



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2021

No. 183

## Senate

The Senate met at 10:02 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, touch the secret place inside each of us and know our hearts. In the stillness of this prayer moment, make us so transparent that we shall connect to Your power.

Lord, strengthen our lawmakers by the power of Your Holy Spirit, as the light of Your wisdom illuminates the recesses of their hearts. Lord, give our Senators the wisdom to be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger. When this day is done, may they look back with the realization that they have accomplished Your purposes.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, October 19, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Christine P. O'Hearn, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

#### FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night, I began the process for the Senate to hold a vote on the Freedom to Vote Act, a commonsense proposal that would make it easier for every eligible American to participate in free and fair elections.

The bill, which my colleagues, including yourself, very diligently have worked on for months to put together will set basic standards to improve ballot access across the country, end partisan gerrymandering, and fight the influence of dark money and special in-

terests in our politics. It will go a long way toward restoring people's faith in our democracy while respecting the role of States in administering elections.

Every Senate Democrat has united around this legislation, and I thank all of my colleagues, including you, Mr. President, who worked so hard on this bill. I especially want to thank my friend Senator MANCHIN, who has spent weeks reaching out to our Republican colleagues in an effort to find common ground. I applaud him for his commitment to trying to get something done on this issue in a bipartisan way if we can.

The clock is ticking for this Chamber to take meaningful action to protect Americans' right to the franchise. So, tomorrow, the Senate will vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Freedom to Vote Act.

Every Senator will have to answer a straightforward question: Should the Senate be allowed to simply begin a debate on voting rights, as has been done many times throughout our history? That is what tomorrow's vote is about: Do the Members of this Chamber think protecting our democracy is worthy of even a debate in the Senate?

Senate Democrats think it absolutely is. If our Republican colleagues don't like our ideas for fighting voter suppression and guarding against election subversion, then they ought to tell us what they have in mind. If they are so confident of their position, then let's debate the issue on the Senate floor. What is there to be afraid of by allowing simply a debate?

Democrats are ready to work with Republicans in good faith if they vote to begin a debate on voting rights. We know disagreements run deep. We don't hide from that. But if our Republican colleagues have good ideas, we will work with them. We will listen to them, and if these ideas are truly aligned with the goals of this bill to protect our democracy, we will work to include them in the final text.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S7037

What Republicans should not do—what they must not do—is squelch any chance for the Senate to debate something as critical and sacrosanct as the right to vote, nor should they pretend like the Federal Government has no role to play in protecting our democracy. On the contrary, throughout history, the Federal Government has sometimes been the only remedy when States try to suppress the vote. And no honest observer can look at the way the States have changed election laws this last year and pretend that there is nothing malicious afoot.

As Senator MANCHIN said earlier this year regarding congressional action on voting rights, inaction is not an option. Let me repeat that because this is one place where Senator MANCHIN and I agree. As Senator MANCHIN said earlier this year regarding congressional action on voting rights, “Inaction is not an option.” Inaction is not an option. I agree. All 49 other Democrats agree with Senator MANCHIN. Inaction is not an option.

The Senate can rise to the task if given the chance, but its Members must vote to begin debate first.

#### BUILD BACK BETTER AGENDA

Mr. President, now on Build Back Better, for decades now, millions of families in this country have found the basic American promise that if you work hard, then you can have a better life for yourselves and your loved ones, the proverbial American dream—Americans have found it is getting harder to reach. That is what creates a sourness in the land. That sunny optimism so crucial to our identity has receded away from view.

Democrats have promised to do something about it. When Senate Democrats secured our majority this year, we committed to delivering on the trust that the American people placed in us and to respond to the challenge of our times. That is why we immediately set to work and passed the American Rescue Plan to propel our economy out of the crisis of COVID. And that has been the driving force behind our efforts to make President Biden's Build Back Better agenda into law.

Last night, I continued my discussions with Speaker PELOSI and President Biden as we work to an agreement on legislation we can bring to the floor. I know that, throughout the day, the President will meet with a number of Members from both Chambers, and, as the week progresses, I will continue to hold talks with my colleagues as we move forward to the finish line.

Here is what matters: Build Back Better legislation is going to dramatically improve the lives of tens of millions of American families for years to come. Something that impactful is not an easy feat, but we are going to keep working. By passing this legislation, we can create good-paying jobs for this generation and the next; we can lower costs and cut taxes for American families while taking overdue steps to

meaningfully address the climate crisis.

We still have work to do, but we are going to continue at it until—until the job is done.

I yield the floor.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

#### THE ECONOMY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, every day, American families are feeling real pain because of the reckless and inflationary policies that Democrats have already rammed through. The American people are facing the highest inflation in more than 10 years. They are paying an extra dollar a gallon at the pump and soaring prices at the grocery store. Real wages are down. Rising prices are wiping out raises and bonuses. Last month's jobs report was another huge disappointment, showing less than half the hiring that had been expected.

But, amazingly, the Biden administration and many of our colleagues seem to think the cure for this inflation hangover is the hair of the dog. They are trying to exploit the economic anxiety they have created by pitching yet another multitrillion-dollar socialist spending spree. They want to try to inflate their way out of inflation.

Oh, and get this: The Biden administration is simultaneously saying that their latest spending spree will cost zero dollars.

Let me say that again. The Biden administration is simultaneously saying their latest spending spree will cost zero dollars—it will be totally free—and it will come with massive, historic tax hikes in order to pay for it.

All this socialism is going to be totally free of charge—but it also needs the biggest IRS cash grab in decades in order to pay for it. Go figure. The Democrats' plan contains more than 40 separate tax hikes on the American people—40 separate tax hikes on the American people. These increases would impact taxpayers at every income level. Small business owners and family farmers would feel yet another pinch. Even the tax hikes that are ostensibly aimed at Washington Democrats' favorite punching bag, American industry, would find their way back down to working families.

Democrats' war on affordable American energy would hit pocketbooks just in time to spike winter heating bills and the prices of made-in-America goods. Their corporate tax hikes would leave American businesses paying a higher tax rate than businesses—listen to this—in communist China. As the Joint Committee on Taxation has shown, two-thirds of the burden of Democrats' proposed new taxes on businesses would fall on lower and middle-income Americans—two-thirds.

But Washington Democrats aren't just laying out massive new tax hikes in the light of day; they also want to

hand the IRS new snooping powers to start digging through individual Americans' bank accounts. They want to pay for their reckless taxing-and-spending spree by treating normal American households like everybody is under audit. They want to treat normal American households like everybody is under audit.

So, to review, this has been the story of Democrats' unified control of government in 2021. Here is what they have done: First, they knee-capped our economic recovery with stifling spending, including to pay Americans more to stay on the sidelines than to rejoin the workforce. Then, as working families feel the pinch of runaway prices, they are putting forward even more spending and also massive tax hikes. As icing on the cake, they have schemed for even greater access to Americans' personal finances so Washington bureaucrats can spy—can spy—on citizens' routine transactions.

This is not what American voters signed up for, and it won't earn a shred of support from this side of the aisle.

#### PROTESTS

Mr. President, now on another matter, last week, Washington, DC, was again the site of illegal political violence from the radical left. A mob of environmental extremists set upon the Department of the Interior. They shoved through blocked doors. They hurt the police and security personnel who tried to hold the line. These radicals put one law enforcement officer actually in the hospital.

Political violence and attacks on government buildings are flatout wrong no matter who is perpetrating them or what they claim to believe. That is why it is puzzling that last week's incidents attracted so little attention and condemnation. The White House was directly asked about the day's demonstrations just a few hours after the violence and the break-in occurred. Instead of condemning the radicals, the Biden administration actually praised them—praised them.

The White House Press Secretary was asked about the protests multiple hours after the violence and the break-in and said—this is a direct quote—“Of course we're listening to advocates and people who have been elevating the issue of climate for decades. They have important voices.”

So that is how the Biden administration officially described the demonstrators who put a cop in the hospital—“important voices.” This is just absurd. But those weren't just regrettable comments; they capture the politicized and selective approach to law enforcement that increasingly defines the Democratic Party.

Last year, our Nation saw a 30-percent jump in homicides—the biggest jump in the murder rate in modern history; the worst spike in the homicide rate in modern American history. The head of the National Center for Health Statistics says it was the worst increase in more than 100 years, since at

least 1905. Actually, he went on to say that even 1905 wasn't comparable because that was likely a clerical matter. So the experts don't really know the last time the murder rate shot up this much, but we know it was before the average American family had electricity or indoor plumbing. That was a long time ago.

Responding to this terrible trend should be very simple. It should be a no-brainer for elected officials at every level: more and better resources for more and better policing for more and better community safety.

Instead, liberal local officials across the country from city halls and city councils to right here in Congress have gotten caught up in the radicalism of "defund the police."

As one leftwing House Member put it, "Not only do we need to disinvest from police . . . we need to completely dismantle"—"dismantle"—her local police department." That was a Member of the Congress.

Another declared, "Policing in our country is inherently and intentionally racist."

One news story from last weekend reported that "a crowd of 100 people wreaked havoc in downtown Portland, Oregon, this week—smashing storefront windows, lighting dumpsters on fire and causing at least \$500,000 in damage—but police officers didn't stop them. Portland Police Bureau officials say that's because of legislation passed by Oregon lawmakers this year, which restricts the tools they can use to confront people vandalizing buildings and causing mayhem." So apparently it is OK in Portland to do those kinds of things because of legislation they passed out in Oregon.

While all of this is percolating, what is the Department of Justice focused on?

Where is the Attorney General training his firepower?

Well, here is the answer: Two weeks ago, Attorney General Garland published a special memorandum directing Federal law to focus specifically on parents who are dissatisfied with "woke" school boards and far-left indoctrination. You get the picture here.

The worst spike in the murder rate in over a century and the Attorney General wants main justice laser-focused on—listen to this—parents who are asking questions about their kids' curriculum. It is beyond parody.

To be perfectly clear, I never offered anything but condemnation for violence and threats in the political square, but local law enforcement is fully capable of handling isolated incidents where crimes are committed. There is absolutely no reason—none—for Attorney General Garland to pull this J. Edgar Hoover act on American parents. But these strange and warped priorities are defining the Biden administration's approach: soft on crime; heavy on indulging far-left fads.

Currently deadlocked in the Judiciary Committee is the nomination of

Rachael Rollins, a would-be U.S. Attorney who has a national reputation for being soft on crime during her time as a prosecutor. In her current role as district attorney, the nominee has said that prosecutors in her jurisdiction should—listen to this—decline to prosecute a whole laundry list of crimes—just decline to prosecute them. From shoplifting to trespassing, to drug possession with the intent to distribute, Ms. Rollins wants her county to be a place where these crimes get free passes.

And the Biden administration rewards this with a big promotion?

Mr. President, support for equal justice, support for law enforcement, and support for the innocent people they protect go hand in hand. It is time for the Biden administration to get serious about the rule of law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMEMBERING TIMUEL BLACK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it was December 7, 1941, a young African-American man from the South Side of Chicago was celebrating his 23rd birthday. He was in a neighborhood tavern, and somebody bolted through the front door and cried out that the Japanese had attacked Pearl Harbor.

In 1943, that same young man was inducted into the U.S. Army, a segregated institution at the time. He landed in Normandy within days of D-day. He fought across France in the Battle of the Bulge. While his unit regrouped, they heard rumors—horrible rumors—about a camp near Weimar, Germany. This young soldier and his commanding officer hopped into a jeep to see for themselves. What he witnessed at Buchenwald, the Nazi death camp, changed this man forever.

As he recalled in his memoir, his first thought was "this is what happened to my ancestors." This is what happens when human beings see others as less than human.

Then he made a vow to himself. He said:

I made an emotional decision that when I returned from the Army, the rest of my life would be spent trying to make [the place] where I live, and the bigger world, a place where all people could have peace and justice.

That soldier's name was Timuel Black. He kept that vow faithfully for 76 years. Tim Black was a foot soldier for justice. He died last week at the age of 102, living in the neighborhood that had been his home nearly all his life, a place that he personally called a "Sacred Ground," the South Side of Chicago.

His passing is our loss—to our city, our State, and our Nation. If you are not from Chicago, you may not know his name, but we all live in an America

that is better because Timuel Black helped shape it. He was a living link to some of our Nation's worst sins and our greatest achievements.

All four of Tim Black's grandparents were born into slavery. When he was a year old, Tim Black and his parents left Alabama and the terrorism of Jim Crow and headed to Chicago, part of the first wave of America's Great Migration. They settled on the South Side in a then-segregated neighborhood now known as Bronzeville.

After he served in World War II, Tim Black returned to Chicago. He graduated from Roosevelt University, earned a master's degree in history from the University of Chicago. He was teaching history in Chicago public schools in 1955 when he heard a young minister speaking on television, he was so moved that he decided, at his own expense, to fly to Montgomery, AL, to meet this man, a man by the name of Martin Luther King, Jr.

In 1963, Dr. King and the great African-American labor leader A. Philip Randolph called on Tim Black. They asked him to organize Chicago's contingent to come to Washington for the great March on Washington. Three years later, Tim Black asked them to return the favor and he persuaded Dr. King to bring his campaign for racial justice to Chicago. Together, they pressed for an end to discriminatory housing laws that squeezed many of the city's Black residents into overpriced, ramshackle apartments in unsafe, segregated neighborhoods with few jobs and failing schools.

In 1975, after decades working at high schools, Tim Black became a professor of sociology, anthropology, and Black history at what is now known as Harold Washington College. He was the Griot of Chicago, who preserved the rich history of the Great Migration and Bronzeville. He was also a brilliant political strategist who understood how to use his power to help others.

So, in 1982, Harold Washington, who had been his friend since they were children, was representing their neighborhood in the U.S. House of Representatives. Professor Black and a few others went to Harold Washington and said: You have to run for mayor of Chicago.

Washington replied: "Sure. If you get 50,000 new Black voters and raise \$100,000, then I'll consider it."

Washington figured that was the end of it; they would never reach those goals. But Professor Tim Black started a fundraising drive and helped organize a voter registration campaign that ultimately registered not 100,000, not 50,000, but 263,000 new voters in Chicago, and he raised more than \$1 million for the Harold Washington campaign.

In 1983, with the support from voters from all backgrounds—Black, White, and Brown—Harold Washington became Chicago's first Black mayor.

A decade later, a young lawyer by the name of Barack Obama sought out

Professor Tim Black's guidance when he first considered running for office. Last month, President Obama returned to the South Side to break ground on the Obama Presidential Center in Jackson. Although Professor Black's failing health didn't allow him to attend in person, it is a good bet that ceremony couldn't have happened without him.

Mr. President, I was blessed to know Tim Black. When Barack Obama, my Senate colleague from Illinois, was elected President, I was given a handful of tickets to the inauguration. The first name that came to my mind was Tim Black. He had to be there, and his wife Zenobia Johnson-Black, a personal friend who volunteered to drive me in my first Senate campaign. Zenobia is a wonderful person. She is an exciting driver, and we had many escapades together.

So I invited Tim and Zenobia to come and sit in the best seats that I had for the inauguration of Barack Obama, the first African-American President from the South Side of Chicago.

I was fortunate I knew Tim Black. I counted him as a friend. I was there sitting next to him at his 100th birthday party. It was a great night, and the man still had it all together and a great sense of humor.

Loretta and I send our condolences to his beloved wife of 40 years, Zenobia Johnson-Black, his daughter Ermetra, and his countless friends and students. A great man has left us. He will be missed.

#### FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT

Mr. President, tomorrow, the Senate will vote on whether to protect free and fair elections in America.

A big question we have to ask in the U.S. Senate is whether the right to vote and free and fair elections are worth any of our time.

You see, the first vote we have here is what is known as a motion to proceed. It is a basic question in the Senate: You want to talk about something? Is it important enough for your time? You want to bring it up here and say a few words about the right to vote in America?

That is the first vote. I think it is pretty simple.

Why wouldn't we, at this moment in history, with everything that is going on, spend some time talking about the right to vote?

Senator McCONNELL, the Republican leader, says, no, we shouldn't take any time to discuss the right to vote in the United States of America. He and many of our Republican colleagues are threatening to use the age-old weapon against civil rights, the filibuster, to stop even a conversation on the floor of the U.S. Senate about the right to vote.

