne (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
(Jacobs (CA))	Ruiz (Aguilar)	(Hayes)
Lieu (Beyer)	Rush	Young (Joyce (OH))
	(Underwood)	

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE CHAMPLAIN TOWERS COLLAPSE IN SURFSIDE, FLORIDA

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a grieving but hopeful heart in the wake of an unimaginable tragedy in Surfside, Florida.

As we gather, our world-renowned Miami Dade search and rescue teams are joined by teams from as far away as Israel and Mexico to search for potential survivors of Champlain Towers South in Surfside.

Since that unprecedented collapse, first responders, medical personnel, engineers, grief counselors, and case-workers have painstakingly worked nonstop to assist in the search and rescue, providing support to the families and to begin an investigation.

For those still trapped, we hold out hope for the search to discover survivors. For all those who lost loved ones, we send our deepest condolences and pledge support and solidarity.

So many in our community fled nations where they faced danger. That makes this tragedy all the more painful. But we are resilient. We will be there every step of the way for the families of those missing in the rubble. But we know we cannot do this alone.

I thank the Biden administration for the speedy delivery of Federal resources, and Mayors Daniella Levine Cava and Charles Burkett for their steadfast leadership in this truly unprecedented crisis.

And our deepest thanks for the remarkable, relentless first responders who are still on that pile, searching around the clock in the hope of finding even one survivor.

Madam Speaker, the agony that these families are going through is beyond comprehension. So on behalf of the missing, those who perished, and their families, I ask that the House please rise and pause for a moment of silence in memory and in honor of those who have been struggling through this Surfside tragedy and crisis.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all Members to rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the victims of the collapse of the Champlain Towers building in Surfside, Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is

the question on amendment No. 4, printed in part A of House Report 117-74, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 220, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—182

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

NAYS—220

Adams	Bourdeaux	Case
Aguilar	Bowman	Casten
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Auchincloss	F.	Castro (TX)
Axne	Brown	Chu
Barragán	Brownley	Cicilline
Bass	Bush	Clark (MA)
Beatty	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bera	Butterfield	Cleaver
Beyer	Carbajal	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cohen
Blumenauer	Carson	Connolly
Blunt Rochester	Carter (LA)	Cooper
Bonamici	Cartwright	Correa

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

NOT VOTING—28

Arrington	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)
Banks	Guest	Norman
Buck	Herrell	Pfluger
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Rose
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Fulcher	Issa	Tiffany
Gallagher	Jackson	Weber (TX)
Garbarino	Johnson (LA)	Williams (TX)
Gohmert	Long	
Good (VA)	Miller (IL)	

□ 1840

Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS, Messrs. COHEN, LIEU, and LOWENTHAL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia and Mr. CARL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 194.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Boebert (Gosar)	(Butterfield)	(Correa)
Bourdeaux	Jacobs (NY)	Owens (Curtis)
(Kuster)	(Garbarino)	Payne (Pallone)
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
(Gomez)	(Jeffries)	Rush
Carl (Joyce (PA))	Kind (Connolly)	(Underwood)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (DelBene)
Clark (MA)	(Stanton)	Steube
(Kuster)	Lawson (FL)	(Franklin, C.
Cohen (Beyer)	(Evans)	Scott)
Fallon (Nehls)	Leger Fernandez	Strickland
Gallego (Gomez)	(Jacobs (CA))	(DelBene)
Garcia (IL)	Lieu (Beyer)	Timmons
(Gomez)	Lowenthal	(Wilson (SC))
Garcia (TX)	(Beyer)	Torres (NY)
(Jeffries)	McClain	(Jeffries)
Grijalva	(Bergman)	Wilson (FL)
(Stanton)	Meng (Jeffries)	(Hayes)
Horsford	Mullin (Lucas)	Young (Joyce
(Jeffries)		(OH))

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin). 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 passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 182, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—221

Adams	Craig	Huffman
Aguilar	Crist	Jackson Lee
Allred	Crow	Jacobs (CA)
Auchincloss	Cuellar	Jayapal
Axne	Davids (KS)	Jeffries
Barragán	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (GA)
Bass	Dean	Johnson (TX)
Beatty	DeFazio	Jones
Bera	DeGette	Kahele
Beyer	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Katko
Blumenauer	Delgado	Keating
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Khanna
Bourdeaux	Deutch	Kildee
Bowman	Dingell	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Kim (NJ)
F.	F.	Kind
Brown	Escobar	Kirkpatrick
Brownley	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Bush	Españillat	Kuster
Bustos	Evans	Lamb
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	Langevin
Carbajal	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Foster	Larson (CT)
Carson	Frankel, Lois	Lawrence
Carter (LA)	Gallego	Lawson (FL)
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Case	Garcia (IL)	Lee (NV)
Casten	Garcia (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Castro (FL)	Golden	Levin (CA)
Castro (TX)	Gomez	Levin (MI)
Chu	Gonzalez,	Lieu
Cicilline	Vicente	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Lowenthal
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al (TX)	
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lynch
Clyburn	Harder (CA)	Malinowski
Cohen	Hayes	Maloney,
Connolly	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Cooper	Himes	Maloney, Sean
Correa	Horsford	Manning
Costa	Houlahan	Matsui
Courtney	Hoyer	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)
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
Suozi
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—182

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Billrakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Gaetz
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs

Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrera Beutler
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks

Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rosendale
Rouzer
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)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—27

Arrington
Banks

Carter (GA)
Cloud

DesJarlais
Doggett

Fulcher
Gallagher
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Guest
Herrell
Hice (GA)

Higgins (LA)
Issa
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Long
Miller (IL)
Moore (AL)

Pfluger
Rose
Roy
Tiffany
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Williams (TX)

□ 1902

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

Babin (Nehls)
Boebert (Gosar)
Bourdeaux
(Kuster)
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Carl (Joyce (PA))
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Clark (MA)
(Kuster)
Cohen (Beyer)
Fallon (Nehls)
Gallego (Gomez)
Garcia (IL)
(Gomez)
Garcia (TX)
(Jeffries)
Grijalva
(Stanton)
Horsford
(Jeffries)

Jackson Lee
(Butterfield)
Jacobs (NY)
(Garbarino)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kind (Connolly)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Leger Fernandez
(Jacobs (CA))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
McClain
(Bergman)
Meng (Jeffries)
Mullin (Lucas)
Napolitano
(Correa)

Norman (Wilson
(SC))
Owens (Curtis)
Payne (Pallone)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Steube
(Franklin, C.
Scott)
Strickland
(DelBene)
Timmons
(Wilson (SC))
Torres (NY)
(Jeffries)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)
Young (Joyce
(OH))

REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF
ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH
BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3005) to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 120, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

YEAS—285

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown
Brownley
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cárdenas

Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen

Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)

Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Sherrill
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCauley
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley

Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rodgers (WA)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Levin (CA)
Sherrill
Levin (MI)
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—120

Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Cammack
Carl
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cline
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Curtis
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan

Dunn
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Franklin, C.
Scott
Gaetz
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Green (TN)	Massie	Rosendale
Greene (GA)	Mast	Rouzer
Griffith	McClain	Rutherford
Grothman	McClintock	Salazar
Hagedorn	McHenry	Scott, Austin
Harris	McKinley	Sessions
Harshbarger	Meuser	Smith (MO)
Hartzler	Miller (WV)	Smith (NE)
Hern	Miller-Meeks	Steel
Johnson (SD)	Mooney	Stefanik
Jordan	Mullin	Steube
Joyce (PA)	Nehls	Tenney
Keller	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (MS)	Norman	Timmons
Kustoff	Nunes	Turner
LaHood	Obernolte	Van Duyne
LaMalfa	Owens	Walorski
Lamborn	Palazzo	Waltz
LaTurner	Palmer	Westerman
Lesko	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Letlow	Perry	Wittman
Loudermilk	Posey	Womack
Lucas	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	
Mann	Rogers (KY)	

NOT VOTING—26

Arrington	Herrell	Moore (AL)
Banks	Hice (GA)	Pfluger
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Rose
Cloud	Issa	Roy
Fulcher	Jackson	Sánchez
Gallagher	Johnson (LA)	Tiffany
Gohmert	Long	Weber (TX)
Good (VA)	Maloney, Sean	Williams (TX)
Guest	Miller (IL)	

□ 1924

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I was absent from votes in order to tour the immigration and humanitarian crisis unfolding at our southern border. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 193, “yea” on rollcall No. 194, “nay” on rollcall No. 195, and “nay” on rollcall No. 196.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)	Jackson Lee	Norman (Wilson)
Boebert (Gosar)	(Butterfield)	(SC)
Bourdeaux	Jacobs (NY)	Owens (Curtis)
(Kuster)	(Garbarino)	Payne (Pallone)
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
(Gomez)	(Jeffries)	Rush
Carl (Joyce (PA))	Kind (Connolly)	(Underwood)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (DelBene)
Clark (MA)	(Stanton)	Steube
(Kuster)	Lawson (FL)	(Franklin, C.
Cohen (Beyer)	(Evans)	Scott)
Fallon (Nehls)	Leger Fernandez	Strickland
Gallejo (Gomez)	(Jacobs (CA))	(DelBene)
García (IL)	Lieu (Beyer)	Timmons
(Gomez)	Lowenthal	(Wilson (SC))
García (TX)	McClain	Torres (NY)
(Jeffries)	(Bergman)	(Jeffries)
Grijalva	Meng (Jeffries)	Wilson (FL)
(Stanton)	Mullin (Lucas)	(Hayes)
Horsford	Napolitano	Young (Joyce)
(Jeffries)	(Correa)	(OH)

MOMENT OF SILENCE RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF EARL MICHAEL WILLIS

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, 28 years ago, Earl Michael Willis was born in Brusly, Louisiana. When he was 14 years old, his sister, Rachael, died of cancer. He went on to go to Catholic High, my high school, and went on to LSU.

In 2018, he got engaged to his wife, Megan. He and Megan got married just last year.

In order to honor his sister Rachael's death, he said he was going to run a 100-mile ultramarathon, and he did so earlier this year in Key West, Florida. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, that effort to honor his sister Rachael's life resulted in his death. The day after the ultramarathon, Michael Willis, at the young age of 27, passed away.

Madam Speaker, I want to honor his life. Our best wishes and thoughts and prayers to his mother, Cristal; his father, Earl; his brother, Nicholas; and his wife, Megan.

Madam Speaker, I ask that we have a moment of silence to honor his life.

IMPROVING TRANSPORTATION IN RHODE ISLAND

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong support of the INVEST Act, which contains nearly \$19 million in funding for three infrastructure projects in Rhode Island's Second District.

This legislation will improve roads in Westerly and Charlestown to increase accessibility along the Scenic Highway, repair roads in Cranston to smooth the commute for Rhode Islanders traveling across the State, and connect a key stretch of the East Coast Greenway in Coventry to boost tourism, create jobs, and spur economic development.

Madam Speaker, Rhode Island's roads and bridges desperately need repair. According to the White House, 148 bridges and over 860 miles of highway are in poor condition in Rhode Island, earning our State the grade of C-minus on our infrastructure report card.

Investing in our aging infrastructure will create good-paying jobs and make our roads safer and less congested. That is true of Rhode Island and every State across the country.

Supporting the INVEST Act and the important projects within it is a no-brainer.

As my New England Patriots always say: Do your job.

To my colleagues, let's do our job so Americans can get on with theirs.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTIONS ACT

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand in solidarity with the majority of Americans that oppose taxpayer funding of abortions.

Despite how clear Americans are on the issue, President Biden and the Democrats in Congress are attempting

to force Americans to pay for abortions.

President Biden's recent budget calls for removal of the Hyde amendment, the appropriations rider that prohibits Federal funding of abortion. Congressional Democrats have committed to removing the Hyde amendment and other longstanding pro-life provisions from this year's appropriations bill.

We must not allow longstanding abortion funding prohibitions that are widely supported by the American people to be gotten rid of at the whims of pro-abortion radicals.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STANSBURY). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

RECOGNIZING NEW JERSEY'S OLYMPIC TRACK ATHLETES

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize some of the amazing track talent from the 12th District.

This past weekend, Athing Mu of Trenton, the child of Sudanese immigrants, dominated her 800-meter Olympic qualifying race, nearly breaking the American record despite an early collision on the track. This young woman is finally getting the recognition she has worked so hard for.

No less impressive was Dunellen's own Sydney McLaughlin, who broke the world record for the 400-meter hurdles, becoming the first woman to ever run the race in under 52 seconds.

We have known about these extraordinary young women for quite some time back home, but now America has had the opportunity to see them in action.