That would make it the third time this year that Senate Republicans have used the filibuster to kill voting rights legislation. They filibustered For the People Act twice this year after it passed the House. They said then they

support voting rights, but not that voting rights bill. They said more compromise was needed. You can't reach compromise on anything until you talk about it.

We are going to have a motion to proceed to talk about voting rights on the floor of the Senate tomorrow. If they want to offer a compromise, if they want to get into a conversation or debate, that is the moment.

This empty Chamber—I wonder sometimes why we leave it the way it is. This would be a great meeting hall. We could rent it out for wedding receptions and have something productive happen on the floor of the U.S. Senate. But instead, this empty Chamber, day after day, finds ways to avoid the important issues of our time. That is sad.

There are very few of us who have been given this great honor and opportunity to serve in the Senate. We are supposed to come and talk about the things that matter in America.

Isn't the right to vote one of the most important things that matters in this country?

The Freedom to Vote Act is a compromise itself. It is based on a set of principles offered by Senator MANCHIN of West Virginia. Now, Senator MANCHIN has not concealed the fact that he didn't agree with the original bill, but in fairness to him, he sat down in good faith and bargained a compromised bill. He has worked exhaustively for months with Democrats, Republicans, and Independents to find some common ground. I salute him for that. That is what we all should be doing.

The Freedom to Vote Act includes reasonable national standards for a voter ID in States that require identification for in-person voting. Now, that is a big concession from the Democratic side because, although many of our States have a photo voter ID requirement, many do not, and we believe in some cases in the past it has been abused.

With the fundamental concept of a voter ID, I don't have any objection to, as long as it is managed and administered fairly. That is what we are setting out to do.

If our Republican colleagues are really worried about election integrity and making sure voters are who they say they are, wouldn't you think that they would at least vote to start the debate on the Freedom to Vote Act? That we would have a conversation in this empty Chamber that might even attract a handful of Senators on both sides of the aisle to talk about the right to vote in America in the year 2021 and beyond?

That just seems so basic.

Well, what the Republicans say is the Freedom to Vote Act is much more than just a debate topic; it is a Federal takeover of our elections.

That simply is not the case. The Freedom to Vote Act does not create any undue burden on any State. Instead, it sets reasonable, minimum

standards for voting access in all States, including automatic and same-day voter registration, 2 weeks of early voting, no-excuse mail-in voting. It establishes election day as a Federal holiday.

(Mr. PADILLA assumed the Chair.)

All of these proposals are consistent with the clear language of the Constitution. It will protect nonpartisan election officials from undue pressure and prevent politicians from overturning elections if they don't agree with voters' choices.

The Freedom to Vote Act makes it harder for billionaires and powerful corporations to buy elections. Let's be real honest, Members of Congress and others who run for office and set out to raise money, but the important fundraising is taking place in a mystery, in secret, with dark money that comes into an election with no indication of its source.

The Freedom to Vote Act is going to prevent the flow of foreign money into U.S. elections. Is there anybody who wants to argue for the premise that we should allow foreigners to invest in our election results or to try to influence the electorate, sometimes with misinformation and outright lies? I don't think they have any business interfering in our elections. I think most Americans agree with that. That is what the Freedom to Vote Act says.

In addition to that, dark money needs to get out of politics. If you want to stand up and support a candidate, so be it. But for goodness' sake, say who you are; identify yourself; let the American people know who is pushing one candidate or the other.

Organizations engaged in political spending will be required to tell the public who is giving them how much money. That is pretty simple, pretty obvious. There was a time when that level of disclosure was supported by the Republican minority leader in the Senate. I remember his speeches well on floor of the Senate. He shifted 180 degrees on the topic now.

Last fall, 2020, Americans braved a pandemic to vote in record numbers, but supporters of the former President nonetheless exhausted legal challenges and recounts seeking to validate the outrageous lie of election fraud, and their efforts went nowhere. Former President Trump went to 50 or 60 different courts to argue that Joe Biden didn't win the election. He couldn't produce a shred of evidence. All he had were the ramblings and gossip and fake news, if you will, on the internet. It didn't work.

Rudy Giuliani came up with some hair-brained schemes on behalf of President Trump: "Italy-gate," that somehow the Italians had satellites that controlled America's voting machinery. Ridiculous things.

When that didn't work, the former President decided he would just take over the Department of Justice. Our Judiciary Committee, which I serve on, Mr. President, went into extensive investigation of that and came up with

detailed information, which we released to the public 2 weeks ago. And the Republicans were in on all of our investigation. They were invited to question the witnesses, to be present, to even see our majority report in advance.

We wanted to make this bipartisan and fair, and we did. And what we found was the President's failed attempt to take over the Department of Justice—to force them to go to the States and say: Don't validate the 2020 election.

A few people stood up and showed courage at the Department of Justice and said they were prepared to resign before they bent to President Trump's pressure, and that was a fact.

That is what we are faced with now—this former President still marketing his lies across America about the outcome of the 2020 election, and we will not even take the time to discuss elections and voting. The Republicans will stop us with a filibuster.

Many politicians in many States continue to use the Big Lie of the stolen election to try to make it harder for citizens to vote in future elections.

According to the Brennan Center for Justice, 19 States passed 33 bills to make it harder for citizens to vote, so far this year.

Hundreds of similar bills have been proposed in 49 States. These laws and proposals are a dagger at the heart of America's democracy.

The Freedom to Vote Act, which we want to start the conversation on, just the conversation and debate on tomorrow, is America's democracy defense act.

I want to commend the bill's sponsors: Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR. I don't know anybody who has worked harder than she has as chair of the Senate Rules Committee; Senator MANCHIN, he has been involved in the compromise; Senators TIM KAINE, ANGUS KING, and Rev. RAPHAEL WARNOCK.

And particularly I want to acknowledge our majority leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, for his leadership in this effort. He has worked hard at it, trying to bring this matter before the American people and on the floor.

We have also been engaged in a similar process on an equally critical piece of legislation, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

I have been here long enough to remember a time when the Voting Rights Act came before the U.S. Senate and got 98 votes—virtually all the Democrats, all the Republicans voted for it. No controversy. They believed that this product of the 1960s civil rights debate was fair. It said that in certain States with a proven history of discrimination against minority voters, when they proposed changes in election laws, we would examine them, preclear them, as they say.

The Supreme Court tossed out that section, and we have tried to restore it. I think the Supreme Court was wrong and maybe even naive in believing that

voter discrimination could not take place in the future.

When there was a voter suppression law passed in North Carolina and it was taken to a Federal court, the court said, and I paraphrase: They worked with “surgical precision” to violate the voting rights of minority voters.

The Freedom to Vote Act is the first of two crucial steps to take what our friend and colleague John Lewis said is a “precious, almost sacred” right, and I hope we take similar action on the Voting Rights soon.

Like the Freedom to Vote Act, the Voting Rights Act extension that Ronald Reagan signed in 1982 was the result of a compromise. In signing it, President Reagan said the final bill “prove[d] that differences can be settled in good will and good faith.”

Wouldn't that be nice to have that happen on this empty floor of the Senate tomorrow? That is all we ask of our Senate colleagues. Don't use the filibuster, the weapon of Jim Crow, to abet the attacks we are seeing on Americans' voting rights.

Offer amendments if you like, but work with us in good will and good faith to protect the voting rights which so many have sacrificed for.

#### INFLATION

Mr. President, the Republican minority leader came to the floor a few minutes ago and once again spoke about inflation. And of course we are concerned about it, and we are watching it closely.

We are in an unusual place where we are recovering from a pandemic and the economy is getting back on its feet. And, yes, there are problems. We see supply chain problems addressed by President Biden just this week. We know things are stacked up trying to get into the United States.

That was possibly unavoidable in the midst of a pandemic, when customer demand cratered, and now it is recovering and our demand outstrips the supplies that are flowing into our country.

But I also want to remind the Republican leader from Kentucky that his opposition to extend the debt ceiling, unfortunately, is also a problem when it comes to inflation. If there is uncertainty as to whether this Nation will pay its just debts, obviously that will be reflected in the financial markets and higher interest rates. So the strategy of Senator MCCONNELL, when it comes to the debt ceiling, is pro-inflationary itself.

Also, he talks about the “socialist spending spree” of the reconciliation bill, Build Back Better. And he says in critical terms that the Democrats argue that the cost of this will be “zero dollars.” He says that what Democrats don't say is they have to impose massive tax hikes for this to happen.

Well, I might say to the Senator from Kentucky, we have been very open about what our tax policy would be to pay for Build Back Better.

That policy would say those making over \$400,000 a year in income would

have to pay higher taxes. Yes, we have said it. Those people would have to pay higher taxes. And corporations that are escaping their just tax liability would now have to pay their fair share, too. In those two instances, we are raising taxes, but the taxes don't touch the working people in this country or those in lower income categories.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, he says—these are his words—Democrats are waging a war on affordable energy. I want to just reflect on the words “affordable energy.” It is true that we have ample energy resources in most places in America, but to argue that they are affordable is to fail to take into account what the costs of climate change are in America and around the world.

It is not affordable for us to have so many greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuels that we are creating extreme weather events all across the world. And we have seen them here in the United States. We have seen the fires in your State of California and in the Northwest; we have seen the flooding all across the country, including the Midwest; we have seen violent weather occurring at times of the year when historically it never occurs; and we are paying a heavy price for climate change, global warming, and the fact that we are so dependent on fossil fuels.

So when the Democrats—it used to be another bipartisan issue—and it no longer is—but when the Democrats sound the alarm about climate change and global warming, it is because current energy sources are not affordable in terms of the future of our planet. We have to find a better way.

I am sorry to see so many current politicians unable or unwilling to accept their responsibility to change this country and the world for the better and to leave an Earth, a planet, an environment that our kids can live in. I don't think that is too much to ask, and I think we ought to do our part.

#### IRS

Mr. President, the last thing Senator MCCONNELL went into this morning was giving new powers to the IRS to snoop.

Well, I guess that is true in some respects. We believe that people who owe taxes ought to pay them, and the vast majority of American families are honest; they want to do their civic duty. They file their taxes on time and try to pay every penny they are supposed to—not more, but every penny they are supposed to.

And yet there are many hiding their assets, hiding their profits, hiding their revenues, and hiding their money from the IRS. They should be held accountable.

Why should the average American family be held to a higher standard of honesty than the richest people in this country? I think it is only fair that everyone be held to the same standard.

## SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. President, finally, I want to say this about a memorandum by the Attorney General, Merrick Garland, that Senator MCCONNELL referred to earlier. He suggested that we are going after parents, that we want to somehow harass, intimidate, and arrest parents who are appearing before school boards.

I went back to read this memorandum. It is very explicit.

Those who engage in violent conduct at school board meetings are going to be stopped. They are violating the law, and they are violating the spirit of those meetings where communities come together and decide the fate and future of public education.

I think the Attorney General is right, we should have safety in that environment, just as we demand it here on the floor of the U.S. Senate—nothing more and nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

## INFLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, as I begin this morning, let me just start by reacting to a couple of things that have been said here on the floor this morning already by my Democrat colleagues.

You know, the leader, Republican leader, when he was down here earlier, talked about the impact of inflation on the economy, and I have to tell you, that is very real. The inflationary impact is being felt all across this country. Energy costs are up, gasoline costs are up by huge amounts. Food costs are up in this country. Housing costs are up.

There isn't hardly any area of our economy where people aren't being impacted by inflation, meaning that the dollars that they earn are stretching less all the time. That is not a fake thing; it is not a temporary thing; it is a real thing. People are experiencing it in their economic lives on a daily basis, and to hear the Democratic leader say, well, you know, all the spending they are going to do is not going to cost anything, that it is going to be covered by tax increases and those tax increases are just going to hit people in the higher income categories, also is something that just isn't accurate.

Now let me just for a minute suggest something that I think is sort of fundamental when it comes to economics, and that is, when you have too many dollars chasing too few goods, you get inflation. The demand for a product goes up, and when the demand goes up, the price usually follows along with it.

Well, we have right now a lot of government dollars that have been swirling around the economy for some time, which is why I think in many respects we are seeing this inflation—the highest inflation that we have seen literally in 30 years in this country, affecting, as I said earlier, kind of all sectors of the economy and things that people have to purchase in their daily lives.

If you put more dollars out there, which is what is being talked about by our Democratic colleagues—another \$3.5 trillion that would flood the economy—I think the expectation is a very real one that you are going to see that inflationary pressure accelerate, intensify, because when you have that much money, that many dollars chasing too few goods, inflation is an inevitable result. The idea that we need to spend another \$3.5 trillion and that somehow that is going to be a solution right now also is not consistent at all with the facts and the data.

We saw here just recently the Congressional Budget Office come out with a report that suggested that government revenues are at the highest level—biggest increase, I should say, year over year since 1977. We are now over \$4 trillion this last year in revenues—\$4 trillion. It has never happened before in this country. It is the biggest 1-year increase in revenues since 1977, paid for largely by corporate tax receipts, which were up 75 percent year over year, and also by individual income tax receipts, much of which was coming from high-income earners. A lot of that increase that we have seen in income tax receipts in this country in government revenues comes from those people who are high-income earners.

All that to say, if you have that much revenue coming in to the government in this country, why, then, would you need to go out and raise taxes even more and spend even more when you have an economy that is in the process of recovering and people concerned about inflation? And the Democrats' solution to that is to spend more, put more money out there, and raise taxes even higher at a time when you have historic revenue coming in to the Federal Government. It is the first time ever—ever—in our Nation's history that we have had over \$4 trillion in revenue come in.

The other thing that was mentioned by my colleague from Illinois just a minute ago is that the issue of the tax gap, which was alluded to earlier this morning on the floor by, again, the Republican leader—the Democratic solution is to go after people, essentially shake them down, and get them to pay more in taxes.

I am not suggesting for a minute that there aren't people out there who aren't paying the taxes that they should under the law and that the law needs to be enforced. What I am suggesting is that in the effort to close that so-called tax gap, there are huge differences of opinion about what effect that would have, how much could be generated, and who is ultimately going to pay for that.

Well, now there is additional research out coming from the Joint Committee on Taxation that, in fact, the Democratic efforts to close the tax gap will hit lower income taxpayers the most.

To say that none of the tax increases or none of the tax policies that are

being proposed by the Democrats in their \$3.5 trillion tax-and-spending spree proposal won't harm people who are making less than \$400,000 a year is laughable under any—any—plausible review of these tax policies and proposals, but this one in particular hits hardest at low-income taxpayers.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, people making less than \$50,000 a year will pay anywhere from 40 to 57 percent off all the revenue that is generated off of that one proposal. People making less than \$100,000 a year will pay somewhere between 65 and 78 percent of all the taxes that are generated under that particular proposal in the Democratic plan. People making less than \$200,000 a year would pay up to 90 percent of the amount generated under that particular proposal in the Democrats' plan. So people making less than \$200,000 a year are going to be paying tens of billions of dollars more in taxes just on that one proposal which is out there, allowing the IRS essentially to snoop into people's personal transactions up to the \$600 level. I don't think there is any way you can get around the fact that under that scenario, people in the lower income categories are going to end up paying the lion's share of the cost of that.

So this isn't going to be without cost. This isn't going to be without consequence. This is not going to be without impact on lower income taxpayers in this country. They are going to get hit and they are going to get hit hard under this Democratic proposal.

So when we talk about it, we are talking about real impacts, real economic impacts on the American people's lives. And we are going to continue to do everything we can to fight against really bad tax policies being put in place to finance massive amounts of spending, expansion, and growth of government at a time when government revenues just hit a historic high; never seen before; biggest year-over-year increase in revenue since 1977. And Democrats want to raise taxes—taxes—on everybody, including those in the lower income categories.

## BORDER CRISIS

Mr. President, the Biden border crisis continues unabated. In August, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 208,887 people attempting to illegally cross our southern border, a 318-percent increase from August of 2020. Now, for context, that number is bigger than the population of Sioux Falls, SD, the largest city in my home State.

At this point, "crisis" is too mild of a description. Things at the border are out of control, and there is little to suggest that things will improve anytime soon as the Biden administration continues to permit an influx of migrant entries and has sought to install appointees who have lax views about enforcing our immigration laws.