New Jersey is so proud of them. I can't wait for them to show the world what they will do at the Olympics.

CONDEMNING CCP FOR 100 YEARS OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

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

Mrs. STEEL. Madam Speaker, I rise to condemn the Chinese Communist Party for 100 years of human rights violations.

The CCP centennial is not a cause for celebration but a time to reflect on the millions of people who have been repressed, tortured, and killed at the hands of the Communist regime.

From the suppression of a free press in Hong Kong to the mass internment and torture of the Uighurs, the record of human rights abuses carried out by CCP is as horrific as it is long.

We must hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable. As a member of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, I am committed to working with my colleagues to hold China responsible for their abuse.

Madam Speaker, I stand with those fighting for freedom and democracy.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER THOMAS SAWYER

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

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Thomas Sawyer of the Hammond Police Department, who heartbreakingly passed away earlier this month after a 5-week battle with COVID-19.

Officer Sawyer's life's work was one of public service. After serving as a member of the United States Air Force during tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, he went on to serve another 23 years with the Hammond Police Department.

The first responders of northwest Indiana and across our Nation run toward danger at a moment's notice in our times of greatest need, and our communities will forever be grateful for the selfless service of Officer Sawyer.

As Officer Sawyer contracted this disease in the line of duty, let us continue to recognize its ever-present danger and how we must take action to keep ourselves and our neighbors safe.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with his wife, Mary, and all of his family and friends during this difficult time.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

Mr. COHEN, Tennessee, Co-Chair
Ms. MOORE, Wisconsin
Mr. CLEAVER, Missouri
Mr. VEASEY, Texas
Mr. GALLEG0, Arizona
Mr. WILSON, South Carolina
Mr. ADERHOLT, Alabama
Mr. HUDSON, North Carolina
Mr. FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania

REPEAL UNJUST SALT CAP AND RESTORE FULL DEDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, tonight, over the next hour, I, along with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, will rise to advocate for the repeal of the unjust and unfair SALT cap and the full restoration of the SALT deduction. There are five basic arguments that I, along with my colleagues, will flesh out over the next hour.

One, the SALT cap was specifically and unjustly targeted against the residents of New York, New Jersey, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Maryland, Minnesota, Michigan, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Rhode Island, Hawaii, and other congressional districts with high local and State taxes.

Two, middle-class families, which in these States can earn between \$100,000 and \$200,000 per year, are disproportionately impacted in a negative way.

Three, these same middle-class families, as well as wealthy families, are incentivized by the loss of the SALT deduction to leave States with high State and local taxes, thereby leaving a gaping hole in the revenues that are used by these same States to fund their programs. When wealthy individuals and families leave our States because they have been incentivized to leave because of the loss of the SALT deduction, it is middle-class and low-income people who are left behind to hold the bag. Because of the gap in revenues, they will either face higher taxes, which is unacceptable and unsustainable, or reduced services, which is unlikely.

Four, the SALT cap is anti-union because one of the main reasons that taxes are higher in SALT States is because we pay our teachers and our public safety and our civil servants significantly higher wages than our low-tax competitor States.

Five, many States with high State and local taxes that have been negatively affected by the SALT cap are net donors to the Federal Government. That is, these States contribute more to the Federal Government in income taxes than they receive in Federal programs and contracts. They are donor States.

Why are the taxes higher in New York, California, and other SALT States? Why are the taxes lower in Florida, Texas, and other low-tax States?

The reason for our higher taxes is because we insure our children. New York State and California have some of the lowest rates of uninsured children in the Nation, while Texas and Florida

have some of the highest rates of uninsured children in our country. We adopted the Affordable Care Act; they refused to.

Our States have the highest rates of union employees. Our low-tax competitors don't like unions. In fact, they actively oppose them. They have right-to-work laws. They don't pay their teachers well.

In States like New York, we have one of the greatest mass transit systems in the world that delivers the lowest carbon footprint per capita of any city in the world. In California, they have been implementing policies to address climate change for decades. Yet, in low-tax States, they have no mass transit to speak of, and they are still debating whether climate change is a hoax.

Secretary Yellen has said that we need to stop the international race to the bottom by creating a global minimum corporate tax. Well, we need to discourage a race to the bottom right here in the United States of America.

It is cheaper not to insure your children. It is cheaper to use nonunion labor. It is cheaper to have lax environmental regulations, unregulated utilities that shut down in cold weather, or septic tanks instead of sewers that cause red tide in your waterways.

Each State, each city, each laboratory of democracy has decided how they want to govern, what services they want to provide, and how much in taxes they will collect. By removing the SALT deduction, the first deduction in the Federal income tax code, a deduction that has been in place for over 100 years, by capping this deduction, we are crippling the very States, cities, and local municipalities that are the economic engines of our Nation.

By capping the SALT deduction, the long arm of the Federal Government is reaching into our States and local governments to try to determine what programs they should provide, how much they should collect in taxes. They are breaching the covenant of federalism that has been in place for over 100 years.

That is why, tomorrow, will be holding a press conference with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties to showcase how the SALT cap is devastating our local governments.

Last week, we held a press conference with unions to show how they are negatively impacted by the SALT cap.

That is why, tonight, so many of my colleagues are here to join me in our call to repeal the unfair and the unjust SALT cap.

□ 1945

Now, I yield to my friend from California (Mrs. KIM), who has taken a leadership role from the other side of the aisle to talk to us about SALT.

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, Representative SUOZZI from New York, for yielding. And I want to thank him for working with me in a bipartisan push to repeal the cap on SALT deductions that is hurting American workers and families.

Californians in the 39th District—which I represent—and across our State, have been burdened enough by high State and local taxes in addition to high cost of living and housing. The last thing they need is to be hurt even more because of these State and local taxes at the Federal level.

I have heard from many of my constituents about the burdensome taxes they have to pay as a result of the SALT cap. These are workers, business owners, and families who are struggling to survive due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is estimated that in the 2022 tax year, California's 39th District will pay on average \$600 million more in taxes.

In 2018 alone, Californians paid an additional \$11.2 billion in Federal taxes because of the SALT cap. That translated into 55,000 fewer jobs and a loss of \$3.4 billion in wages.

Assuming a middle-of-the-road rate of 25 percent, an average taxpayer who claimed itemized deductions would have saved \$6,521 in taxes if the SALT deduction were not capped at \$10,000. These high tax rates are on top of the skyrocketing housing prices across the State. In fact, according to the National Association of Realtors, the median price for a single-family home in California has increased by more than 39 percent in the past year alone, surpassing the \$800,000 threshold for the first time in April of this year.

That is why it is a top priority of mine in Congress to make life more affordable for Californians and repeal the SALT cap. This is hurting my constituents and many middle-class Americans across the Nation.

I was proud to join my friend, Representative SUOZZI, as an original cosponsor of the SALT Deductibility Act. This bill would simply repeal the cap on SALT deductions and send a message: No more to burdensome taxes, and yes to our families keeping more money in their hands.

I am also proud to serve as co-chair of the bipartisan SALT Caucus as we continue to work together to repeal this cap and help lower taxes for my constituents and businesses.

I will continue to do all I can to deliver results for California's 39th District. I thank Representative SUOZZI for organizing this Special Order and for his leadership to repeal the SALT cap.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Congresswoman KIM so much and thank her for being here this evening.

You have been hearing about the SALT cap and the effect on your constituents. Have they been talking to you about this a great deal?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, on a regular basis we have had townhalls and we have had regular meetings throughout my business roundtable discussions, and they brought this issue up over and over.

Mr. SUOZZI. And are people talking about leaving the region because of the effect of the taxes? I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KIM of California. In the last several years we have had many thousands of Californians leaving to other States like Texas, and I have to literally go over there to meet my friends and listen to these problems. So, yes, this is a major issue, and I will continue to work with the gentleman to repeal the SALT cap.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman KIM for her comments.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been a real leader on the issue of SALT, and who has been outspoken ever since 2017 on this issue. We are grateful to him.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SUOZZI for yielding.

When talking about the SALT deduction, we are not griping about something that came about yesterday. The SALT deduction goes back to the Civil War. We are talking about 150 years of history when President Lincoln had to fund a brand-new army to crush the traitor States in the South. So we must use the 150-year history as a baseline for our tax policy when discussing reform.

It is not low-hanging fruit as it was in 2017 when they looked for the money for the false tax cuts and they got slammed out of office in 2018. Go to the facts.

Abe knew what he was doing, how it took money away from the States. They couldn't build hospitals. They couldn't build schools. They couldn't build roads. He knew what he was doing. The States needed money, too.

Republicans targeted blue States. They bragged about it. I couldn't believe it. I couldn't believe my ears when I heard them on the floor of the House openly admitting it. They made no qualms about it. They targeted these blue States when passing their 2017 tax scam. Talk about a hoax. They bragged about it.

Its motivations alone are disqualifying, but its impacts are worse. SALT was a lifeline to the middle class. Despite half-truths and outright falsehoods, SALT is about the middle class, and if you can't stand up for the middle class, you shouldn't be here.

In 2017, 42 percent of the Jersey taxpayers, nearly 2 million people, deducted their State and local taxes, averaging over \$19,000 per household. That is a \$9,000 increase in taxes. Those phonies did it. That is why they got smashed in 2018.

More than 81 percent of those who deducted SALT earned less than \$200,000. Naysayers claim this deduction only benefits the well-off. They do not recognize the cost of living in our States. The same people who voted for the tax cuts that helped the 1 percent, the 1.5 percent, they felt badly about the rich people who—one clown who went to jail in New York State, before he went, he said that we had to take care of our donors. He said it. I didn't. I mean, he didn't go to jail for saying that. He played the stocks.

Middle income in New Jersey is not the same as Oklahoma or South Dakota. Housing, food, childcare, and transportation costs are much lower there. Our middle-class taxpayers are the pack mules of the U.S. tax system, and as one of our brothers from New Jersey would say, we are tired of being the lackeys for these other States. Look who is paying Federal taxes.

Our middle-class taxpayers will no longer sit idly by. This cap dumped even more weight on the backs of my constituents in my district, the Ninth District of New Jersey. I appreciate the growing recognition that relief is needed.

Senator SANDERS' budget draft is an important step in the right direction. But we have got to think big. We demand relief now for our States and our middle-class constituents. They are the backbone of the Biden administration's coalition. Just last week, we stood shoulder to shoulder with working-class firefighters, police officers, and teachers who support our SALT demands. Our urgency is absolute.

We won't allow our neighbors' pay to be taken for granted. I will close with just four words: No SALT, no deals. And I will close by saying that Abraham Lincoln, one of the greatest Presidents in the history of the country, a true patriot, he stood behind the middle class. He knew what the States went through.

This is the oldest deduction on the books, and they have criminalized it. And if anything I reported here is not right, I hope they stand up and say that it is not right. I have got the other facts here. What other facts are you talking about?

Mr. SUOZZI. Well, I thank Mr. PASCRELL very much for his comments. I wanted to mention that the gentleman served as the mayor of his hometown. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, I did.

Mr. SUOZZI. And you talk about President Lincoln when the Federal Tax Code was first adopted, and the idea was that we didn't want the Federal Government stopping local governments and State governments from being the laboratories of democracy.

Mr. PASCRELL. That is right. It is a fact of life, yes.

Mr. SUOZZI. And so they put a deduction in place for State and local taxes so that State and local governments could govern the way they wish.

Mr. PASCRELL. And they could build the hospitals and the schools and

the roads. Where were they going to get the money if the Federal Government took all of the money to fight the war?

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I know that the gentleman has always been a strong proponent for law enforcement, for the firefighters, and public safety officials, and they are very dramatically negatively affected by this. Is that right?

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes. And many of the first responders came out and supported this bill last week.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. PASCRELL very much for his comments.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), a good friend and a leader, not just on this issue but in Congress.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and certainly for his wonderful leadership on this issue.

Anyone that is tuned in this evening from across the country is hearing a lot of passion spilling over at the podiums here, and for very good reason. In 2017, despite the opposition of every single Democrat in the United States House of Representatives and some Republicans, Congress passed a tax law that bulldozed the State and local tax deductibility. This hurts a lot of people.

Now, that was close to a \$5 trillion package and so why was this bulldozed? They went through the Tax Code looking for things that were deductible to lower the price tag of a highly inequitable tax package. And the SALT deduction, as it is known, was then capped at \$10,000 for both individuals and then for married couples filing jointly.

I viewed this then, as I do today, as an assault on the middle class of our country. It was one of the main reasons that I voted against the 2017 tax law. Now I think that if you ask the question of 435 Members of the House: Do you support the middle class? They would all say "yes." But the RECORD shows something else.

We know that everyone aspires to get into the middle class, and we know that the middle class, as my father always used to say, is made up of extraordinary, ordinary people who are the backbone of this country. And that is why this policy is so wrong and it is so hurtful.

This is a very important deduction for the middle class. Middle class, you file long term, and you have four areas that you can deduct: mortgage interest deduction, charitable contributions, healthcare expenses, and State and local taxes. And they wiped that out.

Now, you tell me whether that is fair or not. I don't think so. And I don't think people across the country do either. Capping the SALT deduction affects nearly 200,000 families in my congressional district.

I am not talking about the whole State of California. I am talking about

California's 18th Congressional District, and it has raised taxes on over a million households in the State of California. Prior to this harmful cap, my constituents—hold on to your seats, hold on to your hats—deducted an average of \$63,083 in State and local taxes. Wiped it out.

Some have unfairly, I think, maligned the SALT deduction as a benefit for the wealthy. I think it is an essential deduction for taxpayers in high-cost, high-tax States like California. And that has been spoken to earlier. That is a very important legitimate case to be made. In the bay area, the beautiful bay area of California, northern California, the cost of living is really very expensive, and it keeps going up.

□ 2000

And it is so high that the Economic Policy Institute estimates that a family of four needs to earn more than \$100,000 to earn a modest but adequate standard of living. That is simply a fact.

So prior to the law, more than 3 million households in California with an income of less than that annually claimed this deduction, as did nearly one-third of taxpayers nationwide.

This evening, I think each one of us can outline why this is wrong; why the deductibility needs to be restored. Congress needs to reform our tax code. And when we do, so should the restoration of this deductibility be restored.

Why?

Because, again, the middle class is the backbone of America. We should not be assaulting them. We should be assisting them.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for leading this effort this evening. It is a worthy one.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this and for being such a fierce advocate for the middle class.

I now introduce a good friend of mine from California, who really had a district that was devastated by COVID. People lost their jobs at one of the greatest entertainment facilities in the country, and now he wants to tell us about how SALT is affecting his district.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is right, Madam Speaker, COVID really devastated my community, but, more importantly, SALT also landed a devastating punch.

This issue is about proud Californians who pay more than their fair share of Federal taxes. It is about equity for fellow Americans, like Californians, and other States like California.

California today is still the largest State in the United States in terms of population and economic activity. For years and years, California has been a net donor State to the United States.

Let me repeat. For years and years, California has paid more Federal dollars than it gets back from the Federal Government.

We Californians work hard. We live in a State that generates tremendous economic activity, and we have a very high cost of living. And we pay more—we pay more than our fair share of taxes proudly. As Americans, we pay our Federal taxes proudly.

So I ask why? Why is the Federal Government not being fair to States like California?

So why do we randomly have a law that arbitrarily caps our State and local tax deductibility on our Federal taxes?

This SALT cap hurts. It hurts my friends and neighbors. It hurts middle-class families in California. In my State, the average price of a home, a used house, middle class, is now close to \$800,000.

So why would we make it more difficult, more expensive for a middle-class family to buy a home?

I say to all of you, both sides of the aisle, let's be fair and let's be equitable to the middle class in this country. Join me in thanking States like California for paying more than their fair share of Federal taxes. Join me by eliminating the SALT cap, that is deductibility of local taxes on the Federal return.

And I say to you: No SALT deductibility, no deal.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I just want to—some people, when they hear you talk about this, and they hear a home worth \$500,000, \$600,000, \$700,000, \$800,000, they think, boy, that person must be really rich.

What they don't seem to understand is that in my State, in your State, and many of the States represented here, those are actually middle-class home values.

Mr. CARBAJAL. That is a starter home.

Mr. SUOZZI. So we have to recognize that the country is not the same all over. If you make \$150,000 in your household, you are in the top 20 percent of the income earners of the country.

However, if you make \$150,000 in your district or my district, you are not a rich person. If you make \$150,000 in Oklahoma or in Iowa or North Dakota, you may be a wealthy person. So we have to recognize these regional differences.

People say: Well, why should we be subsidizing what you are doing?

And the gentleman points out so clearly in what he just spoke about that we are, in fact, in our States, subsidizing the rest of the country. We are net donors and they are net takers.

Mr. CARBAJAL. We pay more than our fair share of Federal taxes year after year.

Mr. SUOZZI. I thank the gentleman for being such a fierce advocate.

Madam Speaker, I want to travel across the country from California now

to New Jersey, to another fierce advocate; someone who served in the U.S. military as a Navy helicopter pilot for 5 years both in the Middle East and in Europe; someone who has been one of the fiercest advocates for the reinstatement of the SALT deduction.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be rising today alongside so many of my colleagues to declare loudly that the time has come to finally address the State and local tax deduction cap for families that have been slapped with this double tax for 4 long years.

In States like New Jersey, we pride ourselves on making the investments necessary to sustain our top-tier public schools, invest in infrastructure and open spaces, and support a prevailing wage for our unions. That is why people move to my State. That is why families stay for generations.

But when the SALT deduction cap imposed by the 2017 Trump tax bill instituted, our ability to keep making those key investments was threatened.

The SALT deduction cap affects residents in every corner of my district. It impacts families made up of teachers, first responders, and public servants.

For my constituents and millions of taxpayers throughout the country, the bottom line is you don't have to be a millionaire to be impacted by SALT. The simple fact is that it has imposed a harmful double tax and has created one of the largest marriage penalties in the Federal tax code.

With the SALT cap in place, States and localities face increased pressure to cut back on important investments in priorities like education, prevailing wages, infrastructure, environmental protections, and services for seniors. Those investments became harder to make when the Federal Government decided to tax New Jersey families twice. This means that more New Jerseyans' money is going to the Federal Government, instead of being invested in our local communities.

The result will be less spending over time on these priorities, which would be a detriment to ensuring our economy works for everyone.

I have been fighting since my first day in office to repeal the SALT deduction cap. I have helped secure passage of a repeal twice in this very Chamber. And I feel confident that so many of my colleagues understand this issue and why it is critical that we repeal it; largely because of the work and advocacy of the Members who are speaking here tonight.

But we need to keep up this fight for our constituents. As we head into crunch time on infrastructure negotiations in Congress, now is the time to deliver relief for families across New Jersey and States around the country that are disproportionately impacted by this harmful double tax.

Last week, I launched an initiative back in New Jersey, declaring it the

Summer of SALT, to make it clear that we will do everything in our power to make it happen. There simply isn't another option for New Jersey families.

Mr. SUOZZI. Congresswoman, you have been an amazing advocate. You mentioned in your remarks at the end there about this being a double tax. Can you tell us a little bit about that?

Ms. SHERRILL. Sure. So as you know, the people in my district pay State and local taxes, and that is what funds our great public school system. New Jersey has the best public school system for 2 years running in the Nation; types of things like that, services that our New Jersey families care so much about. And now the Federal Government is taxing that money. So you are getting taxed twice in New Jersey, to really put downward pressure on our ability to fund those great public services.

Mr. SUOZZI. So you are getting taxed on the taxes you have already paid.

Ms. SHERRILL. Exactly.

Mr. SUOZZI. So if a family makes \$100,000 in your State, and they have to pay \$20,000 in taxes, between their property taxes and their income taxes, that leaves them with \$80,000 of that income.

However, if they are in a low tax State where they don't have as good services, they start with \$100,000, but they only pay \$5,000 in State and local taxes, they have got \$95,000 left in income.

Ms. SHERRILL. Yep. Exactly.

Mr. SUOZZI. But they are being taxed the same at the Federal level.

Ms. SHERRILL. And now not able to deduct that.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, now I want to go across the aisle again to Congresswoman MICHELLE STEEL from California, who is also being accosted by her constituents. They are talking to her about the fact that they need the SALT deduction back.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. STEEL).

Mrs. STEEL. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman SUOZZI for leading this important tax matter. It is very important to our constituents.

Taxpayers in California's 48th Congressional District, which I am proud to represent, were responsible for 19.8 percent of all SALT deductions in 2018.

The average SALT deduction lost in my district was \$28,532. In a place like Orange County, where we already pay some of the highest taxes in the country, this cap takes more money from hardworking families.

There were great improvements made in the 2017 tax reform law, like simplifying the tax code and making the corporate tax rate more on par with other nations. But it also chose winners and losers; and, unfortunately, those in high-cost-of-living States, like in New York and California, are paying the price.

This is a bipartisan issue because we know how much this affects hard-

working families in these high-cost States. I do think we can make progress on this, but not at the cost of raising taxes on Americans and American businesses, especially at a time when we are working to rebuild our local economies and get businesses back open.

This is a bipartisan issue. We can't muddy the water by adding it to partisan legislation that will pass on party line only. I don't want to see additional tax gimmicks come before Congress. I want the deduction back on the table.

I am proud to support two pieces of legislation that would fully repeal the SALT cap. One bill by my fellow Californian, MIKE GARCIA; and the other one by New York Congressman THOMAS SUOZZI.

Our constituents should keep more of their hard-earned money. It belongs to them, not the Federal Government.

I am proud to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue calling for a repeal of the SALT cap.

Mr. SUOZZI. Congresswoman, thank you so much for being here tonight and for speaking out on this very important issue. We are grateful for your presence here tonight.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to go to the middle of the country, to the State of Illinois, where my good friend who serves on the Ways and Means Committee really is one of the brightest minds in Congress today, who wants to speak to us about the SALT deduction and its effect on his district.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Congressman SUOZZI, I am grateful for you holding this Special Order. I am grateful for your friendship in Congress and the work we do together on many things, but, in particular, on our efforts to repeal the onerous cap on the SALT deduction.

In 2017, the Trump administration raised taxes for middle-class families in Illinois and across the country by capping the State and Local Tax deduction at \$10,000.

The decision was both bad policy and bad politics. Capping the SALT deduction raised the tax burden for Illinois working families and small business owners.

In the 10th District, my district, 42 percent of families rely on the SALT deduction. Statewide in Illinois, one in three taxpayers file using the SALT deduction affected by this cap.

And this deduction is not a tax break on the wealthy. Eighty-five percent of Illinois filers who take the SALT deduction are middle-income individuals and families.

I have heard from constituents, and some of them want to move out of Illinois because their taxes are simply too expensive. I see everything our communities have to offer, from our schools, our parks, our public places, communities that make a difference and make a great place to raise family; and it

breaks my heart that someone would choose not to live in the 10th District just because of an unfair decision made to increase the tax burden to punish States like Illinois.

The SALT cap also makes it harder for our cities to provide essential services, like police departments, fire services, fire protection services, libraries and public health. These services and the workers performing them are the backbones of our community. The pandemic has already strained their budgets, and we do not need to strain them any further.

Finally, it is no accident which States are most affected by the SALT cap. These are the States most affected: Illinois, New York, New Jersey, and California.

These States have made the decision to invest in their communities, to invest in their people. They have invested in their children, their schools, their infrastructure. We should not be double-taxed just because we have decided that we want to continue to pay to make our communities stronger.

Reinstating the full SALT deduction is a decision about fairness and responsibility. A Federal tax on income already paid to State and local governments is, quite simply, double taxation. We have the responsibility to stand up for our families, our small businesses, and our communities.

□ 2015

We need a tax system that is fair, lifts our Nation, and gives our children the future that we all want them to have. It is critical that we reinstate the full SALT deduction and reduce the tax burden for middle-class families across the country.

Mr. SUOZZI. Congressman, I want to thank you so much. You hit on the topic of fairness so many times. Many of our States and our local governments have relied on this deduction for literally a hundred years, and it was suddenly taken away in 2017. It has had a dramatic effect.

Can you briefly touch on fairness one more time?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Absolutely. As you know, when the income tax was put in place more than 100 years ago, it was a decision that communities, that States that decided to invest in their people, would not be double taxed.

Yet, in 2017, the decision of the Republicans was to specifically attack these States, these blue States like Illinois and New York. It is unfair to these communities that are investing in schools, public services, fire departments, police departments, making the decision to responsibly pay for them, and then have their residents told they have to pay a second time with the Federal tax.

To add on top of that, these are the States, like New York and Illinois, who pay more to the Federal Government than they get back. So not only are we getting double taxed, we have a burden of subsidizing the States that are attacking us now.

So this is absolutely unfair. It is unfair to the States. But, more importantly, it is unfair to the families we represent.

Mr. SUOZZI. Thank you, Congressman. It really galls me sometimes when I hear people boasting about the fact that they are leaving our States and moving to other States, when, in fact, we are subsidizing the rest of the country with our tax dollars. Thank you so much for your leadership on this issue. We are very grateful.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), one of the most progressive Members of the United States Congress, and also one of the great intellects who has been so passionate about this issue and has some very interesting things to share with us.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I am here today to champion tax fairness for every American across the country, across parties, and across the aisle. We are here tonight to talk about what does it mean to have a fair tax system.