In yet another sign of how bad things are, dozens of National Guard members from South Dakota recently deployed

to our southern border. I know these South Dakotans are always ready to serve wherever and whenever they are needed, and I am grateful for their service.

You would think that the border crisis would be at the top of the Democrats' priority list here in Washington, DC, particularly when they have to call in the National Guard from States around this country, but you would be wrong. In fact, the border crisis seems like barely a blip on the Democrats' radar, and it is not the only crisis they are ignoring.

Our national security situation is taking a giant step backward with the President's disastrous Afghanistan withdrawal and the Taliban takeover of Afghanistan. Here at home, inflation is becoming a serious and a long-term, not a temporary, problem. Americans' purchasing power is shrinking as they have to stretch their paychecks to cover increases in everything from the price of groceries to the high price of gasoline.

But none of that really seems to matter to Democrats. Their main priority seems to be forcing through a \$3.5 trillion partisan tax-and-spending spree that would permanently expand the reach of government into Americans' lives.

Where to start when it comes to Democrats' tax-and-spending spree? Well, there are tax hikes that would put American businesses at a disadvantage on the global stage and shrink jobs and opportunities for American workers. There is a death tax expansion that could put a lot of family farms and businesses in jeopardy. There are the major new entitlements—free college, free preschool, subsidized daycare, paid leave. Yes, one of the major existing entitlement programs, Medicare, is rapidly heading toward insolvency. Yet, instead of shoring up that program, Democrats are expanding entitlements and putting the government on the hook for an unsustainable level of spending.

Then there are items that get less attention, but they are just as troubling. Traditionally in the United States, individuals have picked the winners and losers through the free market, but the more you insert government into economic and family life, the more government ends up being the one making the decisions. Government ends up picking the winners and the losers.

Take the Democrats' childcare benefit. A 2020 Bipartisan Policy Center survey found that among working families who used center-based childcare, 53 percent used a faith-based center—53 percent. But now Democrats are coming in with their childcare subsidies and in the process changing decades-old childcare funding programs to favor secular childcare providers who provide care at daycare centers. So if you are one of the 53 percent who chooses a faith-based provider for your child, you could be out of luck, not because you changed your childcare preferences but

simply because Democrats have set up their benefit to favor secular center-based childcare providers.

Democrats are repeating this pattern of picking winners and losers throughout their bill. Labor unions win under this bill. Democrats have included a special benefit that would expressly allow union members to deduct their union dues on their taxes. Meanwhile, nonunion workers can expect to pay their usual tax bills. You only get special privileges if you are a union member. If you are one of the 90 percent of American workers who don't belong to a union, then you are not going to see say help as they subsidize the dues of those who do belong to a union. I guess Democrats want to make sure that they get those union votes to come out at election time.

Of course, that is not the bill's only benefit for unions. There is funding for electronic voting systems for union elections and incentives to purchase an electric car from a union factory.

Unions, of course, are not the only winner. Electric vehicle manufacturers, for one, also win. The bill clearly endorses electric vehicles as the—the—climate change solution for the transportation sector. Other clean energy technologies—notably, biofuels—take a back seat in this bill.

I could go on all day when it comes to the spending priorities in this bill, like the fact that the bill dedicates more than \$200 million—\$200 million—to urban agriculture. That is right—urban agriculture. I am not saying that you can't have a garden if you live in a city, but urban gardens are never going to produce the volume of food needed to feed our country, and anyone who thinks they will doesn't know much about agriculture, which may be the problem here.

Democrats' tax-and-spending spree reads like the product of too much socialist daydreaming and not enough time spent learning about how things like agriculture, energy, and economies actually work. Speaking of which, I haven't mentioned the Democrats' tree equity measure—yes, tree equity. Democrats have allowed \$3 billion prioritized for what they recently referred to and have been referring to as tree equity. Now, I support and encourage planting trees, but I don't think the Federal Government can afford to spend \$3 billion on tree equity, especially when Democrats are planning to spend \$200 million—yes, \$200 million—for a park in House Speaker PELOSI's district that features luxury housing and a golf course and provide tax benefits for Ivy League universities and other well-funded colleges, including a new tax credit for higher education institutions for teaching “environmental justice” programs.

Then there are the tax credits for electric bicycles—bicycles that can cost up to \$8,000. It may be just me, but if you can afford an \$8,000 bicycle, I am not sure you need a tax credit for it from the Federal Government.

Then, of course, Democrats are planning to provide billions of dollars to fund a Civilian Climate Corps to provide government jobs for climate activists and \$20 billion for the creation of a National Climate Bank to fund Democrats' pet environmental projects.

Now, as you can see, this list goes on and on and on. The more you read the Democrats' bill with its massive expansion of government and historic tax hikes and its payoffs to liberal constituencies, the more you realize that there is pretty much no area of life the Democrats think wouldn't be better run by the Federal Government.

But my fellow Republicans and I still believe in a vibrant, private economy, and in the right of individuals and families to run their lives as they see fit. So we will continue to oppose Democrats' social spending spree, and continue to fight to secure a future of prosperity, opportunity, and freedom—freedom—for each and every American.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator CORNYN be able to complete our remarks prior to the vote.

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

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I just want my colleagues to know that the Senate Appropriations Committee, yesterday, released nine appropriations bills. They allocate important resources and they help to address the pressing priorities of America's families and communities, but they also promote U.S. national security.

For more than a decade, this country has underinvested in our children, in our infrastructure, in science, and in public health. Frankly, that means we underinvested in our future.

These bills include historic increases to educate our Nation's children, to combat climate change, promote affordable housing, and improve healthcare. I am proud of the work of the committee in producing these bills, and I commend each of the subcommittee chairs for their commitment to America's future.

Now, the bills comply with the topline spending allocation contained in the fiscal year 2022 budget resolution passed by both the House and the Senate earlier this year.

So you combine this with the three bills reported from the Appropriations Committee in August, the bills provide a 13-percent increase for nondefense discretionary programs and a 5-percent increase for defense programs compared to what fiscal year 2021 enacted.

The 5-percent increase for defense programs, that is consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA, which was reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee on an overwhelming bipartisan vote, and it passed the House last month again with overwhelming bipartisan support.



The Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill makes long overdue investments to help care for and educate our Nation's children, including doubling the funding for Title I-A grants to local educational Agencies. That program I mentioned is the foundation of Federal support to schools across this country.

It also increases funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant by 23 percent, and Head Start by 11 percent. We do this to provide high-quality childcare and education to working families across the Nation.

It provides a 24-percent increase over last year for the Centers for Disease Control. That is done to strengthen U.S. public health infrastructure. We know we have to do that in the wake of a global pandemic that has created terrible problems in that area.

The Commerce, Justice, Science bill provides historic funding levels for the Department of Justice Violence Against Women Act programs. That is a 48-percent increase over the last fiscal year. It is the largest appropriation for the Violence Against Women Act since its creation.

The Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development bill includes significant increases to reduce homelessness and improve housing conditions and increase affordability—something that touches all 50 of our States.

The Interior bill includes significant resources to promote conservation, to preserve our natural infrastructure, and to protect our Federal lands. And we made climate change front and center when drafting these bills, and each contains new and critical funding to help combat this challenge.

For example, for the first time ever, we invested \$54 million in a new Climate Conservation Corps; and we provide historic increases, 46 percent over last year, for EPA's air and climate program. And, for the first time in 4 years, the U.S. will contribute to the Green Climate Fund and the Clean Technology Fund, rejoining the international fight—it has to be an international fight—against climate change. We had a global retreat with the last President. The United States is standing up again and is back in the game.

We also make historic investments in medical research. I don't know anybody who doesn't want us to always improve our medical research. It ensures that America remains on the cutting edge of advanced medical science and research. So we put a 6-percent increase for the National Institutes of Health, and \$2.4 billion to create the first ever Advanced Research Projects Agency for Health, and that is because of the President's bold and promising proposal to accelerate the pace of breakthroughs in medicine.

And, finally, the bills contain critical funding increases for mental and behavioral health services and to combat substance abuse—something that is a problem in every single State. These

funds are desperately needed, as we saw the rates of anxiety and depression soar during the COVID-19 pandemic and drug overdose deaths are expected to reach their highest levels to date.

Now, these are just some of the highlights of the important programs funded in the nine bills we released yesterday. They make a real difference in the lives of millions of Americans, especially after the tough year and a half we faced with COVID-19. These bills demonstrate the good work we can do with a topline in fiscal year 2022 budget resolution, which was passed by the Senate and the House earlier this year.

Now, I wish we could have followed regular order and done these bills in committee, but our Republican colleagues said they would prevent any additional consideration of bills until we have a negotiated topline. I cannot and will not allow that to stop our work. It would be irresponsible. We need to move the ball forward. In posting these bills, we show the American people what we are for.

Now, some on the other side of the aisle may characterize these bills as partisan. That is simply not true. In the spirit of comity and bipartisanship, which is the tradition of our Appropriations Committee, we worked hard to accommodate the funding priorities of all Members, both Democrats and Republicans. And the posted bills reflect that effort with many, many, many of the priorities of Republicans and many of the priorities of Democrats.

I am proud of the work of this committee in producing these bills, but our job is not done. The Federal Government is existing under and operating under a continuing resolution only until December 3. Time can go by very quickly around here. Between now and then, it is imperative that we make progress on negotiating a topline—one that is bipartisan and bicameral—so we can enact these bills into law.

I think we struck the right balance with the bills we produced and made public this week. As with everything in Congress, we rarely end where we begin.

So I look forward to working with Chair DELAUNO, Ranking Member GRANGER, and Vice Chairman SHELBY to move this process forward with the goal of enacting all 12 bills by December 3.

If we fail to do that, then we face a long-term continuing resolution, which would lock in outdated spending priorities that will not serve the American people, will not meet the challenges of today, and, unfortunately, will not contain those things that both Republicans and Democrats have asked and were submitted and included in the bills that we have put in.

I know that my friend and colleague from Texas is waiting to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Vermont, for his courtesy.

Tomorrow, the Senate will vote on the latest iteration of what has come to be known as the Democrats' partisan power grab over our elections conducted overwhelmingly by the States—actually, exclusively at the State and local level.

The legislation that prompted this discussion first popped up in 2019, when the newly elected majority in the House went on a messaging bill spree. Over the last 2 years, they have tried a number of different marketing strategies to convince the American people that this overhaul was needed.

This latest version is proof that Congress isn't buying what they are selling, and that is for good reason.

Those who were advocating for a national takeover of our State-run elections, at one point they said it was a matter of election security. Then they said this was designed to help restore voter confidence. Then they said this is a way to remove obstacles that prevented people from voting.

But facts are stubborn things. In 2020, we saw record turnout. Two-thirds of eligible voters cast a ballot, and that was the highest turnout in 120 years.

I was on the ballot in 2020. The last time I had been on the ballot, 6 years previously, there were 4.8 million voters in Texas. In 2020, there were 11.3 million voters in Texas. Compared to the 2016 Presidential election, 17 million more Americans cast a vote, and we saw historic turnouts by Black, White, Asian, and Hispanic voters.

So facts being stubborn things, clearly it is time for the advocates for this Federal takeover to come up with a new sales pitch. So our Democratic friends attacked election integrity bills being passed by State legislatures, like Texas, all across the country.

The Constitution itself gives States the power to determine how their elections should be run, and States are using that authority to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat.

Our Democratic friends have tried to frame these new State laws as somehow suppressing voting rights. As we have seen, if that is the objective, they certainly are doing a lousy job at it because people are voting in unprecedented numbers.

Well, it is interesting to contrast some of the changes that our Democratic colleagues, including the Merrick Garland's Department of Justice, comparing the reforms they have attacked and those that they believe are just fine.

The Georgia law, which the Department of Justice has sued under section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, actually expanded early voting in person to 17 days. But if you live in Massachusetts, you can only vote for 11 days. I haven't heard many complaints about the Massachusetts voting laws restricting people's access to the polls. And the President's home State of Delaware, they



don't even offer in-person early voting, but they will in 2022. But even then, they are even more restrictive than Massachusetts. It will only be for 10 days.

So somehow a short period of early voting in Delaware is acceptable—actually, currently is not available but soon to be acceptable for 10 days—but 17 days of early voting in Georgia is an assault on voting rights. Both cannot be true.

Of course, our Democratic friends believe the only answer to this manufactured assault is an unconstitutional, partisan power grab that they have been pushing for years, as I said. Well, the initial iteration of this came up for a vote in June, and it was sadly rejected, for good reason. The bill would have turned the bipartisan Federal Election Commission into a Democrat-controlled Commission. This is supposed to be evenly split and non-partisan, but that would change under the proposal that we voted on in June.

It would have also allowed ballot harvesting—a dubious practice that is a recipe for mischief and wrongdoing, as a ballot could be harvested by paid campaign staffers, political operative, or anyone who had a stake in the outcome of the election. Just go to your closest nursing home or community center, get people to sign a ballot, and harvest away. That would have been permitted. And, actually, prohibitions against ballot harvesting would have been prohibited under the Democrats' bill.

And the bill would have commandeered States' constitutional authority to draw their own congressional districts. The only thing this proposal would have done for the people, as it is called, would be to help make sure that the outcome of virtually every future election meant that Democrats win and Republicans lose; thus, Republicans would be relegated to a permanent minority status. That was the goal.

If this bill weren't so dangerous, it would have been laughable. Nobody would have taken it seriously. It is no surprise that the only thing bipartisan about this legislation is the opposition. In both the House and the Senate, Republicans and Democrats voted against this legislation.

Still, our Democratic colleagues—I admire their perseverance—they refused to throw in the towel. They decided to work on what they now call a compromise.

Well, generally, a compromise indicates that you have found common ground with somebody who holds a different view. But the so-called compromise bill we are scheduled to vote on tomorrow isn't the result of negotiations between Republicans and Democrats; it is a compromise between the left and the radical left. You really can't call something a compromise when your negotiating partner is sitting on the same side of the table with you.

All this is done to create the illusion or a narrative that the partisan pieces have been stripped out of the bill and it now includes mainstream reforms. But that is far from the truth.

Just like its predecessor, this bill seizes States' constitutional authority to make decisions on matters like voter registration and early voting. It contains invasive disclosure requirements that would undermine citizens' privacy and chill free speech. It places Federal standards on States for redistricting, and threatens action from the Democratic-controlled Attorney General's Office if those standards aren't met. And it makes it harder to root out election fraud, and easier to cheat.

If that is not bad enough, it also takes tax dollars from the American taxpayer and would require it be given to candidates for public office that those taxpayers disagree with. They call that public funding of elections.

Nothing about the bill is a compromise. They may have stripped out some of the most outrageous provisions, but certainly overtly partisan provisions remain.

Republicans uniformly oppose the first attempt at this partisan power grab, and it is no surprise we will oppose this one as well.

This is not a good-faith attempt to ensure our elections are secure from fraud and interference and accessible to all eligible voters. It is rather a political stunt and statement designed to mislead the American people and appeal to the most radical members of the Democratic base.

I am certainly not one to tell the majority leader how to do his job, but it seems like show votes ought to be pretty low on our list of priorities.

Our Democrat colleagues narrowly averted a debt crisis 2 weeks ago, and they have less than 2 months to figure out how to increase the debt ceiling and avoid an economic disaster.

In the coming months, the Senate needs to do what has become an annual tradition, which is to pass the National Defense Authorization Act to give our troops the support they deserve and our commanders the predictability they need for the future. And we need to pass a full slate of appropriations bills to avoid a government shutdown just before the holidays. Those are the things we need to do, at a bare minimum.

We should also be advancing legislation to avert—or to address the border crisis, which has been raging on since January. We need to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. We need to bring down sky-high drug prices, and approve accountability and transparency in policing.

There is a lot we should be doing to solve real problems that deserve action from the country and which our constituents deserve as well.

There is a strong appetite for bipartisan work on both sides of the aisle, but the leadership of the Democratic Party has effectively stonewalled bi-

partisan legislating in favor of a completely partisan approach. It is really a head-scratcher.

Our Democratic colleagues don't have the kind of majorities that FDR had during the New Deal. We have a 50-50 Senate, with the Vice President as the tie-breaker. Common sense ought to tell you that that demands and requires bipartisan legislating, not these kinds of show votes.