Since coming to Congress, I have repeatedly heard from my constituents about how the Trump tax bill doubled the taxes they owe due to an arbitrary cap on allowable State and local tax deductions, often called SALT.

In the last year before this arbitrary \$10,000 cap was imposed, nearly two in five taxpayers in my district claimed the SALT deduction, and their average deduction was \$22,000 per household. They were paying an average of \$22,000 in State and local taxes.

Capping the SALT deduction created double taxation on those families, and it penalized millions of middle-class families—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—based solely on the State where they live.

It is an unfair Federal tax system to penalize people based solely on their State of residence, yet that is what this arbitrary SALT tax cap does.

Given the rising cost of housing, prescription drugs, college, and childcare, every dollar counts for American families and families in Orange County. This is especially true after a year of financial hardship during which millions of families across the country are struggling to stay afloat.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the country and across the aisle to restore the State and local tax deduction to create a fairer tax system for every American.

Mr. SUOZZI. Congresswoman, I ask you, please go into it a little bit further about this concept of double taxation. We have heard it several times here tonight. Just explain what you mean by double taxation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the Congresswoman for a colloquy.

Ms. PORTER. The basic principle of an income tax is that you are taxed on the money that you have available to purchase things, to purchase goods and services, to invest, to save. You are taxed on that. That is what a progressive system of taxation means.

When you are having taxes taken out of your paycheck, or you owe taxes to your State and local government, you do not have that income left over.

So let's use an example. If someone earns \$100,000 and they pay, as is typical in my district, \$20,000 in State and local tax, that is not optional. They must pay that \$20,000 under the law. What they have left to provide for their family, to save for college, to pay for housing, to do other things, is \$80,000. That is the amount of income that the Federal Government should tax.

What the SALT cap does is say to the family earning \$100,000: You can only deduct \$10,000, a completely arbitrary number.

What that does is say to a family that only has \$80,000 left because they had to pay the county, they had to pay the city, they had to pay for fire services and school services. And they pay that money because they are proud of their community and they want our communities to thrive. But then they are taxed as if they have \$90,000 available to them, but they don't. They only have \$80,000.

So this whole idea of capping the State and local tax deduction is completely contrary to the entire basic theory of an income tax, which is you pay tax on your available income. If you owe money to the State and county government, whether it is for property tax or State or city taxes, you do not have that money left.

In effect, these families are being asked to pay money and find money they do not have relative to their peers in other parts of the country. That is simply an unfair tax system.

Mr. SUOZZI. It is very important, Congresswoman, what you point out. This is a mandatory payment. You are not spending the money to go on vacation; you are not spending money to go out to dinner; you are not building an addition onto your home. This is a mandatory expense that you must pay, as you said, to your county, to your village, or to your State. That is no longer available to you.

In other States where the overall income is exactly the same, but the mandatory taking is much smaller, the tax bill is not as burdensome.

Ms. PORTER. That is right. So the State and local tax deduction is really about saying that two families in two different States, trying to support themselves on the identical amount of income, ought to owe the same amount of Federal tax. That is what we are here to champion today.

I am proud to be doing it with colleagues from across the country and across the aisle.

Mr. SUOZZI. Congresswoman, I want to thank you so much for being here. We have had some Republicans across the aisle here tonight. We have had some moderate Democrats here tonight. And we have progressive Democrats, such as yourself, here.

I think it is important that we point out that actually the SALT deduction

is in keeping with progressive policy, because it supports those States that want to promote progressive policies within their States.

Ms. PORTER. That is right. Because cities and counties depend on the resources from State and local taxes to be able to pay for schools, to do a good job educating every single child, to make investments in roads and bridges, to pay first responders fair wages for putting their lives on the line to protect us.

These are the kinds of policies that progressives champion, and we cannot ask our cities and our States and, most importantly, our fellow Americans to make those kinds of investments on the city, county, village, and local level, and then have the Federal Government treat them unfairly solely because they are trying to do right by each other in their community.

Mr. SUOZZI. Congresswoman, thank you so much. We really appreciate you being here this evening to talk about this.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), back across to the other side of the country, one of my neighbors and good friends who serves as the chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus. He has been one of the strongest advocates for the reinstatement of the SALT deduction and the repeal of the SALT cap.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, we are here today representing tens of thousands of middle-class families, like those back in my home district in northern New Jersey, who got whacked with the 2017 tax hike bill, which gutted our State and local tax deduction with the disastrous \$10,000 cap.

It is high time that Congress and the rest of the country heard just how badly these hardworking families have been hurt by the SALT cap. It is something I know we heard about a lot tonight, and I really want to thank my dear friend TOM SUOZZI for his excellent leadership on this issue.

The usual naysayers continue to try to undermine our efforts to reinstate the State and local tax deduction, or SALT, by claiming it is just a giveaway to the wealthiest Americans. But anyone who actually lives in my district in northern New Jersey knows that the \$10,000 cap has hit middle-class families hard, many of whom are already struggling with high costs.

It has also caused residents and jobs to leave our State. And now, with a declining tax base, it's threatening our best-in-class schools, teachers, law enforcement, firefighters, and our State's services for hard-pressed families.

The cap on the State and local tax deduction does not solely impact the highest earners. It has also increased taxes on scores of middle-class families, as I said. It is a very important point to understand.

In Bergen County, which is the largest county I represent, for instance, before the cap was put in place, the aver-

age SALT deduction was above \$24,000 a year. Put another way, a married couple in Bergen County, a teacher and a law enforcement officer making a typical salary, could have had a SALT deduction of more than \$17,000.

According to reporting from New Jersey's Star-Ledger, if we reinstated the State and local tax deduction, nearly one-third of New Jersey residents, almost 3 million people, would get tax relief. Yes, they would get a tax cut they so desperately need. As many as 80 percent of them had incomes of \$216,000 or less.

Again, that is a firefighter and a teacher. That is hardly the 1 percent, especially in a high-cost-of-living area like New Jersey. I know the same thing is true of California, like we heard about from KATIE PORTER, or TOM SUOZZI's district in New York.

We know that when taxes goes up, it leads to an exodus of middle class and higher earners in State likes ours. In fact, according to United Van Lines, ever since the SALT cap, New Jersey has been the number one out-migration State in the entire country. New Jersey is losing its highest earners, and the disproportionate taxes they pay, to States like Florida, North Carolina, and Texas. That has only been exacerbated during the pandemic.

The SALT cap is literally draining the tax base out of States like New Jersey that offer far better schools and government-supported services to middle- and lower-income families than our counterparts in other parts of the Nation.

For instance, I mentioned \$15,000 is the median property tax in Bergen County, New Jersey. If you go to Mississippi, their median property tax is \$550 a year.

The New York Times editorial board even once reiterated this point that I am trying to make, where we have good services for hard-pressed families in States like mine and other State I mentioned, like Mississippi or Alabama, don't have the resources to offer those kinds of services.

So The New York Times editorial board made this point when they said that States like New Jersey and New York "generally do a better job of providing for the health and welfare of their citizens, and are more willing to pay for institutions that are good for society as a whole."

This is the difference between States like ours and moocher States like Mississippi and Alabama that tend not to give back to the people they represent.

Thankfully, there is real bipartisan work taking place here in Congress to reinstate the SALT deduction, to get more money back in the pockets of Jersey middle-class families, and to help stop residents from moving out and eroding our State's tax base.

Along with Congressman SUOZZI, I have helped introduce the SALT Deductibility Act, a bipartisan bill to fully restore the deduction.

In the SALT Caucus, with Congressman BILL PASCRELL, who spoke earlier,

we are working in a bipartisan way with more than 30 Members to find a way to get this done in Congress and to actually get tax relief for the middle-class families we represent. I am very proud to co-chair that bipartisan caucus.

This tax cut of reinstating SALT can be a win-win for everyone. Let's get the SALT deduction fully reinstated so that millions of Americans and families nationwide can finally get some relief.

Working together in a bipartisan way, I believe we really can get this done so that our best days are always ahead of us.

Mr. SUOZZI. Congressman GOTTHEIMER, thank you so much for pointing out all of those important points.

I want to go back to one thing that you have mentioned here tonight. We have heard from Senator MCCONNELL and from others the concept of a blue State bailout, the idea that the SALT deduction is some sort of advantage for blue States. But you talked about how your State is actually a net donor to the Federal Government.

Could you tell us a little bit more about that?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman for a colloquy.

□ 2030

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to.

One of the biggest challenges people don't realize for States like New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and California is how much our taxpayers pay into the Federal Government and, historically, how we get back less in return than some of the other States in the country do.

For instance, for every dollar that Mississippi sends to the Federal Government, they get \$4.38 back. Alabama, I believe, receives \$4.32 back. The State of Louisiana starts its budget every year with half coming from the Federal Government.

States like Jersey, we get back 67 cents, historically, on the dollar.

What does that mean? It means that we pay lots of money to Washington. People like me are fighting to claw more back to Jersey, but we know that other States benefit more.

When the tax hike bill passed in 2017, and the red States gutted the State and local tax deduction, capping it at \$10,000, what they did was shift actually even more of the tax burden over to blue States like ours, and the red States benefited even more.

It just reiterates, even more, the importance of actually reinstating the State and local tax deduction, not only because, as KATIE PORTER said, it is double taxation and not only because it has been around since 1913 or even before for exactly this purpose. It is because we recognize that some States pay more than others, and we have to find ways to balance that out. Otherwise, we are going to keep losing people from States like ours to States like Florida and other red States.

Frankly, that is why it is so important that we fight back to get tax relief for the people that we represent, to make sure they can afford to live in our States and that we have a good tax base to be able to have great schools and stand by law enforcement, firefighters, and others.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, Mr. GOTTHEIMER has been a great champion on this issue. I am grateful to him for pointing that out.

I know, in the case of my State of New York, in the past 5 years, New York has sent \$150 billion more to the Federal Government than they have received back in Federal services or Federal contracts, whereas MITCH MCCONNELL's State in the past 5 years, this same period, they have received \$150 billion more in services and contracts than they have put back into the system.

The gentleman's advocacy on this issue has been stellar. I am grateful to him for being here tonight.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman SUOZZI for putting together this Special Order hour.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time that my colleagues and I have had tonight to make these different points.

I want to close by saying this is about fairness. It is not fair.

It is not fair that the State and local tax deduction has been in place for over 100 years so State and local governments have relied on this deduction in order to fund the programs that we have.

It is not fair that people are being taxed on taxes that they have already paid.

It is not fair that the taxes that are being paid in these States are no longer deductible on people's income tax returns.

It is not fair that, after all these years of relying on this deduction, it is no longer in place, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been boasting about people leaving my State and going to their States while we are, in fact, subsidizing those very States.

This is a battle that is going to continue. Hopefully, over the next few months, we will be able to build a coalition, together, of Democrats and Republicans who recognize that this unfairness has to be addressed and that we need to restore the State and local tax deduction for the benefit of the residents of my State and people throughout the United States of America who are relying on basic fairness.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of ending the cap on State and Local Tax deductions—better known as the SALT deduction.

For more than 100 years, an idea dating back to Abraham Lincoln, the SALT deduction has allowed families to deduct taxes already paid to state and local government from their federal tax returns.

Many middle-class Americans benefit from this commonsense tax policy every year. In

past years, almost a third of Rhode Islanders have claimed the SALT deductions, including almost 60 percent of people in my district who make between \$75–100,000 per year.

The destructive 2017 Trump tax cuts, however, imposed a \$10,000 cap on SALT deductions, meaning that if a family pays more than \$10,000 in state and local taxes, the taxes paid in excess of that \$10,000 can no longer be deducted from federal returns raising those families' tax liability significantly.

It just doesn't make sense to have Americans, especially middle-class families living in states with high tax rates, pay extra taxes on the taxes they have already paid.

Most middle-class Americans living in high tax areas are there so their children can go to high caliber public schools or receive better programs.

Many of them made 10, 20, and 30-year investments in home ownership in these high tax areas, relying on the SALT deduction that had been in place for more than 100 years when budgeting for this big expense.

Then they had the rug pulled out from under them and were told they were suddenly liable for thousands of dollars more in taxes per year. For many of these people, that extra tax is a significant portion of their annual income.

These Americans are working hard to give their families the best life possible. Putting a secondary tax on the taxes they have already paid will force many middle-class Americans to struggle.

In fact, middle-class Americans have said that the SALT Cap will, quote: "wipe them out" by forcing them to pay those extra federal taxes in addition to state and local.

This is why I cosponsored H.R. 613, the SALT Deductibility Act, this Congress.

This bipartisan bill would reverse the 2017 law and allow Americans to use the SALT deductions when paying federal taxes without a \$10,000 cap, keeping money in the hands of American working families.

I applaud Congressman SUOZZI for introducing this important legislation. It will have a significant impact to help American families, which is especially important after the devastating economic effect of COVID-19 that has left so many middle-class Americans struggling financially, including many Rhode Islanders.

The 2017 law was more than a mistake, it was bad policy, and I hope that this body does the right thing by taking action to correct it.

SUPPORTING STRONG NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of strong national security policies, policies like the remain in Mexico policy, enforcement of our existing interior immigration laws, and the completion of key miles of fencing and technology that protect our southwest border—policies, Madam Speaker, that President Biden hastily removed on his first day in office, without any plan to replace them.

President Biden and the Democrats in the House and Senate supported end-

ing those Trump-era policies. Those policies, Madam Speaker, were working to rein in the flow of illegal immigration.

Now, with no plan and no substitution, the result is pure political theater, simply because those were Trump policies. While they were working, President Biden stopped them.

President Biden appointed Vice President HARRIS to serve as the border czar. One would think that she would act in critical ways to replace those national security policies that were working under the Trump administration and that President Biden ended. Not only did she not present solutions to the historic number of hundreds of thousands of immigrants who were pouring across our southern border, but she refused to visit the border for nearly 100 days since being appointed border czar.

She even laughed at the idea of visiting the border, comparing it to taking a trip to Europe. Finally, after cries from the American people and calls from House and Senate Republicans, she did agree to take a trip to the border.

Madam Speaker, I have been to the border seven times over the past 5½ years, most recently in April. Specifically, I traveled to the Rio Grande sector in the Rio Grande Valley. The conditions I found there were worse than I have seen on my previous trips. In fact, Border Patrol estimates that the drug cartels in Mexico made \$400 million in February alone in human trafficking.

Think about that, Madam Speaker: \$400 million in one month by charging \$5,000 to \$9,000 to traffic hundreds of thousands of people across the border, some innocent, some not.

These drug and human trafficking challenges are just part of the crisis at the border because while Customs and Border Patrol are working on the humanitarian elements of this crisis, drugs are coming across the border and criminals are coming across the border.

In fact, Madam Speaker, we have interdicted in the first 6 months of this year enough fentanyl to kill all in America. It is shocking that we have interdicted that much fentanyl drug that it could kill everyone in this country because it only takes the amount in a Sweet'N Low packet, Madam Speaker, to kill 500 Americans. This is a deadly drug.

The Vice President chose to visit El Paso. El Paso is nearly 1,000 miles west of the Rio Grande Valley, where this crisis has its epicenter. If she had gone to the Rio Grande Valley, she would have seen cartels dropping off migrant families by the dozens and holding camps for migrant families struggling to get the water, time, and care that they need.

Regardless of who designed the policies, the Biden administration should be for stronger national security policies on the border. But the Biden border crisis is out of control, and it is going to take more than a short public relations visit to El Paso to fix it.

I encourage the Vice President and the administration to come to the table with Republicans in the House and Senate and implement strong national security borders and reform our broken illegal immigration system.

ANNOUNCING AMERICAN HOSTAGE TASK FORCE

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce that the Congressional Task Force on Americans Wrongfully Detained Abroad has been initiated by Congressman TED DEUTCH from Florida and myself.

The inspiration for me to form this task force was Majd Kamalmaz, a former resident of central Arkansas who was traveling to Syria to attend a family funeral where he was wrongfully detained and has been held in Syria ever since. I am dedicated to bringing him home safely to his family.

Having a loved one detained or held hostage abroad is unimaginable. It is a heartbreaking experience for any family.

Representative DEUTCH and I created this task force not only to help these struggling families but to be a resource for our colleagues in the House, as there are over 50 families here in America who are struggling with a member of their family held abroad. We want to help Members of Congress help their constituents cope with this issue.

Every channel of the United States Government should be working to bring these Americans home and to disincentivize the wrongful detention of Americans in the future, by state actors or nonstate actors.

Madam Speaker, I am committed to bringing Majd Kamalmaz home to his family. TED DEUTCH and I are committed to using this task force to bring other Americans wrongfully detained home, into the arms of their loved ones.

MARKING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CCP

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, a century ago, the Chinese Communists took control of one of the great countries in global history. The Chinese Communist Party marks, this month, a century since the beginning of China's descent into authoritarianism.

Just as the Chinese Communist Party used violence to impose its will onto the Chinese people during the Chinese Civil War, now it uses that same violence and threat of violence to crush any dissent within its borders.

We saw this last summer, when the CCP silenced the democratic voices of Hong Kong, swiftly marching troops into the city to stop demonstrations for freedom. Beijing has blatantly ignored the terms of its 50-year treaty with the United Kingdom and ignored Hong Kong's legislature, arresting pro-democracy activists and lawmakers en masse and crushing a long history of press freedom with the recent closing of Apple Daily.

As I speak, over a million Uighurs and other Muslims have been interned in concentration camps for reeducation. Families have been separated, lives destroyed, and cultures all but

erased in the name of the magnificent Chinese Communist Party's ultimate authority.

Respect for human rights is a fundamental tenet of American foreign policy. The continued suffering of the Uighurs, the citizens of Hong Kong—and all other individual rights of speech, privacy, assembly, and religious belief are trampled by the Chinese Communist Party.

It is no 100-year celebration here on the House floor, Madam Speaker. The American people stand with the hardworking people of China. The Congress of the United States stands with the hardworking people of China, and we will work to continue to advocate for freedom of people, assembly, belief, and press in China.

APPLAUDING FBI CYBER BUSTS

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the tireless dedication of members of the FBI in recently seizing approximately \$2.3 million from the hacker group responsible for the Colonial Pipeline ransomware attack.

After the Colonial Pipeline paid the hackers the entire \$4.4 million ransom, and with the money seemingly lost forever due to bitcoin encryption, these FBI agents were able to recover more than half of the demanded sum.

I am also proud to recognize that the FBI conducted 800 arrests in 16 countries thanks to an encrypted messaging app it developed as part of a 3-year digital sting operation on international crime.

Just as encrypted, untraceable communications have become pervasive in how criminal enterprise operates on a global scale, ransomware attacks have been on the rise as they prey on the digital vulnerability of our businesses and infrastructure, often with little hope of recovery or justice.

I applaud the vigilance and ingenious methods of the investigating agents and encourage their continued efforts to ensure safety in our digital age.

REINTRODUCING COPTIC CHRISTIAN RESOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my resolution, H. Res. 117, which calls on the Egyptian Government to end the culture of impunity for attacks on Christians and to undertake the arrest, prosecution, and conviction of individuals who carry out attacks on Copts and other Christians in Egypt.

I was the lead on a nearly identical resolution in previous Congresses. I truly appreciate the support I received from my original cosponsor, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), and nearly 50 of my House colleagues who have cosponsored the resolution in this Congress.

Madam Speaker, Egypt and the United States are important partners in the fight against terrorism. Egypt's role at Camp David has led to some of the closest ties between the United States, Egypt, and Israel in their history, and we are grateful for their most recent engagement between the terror

group Hamas in the Gaza Strip and the Government of Israel.

Madam Speaker, I respect President el-Sisi and his good relationship with the Coptic Pope. He has attended Mass on multiple occasions. He has had some churches reconstructed, and he has constructed the largest Christian cathedral in the Middle East in the new administrative center in Egypt. And President el-Sisi is relentless in holding terrorists accountable for their atrocities.

□ 2045

People all around the world, regardless of their religious affiliation deserve the same freedom to practice their chosen religion like we have enjoyed here in the United States for more than 200 years.

The respect for human rights and religious freedom is a fundamental tenet of American foreign policy. I will continue to advocate for the Coptic Christians and all Egyptians, be they Christian or Muslim, who together take their water from the Nile.

ARKANSANS SHOULD CHECK THE STATUS OF THEIR PASSPORTS

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge all Arkansans to check the status of their passports well before traveling.

Due to backlogs in the State Department, passport renewals by mail are taking longer than usual. There is a backlog of up to 10 weeks for their expedited service and 18 weeks for their regular service.

This lag in service at the State Department is affecting Arkansans wanting to travel for mission trips, study abroad, or take a family trip in the aftermath of the pandemic.

So far, my office has helped 70 people this year receive their passports, and we have opened more than 90 cases in the past 6 months. And this compares to opening cases and receiving passports of only about 200 in the 5 previous years.

So, to my friends in Arkansas, check your passport prior to your trip, and if it is expired, get it renewed as soon as possible.

I encourage everyone to stay up to date on passport services and travel advisories and to check COVID-19 protocols, masks, testing, and quarantine issues before you travel.

ARKANSANS MUST GET VACCINATED

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to encourage all Arkansans who are not currently vaccinated for COVID-19 to consult with their doctor about getting the COVID-19 vaccine.

The best way to combat the spread of these COVID variants is by receiving the vaccine. As more information and research develops around the delta variant of the coronavirus, I want to ensure that all Arkansans stay safe and remain healthy as we prepare for this spread.

The only way that we can fully reopen our economy and get truly back on our feet is with more people being vaccinated for COVID-19.

Each FDA conditionally approved vaccine is backed by science and doctors who have worked hard over the past year to develop, manufacture, and distribute these critical vaccines.

So work with your physician. Help protect your family and the Arkansas community by getting a vaccine shot soon.

RECOGNIZING GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize that June is Great Outdoors Month and recognize the great conservation work of my colleagues in Arkansas in the Governor's office and at the Arkansas Department of Parks and Tourism.

As a lifelong outdoorsman living in The Natural State, I have a lot of pride in recognizing June as Great Outdoors Month. For 9 generations, my family has lived in Arkansas and enjoyed the extraordinary natural beauty throughout our State.

I agree with many of the earliest conservationists in protecting our wildlife and our wild places and that can be done through reasonable and realistic means, and I am proud to continue my work in central Arkansas.

Just last week, I joined Governor Asa Hutchinson and Secretary of Parks and Tourism Stacy Hurst in announcing the new Office of Outdoor Recreation and the addition of a great new wild place in central Arkansas: Blue Mountain just west of Pinnacle Mountain. Just west of Rattlesnake Ridge, Blue Mountain will be a new opportunity for hiking, mountain biking, and enjoying the extraordinary view of Lake Maumelle from the Nature Conservancy and the Arkansas Department of Heritage's latest partnership to expand outdoor recreation.

In the same announcement, the Governor announced that our parks and tourism department would work with the Ouachita National Forest and open up Lake Sylvia Recreation Area and the old Camp Ouachita to year-round participation by Arkansans. This is a great partnership between the Federal Government and the State government to offer more outdoor recreation opportunities for our families to enjoy in The Natural State.

THE NATIONAL PERSONNEL RECORDS CENTER MUST GO DIGITAL

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness to the difficulty for many to obtain a critical document for our veterans: That is their form DD-214.

You can't do anything as a veteran without a copy of your DD-214. This paperwork is required to verify for our servicemembers their benefits, how to obtain a disability claim, funeral service, research about lost medals. We need a copy of your DD-214.

Well, the pandemic has not been good for this need for the millions of veterans in our country. The National Personnel Records Center shut down, and as we come out of the pandemic when our veterans need these resources, they are still terribly behind,

despite Congress appropriating more money.

It is critical that the National Personnel Records Center go digital so that we can properly verify these servicemembers and give better service for those who have served their country in such a valuable way.

It should not be difficult for our veterans to get their DD-214 to pursue their benefits or claim healthcare at our Veterans Administration. It shouldn't be a burden to a spouse, to a family of a fallen veteran to have the proper paperwork to have a proper funeral.

So I urge my colleagues to join me and continue to press the National Archives to improve their service for the bravest men and women and their families.

RECOGNIZING STEVE WELLS

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments and retirement of Catholic High School teacher and longtime friend Mr. Steve Wells.

Mr. Wells has been teaching at Catholic High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, for 38 years. His decision to end his long service at the school, having graduated there in 1973, is recognized by many as the end of an era at CHS.

Steve's a native of north Little Rock and came back to the school as a substitute English teacher in 1983. The teacher for which he was substituting never returned, and Steve Wells has been teaching there ever since.

When you walk into our beloved Catholic High there is a quote that is above the front door. It says: "Come boys, so that you may become men."

Mr. Wells did exactly that. And he served as a teacher and a role model for generations of students throughout the years.