We have a long list of tasks that are far more important than virtue signaling. So I hope our colleagues will reevaluate the wisdom of this parade of partisan bills and spend time working with us to find where we have common ground, where we can actually pass legislation and make a difference for our country.

Until that time, we will continue to oppose partisan attacks on our Nation's elections and any other damaging, politically motivated bills Democrats bring to the Senate floor.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Maine.

**Mr. KING.** Mr. President, with regard to the comments of the esteemed Senator from Texas, I say to the Senator: I would suggest, if your colleagues are interested in election reform and election laws, that we have a dialogue and that we have some discussion. I would welcome a proposal from your side of the aisle on election laws and how we deal with efforts to suppress the vote in other parts of the country, and also to change the Electoral Count Act.

Is the Senator interested in those and entering into such discussions?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Texas.

**Mr. CORNYN.** Mr. President, if I may respond to the Senator from Maine.

I am always interested in working on bipartisan bills and finding common ground. I think my record—and as the Senator knows, we have worked together on a number of things. The fundamental problem with our Democratic friends' approach to election reform is they want to nationalize the election. They want to take the authority away from the States, which is clearly given to the States under the Constitution.

But if we can take that off the table and talk about some other areas, we could work together in that area, I would be more than happy to work with my friend from Maine.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Maine.

**Mr. KING.** Not to prolong the discussion, but Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution makes it abundantly clear that the responsibility for election administration is a joint one between the States and the Congress, and that the Congress, at any time, can alter regulations or the efforts to control the vote in a particular State.

That has been true ever since the drafting of the Constitution. It was true at the time of passage of the 15th Amendment. It was true at the time of the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

So I look forward to the possibility of working with any colleague on protecting the sacred right to vote in this country.

I will have further comments on this legislation today.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 261, Christine P. O'Hearn, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Charles E. Schumer, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert Menendez, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher A. Coons, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jacky Rosen, Patrick J. Leahy, Mazie Hirono, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tammy Baldwin, Richard J. Durbin, Chris Van Hollen, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Lujan.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Christine P. O'Hearn, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

(Mr. LUJÁN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 415 Ex.]

#### YEAS—53

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

#### NAYS—44

Barrasso	Cotton	Hagerty
Blackburn	Cramer	Hawley
Boozman	Crapo	Hoeven
Braun	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Burr	Daines	Inhofe
Capito	Ernst	Johnson
Cassidy	Fischer	Kennedy
Cornyn	Grassley	Lankford

Lee	Risch	Sullivan
Lummis	Romney	Thune
Marshall	Rubio	Toomey
McConnell	Sasse	Tuberville
Moran	Scott (FL)	Wicker
Paul	Scott (SC)	Young
Portman	Shelby	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Rounds	Tillis
-------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

#### NOMINATION OF CHRISTINE P. O'HEARN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, today I rise in support of the confirmation of Ms. Christine O'Hearn to the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. I was proud to recommend Ms. O'Hearn for this nomination. She has the qualifications, intellect, and the temperament necessary to make an excellent and impartial Federal judge, and I am confident that she will serve the U.S. District of New Jersey well.

A proud South Jersey native, Ms. O'Hearn was born in Camden, graduated from the University of Delaware, and earned her juris doctor from Temple University's Beasley School of Law in Philadelphia. She is an expert in employment and labor law who has worked on behalf of both employers and workers during her impressive career.

She is currently a partner at the firm of Brown & Connery in Westmont, NJ, where she is highly regarded by her colleagues for her keen insight and confident command of the issues at hand in every case she takes on. Twice she was named one of the Top 40 attorneys under 40 in New Jersey. She has also been featured in New Jersey Law Journal's "Women and Minorities in the Profession." Ms. O'Hearn also previously served as an adjunct professor at Rutgers University School of Law in Camden.

In 2020, Ms. O'Hearn was appointed to the U.S. Magistrate Judge Selection Committee and has served on various distinguished boards, including the New Jersey State Committee of the American College of Trial Lawyers and the New Jersey Court's District IV Ethics Committee.

And this year—this gives you an insight of the person that she is beyond her competence and capability and intellect—she has spent more than 85 hours volunteering as a pro bono attorney for newly arriving Afghan refugees

in Fort Dix, NJ, informing them of their rights and helping them navigate our complicated immigration laws. She described this work as immensely fulfilling and humbling, and I hope it inspires others in the legal profession to lend a hand to the nationwide refugee resettlement effort.

Ms. O'Hearn's professional credentials, combined with her compassion and commitment to the fair and impartial administration of justice, will make her an outstanding judge.

Finally, I would like to remind my colleagues that the U.S. District of New Jersey is one of the busiest courts in all of America. As of last year, more than 46,000 cases were pending before it, many of them among the most complex and challenging cases in the Nation.

Yet multiple vacancies on the court have left its seated judges with some of the highest caseloads in the country, prompting the Judicial Conference of the United States to declare them judicial emergencies.

Now, we have made some encouraging progress on that front in recent months. However, the people of New Jersey deserve nothing less than a fully staffed district court, not to mention all of the parties with business pending before it.

I am confident that Ms. O'Hearn's experience and intellectual rigor will be an asset to the U.S. District Court of New Jersey, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of her swift confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote that was scheduled for 2:30 occur immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VOTE ON O'HEARN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the O'Hearn nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 416 Ex.]

#### YEAS—53

Baldwin	Brown	Casey
Bennet	Cantwell	Collins
Blumenthal	Cardin	Coons
Booker	Carper	Cortez Masto

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

## NAYS—44

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

## NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Rounds	Tillis
-------	--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

## MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs from further consideration of Brian Eddie Nelson, of California, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the two leaders, or their designees, with no motions, points of order, or amendments in order.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. There is.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, we expect the vote to discharge the nomination to occur about 5:30 p.m. today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

## VOTING RIGHTS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise today in defense of the most sacred right we have in this country, and that is the right to vote. This right is fundamental to our democracy. It is the right to make your voice heard in our government.

But this right is under attack by ultraconservative State lawmakers who

are restricting access to our ballot boxes—the same people who continue to cast unserious, faceless and dangerous doubts on the results of the 2020 election.

I am not being hyperbolic when I say, if these attacks succeed, there will be grave consequences for our democratic system not just in those States, but throughout our country.

So as I have said time and again, we must pass strong Federal voting rights protections into law, because doing so is essential to making sure that our democracy stays a democracy. Democrats are rightfully exploring every potential avenue to ensure Americans' fundamental right to vote is not restricted.

We are voting on legislation this week—the Freedom to Vote Act—that has been the result of extended negotiations and discussions. And I appreciate all my colleagues who are working to craft a bill all of us can agree to, one that ensures that voters have equal access to the ballot box; that promotes best practices for voter registration and administration; and protects our elections from the very real threat of interference, both foreign and domestic.

This is a reasonable bill by any stretch of the imagination. And I challenge anyone to tell me what could be more controversial about making election day a public holiday or ensuring everyone has the opportunity to vote early, making sure everyone can request a vote-by-mail ballot.

These are simple measures to ensure that every American's voice can be heard. And I am glad that this bill includes protections so it will help give power back to the people in our government, making sure people pick their representatives rather than representatives picking their voters; by stopping special interest money from drowning out Americans' voices and votes; and by protecting and securing each American citizen's right to cast their ballot.

Again, nothing in this bill should be controversial if you care about the health of our democracy. So I hope our Republican colleagues will join us in supporting it, because I strongly believe protecting every American's right to vote should not be a partisan issue. And my Republican colleagues will have a chance this week to inspire confidence in our elections and make sure they are secure by voting for this commonsense legislation.

But if there are some who want to stand between voters and their due right to the ballot box, we cannot, as public servants, simply throw up our hands and say: Oh, well, we tried.

So Republicans choose to look the other way on implementing Federal voting rights protections because voter suppression tactics might benefit them politically.

Democrats must use every legislative tool needed to get the Freedom to Vote Act to President Biden's desk, including an exemption to the filibuster, because, as I have said, of all the critical

things we will vote on this Congress—and many are so important to our workers and families—this is the most important. It is about the future of our democracy.

And if our Republican colleagues are not willing to stand up for our democracy, we can't let them hide behind Senate rules and block Democrats from doing so on our own. The stakes are really simply too high to fail. One way or another, this Senate has to pass the Freedom to Vote Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

## ENERGY

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about what Americans are talking about all across the country, and that is the fact that energy prices are rising and doing it dramatically.

Energy is called a master resource for a reason. It powers our communities, our homes, our military, and our economy. It fuels the trucks that bring goods and groceries to market. It keeps the lights on at small businesses all across the country, and it heats our homes. This is the reason why higher energy prices mean higher prices in every other part of our life.

Now, over the last 9 months, people have been seeing this all across the country. Energy prices have gone up, and not just by a little. They have gone up a lot. It has contributed to higher prices for just about everything we do and everywhere we go.

The cost of a tank of gas is about a dollar higher now than it was when Joe Biden came into the White House. As a result, if you go to fill up at your local gas station, it is about \$25 more to fill your tank today than it was back in January, on the 20th, when Joe Biden took the oath of office.

Now, it is not just gasoline that has gone up; it is the gas we use to heat our homes. Natural gas powers over half of the homes that are heated across America. And the price is now at a 7-year high. So as a result, families are going to pay a lot more not just to drive, but also to heat their homes this winter.

And it is interesting because here in America, we have the energy resources we need; we are just not able to use them because of this administration.

Under the last administration, America became the largest producer of oil and natural gas in the world—in the world—America. America's energy dominance worked to help us reduce our trade deficit. It brought home more jobs, brought industries home to America. It fueled the best economy in my lifetime here at home in America. And as a nation, we became energy independent for the first time in 70 years.

Well, these were historic achievements by America's energy workers. In my home State, the State of Wyoming was proud to play a major role in these achievements. Wyoming is America's No. 1 per-capita exporter of energy. We

produce it in Wyoming, and we send it around the country and around the world. We power America and we power the world.

Yet, ever since Joe Biden became President, it has become a lot harder. Now, I talk to energy workers at home all of the time in Wyoming, all across the State, and what they continue to tell me is it has never been more difficult than it is right now. In just 9 months, Joe Biden has already become the most anti-American energy President in our Nation's history.

On his first day in office, he drew a target on the back of American petroleum energy, and he pulled the trigger. He killed the Keystone XL Pipeline, and that ended thousands of good-paying jobs at the height of a pandemic. President Biden also shut down oil and gas exploration near the Arctic. He banned oil and gas leasing on Federal land.

This has been devastating to Western States: Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico.

Nearly half of Wyoming is Federal land, and now Joe Biden says that land is off limits to Wyoming energy workers.

Because of Joe Biden's radical anti-energy agenda, people in every corner of this country are paying higher prices for energy. We are paying more at the pump, paying more at the grocery store—paying all around.

Even one of the Democrats' favorite economists, Mark Zandi, says the American people are now paying \$175 more every month—\$175 every month—more than they were a year ago. That includes gas, groceries, rent. Joe Biden inflation—it is equivalent to \$2,100 a week. That is a heck of a paycheck cut for American workers.

So who gets hurt by this?

Well, it is struggling families. It is seniors. It is people living on a fixed income.

Polls show that about half of the country lives paycheck to paycheck. Forty percent of the country says they couldn't afford to cover an emergency if the cost were above \$400.

Well, in the Joe Biden economy, people are paying five times that amount—the amount they can't handle for an emergency—just in the cost of annual inflation.

The Biden White House doesn't seem to care very much about it, doesn't understand it—clueless. Last week, the White House Chief of Staff retweeted a message which said inflation is a "high class problem."

He couldn't be more wrong. If the White House believes this, they are woefully—woefully—at a loss for understanding what is happening in this country, because what is happening is exactly the opposite of what the White House thinks. The White House Chief of Staff clearly doesn't understand the struggles of working families all across this country.

Now, the big Democrat donors in CHUCK SCHUMER's Brooklyn, NY, or

NANCY PELOSI's San Francisco—they are going to be just fine. It is the working families in rural America who are getting hurt the most.

And as winter is coming, energy costs are going to go up significantly. The U.S. Energy Information Administration—branch of the government—says energy bills will be up dramatically this winter compared to last.

This inflation nightmare is absolutely at a point where there is still no end in sight. The American people believe it is going to continue and it is going to get worse.

Democrats have finally been hit with the reality that people are worried about the high cost of energy. So what have they decided to do about it? What will the White House do about it? What will the administration do about it?

Astonishingly, in August, the National Security Advisor begged Russia and OPEC and the oil cartel to pump more oil. It is hard to believe that really happened. It is also hard to believe—my friend and colleague the senior Senator from Alaska told us in the Energy Committee that the United States is using more oil from Russia than we are from Alaska right now.

If you don't believe it in terms of the fact that the administration is asking OPEC and Russia to produce more oil to help lower the costs in the United States, just go to the White House website. They put it on the White House website.

Joe Biden would rather buy energy from our enemies and send American dollars overseas than produce it here at home. He would rather send American dollars overseas to our enemies than explore for American energy and the resources that we have, where we have the capacity to lead the world.

Last week, the Biden administration made an off-the-record call to U.S. energy-producing companies. The administration had the nerve to ask them to lower their prices at the same time that this administration has forced them to lower their production. It is economics 101: supply and demand. It is basic arithmetic.

And now the Energy Secretary says that we might have to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to try to bring more energy onto the market to help deal with the costs that have gone up as a result of the Biden policies. We went to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve during the first Iraq war and after Hurricane Katrina and during the Arab Spring. In other words, this is something we do in a crisis.

The Biden administration won't say it out loud yet, but let's admit it; there is a crisis, and it is one that Joe Biden and this administration have created. It is a crisis of Joe Biden's own making, and it is a crisis that Joe Biden could end tomorrow because we have the capacity at home to do it.

Instead, what are the Democrats doing? Well, they are threatening to make it even worse. Democrats in the Senate are pushing a \$3.5 trillion reck-

less tax-and-spending spree. Last month, one Commissioner of the FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, told us at the Energy Committee that to pass this \$3.5 trillion bill would be "like an H-bomb" on America's energy markets. That is because the bill contains huge portions of what has become known to be the disastrous "green bad deal."

Here are just a few of the examples that are included in this \$3.5 trillion Democratic bill in the House right now: \$8 billion for a so-called Civilian Climate Corps. These are taxpayer-funded climate police. They will get free housing, free clothing, free college tuition, free childcare to go out and police the environment based on the climate.

The Democrat spending spree also includes \$10 billion for what the Democrats call environmental justice in higher education. The bill includes \$105 billion for what the Democrats call climate justice and then green energy subsidies.

Let's take a look at the subsidies. These subsidies include huge subsidies for people who buy and drive electric vehicles. And who buys and drives electric vehicles? Basically, people with lots of income, not the average American. The government is already giving billions of taxpayer dollars to electric vehicle manufacturers and owners. Nearly 80 percent of the tax credits go to households making at least \$100,000 a year. That is who this administration is beholden to. The spending spree would give up to \$12,500 to married couples to buy electric vehicles. A single person earning up to \$400,000 a year could get a subsidy. A married couple earning up to \$800,000 a year could get a subsidy.

Now, how are the Democrats going to pay for all these things, all these handouts? Well, they want to put more taxes on producing natural gas. What is that going to do to the average person trying to heat their home this winter? It is going to raise natural gas prices even higher. Oh, and at the same time, we would eliminate 90,000 American energy jobs. It is going to raise energy costs for people all across the country.

The administration's answer is the last thing we need in this country right now. We in this country have the best energy resources in the world. We also have the best energy workers in the world. It is time to let these good men and women do their jobs. American people don't need trillions of dollars more in taxes and spending and debt. We need more American energy. It is time for Joe Biden and the Democrats to get out of the way of affordable American energy. The people of this country need it badly.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEKEND

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I want to begin today by recognizing the service and sacrifice of our

law enforcement officers. This past weekend, Americans here in our Nation's Capital and around the country participated in National Police Week-end.

Being a law enforcement officer is one of the toughest and most dangerous jobs that there is. I think people on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber would agree with that. Law enforcement officers serve as a boundary between a functioning society and a lawless one. And, sadly, during the course of their vital duty to serve and protect our communities, some pay the ultimate price.