I congratulate my friend, Steve Wells, on a dedicated career of helping boys become men and wish him the very best in his retirement.

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS' WOMEN VETERANS

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, today I rise in honor of Women's Armed Services Integration Act. I am proud to recognize the more than 20,000 women veterans in Arkansas.

Women have been serving in the military in different capacities for more than a century. Women like Deborah Sampson, who fought in the Revolutionary War, and Loretta Walsh, America's first official enlisted woman of any service.

They pioneered the way for women to serve in the United States Armed Forces. And with more women serving now than ever before at any time in our history, action is being taken to continue and build a positive environment for women in the armed services. Further, our Veterans Administration continues its efforts to enhance families, facilities, and services for our growing number of female veterans in Arkansas.

I thank the women of our armed services for their dedication and service to our country.

RECOGNIZING GRACIE LEE, ALYSSA HUIE, RANDILYNN STRIPLING, AND CATHERINE MILLS

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize four incredible young women on the Clinton Arkansas Future Farmers of America team.

Together, Gracie Lee, Alyssa Huie, Randilynn Stripling, and Catherine Mills made history by being the first all-female team to win not one, but two State competitions in electricity.

Due to the pandemic, the team was allowed to compete in the State contest a second time, making them back-to-back State champions in electricity.

This team serves as a great example to all the young Arkansans that are committed to working hard and being pioneers in their fields. I applaud them for their diligence and determination.

This team demonstrated great dedication, and I am incredibly proud to represent these history-making young women and all young Arkansans in central Arkansas.

RECOGNIZING MELVIN WILLIAMS

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the determination of Little Rock native, Melvin Williams. A terrible and unfortunate injury in high school ended his football dreams. His grades slipped, and Melvin dropped out of school.

Years later, Melvin had earned his high school diploma at a program at Goodwill Industries. The Excel Center at Goodwill is a fully accredited and cost-free public high school in Little Rock for adults 19 and older.

Not only is Mr. Williams now working toward a business degree at the University of Arkansas Pulaski Tech, he is one of Goodwill's newest employees. He is in charge of recruitment and retention at Goodwill.

Goodwill Industries of Arkansas CEO Brian Marsh says, "Melvin is exactly who we need for this role."

I congratulate Melvin on his accomplishments and for being a wonderful representative for Goodwill Industries.

CONGRATULATING ELLIS FREEL

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Miss Ellis Freel on being a recipient of the Congressional Award Gold Medal.

The Congressional Award Gold Medal requires the recipient to complete a minimum of 400 hours of volunteer service, 200 hours of personal development, and 200 hours of physical fitness and 5 days of exploration or expedition.

Miss Freel cites the most challenging obstacle in completing the requirements of being a gold medalist as her 5-day wilderness expedition. Due to restrictions from the pandemic, Ellis had to make adjustments that taught her patience and flexibility.

Miss Freel serves as a wonderful asset to her hometown of Bryant, Arkansas, her college campus at the University of Arkansas and to Arkansas' Second Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING FINALISTS OF THE ARKANSAS
STATE CODING COMPETITION

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the finalists from central Arkansas in the fifth annual Arkansas State Coding competition and a finalist for the Arkansas Computer Science Educator of the Year Award.

The team taking third place at the State coding competition this year was from eStem High School in my hometown of Little Rock. The three-person team included Elijah Keen, Spencer Knight, and Sergio Markin. Each student received a \$29 college savings plan worth \$500, in addition to winning \$4000 for their school.

Also, a special congratulations to Kimberly Raup for being a finalist in the 2021 Computer Science Educator of the Year Award. She teaches at Conway High School, and she received a \$2,500 award for being named a finalist.

Congratulations to these students and to Ms. Raup on their awards, and a special thank you to the University of Arkansas at Little Rock for hosting this event.

It is events like this that allow our central Arkansas students to showcase their coding and STEM talents to show the importance of computer science for our youth.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY AMERICA

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I bring birthday greetings to our beloved Nation. I rise today to celebrate freedom and independence and democracy right here in the United States.

□ 2100

Madam Speaker, 245 years ago, our brave Founding Fathers gathered together in Philadelphia to sign the Declaration of Independence. And on that hot July, in that stuffy room in Philadelphia, they came together to change world history, to change history here in the United States, and to open up a lifetime of opportunity for generations of Americans yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, what amazes me about that time is that small committee of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, thinking through of how would we break with Great Britain, how would America leave Great Britain.

Madam Speaker, Jefferson was concerned. In his rough draft, he said of Great Britain and the United States: "We might have been a free and great people together."

Those words are not placed in the final copy of the Declaration of Independence, but it shows the struggle that the Founding Fathers had and Thomas Jefferson had as a principal author of how to make that break with a people they had respect for, and a king and a king's policies they despised.

"We might have been a free and great people together."

But think of the momentous feelings they had, the prayers they had every

day on their knees for strength to take on the most powerful country in the world, with the most powerful Navy and military in the world.

As Jefferson said: "... it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another ..." To pursue life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Jefferson, while he didn't include that statement about being partners as a free people going forward, he argued, "we have appealed to their"—the British—"native justice and magnanimity." And they were rejected.

Madam Speaker, think of the bravery there. As the signers of the Declaration, those Founders came together and said in the final closing words of the Declaration of Independence: "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

And they did that for those generations of Americans unborn in this great land.

So 245 years later, we have proven our resilience and our strength once again in coming through the pandemic, defeating COVID-19. And I am optimistic about the future of our beloved country. While it has been challenging over the last year and a few months, but compared to the challenges those Founders faced, compared to the challenges this country has faced many, many times before, we show our strength, we show our true mettle, we pull through as one Nation under God many times before.

So on this Fourth of July, I invite all Americans to celebrate our country's birthday with their friends and family. Honor our cherished freedoms. And may we never forget the sacrifices of those generations before us in public service, in uniform, on the battlefield, who have sacrificed so much so that we may enjoy those freedoms that we have today. God bless each of you and God bless our great country.

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

ESSENTIAL CAREGIVERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) for 30 minutes.

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise before you today to share the heart-breaking stories from Americans around the country, including my own district, who were cut off from their loved ones in long-term care facilities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

For the next several months in this Chamber, I will share harrowing testimony submitted to my office from these families.

Essential caregivers were prohibited from entering nursing homes, group homes, and other long-term care facilities

to provide an extra level of care and love, which is so desperately needed and deserved by those who call these facilities home.

Over the past year, long-term care facility residents suffered in isolation. Alone, many lost the will to live, and many others deteriorated physically and mentally.

While we cannot go back in time to fix what has been done, we can take steps today to prevent this from ever happening again. If Congress fails to act, we could see thousands more Americans die or suffer in isolation again.

I have introduced the bipartisan Essential Caregivers Act to fight for the rights of our seniors, our constituents living in group homes with disabilities, and anyone who resides in a long-term care facility. This also includes young children with developmental disabilities.

Under Federal law, residents in long-term care facilities have a right to receive visitors at any time. But during the pandemic, this right was curtailed completely. Many residents, including children with disabilities and seniors, were not allowed access to loved ones who had been caring for them prior to the pandemic. This took a tremendous toll on them.

My bipartisan bill addresses this issue by striking a commonsense compromise. It implements a new Federal standard that will end this indignity. This bill permits each facility resident to designate up to two essential caregivers who will be provided safe, reasonable, and transparent access to residents during any future public health emergency.

The Essential Caregivers Act is a compassionate step to ensure the most vulnerable among us never suffer alone again.

Why is this so important?

Because essential caregivers aren't just visitors; they are, as the name implies, caregivers who help with activities of daily living and provide emotional support and companionship.

This care enriches the lives of residents, enhances their well-being, and helps them thrive personally and socially. Without it, residents ultimately suffer. This is exactly what we saw during the 15-month lockdown.

The importance of the essential caregivers in no way diminishes the critical role that facility staff place in residents' lives, which during this pandemic was nothing short of heroic. Essential caregivers simply supplement the care provided by facility staff. They are a force multiplier that enhances the ability of residents to thrive and to live their lives fully.

Importantly, this bill upholds strict safety and health standards to protect residents, staff, and caregivers. Any essential caregiver must comply with whatever health standards are put in place by a facility. This includes requirements for testing, PPE, and social distancing.

In my home State of New York, one of the greatest tragedies of the COVID-19 pandemic was the suffering of those living in nursing and group homes. First, they suffered because of Governor Cuomo's negligent policy to return COVID-positive patients to long-term care facilities. Then they suffered by not being able to access the caregivers they depended on for so many years.

Today I want to tell their stories not only from the constituents I represent in New York, but also from those around the country who similarly suffered.

First, we remember the life of Ana Martinez. Vivian Zayas and Alexa Rivera are the cofounders of Voices for Seniors. Their mother is Ana Martinez, who was supposed to undergo a few weeks of physical therapy in West Islip, New York. But because of Governor Cuomo's COVID mandates, Vivian and Alexa were unable to tell their mother good-bye before she passed away after contracting COVID in the facility.

Vivian and Alexa has since made it their life's mission to see that no one else endures the hardships they experienced being cut off from their own mother.

We remember the life of Daniel Alvino. Tracey Alvino is the daughter of Daniel Alvino. Daniel was a veteran and a football fanatic. His family meant the world to him. His laugh was the highlight of all of their holiday parties.

In March 2020, Daniel was placed into a rehab facility in a New York nursing home after having neck surgery. Under Cuomo's nursing mandate, Tracey had no access to her father for a significant period of time. Daniel fell very ill and had to be rushed to a hospital and placed on a ventilator.

On April 14, 2020, Daniel Alvino passed away at the age of 76. It wasn't until a year later that his family finally held his funeral to commemorate his life that was cut far too short.

This evening, we remember Mr. Alvino.

We also remember the life of John Daly. John Daly was a husband, father of five, grandfather of nine, and a Marine veteran who served on the front lines in Korea. He and his wife, Mary, were together for 63 years until the day he entered the Gurwin Jewish Nursing Home and Rehabilitation Center at the time lockdowns were put in place.

John spent 20 days at the facility after having been hospitalized with pneumonia. Having suffered a minor stroke previously, John had limited use of his left arm and needed assistance.

□ 2110

Madam Speaker, his wife was the one who was normally there to help him in the facility, but she was cut off from him completely. She was no longer able to see John and received only infrequent phone calls.

Once his rehab was over, the family picked him up to find that he was no longer able to walk. His condition had deteriorated significantly. In a matter of days, the family had to choose between hospice or fighting for his life. They chose to fight.

Sadly, because of the isolation he faced, John was not eating enough to live. Sadly, John lost his life on May 24, 2020.

The family feels strongly that if his wife had been by his side, giving him the love and care that he needed, he would be with us today.

This evening, we remember John Daly.

Madam Speaker, we also remember the life of Rosemary Abraham. Karla Abraham-Conley is the daughter of Rosemary Abraham. Rosemary was admitted to a long-term care facility in September 2019.

Before the pandemic, Karla was by her mother's side as a caregiver. She took her to lunch, brought her to family dinners, and provided help with the day-to-day activities.

When March 2020 arrived, Karla was cut off from her mother completely. After months of isolation, speaking only over the phone, Karla noticed the toll that it was having on her mother's health.

Window visits were brutal and confusing for her mother. Karla's mother simply did not understand why Karla wasn't allowed in to see her.

As they spoke over FaceTime, Karla watched her mother deteriorate. Only after Karla pleaded for someone to care for her mother was she eventually sent to the emergency room due to poor health.

Sadly, Rosemary Abraham died 7 days later, on October 4, 2020. She died from isolation, failure to thrive, and neglect.

If Karla had been allowed to be in the facility with her mother, she would likely be alive today.

This evening, we remember Rosemary Abraham and remember that Karla Abraham-Conley was one of the people who inspired us to put together and to draft the Essential Caregivers Act.

Madam Speaker, we also recognize the suffering of Susan Wilson. Robert Wilson is married to Susan Wilson. She is a retired pediatric nurse who suffered a major hemorrhagic stroke that left her paralyzed on the right side. Her speech was limited, as was her ability to perform daily living activities.

She did not get COVID, nor did she die in the long-term care facility, but she has suffered severe damage by the extended lockdown.

For a full 7 months, he was excluded from seeing her. Even though she was in an excellent nursing home, her care and her emotional, physical, and mental state deteriorated significantly.

No staff, no matter how good, can provide only what an essential caregiver can provide. His wife was admitted to the hospital twice. Her speech

deteriorated. She lost the ability to use her nondominant hand. She lost progress on relearning how to walk and is now confined to a wheelchair.

In his formal testimony, Robert said: "I am not a visitor. I am Susan's voice, her only voice. She should never have been subjected to the isolation, and you all have the ability to keep it from happening again."

This evening, we recognize Susan's suffering. The Essential Caregivers Act would have protected Susan's rights and allowed critical access for John to continue for her care.

Madam Speaker, we also recognize the suffering of Gina Zanchelli. Dolores Zanchelli was the caretaker of her mother, Gina, who lived in a skilled nursing facility in Long Island, New York.

Dolores visited her mother every day to provide the extra care that the facility was not able to deliver each day. Having access to her mother allowed Dolores the chance to monitor her mother's health closely.

Once lockdowns went into effect, Dolores was cut off from her mother, who became depressed from being isolated. Physical therapy stopped, and the necessary care she needed was deemed unessential in the facility.

Dolores and her mother were limited to only video calls during the lockdown. After Dolores went through a rigorous process to see her mother, she was able to have three socially distanced visits over the course of 13 months, about 10 to 15 minutes each, but the isolation had already taken its toll.

Gina's rights were violated, and the damage that resulted physically and mentally has been irreversible. In Dolores' words: "This should never be allowed to happen again."

This evening, we recognize the suffering of Gina Zanchelli.

Madam Speaker, we also recognize the suffering of Lynn Ray Leljedal. Prior to COVID, Carrie had never been away from her son, Lynn, for more than 9 days. He was 32 when COVID shut down all the long-term care facilities.

Lynn was born with a rare seizure disorder called Sturge-Weber syndrome. At 16 years old, he had to have the right side of his brain disconnected to control seizures.

Lynn moved into a long-term care facility in 2013. His mother, Carrie, has always been a hands-on mom. She never just went to visit; she would spend hours with her son, cleaning his room and eating meals with him and the other residents. Some nights, she would just go over to help him get ready for bed.

In March 2020, Carrie was told that the facility was closed to all visitors. Her heart dropped. For over 4 months, she was only able to see Lynn through a window or through a virtual visit.

When she was finally allowed to see Lynn, it was only at doctor's appointments. The distance took its toll on them.

As Carrie said in her testimony to me: "There is only one way to ensure that any resident of long-term care never faces this again. This is by passing H.R. 3733, the Essential Caregivers Act."

Madam Speaker, these are heart-wrenching stories that show exactly why we need to pass the Essential Caregivers Act. Had this law been in place, these residents would not have suffered alone in isolation, and their caregivers would have been there to safely provide the supplemental care that is so critical. Individuals we lost may have been with us today.

This bill is about protecting the rights of the most vulnerable among us.

Madam Speaker, the stories I shared with you this evening only scratch the surface of the suffering individuals and families endured around the country.

Madam Speaker, I have personally received hundreds of pages, and I will show them to you. This is just some of the gut-wrenching testimony from families who have been through excruciating circumstances fighting for their loved ones' rights.

To read it all would take hours, which is why I will post every page of it on my website. Let it be a permanent reminder of the need for this body to pass the act.

Each of these stories, we will try to get them through. We have another year and a half left of the term to try to get them through Special Orders or other ways on the floor so that these people can be properly recognized.

Before I close, I want to share some additional names of people who also submitted their stories, so that their names are in the RECORD:

Bill Borelle, essential caregiver to his 96-year-old mother.

Tamra Holland, essential caregiver to her mother, Darlene.

Debbie Manderville, essential caregiver for her father, Wallace McTaggart.

Elmer Dengler, essential caregiver to Sara Dengler.

Kim Eastmann, essential caregiver to Eulala Dade.

Ginger Vukas, essential caregiver for Virginia Ross.

Irma Rappaport, essential caregiver to Lillian Felix.

John Barabas, essential caregiver to his wife, Patricia.

Karen Klink, essential caregiver to her mother, Cynthia.

Katie Zaba, essential caregiver to her Uncle Jack.

Laughing Womyn Ashonosheni, essential caregiver to her 86-year-old parents.

Laurette Klier, essential caregiver to her mother-in-law.

Laurie Kruithof, essential caregiver to her mother.

Lucille Powell, essential caregiver to her husband, Jack.

Amy Saunders, essential caregiver to her mother, Gloria Kravetz.

Beth Segessenman, essential caregiver to her mother.

Cindy Goodloe, essential caregiver to her father, Major John Preston Roden.

Denise Holt, essential caregiver to her husband.

Diane McMillen, essential caregiver to her mother, Joanne.

Kathi A. Vanbenschoten, essential caregiver to Karl Landherr.

Emily Main, essential caregiver to her mother, Nancy Proudfit.

Felicia Knary, essential caregiver to her mother, Joyce.

Joyce B., essential caregiver to her mother.

Margaret Melzer, essential caregiver to her mother, Elfried Mach Melzer.

Martha Rhodes, essential caregiver to her 91-year-old mother.

MarySue Phipps, essential caregiver to her mother, Lucille Harris.

Maxine Schwartz, essential caregiver to her mother

Melody Taylor Stark, essential caregiver to her husband, Bill

Merrily Caldwell, essential caregiver to her mother

Mindy Cain, essential caregiver to her father

Nancy Klein, essential caregiver to her son

Paula Fowler, essential caregiver to her father

Rachel Sanchez, essential caregiver to her mother

Regina Clemmer and Ashley Patrick, essential caregivers to their sister

Veronica "Roni" Ferraro, essential caregiver to her husband

Sam Kukich, essential caregiver to her grandmother

Sandra Waters, essential caregiver to her mother

Sharon Echtmann, essential caregiver to her husband

Sherri Ustich, essential caregiver to her special needs daughter

Sommer Reider, essential caregiver to her mother

Susan Groseclose, essential caregiver to her husband, Dennis

Suzanne Von Bargaen, essential caregiver to her mother

Todd and Marla Carter, essential caregivers for Tanya, Freddy, and Linda

Victoria Cerrone, essential caregiver to her father, Vittorio

Bridgette Gianturco, essential caregiver to her mother, Joy Preston

Jaime, essential caregiver to their mother, Jeanette Hohler

Bernadine Chapman, essential caregiver to her brother

Courtney Templeton, essential caregiver to her mother

Cynthia Hadden, essential caregiver to her father

John Carlone, essential caregiver to his mother

Lynn Norman, essential caregiver to her mother, Connie Power

Denise Bogan, essential caregiver to her mother, Gabrielle Lewis

Sally Raque, essential caregiver to her 90-year-old mother

Julie Lewis, essential caregiver to her 80-year-old father

Amy McGuire, essential caregiver to her mother, Frances Dowell

Rick Winter, essential caregiver to many through the years

Karen Basso, essential caregiver to her husband, Derek Franklin Basso

Erma Hall-Thomas, essential caregiver to her older sister

Roietta Combs, essential caregiver to her father

Stacey Palant, essential caregiver to her mother and late father

Deborah Buchanan, essential caregiver to her mother

Catherine Carlton, essential caregiver in northern New Jersey

Virginia Andreoli Muscarella, essential caregiver to her father, Fred Andreoli

Cindy Tate-Gibson, essential caregiver to her mother

Beth Nelson, essential caregiver to her husband, Stanley Fullwood

Kathleen McCartney, essential caregiver to her mother, Mary

Cindy, essential caregiver to her 91-year-old mother

Patricia Cladek, caregiver to her mother, Doris

Crystal Ton, essential caregiver to her son Jackson

Patricia Medeiros and Maria Tavarozzi, essential caregivers to their mother

Mariam Barakzoy, essential caregiver to her mother

Marilynn Lester, essential caregiver to her 87-year-old mother, Ruth Lester

Teresa Trimpler, essential caregiver to her parents, Maria and Enrique Hernandez

Simone Kraemer, essential caregiver to her mother

Ila Haymaker, essential caregiver to her mother

Tim Wall, essential caregiver to his mother, Peggy Martin Wall

Maitely Weismann, essential caregiver to her mother, Celia Weismann

Charles Galligan, essential caregiver to his father, Jack.

Each of these individuals submitted testimony to my office that is just as powerful and compelling as the seven stories I shared with you this evening.

As I said, I will post these testimonies on my website and, hopefully, throughout the next year and a half, I will be able to speak about each one of these people who have given essential care on behalf of a family member and the loss that these people suffered over the next several months.

I encourage each member of this body to take time to read these stories and hear the pleas of those who suffered. The one bit of solace I take from these stories is that the elected Members of Congress here tonight can do something to prevent these tragedies from ever happening again.

We stand together and support passage of the bipartisan Essential Caregivers Act. It will protect these individuals and their loved ones from any future harm.

I want to close by thanking Congressman LARSON from Connecticut for leading this bipartisan effort with me. I also want to thank the bill's other co-sponsors: ELISE STEFANK, JOHN RUTHERFORD, YVETTE HERRELL, MADISON

CAWTHORN, ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, TED BUDD, JEFF VAN DREW, and STEVE COHEN.

Tomorrow morning, I will be joined by caregivers from all over the country at the Capitol steps to call for the House to take up our bill and make right this injustice. No individual deserves the indignity of suffering alone. We can fix this, and we must.

May God bless all of those who suffered and all of those essential caregivers around our Nation. We are grateful to you.

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

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING
FOR THE 117TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: As Vice Chair of the Joint Committee on Printing I hereby submit the committee rules for the 117th Congress.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson.

RULE 1.—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the Ranking Minority Member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

RULE 2.—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the Ranking Minority Member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair, as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chair of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the Vice Chair or Ranking Member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE 3.—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 4.—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and re-

corded on any vote taken by the Committee, except for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

RULE 5.—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session that has been closed to the public.

RULE 6.—ALTERNATING CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR BY CONGRESSES

(a) The Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses: The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the Chair shall be the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the Chair and Vice Chair shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the Chair and Vice-Chair represent different parties, the Vice-Chair shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the Ranking Minority Member as prescribed by these rules.

RULE 7.—PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of Committee shall in the first instance be decided by the Chair; subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

RULE 8.—HEARINGS: PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) The Chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chair shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, all witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries. Limited insertions or additional germane material will be received for the record, subject to the approval of the Chair.

RULE 9.—OFFICIAL HEARING RECORD

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and actions. Brief supplemental materials when required to clarify the transcript may be inserted in the record subject to the approval of the Chair.

(b) Each member of the Committee shall be provided with a copy of the hearing transcript for the purpose of correcting errors of transcription and grammar, and clarifying questions or remarks. If any other person is authorized by a Committee Member to make

his corrections, the staff director shall be so notified.

(c) Members who have received unanimous consent to submit written questions to witnesses shall be allowed two days within which to submit these to the staff director for transmission to the witnesses. The record may be held open for a period not to exceed two weeks awaiting the responses by witnesses.

(d) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee. Testimony received in closed hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of the Committee.

RULE 10.—WITNESSES FOR COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Selection of witnesses for Committee hearings shall be made by the Committee staff under the direction of the Chair. A list of proposed witnesses shall be submitted to the members of the Committee for review sufficiently in advance of the hearings to permit suggestions by the Committee members to receive appropriate consideration.

(b) The Chair shall provide adequate time for questioning of witnesses by all members, including minority Members and the rule of germaneness shall be enforced in all hearings notified.

(c) Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority on the Committee shall be entitled, upon unanimous request to the Chair before the completion of such hearings, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 11.—CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THE COMMITTEE

The information contained in any books, papers or documents furnished to the Committee by any individual, partnership, corporation or other legal entity shall, upon the request of the individual, partnership, corporation or entity furnishing the same, be maintained in strict confidence by the members and staff of the Committee, except that any such information may be released outside of executive session of the Committee if the release thereof is effected in a manner which will not reveal the identity of such individual, partnership, corporation or entity in connection with any pending hearing or as a part of a duly authorized report of the Committee if such release is deemed essential to the performance of the functions of the Committee and is in the public interest.

RULE 12.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The rule for broadcasting of Committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 13.—COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) No Committee report shall be made public or transmitted to the Congress without the approval of a majority of the Committee except when Congress has adjourned: provided that any member of the Committee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Such supplementary or dissenting reports should be as brief as possible.

(b) Factual reports by the Committee staff may be printed for distribution to Committee members and the public only upon authorization of the Chair either with the approval of a majority of the Committee or with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE 14.—CONFIDENTIALITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

No summary of a Committee report, prediction of the contents of a report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation shall be made by a member of the

Committee or by any staff member of the Committee prior to the issuance of a report of the Committee.

RULE 15.—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The Committee shall have a staff director, selected by the Chair. The staff director shall be an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate.

(b) The Ranking Minority Member may designate an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate as the minority staff director.

(c) The staff director, under the general supervision of the Chair, is authorized to deal directly with agencies of the Government and with non-Government groups and individuals on behalf of the Committee.