Alabama has lost four individuals in the line of duty to date this year: Deputy Sheriff William H. Smith, of the Baldwin County Sheriff's Office; Police Officer Marquis Dewon Moorer, of the Selma Police Department; Corrections Officer Maurice "Reese" Jackson, of the Robertsdale Police Department; Sergeant Nick Risner, of the Sheffield Police Department.

And our State has lost five individuals this year from COVID: Lieutenant Jeff Bain, of the DeKalb County Sheriff's Office; Police Officer Juan Manuel Gomez-Lopez, of the Pelham Police Department; Deputy Sheriff Harry "Buddy" Hutchinson, of the Blount County Sheriff's Office; Police Officer Brandon Ard, of the Orange Beach Police Department; Investigator Richard Wendell Humphrey, of the Baldwin County District Attorney's Office.

These nine individuals deserve our honor. They got out of bed each morning, put their uniform on, and went to work for our communities across this country.

To their friends and families, thank you for your sacrifice. It is a tough task, loving and supporting someone who goes to work each day, putting their life on the line to protect people they don't even know. They know only that they are fellow Americans.

And to every Alabamian who wears a badge and a uniform, thank you for all you do for our communities.

It is an unfortunate truth that many officers are being driven out of their profession by a wave of anti-police rhetoric on the heels of bad actors who operated outside their training. The Biden administration had jumped at every opportunity to demonize and demean the entire law enforcement profession. The President has shown that if the optics are bad enough, law enforcement will pay.

This was the case with Border Patrol agents on horseback in the Del Rio Sector in Texas just a few weeks ago. Reports of the agents whipping people turned out to be completely and utterly false.

We shouldn't be surprised. When their policies have failed and created chaos, the Biden administration has had a choice between doing what is right and making our government work better or shaming those expected to do more with less. The Biden administration has always chosen the latter.

The administration routinely chooses to hide behind platitudes and broken promises instead of addressing the crises of their own making.

And because of that, the consequences of this administration's illogical and inconsistent policies will be felt by Americans for decades. If we didn't think it could get even worse, this administration's weak border policies impact every aspect of our Nation's immigration system.

But the problems go far beyond the crisis we have seen unfold over the last 9 months at the southwest border. Just last week, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Mayorkas issued guidance ending worksite enforcement operations, which is the authority the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, better known as ICE, uses to crack down on businesses who employ illegal immigrants and to process illegal immigration workers for removal.

Without the threat of removing illegal workers, this new guidance creates a pull factor, or a magnet, attracting more people to the United States through illegal means. Illegal immigrants come with the knowledge that the consequences for breaking our laws under President Biden is minimal or nonexistent.

But this is a departure from what Democrats used to think. In 2005, then-Senator Barack Obama said:

We simply cannot allow people to pour into the United States undetected, undocumented, unchecked, and circumventing the line of people who are waiting patiently, diligently, and lawfully to become immigrants in this country.

In 2009, Senator CHUCK SCHUMER said:

Illegal immigration is wrong, plain and simple . . . people who enter the United States without permission are illegal aliens and illegal aliens should not be treated the same as people who enter the U.S. legally.

And then, in 2006, then-Senator Joe Biden said:

Let me tell you something, folks, people are driving across that border with tons, tons—hear me, tons—of everything from by-products from [drugs] to cocaine to heroin, and it's all coming up through corrupt Mexico.

So why the change? It is politics. They are bending to the pressure from the far left to abandon enforcement of our laws in this country. And just look where it got us. How about the allegations of poor living conditions, rampant COVID-19 infection, and sexual misconduct between unaccompanied alien children and Federal contractors at Department of Health and Human Services housing facilities?

Nearly 2 weeks ago, I sent a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the countless reports of mistreatment of unaccompanied minors while in Health and Human Services custody until released to a parent or legal guardian.

Because our country continues to face public health emergencies brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic, Presi-

dent Biden kept title 42 in place at the border except for one piece. He made a huge politically driven exception: Unaccompanied children could be admitted regardless of public health emergency. This decision led to an onslaught of unaccompanied minors arriving at the border.

This administration has been so consumed by ensuring that the President receives constant good press that they rushed tens of thousands of children through processing facilities and into the hands of adults who hadn't undergone background checks. What is more is Health and Human Services failed to conduct background checks on the contractors working at the housing facilities where unaccompanied minors stay before being released to parents.

The administration repeatedly cut corners and endangered the lives of children just so they could provide pictures of empty Customs and Border Protection processing facilities to the press.

At every turn, it has been about headlines over sound policy, and it has backfired. That is absolutely no way to go.

Oh, and by the way, I have yet to receive a response from Health and Human Services Secretary Becerra on my questions. It has been weeks.

Now there are reports of yet another memo coming out of DHS, one that would protect those who acquired U.S. citizenship by fraud.

U.S. citizenship is the most valuable status that we have in this country, and it is coveted all around the world. It is the reason millions of people immigrate to the United States every year and have done so for many, many generations. They come here with the hope to capitalize on the opportunities that this country provides, the freedoms and liberties afforded to its citizens.

Allowing people to be naturalized through fraudulent methods devalues our sacred privilege. It cheapens the inherent principles of our great country. I sincerely hope the administration will not actually consider such a drastic change in policy. But based on what we have seen so far, I wouldn't be surprised.

By the end of 2021, Customs and Border Protection will have apprehended nearly 2 million people attempting to illegally cross into the United States. July and August each saw apprehensions of up to 200,000 per month.

Folks, that is astounding. That is 2 million people who decided the dangerous journey through South and Central America was worth the risk to illegally enter the United States through our southwest border, rather than to adhere to the laws and regulations we instituted for legal means of immigration.

These numbers negatively impact the U.S. job market and our economy. They put a burden on the taxpayer through increased spending of Federal benefits. These numbers overwhelm—

and I am talking “overwhelm”—our public schools and our hospitals, which are already maxed out.

Also, wide open borders are also an issue of national security, and you can bet that the longer the border remains open, the more drugs make their way into the United States. Customs and Border Protection has seized over 10,000 pounds of fentanyl this year, more than the last 3 years combined. Imagine the amount of illicit drugs President Biden's open border policy have added to our opioid epidemic.

And while the U.S. economy continues to suffer due to the actions taken by the Biden administration in response to COVID, the cartel economy is booming.

Earlier this year, CBP estimated the cartels make about an average of \$14 million per day smuggling people and drugs into the United States. The cartels are running a multibillion-dollar business along our border, and the President is just letting it happen.

Never before have we experienced illegal immigration on this scale, and it can all be tracked back to the bad policy decisions of this President.

U.S. law allows for legal immigration, as well as pathways to work within the U.S. economy. When we allow people to continuously break our laws, we should not be surprised when more people join in. We should not be surprised when our laws no longer carry weight or authority in our country.

The fact that this administration is not only disregarding current law and regulation but actively advertising ways around them is incredible. It is lawless.

President Biden, or whoever in the White House is making these decisions, should be ashamed of themselves, putting people's lives in danger. The President could stop this today if he wanted to, but reverting to the policies put in place by the Trump administration would be an admission that those policies actually worked.

We should all pray that when the consequences of these bad policies trickle down to our communities across this country, our law enforcement officers are still there to clean up President Biden's senseless mess.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2997

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2997, which is at the desk. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to re-

consider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the Senator will speak further about what he is attempting to do, but I want to make it clear, first of all, that this bill isn't about protecting access to food assistance for moms and babies or ensuring children continue to receive healthy school meals. This actually is, unfortunately, a bill that is in search of a problem.

And if my colleague Senator SCOTT wants to work with me on eliminating barriers to access to SNAP or the WIC Program or school meals, I would be more than happy to work with him on it.

But let me just say this: This bill, again, is in search of a problem because there is no rule requiring vaccinations for families to receive food assistance, and no one in the administration is proposing that.

So let me just say that again: There is no rule requiring vaccinations for families to receive food assistance, and no one in the administration is proposing that.

So if we want to work together on how to support families in our country to help make sure children have the healthy food that they need in schools, that is terrific. But rather than spending time on bills like this, we should be encouraging people to get vaccinated to protect their families, protect themselves, and protect their community.

But this bill addresses something that is just not real nor will it be real. And so I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, this time last year, we still didn't know how much longer this pandemic would last. We didn't know when the vaccine trials would be completed. Thankfully, by December, the vaccine had been approved and brought normalcy back to the lives of many Americans. The Trump administration worked with public and private partners, doctors and scientists across our country to develop a safe and effective vaccine in record time. It was a feat of science, and it was an example of what Americans can do when we are working together.

I had COVID, and I am grateful that I was able to get vaccinated. I hope that all Americans talk with their doctors and consider making the same decision. It is a personal decision every individual gets to make.

That is not how President Biden sees it. Lately, the Biden administration has decided to try and take this decision out of the hands of the American people. With this recently announced unconstitutional vaccine mandate for private businesses, King Biden again is saying that government knows best

and has taken choice away from families in Florida and across the country.

That is not what the American people expect government to do. Government's role is to give Americans all the information and data it has so they can make the right decision for their individual family.

That is exactly what I did when I was Governor of Florida. In the face of life-threatening hurricanes, I made sure Florida families were informed. I went out and made sure everyone knew exactly what to expect and how dangerous the storm could be, but I didn't issue mandates because that is not what governments should do.

When I was Governor of Florida, we had the Zika healthcare crisis, which impacted newborns. Rather than placing mandates on pregnant women or restricting their travel to areas with local transmission of Zika, we simply informed Floridians, worked to be as transparent as possible, and offered free Zika testing to all pregnant women in Florida.

But, again, that is not the approach—that is not the approach—Joe Biden has decided to take. President Biden has decided that threatening corporations and businesses and misleading the American people is a better option.

It is dishonest and authoritarian, and it is no way to lead a nation. Americans should be free to make choices they feel are in the best interests of their own health and the health of their loved ones.

In December, President Biden promised he would not require Americans to be vaccinated or require that they carry vaccine passports. But here he is, less than 10 months into his Presidency, breaking promise after promise and going back on his word.

How can the American people believe anything he says? Americans are sick and tired of the government telling them what to do and are more than capable of making the right choices to protect themselves, their family, and their neighbors.

But even as there are some of us in this Chamber who disagree about national vaccine mandates for private businesses, I wanted to try to find some common ground. Food stamps, supplemental assistance for women, infants, and children, and free and reduced lunch programs are programs run through the U.S. Department of Agriculture and provide food to hungry families and are some of the most basic of programs our government provides to those in need.

For kids who are at school and who come from families who are struggling, I am saying you shouldn't have to be vaccinated in order to eat. Or for families who have trouble putting enough food on the table, I am saying you shouldn't have to be vaccinated to get groceries.

I wish—I hoped—my colleague would agree. I offered a simple bill to say that families who need food stamps and additional support for women, infants,



and children shouldn't have to be vaccinated in order to have a full stomach.

I was a poor kid growing up. My parents struggled to put food on the table, but my colleague is telling families like mine growing up that they don't care about their personal choices: If you want to be able to eat, you have to get a shot.

This is ridiculous. This is un-American. This is an attempt by President Biden to take over every aspect of your life. I am not going to stand for it. The American people are not going to stand for it.

I hope every household in America sees what happened on the floor today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### BUILD BACK BETTER AGENCY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I want to talk about two things as we are waiting for Senator WYDEN.

First, I have been hearing all across the State of Florida, people are really concerned about the Democratic proposal basically to look at everybody's bank accounts.

The latest is that the proposal will take it from looking at every \$600 transaction or \$600 account to \$10,000. Well, if you look at it, almost everybody has a \$10,000 account because what they are talking about is cumulative dollars.

So why does the IRS want to look at everybody's accounts?

It is for one reason. The one reason is to take more dollars out of somebody's pocket.

We can't let this happen. We have a right to privacy in this country. We should be able to not have to tell the government everything we buy. If you want to buy a sofa or anything, you shouldn't have to tell the Federal Government.

So I completely oppose this significant overreach by the Democrats trying to look into everybody's bank accounts, because that is exactly what it would do.

#### SUPPLY CHAIN

Madam President, the second thing I want to talk about is the supply chain. We have a significant problem in the supply chain. Not only do we have a big problem, but if you look at what is going to happen with regard to the vaccine mandate, it is going to cause even more problems.

My dad was a truck driver. If he had to choose, he would have a tough choice if he wasn't comfortable, for whatever reason, getting the vaccine—and I took the vaccine and I had COVID—then he is going to lose his job, which is going to impact a lot of American families. It is going to cause the supply chain to be in worse shape,

and it is going to cause even more inflation.

So with President Biden's recently announced unconstitutional vaccine mandates for private businesses, the President is saying government knows best and is taking choice away from families all across our country, but clearly my State of Florida.

That is not what the American people expect government to do. The government's role is to give people information. Give them the information and let them make good choices. They will make good choices.

My parents didn't have much of an education, but they could make good choices. They figured out what was good for our family.

These decisions should be up to individuals, not government. That's why I asked consent to pass S. 2997, and, unfortunately, the Senate Democrats objected. I hope we can find some common ground.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2998

Madam President, I hope everyone here believes you should not have to receive a vaccine in order to obtain a Social Security check or Social Security disability check. Forcing families to choose between receiving Social Security and choosing to get vaccinated is a terrible choice.

That is why I introduced legislation to protect Social Security recipients and ensure that Biden won't be able to strong-arm them into compliance with his unconstitutional mandate.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2998, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam President. I am trying to juggle two things at once.

We are talking about the Social Security UC; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I reserve my right to object.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and as a former director of the Oregon Gray Panthers, I take a backseat to no one when it comes to protecting Americans' earned Social Security benefits.

Now, we know Halloween is right around the corner and families are getting ready for festivities—decorating their houses, picking out costumes, and watching scary movies. My colleague from Florida seems to be getting into the spirit of all this by telling the American people scary stories about vaccines threatening their Social Security benefits. I don't believe the

American people are so easily tricked. This idea is as fantastical and ridiculous as a vampire living under your bed.

The fact that Republicans are trying to scare folks for political gain I think is just very, very disappointing. These bills that are rooted in political messaging aren't going to help to end this pandemic or take concrete steps to address actual challenges facing many of our constituents.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, well, clearly I am pretty shocked. By objecting to this bill, my colleague is suggesting that it is acceptable for the government to deny Social Security checks to American seniors and checks to those who are physically disabled because they have made a personal medical choice to not receive the vaccine.

This is not farfetched. The Biden administration is already doing it to companies, and people are out of a job. The Social Security system is meant to help those who have spent their lives working in this country, and disability checks are designed to help those who cannot work. These checks are not a tool for government to impose its will on the people, just as it shouldn't be the position of the Biden administration to require companies to enforce the vaccine mandate.

But if you are on Social Security or your parent is receiving Social Security checks, this is what my colleague is suggesting by blocking this legislation: Get the vaccine or go broke.

As we all know, prices are going up, and the Social Security Administration just announced a record cost-of-living increase in benefits to keep up with Biden's inflation crisis. Individuals dependent on Social Security still need to get gas and groceries to survive. By objecting to this simple bill, my colleague is comfortable offering an ultimatum: Get the vaccine or go broke. It is wrong—it is wrong to the core—and the American people know it.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2999

Mr. President, perhaps my colleague may agree with me on a different point—that vaccine mandates shouldn't be tied to participation in Medicare, Medicaid, or CHIP. There are more than 60 million Americans on Medicare and more than 80 million Americans receiving Medicaid or CHIP assistance. These programs are important for ensuring that our families, our seniors, and our kids can stay healthy and have access to a doctor. No one should be deprived of healthcare because they have chosen not to receive the vaccine. It would be simply unethical to do so. It seems like pretty common sense.

My proposal would protect individuals on Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP from any overreaching vaccine mandates, like the President has done with



companies, and ensure that a personal medical decision does not strip them of the access to healthcare they need.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2999, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, again, this deals with an area that is in the province of the Senate Finance Committee. There, I made a special priority of ensuring that Americans who count on Federal healthcare programs can actually get the care they need. The notion that Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP coverage could be subject to vaccination status is just nonsense.

Contrary to Republican views that Federal coverage should be contingent on filing extensive paperwork, as conservative Governors have pushed in States from sea to shining sea, Democrats believe healthcare is a basic human right and should be available to all.