(d) The Chair or staff director shall timely notify the Ranking Minority Member or the minority staff director of decisions made on behalf of the Committee.

RULE 16.—COMMITTEE CHAIR

The Chair of the Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Specifically, the Chair is authorized, during the interim periods between meetings of the Committee, to act on all requests submitted by any executive department, independent agency, temporary or permanent commissions and committees of the Federal Government, the Government Publishing Office and any other Federal entity, pursuant to the requirements of applicable Federal law and regulations.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY FOR THE 117TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2021.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: As Chairperson of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, I hereby submit the committee rules for the 117th Congress.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson.

TITLE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Regular meetings may be called by the Chair, with the concurrence of the Vice Chair, as may be deemed necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedures;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure

the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulation. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.)

3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all members at least 3 days in advance. In addition, the committee staff will email or telephone reminders of committee meetings to all members of the committee or to the appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of committee business will normally be sent to all members of the committee by the staff director at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any member of the committee from raising appropriate non-agenda topics.

5. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the Chair may direct, unless the Chair waived such a requirement for good cause.

TITLE II—QUORUMS

1. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 4 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony; provided, however, once a quorum is established, any one member can continue to take such testimony.

3. Under no circumstance may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

TITLE III—VOTING

1. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

2. If a third of the members present so demand, a recorded vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

3. The results of roll call votes taken in any meeting upon a measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast in opposition to each measure and amendment by each member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

4. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matters shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a)(3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

TITLE IV—DELEGATION AND AUTHORITY TO THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

1. The Chair and Vice Chair are authorized to sign all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide on the committee's behalf on all routine business.

2. The Chair is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

3. The Chair is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 2441. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to expand the Rural Access Network for Growth Enhancement Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study to assess certain mental health care resources of the Department of Veterans Affairs available to veterans who live in rural areas.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 13—A Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission relating to "Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures".

S.J. Res. 14—A Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Recon-structed, and Modified Sources Review".

S.J. Res. 15—A Joint Resolution 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".

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 2021, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

EC-1498. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rescission of the Source-Specific Federal Implementation Plan for Navajo Generating Station, Navajo Nation [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0018; FRL-10024-15-Region 9] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1499. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tolfenpyrad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0067; FRL-10024-51] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1500. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Purpureocillium Lilacinum Strain PL11; Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0073; FRL-10023-91] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1501. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Lead and Copper Rule Revisions; Delay of Effective and Compliance Dates [EPA-HQ-OW-2017-0300; FRL-10024-33-OW] (RIN: 2040-AG15) received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1502. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nevada: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R09-RCRA-2021-0047; FRL-10024-12-Region 9] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1503. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Improvements for Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Test Procedures, and Other Technical Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2019-0307; FRL-10018-52-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU62) received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1504. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Lead [EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0468; FRL-10024-91-Region 5] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1505. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Part 9 Miscellaneous Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0729; FRL-10024-97-Region 5] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1506. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Emissions Reporting Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0387; FRL-10024-93-Region 5] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1507. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Volatile Organic Material Definition Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0542; FRL-10024-89-Region 5] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1508. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; Definitions of emergency and emergency engine [EPA-R01-OAR-2010-0042; FRL-10024-87-Region 1] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1509. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Stationary Sources; New Source Review Updates [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0589; FRL-10024-21-Region 9] received June 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1510. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; Western Nevada County, California [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0440; FRL-10022-39-Region 9] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1511. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — C10-23 Alkyl Group-Containing Alkali-Soluble Acrylic Emulsion Polymer; Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0155; FRL-10023-33] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1512. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Logan, Utah-Idaho PM2.5 Redesignation to Attainment, Maintenance Plan, and Rule Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2020-0021; FRL-10023-84-Region 8] received May 19, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Supplemental re-

port on H.R. 3684. A bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-70, Pt. 2).

Mr. DESAULNIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 508. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3684) to authorize funds for Federal-Aid Highways, Highway Safety Programs, and Transit Programs, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 117-75). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3291. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide assistance for States, territories, areas affected by natural disasters, and water systems and schools affected by PFAS or lead, and to require the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate national primary drinking water regulations for PFAS, microcystin toxin, and 1,4-dioxane, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3293. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish programs to assist low-income households in maintaining access to drinking water and wastewater services, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-77, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

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. CASTRO OF TEXAS (for himself and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 4213. A bill to establish the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 4214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require estimated income tax installments to be paid on a quarterly basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mrs.

LURIA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. CARL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. HINSON, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. LETLOW, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MAST, Ms. MACE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CASE, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. MANN, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 4215. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to increase certain disaster loan limits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. STEIL (for himself, Mr. RODNEY

DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 4216. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Clarence Thomas to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mrs. KIM of California):

H.R. 4217. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a Task Force on Maternal Mental Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 4218. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the frequency that the Advisory Committee on Women Veterans shall submit a report to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 4219. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to adjust the royalty rates for leases for coal mining and oil and gas extraction on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4220. A bill to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a National Climate Service Corps to help communities withstand and respond to changes in the Earth's climate with respect to natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 4221. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate 77416 as the single, unique ZIP Code for Sargent, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. WEXTON):

H.R. 4222. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain overtime pay received by members of the Capitol Police in the computation of annuities for such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS:

H.R. 4223. A bill to provide grants for the conduct of demonstration projects designed to provide education and training for eligible individuals with an arrest or conviction record to enter and follow a career pathway in the health professions through occupations that pay well and are expected to experience a labor shortage or be in high demand, under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 4224. A bill to require, pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, disclosure of the introduction of perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances into treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARK of

Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 4225. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the distribution of 3D printer plans for the printing of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIMENEZ:

H.R. 4226. A bill to restrict the ability of the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to adjust the rates for flood insurance coverage under the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 4227. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definition of a qualifying investment, for purposes of the exemption from registration for venture capital fund advisers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, to include an equity security issued by a qualifying portfolio company and to include an investment in another venture capital fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4228. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to members of a federally recognized Indian Tribe in the United States or Canada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 4229. A bill to reauthorize grants for the Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LURIA (for herself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 4230. A bill to support the full implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1701, reduce Hizballah's influence in Lebanon, address security threats to Lebanon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. HERRELL, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 4231. A bill to direct the Secretary concerned to coordinate with impacted parties when conducting a forest management activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. MOONEY (for himself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 4232. A bill to require financial regulatory agencies to annually review guidance issued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY OF NORTH CAROLINA (for himself and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 4233. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish Vet Center readjustment counseling and related mental health services to veterans and members of the Armed Forces using certain educational assistance benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MASSIE, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HERN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 4234. A bill to prohibit the removal of a statue provided by a State for display in National Statuary Hall unless two-thirds of the members of the State's congressional delegation approve the removal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4235. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to award grants to certain entities for purposes of carrying out climate-resilient living shoreline projects that protect coastal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4236. A bill to guarantee that grants are made under the health profession opportunity grant program under section 2008 of the Social Security Act to grantees in each State that is not a territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. TLAI):

H.R. 4237. A bill to protect and empower residents of certain federally assisted rental housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4238. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the implementation and maintenance of firearms licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act with respect to the importation of live dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4240. A bill to prohibit digital platforms from using information about a user unless the user consents to such use, to ensure personal information is considered a property right, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. POSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 4241. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct testing, removal, and remediation of perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances at all military installations, formerly used defense sites, and State-owned facilities of the National Guard in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 4242. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program for one month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMMONS:

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 with respect to the definition of qualifying venture capital funds,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself and Mrs. McCLAIN):

H.R. 4244. A bill to make amendments to the names of certain agencies to help end the stigmatization of substance use disorder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4245. A bill to require public benefit corporations to accept cash for certain transportation as a condition of receiving Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. ROSS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KAHELE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 applies to the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA), and the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) should work to prevent discrimination on the basis of sex in its programs and activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POSEY:

H. Res. 509. A resolution recognizing a Space Coast Symbol of Kindness and urging acts of kindness throughout our Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TORRES of NEW YORK (for himself, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Res. 510. A resolution recognizing the month of June as "Immigrant Heritage Month", a celebration of the accomplishments and contributions immigrants and their children have made in making the United States a healthier, safer, more diverse, prosperous country, and acknowledging the importance of immigrants and their children to the future successes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4213.

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

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the

United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 4214.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises".

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 4215.

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

Article I Section 8

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 4217.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 4218.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 4219.

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

Clause 16 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 4220.

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

Art. 1, Sec. 8 "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."

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 4221.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7

The Congress shall have Power To . . . establish Post Offices and post Roads . . .

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4222.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4223.

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

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 4224.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 4225.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GIMENEZ:

H.R. 4226.

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

Article 1, section 8, clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 4227.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4228.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 4229.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 4230.

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

"U.S. Constitution, Article 8, Necessary and Proper Clause"

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 4231.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (the Property Clause), which confers on Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the property belonging to the United States

By Mr. MOONEY:

H.R. 4232.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United Constitution

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 4233.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 4234.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4235.

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

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4236.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4237.

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

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 4238.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4239.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4240.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4241.

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

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 4242.

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. TIMMONS:

H.R. 4243.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 4244.

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

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

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4245.

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; . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 3: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 19: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 82: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 228: Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 263: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 304: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 310: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 328: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 425: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 475: Mr. CROW, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 567: Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 578: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 623: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 679: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 750: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 783: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. BOST, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 815: Mr. COOPER and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 889: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H.R. 890: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. WILD.

H.R. 911: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 955: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 962: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1012: Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 1140: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1179: Mr. NEAL, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1210: Mr. KUSTOFF.

H.R. 1223: Mr. MEIJER.

H.R. 1275: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1283: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1308: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 1321: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H.R. 1334: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1346: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 1368: Mr. GOMEZ and Mrs. STEEL.

H.R. 1381: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1470: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 1485: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1542: Mr. KUSTOFF.

H.R. 1596: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1626: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 1716: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1745: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1764: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1854: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 1861: Mr. MANN, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1933: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1956: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 2079: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2116: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2193: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2214: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2238: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2249: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2289: Mr. SCHRAEDER.

H.R. 2295: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 2307: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2325: Mr. SWALWELL.

H.R. 2339: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2346: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2361: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2399: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2415: Mr. JONES and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2435: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2465: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2466: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2467: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2499: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 2503: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2517: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SMUCKER, and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 2525: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2600: Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 2619: Mr. ESTES and Mr. CLYDE.

H.R. 2650: Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. TRONE, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2654: Mr. HIMES and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 2685: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2717: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2740: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2748: Ms. MANNING, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COMER, Mr. LAMB, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 2759: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2773: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2789: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2811: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2815: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2833: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2886: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 2898: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2930: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2974: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2988: Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 2998: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3036: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3070: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 3076: Ms. TITUS, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. MANNING, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3085: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. RUSH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3095: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. ROSS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 3172: Ms. WILD and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3187: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 3203: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3259: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Penn- sylvania, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RUTH- ERFORD, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 3279: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 3281: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BARR, and Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 3283: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 3287: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3294: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3321: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WILD, and Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 3341: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. LUTTKEMEYER, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 3385: Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3404: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3435: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 3440: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3443: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3468: Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 3472: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KUSTOFF, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3474: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3482: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 3513: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 3519: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3529: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3548: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3554: Mr. GUEST, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. RUPPERS- BERGER.

H.R. 3577: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MAST, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. STEW- ART, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3619: Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 3625: Ms. OMAR and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3671: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 3672: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 3685: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 3699: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 3744: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3755: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3789: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3791: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3796: Mr. ROY.

H.R. 3807: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGÓ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SABLAN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 3808: MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 3824: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3827: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3835: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3860: Mr. GOOD of Virginia and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 3924: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana and Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 3962: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3972: Ms. MANNING, Mr. COSTA, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 3985: Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H.R. 3993: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3999: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. MEIJER.
H.R. 4005: Mr. McCAUL and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4013: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 4020: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4042: Mr. LAMB, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4050: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 4059: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 4068: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4079: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. KAHELE.
H.R. 4085: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 4087: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4093: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 4096: Mr. GARBARINO and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 4118: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 4123: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 4126: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4150: Mr. BANKS, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 4170: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4179: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 4199: Mr. CLYDE.
H. Con. Res. 21: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H. Res. 47: Ms. DEAN.
H. Res. 60: Mr. CLINE.
H. Res. 109: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. ALLRED.
H. Res. 114: Mr. LYNCH.
H. Res. 131: Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 214: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H. Res. 289: Mr. STAUBER.
H. Res. 336: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. PFLUGER, and Mr. MEIJER.
H. Res. 352: Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 397: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Res. 404: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.