Millions of Americans have received the COVID-19 vaccine through the Medicare and Medicaid Programs. That ought to be celebrated as a success rather than scaring people about their earned benefits being taken away.

These bills—now two of them—are thoroughly about political messaging and aren't going to help to end this pandemic or do anything to address challenges facing so many of our constituents.

With that, again, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, first of all, let's remember that the President is requiring a vaccine mandate if you have a job. So there are people there who are going to lose their job because they, for whatever reason, are uncomfortable getting the vaccine. So this is not farfetched.

I thought my colleagues had gone too far by suggesting it would be acceptable for the government to tie vaccines to Social Security checks, but this is another level of insanity. My colleague is comfortable denying healthcare to someone because of their vaccine status. It is really quite ironic because for the past 10 years, we have had Democrats falsely claim Republicans want insurance companies to be able to deny coverage based on preexisting conditions. But here we have it right here on the Senate floor—Democrats are doing exactly what they have falsely accused Republicans of. They want to be able to deny healthcare to Americans who have not received the vaccine.

Does anyone really think that denying healthcare to people who don't

want to get the vaccine for whatever reason is truly in the best interest of public health? What do you do when someone is a bit hesitant on the vaccine? And we all have met people like that. For my Democratic colleagues, the answer is simple: Take away their healthcare.

Do you need to refill your arthritis prescription? It seems Democrats want to make sure that pharmacists charge you more unless you get the shot. Maybe it is time to get your physical. If you have been on Medicaid, you are left with two options: Either get the shot or go home because the Democrats don't want you to get your ears checked or your blood work completed unless you have met their standard of getting the shot.

Whether you like it or not, some people are not comfortable. It doesn't matter how poor you are; they are willing to strip you of your health insurance and take away your ability to get your prescriptions unless you get the vaccine.

The American people know these choices are wrong, and the fact that my colleagues stand by their decision I think is outrageous.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3000

Mr. President, now, hopefully, we can get to some common ground. I think our colleagues disagreed on some of these things, but let's see if we can find another one they will agree on, and that is access to housing.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development provides a wide variety of housing programs meant to help individuals and families in need of a home and those who are struggling and down on their luck. They help with everything from loans to first-time home buyers to homeless shelters and housing assistance. More than 5 million people currently receive some kind of housing assistance from HUD.

I can't imagine anyone would think that the government should mandate vaccines for Americans who need to have basic access to housing or be able to limit, if you don't want to get the vaccine, your access to housing.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3000, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. BROWN, reserving the right to object, I don't want to laugh. This is too serious. But we have the chairman of the Republican Senate campaign committee who comes down to the floor—he knows better. I mean, he just knows better. He knows this is a political stunt. It is what he does.

I don't think the chair of the Senate Republican campaign committee gets paid extra to do this kind of stuff, but

it is just clearly a political stunt. He knows. He doesn't really know—I don't know what he knows, but I do know that I haven't seen his interest in housing since he has been in the Senate. I am the chair of the Housing Committee. When I was ranking member with Senator CRAPO, for whom I have great respect, I didn't see any. But all of a sudden, he has this interest in low-income people's housing to make sure that they have safe, accessible, affordable places to stay.

He knows—he should know; I don't know how he would not know—that HUD is not requiring proof of vaccination for people to use their services. There is no hint of any of us—I mean, because I am lucky enough to be chair of this committee, I do more in housing than perhaps anybody in this body—at least one of the three or four who do the most—and I don't know anybody who is saying we are going to require proof of vaccine. So it is just a political stunt.

I don't know if the Senator from—I think it is Florida; I am not sure—the Senator from Florida is going to, as soon as this is over, take down these debates and show how he is standing up for people's access to housing, especially low-income, but he is proposing that the Senate take up and pass a bill to address a problem that just isn't happening.

The sad part is, we know how real housing issues are in this country. It isn't a stunt for people trying to figure out how they are going to pay the rent. We know that before the pandemic, 25 percent of renters in this country were paying more than half their income for rent. That means if the car breaks down, it means if their child gets sick, it means if they have a minor workplace injury and they miss a week of work, it means that then their lives are turned upside down because they are evicted.

I wish I saw my colleague and the other officers of the Republican Senate campaign committee out on this floor fighting for those renters, fighting for those low-income people who are paying \$700 or \$800 a month in rent in Hartford or in Cleveland and could pay less if they owned a home, but they don't have the downpayment. It would be great to see them come out on the floor and work with us—work with us—the Senator from Connecticut and me and others, to help low-income people come up with that downpayment. There are 27,000 Floridians who were experiencing homelessness even before the pandemic.

So I just wish I saw this concern and these concerns in other ways. Housing is a foundation for opportunity. It is the biggest cost most families face. The cost is way too high. We can't build an economy that works for everyone when housing prices eat up more of families' budgets year after year. We can work to fix that.

I encourage the Senator from Florida to join us to fix the real problems in

rural areas, in big coastal cities, in small towns on Lake Erie or the Atlantic Ocean. It is a national problem that needs a national response and a national, significant investment. Let's take housing problems seriously. Let's stop the political stunts. Let's work together for the people whom we serve.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, well, first off, the Senator might not know I grew up in public housing, so I do have a little bit of knowledge about public housing, and we had public housing for my constituents as Governor of Florida. So I watched my friends struggle to make do.

Let's all remember that President Biden promised us that he would not require anybody to get the vaccine or require vaccine mandates, and that has clearly changed.

So, you know, my parents didn't have much of a formal education, but they worked hard, and they made the best choices they could with the information they had, and they focused on the well-being of our family. So it is baffling to me that my colleague might be willing to tell a family like mine that a vaccine was a precondition to have a roof over their head. I am surprised that Senate Democrats are willing to look in the eyes of struggling families and say: We can't help you unless you have been vaccinated first—which is actually going on right now when you are telling people in this country that if you don't get vaccinated, you lose your job. You will lose your job, so you will not be able to pay the rent; you will not be able to afford your house; you will not be able to afford to put food on the table. That is exactly what is going on. So this is not farfetched.

These HUD programs were not meant to be used to force somebody to get a vaccine. So I am shocked that my colleague would object.

My colleagues have objected to several proposals. All my proposals are designed to make sure that there is no government overreach. Why is this important? Because let's remember, Joe Biden promised he would not require anybody to get a vaccine, and he went back on that promise. I don't believe anybody sitting on this floor should ever be in a position to say that they are OK with somebody not getting in a government program because they haven't had a vaccine—food assistance, Social Security, healthcare, or housing, any of them.

Now, look, I want to be clear. I had COVID. I got the vaccine, and I hope every American will consider getting the vaccine. But it is a decision that every American gets to make. They should talk to their doctor and make a decision for their family, and our government should never be in a position to tell somebody to get a vaccine.

We can't give people an ultimatum to comply with unconstitutional man-

dates or go without anything—Social Security, healthcare, housing, food benefits, or a job—which is going on all across this country right now. It is a gross overreach by the Federal Government at a time when we need more information and more compassion, not mandates from an administration more focused on advancing its socialist agenda than looking out for every American.

So, unlike Joe Biden and Democrats in Washington, I don't believe the government knows best. I grew up in a family—and my parents didn't have much of an education, but they did the best they could for our family. They worked hard. They made choices to make sure we all stayed safe. They didn't rely on a government program other than to get information. They were trying to get good information from the government and make their own choices.

So with that, I am very disappointed that my colleagues would disagree.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### CHILD TAX CREDIT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have a message for Ohio voters, my great State of 12 million people.

To Ohio voters, to parents, I say: Check your bank accounts.

On Friday, most Ohio parents—the parents of more than 2 million children, 92 percent of children in our State—most Ohio parents, once again, saw \$250, or \$300, or \$600 in tax cuts directly deposited in their banks accounts, or maybe they got the check in their mailbox.

To parents, I say: We know how hard you work at your jobs and raising your children.

Any parent—any parent—knows how much work it is to take care of children, especially young children.

I am the lucky, proud grandparent, grandfather of eight grandchildren. I watch my children—five of our grandchildren live in Ohio; three of them live out of State not too far away. I watch them. I watch how hard they work, how difficult it is to take care of young children. And it has only gotten harder, of course, we know, over the last year and a half.

So often I say to these parents: Your hard work doesn't pay off like it should.

We have seen what happened over the past few decades: productivity goes up, stock prices have soared, executive compensation is off the charts; yet wages have barely budged.

Meanwhile, you know how expensive it is to raise children: healthcare, school lunch, diapers, clothes, school supplies, braces, sports fees. The list never seems to end. One of the biggest expenses, of course, for so many families is childcare.

Parents feel like they are stuck. The more they work, the more expensive childcare is. You feel like you can't keep up, no matter how hard you work.

It is why we passed the child tax credit—the largest tax cut for working families ever. It is about finally, finally, making your—Ohio parents—your hard work pay off so you can keep up with those extra expenses that keep coming when you are raising a family.

Stories pour into our office from parents from Sandusky to Portsmouth, from Ashtabula to Middletown and Hamilton, from Toledo to Gallipolis—stories we hear over and over about these tax cuts; stories about how expensive childcare is, how parents are using their money to afford childcare so they can go back to work or, in some cases, work overtime.

Kristen of Columbus said she is using this to pay for “Daycare. For two kids [at] \$600/wk.”

Brittany said, “Daycare.”

Ellie said, “Daycare.”

Alex in Cleveland: “Every penny goes to daycare. 4 kids in daycare . . . \$800/week.”

These tax cuts mean more parents are in the workplace. They can afford to go to work. It is that simple.

And let's be clear. Getting \$300, getting \$600 a month per child in tax cuts doesn't discourage anyone from getting a job, or doesn't cause any of them to quit.

I am going to leave my job that pays \$30,000 a year because I am getting \$3,000—said no one ever to us.

There is no way you could afford to raise a family on that. You still need a job. These tax cuts help parents afford that job.

It is all about dignity of work. I can't count the number of families that said: You know—I said on this floor a few minutes ago that 25 percent of renters in this country spend half their income on rent. So we know how anxious those families are on the last week of the month.

One of the things I have heard perhaps more than anything else about this child tax credit is: The last week of the month, we don't have to deny our kids dessert, or we don't have to cut something else because some of that anxiety has been lifted off our shoulders because we are getting \$250 per child in the child tax credit.

It makes a huge difference in just their lives. As I said, it is about the dignity of work. All work has dignity, whether you punch a clock or swipe a badge, whether you work for tips, whether you are on salary, whether you are caring for children, whether you are taking care of a sick parent.

Raising children is work. Raising kids is a hell of a lot more work than moving money from one overseas bank account to another, or than checking your balance in your stock portfolio.

That didn't stop MITCH MCCONNELL from rewarding the wealthiest CEOs and hedge fund managers and Swiss banks account owners. We remember what happened. We looked down the hall in Senator MCCONNELL's office, just 100 feet or so down there, and you see—particularly 3 or 4 years ago, you

saw the lobbyists lining up there as he was dolling out to the wealthiest CEOs and the hedge fund managers and the Swiss bank accounts holders and the politicians, doing their bidding: pass that tax cut for the wealthy and for corporations and outsource jobs.

Don't think a lot of those CEOs didn't take the tax cut, outsource jobs, set up manufacturing in those countries, and sell back in the United States. And then they took part of the tax cut and did stock buybacks to make themselves richer.

Senator McCONNELL and the leaders in this body all knew that is what that was all about. But when it comes time for a tax break for families making \$10- or \$20- or \$50- or \$75,000 a year, they are absent.

We know that it was a partisan vote. Every Democrat voted for the biggest tax cut in American history. Every Republican voted against the biggest tax cut in American history. Fortunately, there were more of us than there are of them. It was 51 to 50.

They promised their tax cuts for the rich would trickle down. We know they never do. They keep the money for themselves. They spent that money on stock buybacks.

Now, as I said, without a single vote from Republicans—I don't like to be partisan around here. I represent a State that leans Republican. A lot of Republicans vote for me because I work with them and want them to succeed, as I want everybody to succeed. But we also know this tax cut shows whose side you are on.

It is a pretty simple contrast—are you on the side of workers, or are you on the side of these big corporations that outsource jobs? Do you want tax cuts for billionaires and decamillionaires, or do you want tax cuts for working families?

Overwhelmingly, Americans from all over the country, from all kinds of backgrounds agree with that. Everyone is lining up behind extending the child tax credit expansion: the faith community, the civil rights community, the children's advocacy community, Catholic Charities, Bread for the World, RESULTS, the Coalition on Human Needs, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the Children's Defense Fund.

So many others are writing us in the last week in support of keeping these checks going, in support of extending the child tax credit 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 5 years, 10 years, making it permanent, because every single month we show parents and workers we are on your side.

So count on it. Starting July 15, first check; a month later, mid-August, second check; a month later, mid-September, third check; just last week, the fourth check. Two hundred and fifty dollars if your child is between the ages of 6 and 17; \$300 per child if your child is under 6. It has been like clockwork. It has made a difference.

We haven't quite reached everybody in my State—2.5 million children are

eligible, 2.4 million. We have reached about 2.3 million of them. So we are still working to find those other parents who don't know about this for their children.

But think of what that has done for 92 percent of my State's children. Ninety-two percent of the kids in my State, their parents are benefiting from this.

One man said to me: You know, for the first time ever, I can buy my child—I can buy my daughter fastpitch softball equipment.

At the same meeting, a woman, a mother, told me: You know, for the first time ever, my son can go to summer camp now, first time ever.

Other parents were talking about childcare. One family said: You know, we can put aside \$100 a month so my daughter can go to Sinclair State Community College, or maybe the University of Dayton, or maybe Ohio University.

Other families talk, as I said, Mr. President, about rent, the anxiety they feel at the end of every month to come up with that rent check so they don't get evicted.

Every single month, we are showing parents and we are showing workers we are on your side. We will keep doing that. I hope more Republicans join us and we can do this bipartisan, but, either way, we will not stop fighting to make sure parents' hard work pays off for years to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

IRS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in the past few weeks, I have been working with my colleagues in the Senate to draw attention to the privacy concerns of requiring all financial institutions to report to the IRS on the inflows or outflows on every checking, loan, and investment account above a certain threshold.

Under the guise of closing the tax gap, Democrats have proposed to drastically expand the powers of the IRS and turn banks and credit unions into private investigators for law-abiding Americans. The proposal as it originally came out in the "Green Book" from the White House required that every single financial account—not just bank accounts, not just credit union accounts, but all financial accounts that have more than \$600 worth of inflow or \$600 worth of outflow in a given year would have to have that reported to the IRS.

We have been pointing this out to people across America now for several weeks, and the uproar is loud. The message has been getting heard obviously because now the administration and the IRS are saying: Well, we didn't really mean just everybody who has a \$600 inflow or outflow of their account. We are willing to raise that to \$10,000—so that you don't have to have the IRS snooping on your financial data in your financial accounts unless you have more than \$10,000 worth of income or more than \$10,000 worth of outflow in your account.

And they said: And we are not even going to count wages or interest or government benefits in that.

Well, let's see what that really means. Does that really reduce the scope of this spying on Americans' financial accounts, this dragnet, letting the IRS have access to everybody's account? How many people don't have \$10,000 worth of income or outflow in their account?

Let me just give you a few data points. From the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average household in America—the average taxpayer in America spends about \$61,000 a year. What do they spend that on? The average is housing, \$20,000; transportation, \$9,700; personal insurance and pensions, \$7,296; healthcare, \$4,968; groceries, \$4,464; restaurants and other meals, \$3,459; entertainment, \$3,226; other, \$2,030; cash contributions, \$1,888; apparel and services, \$1,866; education, \$1,407; and personal care, \$768—for a grand total of the average American running \$61,224 through their personal accounts in a year.

So does raising the total to \$10,000 really stop the IRS from accessing very many people's accounts? No. The IRS today, because of the pressure that we have been putting on them, said today: Well, you know, we already have data from everybody's account on their paychecks; and we already have data on their interest that they get on their various accounts, which has to be reported to us; and we already have data on Federal benefits, like the COVID payments that have been made to people. So we don't need to have those data points collected in this new, massive privacy violation. We can leave those out. But we need—and this is what the IRS said today, trying to defend this: But we need to have access to the other sources of income that people have.

Now, in that very same document, the IRS said: Well, we are not going to audit anybody who makes less than \$400,000 a year. Well, that wasn't what the Green Book said. They didn't say we will change our proposal to forbid us from auditing anybody who makes less than \$400,000 a year. All they said was: Take our word for it. We promise. We will only audit rich, rich people who are billionaires.

Well, if that is really the position they are taking, then why don't they put it in the bill? Why don't they put it in the proposal? Why don't they put right in the proposal that they cannot, secretly or publicly, access the data of private individuals in their private accounts if they make less than \$400,000 per year? It would be really simple, wouldn't it?

But the IRS didn't say that, and the reason they didn't say that is because that is not what they intend to do. Remember, they started out at \$600. That tells you what they wanted. Now, they said: Well, we think we can get away with \$10,000—because they know that still covers everybody.

Think of a family that doesn't spend more than \$10,000—yeah, that spends less than \$10,000 in a year in their financial accounts. Think of a small business in America that doesn't run more than \$10,000 a year of income and expense through their accounts. It will pick up every small business in America; it will pick up, I think, every family in America; and nothing will be changed. The IRS will have data on every American's account.

Then they say: Well, OK, but it is only two numbers. It is just the total of your income and the total of your outflow.

Well, everybody can kind of intuitively tell that that doesn't make sense. What would they do with those two numbers? What they will do with those two numbers is use their algorithms to figure out which taxpayers to audit—or which taxpayers that they don't even need to audit; they will just send them a notice of deficiency and say: Well, we think you should owe more taxes, and this is what we think you should owe us.

And if the taxpayers don't comply, then the IRS can go ahead and audit them. And guess what happens when they audit them? They get access to every single transaction in their account.

I asked the IRS Commissioner about whether this proposal involved transactional data or just totals, and he said: Well, we already have access to their transactional data if we want it. That is not a direct quote, but that is the essence of what he said. And it is true. If they want to audit you, they can get access to your bank accounts already.

So the question is: Who are they going to audit? Now, today, those who are trying to defend this say: Well, we are only going to audit people who have, as they said, \$10,000 worth of inflow or outflow, and we will even exclude wages, which are already reported, and we will exclude government benefits, which are already reported, and we will exclude interest, which is already reported, and we won't look into anybody's account if they make under \$400,000.

Well, that is actually not true. They just said they wouldn't audit those accounts. How can they make the money they are trying to make out of this proposal if they don't?

Let's look at this in another perspective. We asked the Joint Committee on Taxation to tell us what they think the distribution of audits and tax collections would be from Americans in all income brackets of this proposal, and the Joint Committee on Taxation said: Well, you know, we can't tell you that because they haven't given enough detail on their proposal. So we can't tell you what their proposal is going to do because they haven't told us just the details of how their proposal is going to work.

But Joint Committee on Taxation did say: You know, what we can do is

look at the tax gap, which this is supposedly aimed at addressing, and we can tell you where that tax gap falls among the various income cohorts. So we asked them to do that.

They indicated that the tax gap falls mostly in ineffective or less than accurate reporting on schedules C and schedule E. So they went through and they looked at this. So if you look at the Joint Committee on Taxation's report and the tax gap that is available for the IRS to go get, here is what would happen: 40 to 57 percent of the tax gap collections would come from taxpayers making \$50,000 or less. If you add in up to \$100,000, 65 to 78 percent of those making less than \$100,000 would be part of the tax gap that they would be going after; 78 to 90 percent from those making less than \$200,000; and only 4 to 9 percent would come from those making \$500,000 or more.

So if you want to know what the IRS wanted, you can look at this data on the tax gap; you can look at the data on where the tax gap lies; and you can look at their very first proposal that was down as low as \$600. And you know then what the IRS is seeking to get.

Americans should be outraged that the IRS is seeking to make banks, credit unions—I don't know—Venmo, PayPal, credit card companies, everybody who handles financial transactions, report to them, if you hit some level, whether it be \$600 or \$10,000 of either income or expenditure. And then the door is open. Then the IRS can use its algorithms and decide whether to do a deeper dive on you.

And if they use the data from the Internal Revenue Code and from the tax reporting that has already gone on, 90 percent or more will come from people making \$200,000 or less. Or the IRS will have to forgo that; in which case, they will be trying to collect on only 4 to 9 percent, which is the people making over \$500,000.

Either way you look at it, either they are going to be collecting money—and that is billions and billions of dollars—from people who make less than \$400,000 and mostly less than \$200,000 or \$100,000—or they won't make the tax collections that they are claiming they are going to get to justify the spending they want to make in their spending spree, in this big tax-and-spending spree that they are trying to cram down through Congress.

Let's look at it from another way. Does Treasury envision gathering information on all of a—let's take a teacher. So if you have a teacher, does Treasury envision gathering information on all of the teacher's savings, checking, PayPal, Apple Pay, and Venmo accounts and somehow expect financial institutions to crosscheck these transfers to see if the threshold has been tripped? And at which point must additional reporting be done?

It is very important to point out here: When I said earlier the White House and Treasury haven't really said what their plan is, it is because they

don't want people to know what the real plan is.

There is a telling sentence in the Green Book, put out by the White House, about this plan. It says that broad powers will be given to Treasury Department to issue by rule and regulation the details of how they are going to utilize and access this data.

So if you have got a Treasury Department which has already proven it can't keep the data it has safe and that its data will be hacked; if you have a Treasury Department that has already proven that it will not avoid utilizing the data it has for political purposes, that it will not weaponize the data it collects to punish or try to diminish the effect and influence of people with different political points of view; if you already have an IRS that has proven that it will take those kinds of actions, and that it is available to be accessed for its private data to be hacked, what can Americans expect from that?

Again, those today who have talked about it said they have fixes that, as I see it, don't really fix the proposal because it has fundamental flaws. The IRS does not need to have access to the accounts of every American who spends more than \$10,000 or every American who has income of over \$10,000.

Industry has already spoken up about these changes that were proposed today. The American Bankers Association says that even with the modifications announced today, this proposal goes too far by forcing financial institutions to share with the IRS private financial data from millions of customers not suspected of cheating on their taxes.

The exclusion of payroll and Federal program beneficiaries does not address millions of other taxpayers who will be impacted by this proposal. Not every nonwage worker is a millionaire. How about self-employed hair stylists, convenience store owners, and farmers, just to name a few?

If enacted, this new proposal would still raise some of the same privacy concerns; increase tax preparation costs for individuals and small businesses; and create significant operational challenges, particularly for community banks. The list goes on.

Americans must speak up loudly and say "no."

When asked if she was going to put this in the next bill, NANCY PELOSI said: "Yes, yes, yes, yes."

Americans should say "No, no, no, no."

I yield to Senator GRASSLEY.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Senator CRAPO, for leading this effort to point out what is wrong with this \$4.2-trillion reckless tax-and-spending spree. It is a massive government intrusion into the daily lives of American families.

Under their vision for America, there isn't any aspect of life in which the government shouldn't perform a leading role. From cradle to grave, childcare to healthcare, college to career, the Federal Government will be

there in your lives, shaping your every decision.

Their plans go well beyond shoring up the social safety net to prevent those in need from falling through the cracks. And everybody agrees that people that have needs, there is a role for government. But that doesn't include 320 million Americans.

No longer, then, will the Federal Government's primary role be about lending a helping hand so individuals can get back on their own feet. Instead, government would be the ultimate helicopter parent, constantly hovering, regardless of need.

Even wealthy households would be in line for generous handouts to procure Federal Government-approved childcare, send their kids to a Federal Government-structured preschool, purchase Federal Government-approved health insurance on the individual market, and obtain Federal Government-provided paid family leave.

Isn't that a staggering list of things that the Democrats are proposing in this 4.2 tax-and-spending spree they are pushing?

On the one hand, my Democratic colleagues rail against the wealthy paying too little tax. On the other hand, they want to shower the wealthy with government benefits, not to mention hand the wealthy, for instance, \$12,500 to purchase a luxury electric car and make Federal taxpayers subsidize the State tax bills of millionaires.

Can you believe the inconsistency of their arguments?

Tax the wealthy; give to the wealthy. At the same time, Democrats have decided that the best way to crack down on billionaires evading taxes is to snoop on the middle class. You just heard Senator CRAPO speak at length about that. Under their proposal, every American's bank account with \$600, or even if it is \$10,000, of annual taxations would be subject to the peering eyes of the IRS.

Democrats are betting the promise of free gifts will be too enticing for Americans to resist. However, Americans understand anything advertised as free comes with strings. Particularly, if it is free from the government, there is going to be strings attached. Those strings include higher taxes today and in the future and any loss of control over intimate family decisions.

Liberal Democrats, in their progressive bubble, are under the mistaken impression the general public is clamoring for evermore government programs. Now, in reality, Americans have long held a healthy skepticism of Big Government. A recent Gallup poll shows this continues to be true to this very day. According to Gallup—I think it was a weekend poll—nearly 80 percent of Americans say that they prefer lower taxes and less government, or would like to see no change in either. Only 19 percent said they wanted more taxes and more government.

President Clinton—up until 21 years ago, the President of the United

States—understood this well when, in 1996, he declared in a State of Union message, “the era of big government is over,” and then worked with Republicans on comprehensive welfare reform.

Why can't those things go on today?

Hopefully, President Biden and Senate Democrats come to their senses and realize this before taking our Nation down the path of fiscal ruin. And I would define “fiscal ruin” by a Democrat by the name of Larry Summers, former Secretary of the Treasury in the Clinton administration—and I think he also had some posts in the Obama administration—anyway, he told us in January, he told us in April, he told us in August, and I saw it again on television just last week: Spending all this money is feeding the fires of inflation like gasoline on that fire, and we ought to learn not to go through what we did in the seventies and eighties with inflation out of control.

Listen to that, fellow Democrats, today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, Hoosiers have heard me talk about the size of the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spend bill—\$3.5 trillion, and possibly growing in the House of Representatives. They have heard me talk about how this reckless proposal will raise tax on the American people.

When I am talking about this legislation back home, I don't have to go much past the \$3.5-trillion figure. People are against it. All told, Democrats have proposed \$7 trillion in spending this year alone—\$7 trillion.

Let me try to put that in perspective. Seven trillion dollars is roughly the mathematical equivalent of putting \$1 million of credit card debt on every man, woman, and child in the State of Indiana.

Now, Hoosiers know this is something we simply cannot afford. Beyond the massive multitrillion-dollar pricetag, we should examine exactly what the Democrats are proposing, because this bill isn't just a number on one side of a ledger sheet. This spending package—the largest in American history—represents a massive leftward shift in the way our country operates. And Hoosiers and, I think, all Americans need to know what is in it.

Well, thankfully, I sit on the Senate Finance Committee, and in the Senate Finance Committee we are charged with overseeing matters related to taxation and entitlement programs. So if anyone has insight into the particulars of this legislation, it would be a member of the Senate Committee on Finance.

If any legislation this large and this consequential were to pass, it would surely go through the Senate Finance Committee. But the full Finance Committee hasn't held a policy hearing in months.

Tomorrow, we will hold our first full committee hearing since July. That

hearing will be on a topic only remotely connected to the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spend proposal. And to my knowledge, no Senate committee has held any hearing whatsoever on this bill at all.

You see, this reckless tax-and-spend bill has all been done, largely, in secret, behind closed doors. I read about it in the newspapers. I will hear rumors about it from my colleagues.

So it is worth asking: What is the other side trying to hide? What have Democrats put in this mother of all bills?

Well, let's start with what the Wall Street Journal recently called “Entitlements for the Affluent.” This is the Wall Street Journal's way of saying “handouts for the rich,” which is accurate because so few of the new and expanding government giveaways in this bill are targeted in ways that I might support to actually help Americans of modest needs.

Now, for reference, the U.S. median income for a family of four in this country is about \$90,000. But, under this bill, a family can make \$400,000 a year and get an \$8,000 child tax credit from Washington.

How about ObamaCare subsidies?

The original eligibility limit for ObamaCare subsidies is 400 percent of the Federal poverty level—or about \$106,000 for a household of four. Their bill completely removes the eligibility limit. This means much wealthier Americans would be eligible for taxpayer-subsidized health insurance.

If Speaker NANCY PELOSI gets her way, wealthy elites on the coast will get a massive tax write-off for their mansions in high tax cities, like San Francisco; or high tax States, like New York.

Now, what else is in the bill? How about \$80 billion more for the IRS?

Yes, Democrats want to add a mandate that banks turn over to the IRS personal, confidential bank information from rank and file Americans.

You see, if you make or spend more than \$600 in a year, they want your private information. They want to know what you are spending money on, how you earned your money. I have called on Leader SCHUMER to abandon this unprecedented proposal. If you thought the IRS was a political weapon before, you ain't seen nothing yet.

What else is in this bill? How about \$3 billion for tree equity—tree equity—whatever that means. You can't make this stuff up. Some of the provisions that are supposed to be about climate change are really handouts to Democratic constituencies.

The spending bill raises the electric vehicle tax credit by up to \$5,000, among other expansions, with the pricetag of \$42 billion. Did you know you only get part of this credit, this electric vehicle tax credit of up to \$5,000, if your electric vehicle comes from a unionized plant? I represent a lot of quality union members, great Americans. They are patriots. But

under this proposal, plants like the Toyota or Honda or Subaru factories in my State of Indiana are told to take a hike because they are located in largely red States with nonunion employees—by choice.

I haven't even talked about the tax increases supported by the other side that will raise taxes on lower and middle-income households. Some of these households make under \$30,000 a year. This is a clear violation of President Biden's tax pledge—a pledge that 49 out of 50 of my Democratic colleagues formally voted to uphold just 2 months ago when we considered the budget.

Ladies and gentlemen, this reckless tax-and-spending spree is full of giveaways to the wealthy and handouts to Democratic constituencies. I stand for the working men and women of this country. The Republican Party stands for the working men and women of this country. We will stand united against these giveaways to the rich. It is offensive. It is too much money, and it must be stopped.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator yields back. Any other Senators seeking recognition?

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, that concludes the Finance Committee Members' discussion today.

I just want to thank Senator GRASSLEY and Senator YOUNG for joining me to help to continue to make the American people aware of what is going on here in Washington with this reckless tax-and-spending spree and this massive dragnet of IRS access into people's individual bank accounts and other financial accounts.

I hope Americans across the country will speak out loudly in opposition to these terrible ideas that are now being crammed down in both the House and the Senate.

I yield back our time.

I believe Senator GRASSLEY is here to speak on other matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### PREScription DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I hear about rising costs of prescription drugs at nearly every one of my town-hall meetings.

Three years ago, I began a bipartisan effort to lower prescription drug costs. Following our Finance Committee hearings at that time, we had a markup, and we had bipartisan negotiations. Senator WYDEN, now chairman of the Finance Committee, and I introduced, at that time, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act.

The bill caps yearly out-of-pocket drug costs for seniors at \$3,100. It prevents drug costs from growing faster than the consumer price index on a yearly basis. It ends uncapped taxpayer-funded subsidies to Big Pharma. It creates more sunshine, more competition, and it even has oversight into the world of drug pricing. It brings meaningful reform while driving down costs. It has \$72 billion in savings for

seniors—that is out-of-pocket costs to them—and \$95 billion savings of taxpayers' money through Medicare.

An important goal that we accomplish in our bill is lowering drug costs without hurting innovation. We did this by keeping government out of the business of setting prices and indirectly keep the government out of your medicine cabinet.

Democrats have proposed the irresponsible idea of government dictating drug prices. They would do this by getting rid of the noninterference clause in the Part D part of Medicare. It is better known as so-called drug price negotiations, but it is not negotiation; it is dictating prices.

Eighteen years ago, I was the principle architect of the Medicare Part D Program. Adding a prescription drug benefit for seniors was the right thing to do then, and it is still the right thing to do, but it needed to be done in the right way, and that right way is for the patients.

In creating Part D, we enacted a very key policy: keeping the government out of the business of dictating drug prices. Governments don't negotiate; they dictate. Competition is the only thing that drives innovation, curbs costs, expands coverage, and improves outcomes.

The Congressional Budget Office has consistently stated that government negotiations of drug prices would not achieve greater savings than the current market-based system, unless you restrict the formulary or dictate the price through reference pricing based upon what socialist healthcare systems pay in other countries. That is the outcome. The government gets between you and your doctors prescribing.

Democrats propose so-called drug price negotiations in their reckless tax-and-spending spree to save hundreds of billions of dollars. Who is hurt by this policy? Of course, patients are.

The Democrats would have government dictate drug pricing based upon an international reference pricing index. Study after study has shown so-called drug pricing negotiations will reduce the number of new drugs produced. What your doctor wants to prescribe for you might not be on that formulary.

This policy would be devastating if one of those drugs was the cure for Alzheimer's or diabetes or cancer. I don't believe that is what Americans want.

While Democrats attempt to advance their partisan drug pricing scheme, I hope common sense will prevail, and we pass a bipartisan prescription drug bill. I have engaged with colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in a bicameral way. I did this so common sense would prevail, if we ever get to the point of Democrats realizing that the government dictating prices on an international basis of what the prices are in other countries will never get 60 votes here in the U.S. Senate.

All of the Republicans and Democrats I have contacted have expressed

eagerness to find a solution to meaningfully lower prescription drug costs. Holding Big Pharma accountable has historically been a bipartisan effort.

Delivering new reforms to fight price hikes should be no different. Democrats should stop pursuing their reckless tax-and-spending spree that will hurt innovation and produce less cures. Instead, we should act by passing my bipartisan prescription drug bill.

I think maybe there is an inkling of good news coming from the Speaker of the House—and I have had a chance to visit with her at least three times in the last 2 years on this very subject about my bill—when she said that she didn't think—I don't know whether she referred to the number H.R. 3, but that is the bill that has their main effort on reducing prescription drugs—when she said that she didn't think that that would have the votes to get passed.

I hope there is some awakening to the fact that we need to do something and that this bipartisan approach is the answer.

#### TRUMP INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, today I would like to discuss the media's complete misrepresentation of the Republican report on Senator DURBIN's Trump investigation, in which my staff participated according to Committee rules.

I gave an October 7 speech on this subject, and you wouldn't know that anybody read my speech based upon what has been reported on TV. But as I noted in that October 7 speech, Senator DURBIN publicly released a Democratic staff report on his investigation. We Republicans did the same thing that very same day.

I came to the floor that same day to describe the Republican report. In so doing, I laid out what the available facts and evidence showed within the scope of the inquiry. That scope was from December 14, 2020, to January 3, 2021. But TV seemed to think we were talking about what happened on Capitol Hill on January 6.

The Durbin investigation ended on January 3—or events leading up to January 3. I say that date range yet again because many reporters have wrongly conflated this investigation with the January 6, 2021, events here on Capitol Hill. We know all the damage that was done to the Capitol that day.

So I want to repeat: The scope of the investigation stopped on January 3, not January 6, but you wouldn't know it from the TV reports.

I am not going to rehash my entire speech. I have incorporated it here by reference. However, I will note, yet again for the media, several key facts. This is not analysis, as I think TV was trying to do, just the facts.

Fact 1. Records indicate that President Trump's focus was on "legitimate complaints and reports of crimes." And those words come from the transcript.

Fact 2. Witnesses testified that President Trump's main focus was making the Justice Department aware of the potential criminal allegations and to



ensure the Department did its job. Trump's focus then wasn't to direct or order specific investigative steps. And to that point, witnesses said that Trump's focus was on the American people—not himself or his campaign—being harmed by what he believed to be widespread election fraud.

Fact 3, these witnesses testified under 18 U.S.C. 1001, which makes it a crime to give false statements, that it was not unreasonable for President Trump to question what the Justice Department was doing to investigate election fraud and crime allegations.

In fact, one witness testified under 1001 that Trump had “no impact”—those two words—on the Department's actions to investigate election allegations.

I would be remiss if I didn't also note that one witness testified under 1001 that the Justice Department was “dragging their feet and maybe more to keep these investigations from going forward.”

Fact 4, my staff read former U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, BJ Pak, a press release from the Biden administration where Biden set policy for the Justice Department by prohibiting it from using subpoenas for records of reporters in criminal leak investigations.

My staff then asked if any President has similar authority to set the Department's policy with respect to investigating and reviewing voter fraud and election crime allegations. This witness stated, “I would agree that the President has that duty.”

And the last fact, 5, President Trump twice rejected firing Acting Attorney General Rosen, and twice rejected the notion of sending what is called the “draft Clark letter.”

Now, after giving you those facts, accordingly, on the basis of this foundational evidence, with respect to the scope of this investigation from December 14, 2020, to January 3, 2021, President Trump sought and followed the advice and also the recommendations of his senior advisers. I note with specific emphasis the fact that he followed their advice and recommendations. This is a crucial fact.

The report is entitled “In Their Own Words.” It is based on actual witness evidence, not CNN-style partisan analysis. I encourage everyone to read the report and the transcripts and draw your own conclusions. That is how I always approached my investigations in the years that I have been in the U.S. Senate.

Now let's go to how my speech was reported on TV. Some on CNN have said that I showed “fealty” to Trump by stating the facts. They called these facts that I just recited “delusional.” I have never had a problem following the facts wherever they lead, no matter who is in power.

So I am going to refer to an investigation I did in the Trump administration, and it involved some people in the Trump—and close to President Trump.

I ran a transcribed interview on Donald Trump, Jr., during the Trump administration. That was done as part of my Trump-Russia investigation when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which focused on the June 9, 2016, Trump Tower meeting.

I also subpoenaed Paul Manafort to appear at a hearing and provide testimony. Instead of publicly testifying, Manafort voluntarily agreed to an interview with my and then-Ranking Member FEINSTEIN's staff. But as the ranking member's staff then refused to interview him and objected to my staff doing so without them there, that didn't move forward.

Notably, the committee never received any—when I was chairman during this investigation I am talking about, the committee never received any emails from the Democratic National Committee or the Clinton campaign, even though we repeatedly asked for them. Of course, the Democrats wouldn't support subpoenaing them, and you didn't hear a lot about that from the media—the double standard media. The Trump campaign produced records.

Just like there is a coverage vacuum, particularly by CNN, of Hunter Biden and James Biden and their connection with the communist Chinese Government, my and Senator JOHNSON's September 20 report on those financial connections and their potential criminality was attacked as Russian disinformation. Later on, Hunter Biden publicly admitted that he was under criminal investigation for financial matters. I don't hear much about that on CNN.

In my and JOHNSON's report, we made clear that based upon deep financial connections between the Biden family and foreign governments, Hunter Biden is a counterintelligence and extortion concern.

On that note, recently released emails have opened up the possibility that Joe Biden mixed bank accounts and funds with Hunter Biden. Other emails show that Joe Biden shared office space with individuals connected to the communist Chinese regime.

Of course, my and Senator JOHNSON's report was the first to prove that Hunter Biden, James Biden, and other family members had extensive financial and business relationships with individuals not just connected to the communist Chinese regime, but its intelligence and military services.

About that Grassley and Johnson report, POLITICO ran the off-base headline: “GOP Senators' anti-Biden report repackages old claims.”

In contrast, one of their own reporters just very recently confirmed the authenticity of some of Hunter Biden's emails for a book that he was writing.

One Washington Post columnist said: “Even after accepting disinformation from Russian agents, Johnson and Grassley couldn't come up with anything new or interesting on Hunter Biden.”

And NPR said about the New York Post Hunter Biden stories: “We don't want to waste our time on stories that are not really stories, and we don't want to waste the listeners' and readers' time on stories that are just pure distractions.”

Now, compare what I have said—how different Democrats and Republicans are treated; how investigations are done differently by Republicans and by Democrats—and then look at the state of journalism today. What I just said is so much for investigative journalism. Investigative journalism died without so much as a whimper.

The media's attack against the Republican Trump report is essentially an attack on witness testimony received by the committee. Time and again, many in the media have failed to meet the facts head-on in order to fit their own biased story line.

So I say to everybody, including journalists that don't want to do hard work: Read the testimony of those people that were taken on what went on between December 14 and January 3. Read what I say about it. Read what Senator DURBIN says about it. But at least read the testimony if you are going to make comments distorting what I said on October 7. In other words, stop screwing up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 417 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hassan	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Ossoff
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Padilla
Booker	Hirono	Peters
Brown	Kaine	Reed
Cantwell	Kelly	Rosen
Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Coons	Lujan	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sinema
Duckworth	Markey	Smith
Durbin	Menendez	Stabenow
Feinstein	Merkley	Tester
Gillibrand	Murphy	



Van Hollen  
Warner

Warnock  
Warren

Whitehouse  
Wyden

# NAYS—49

Barrasso  
Blackburn  
Boozman  
Braun  
Burr  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Collins  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines  
Ernst  
Fischer  
Graham

Grassley  
Hagerty  
Hawley  
Hoeven  
Hyde-Smith  
Inhofe  
Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
Lee  
Lummis  
Marshall  
McConnell  
Moran  
Murkowski  
Paul  
Portman

Risch  
Romney  
Rounds  
Rubio  
Sasse  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Shelby  
Sullivan  
Thune  
Tillis  
Toomey  
Tuberville  
Wicker  
Young

# NOT VOTING—1

Blunt

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Pursuant to S. Res. 27, and the motion to discharge having been agreed to, the nomination will be placed on the executive calendar.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I will be speaking in a moment. I had planned to deliver my remarks prior to making a unanimous consent request, but in deference to my friend and colleague from Washington, I will be making the consent request first, and then proceed to my prepared remarks.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2847

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 2847, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. Further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, first, before I object, I would like to thank the Senator for his consideration. I really do appreciate that.

Mr. President, reserving the right to object, here we go again. Even after 700,000 deaths and rising, Republicans are coming up with new ideas to undermine our vaccination efforts and make it harder for us to safely reopen our country; and in this case, even make it harder for us to respond to future pandemics.

Requiring basic precautions to keep people safe when traveling is nothing new in this country, nor are immunization requirements, for that matter.

And let's be clear and remember, the vaccine requirements President Biden has enacted so far include tailored exemptions for legitimate religious and medical conditions that have long been standard, and the emergency temporary standard he has envisioned would allow testing as an alternative.

Therefore, I would call on my Republican colleagues to remember this is a pandemic; it is not a political football. We need to treat it as a public health crisis.

And, therefore, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have come here to the Senate floor six times now to oppose President Biden's unconstitutional actions, using the Federal Government and using the Oval Office, in particular, in order to force Americans to get the COVID-19 vaccine.

Now, as I have said before, as I have said each and every time I have spoken on this issue, I am not opposed to the COVID-19 vaccine. I have been fully vaccinated, as has every member of my family, with my encouragement. I encouraged my family, I have encouraged friends, everyone I know, to get vaccinated.

I think the vaccine is a blessing, and it is one that has helped a lot of people. And I think it is one for which society, as a whole, has benefited.

I have had and recovered from COVID-19 before I got vaccinated, and I can tell you that contracting COVID is not an experience that I would like to repeat, and it is not an experience that I want others to have. That is why I have had the vaccine and why I have encouraged others to do the same.

I, nonetheless, raise my hand in this very Chamber each time I have been sworn into the office. Pursuant to the Constitution, I stood right there on those steps and I swore an oath to uphold and protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

That inspired document limits the powers of government. It does so because government power is sacred. Government power is dangerous. Government power always involves the actual or threatened use of coercive force. It is what government is—the ability and the authority to use coercive force and to do so on an official basis through law. It is for that reason that the Constitution carefully contains the power of government and does so in a way that reflects its immense capacity for harm.

There are lots of other things that are useful that we have to be careful when handling. You know, fire, electricity, oxygen, water, these are all things that are necessary, that we depend upon, that we need; and things that, if left uncontrolled, can inflict all sorts of harm, can hurt people, can kill people, can destroy life and property.

So that is why the Constitution goes to great lengths to draw boundaries and assign authority not only to different branches of government, but also different levels of government. In fact, every single provision of the U.S. Constitution is itself a form of limitation on government power.

These protections were designed to prevent government from excessively burdening the American people, because we have seen over time the tendency of governments to abuse that power and, in particular, the tendency of governments to become abusive when there is a dangerous accumulation of power at the hands of a few.

Tragically, and under the direction of Senates and Houses of Representatives and White Houses of every conceivable partisan combination, we have strayed far from the design of our government—the design put in place by the Constitution, the very same Constitution to which we have all sworn an oath.

And as a result of that, Americans are now forced to work many months out of every year just to pay their Federal tax obligations only to be told after the fact, by the way, that is not nearly enough because we are now nearly \$30 trillion in debt in closing.

The monetary printing presses are pumping out tsunamis of fiat currency that eats away at Americans' savings and earnings. Government regulations cost trillions of dollars a year as a hidden back door, invisible, and highly regressive tax on American productivity and on American development.

And this is a tax that is borne disproportionately by poor and middle-class Americans who find that everything they buy—goods and services alike—become more expensive. And we find that they also pay for it with diminished wages, unemployment, and underemployment.

Almost every aspect of American life is now inappropriately restricted, directed, or taxed by the Federal Government. President Biden's recent mandate adds yet another roadblock to millions of Americans just trying to get by, forcing them to choose between getting vaccinated on the one hand and having a job on the other hand.

What it is doing is it is saying: Look, you don't agree with the government position on this? Fine. You are going to lose your job. You are going to pay. You are going to lose your job. You are going to be rendered unemployed and effectively unemployable. Not only that, but we are going to do it in a way that many instances will render it basically impossible for you to recover unemployment benefits.

One of the things that is particularly devious about this one is that the mandate itself hasn't been issued, and yet it has been now a month and a half or so since President Biden gave the speech announcing his intention to create it.

Had he created it, we would at least know what we were dealing with. We would know the precise source of authority in the law that he was claiming. We would know the contours of how it would be enforced. We would know the contours of any exceptions to the mandate.

And because we would have an order, there would be something that people could challenge in court, where necessary. But as of right now, we have none of those things. We have only this Damoclean sword hanging over the American people, who are forced to guess.

And in the meantime, we have corporate America—we have employers with more than 99 workers, understandably, scrambling in an effort to get ahead of this thing because they know that the penalties for noncompliance with this are likely to be significant. So many of them are trying to get ahead of it so they are not caught flat-footed and unable to comply.

As a result, many of these have just tried to guess at what the mandate will say and adopted those policies, sometimes knowing that their policies might be more aggressive than what the Federal Government will require.

But in the meantime, this leaves no one accountable. The corporations have the Federal Government to blame. And the Federal Government responds by saying there is no policy yet; there is nothing to sue on yet; there is nothing for the Federal courts to enjoin as unlawful, as unconstitutional, as an improper exercise of Federal power generally—keeping in mind that the Federal Government is one of few and defined powers, as James Madison described them in *Federalist* No. 45. The powers reserved for the States are numerous and indefinite. We flipped that on its head here. There is nothing that gives the Federal Government this power.

My friend and colleague from Washington moments ago made the argument that vaccines are nothing new and that vaccine requirements are nothing new. Well, you know, they are new when it comes to a general mandate issued by the Federal Government to do this. Yes, there have been mandates in the past, but insofar as they deal with the general population as opposed to military personnel or certain government workers. These are not Federal law issues. These have been State law issues. The Federal Government has no general police powers.

Even if there were power within the Federal Government to do this, which I assure you there is not, we know for certain that one person acting alone—even if that person is the President of the United States—has not the power to do this.

This is, I believe, perhaps the most egregious example of Presidential overreach, the most shameless executive branch power grab since President Harry Truman seized all steel mills in the United States in the 1950s in order to support the Korean war effort.

Now, President Truman did not get away with that. The Supreme Court appropriately struck that down as well outside Presidential powers. You see, nothing in the Constitution and nothing in Federal statute gave President Truman the power to seize steel mills simply because he deemed them an important part of the war effort.

Here, that hasn't happened. Here, that can't happen—at least not yet because we don't have an order. The President, after making this announcement about 6 weeks ago, hasn't had the decency to even tell us what the source of his authority is.

And I will let you in on a secret: He has none. He has not a single scintilla, not a shred of authority—not statutorily, not constitutionally—to do this. He does haven't the power to do it.

Now, lest you be deceived into thinking that this is an academic infringement of some esoteric liberty, it is not. Let's be honest about what we are doing here. We are telling hard-working American moms and dads: If you do not succumb, if you do not heel, if you don't obey the Presidential dictate at issue here, you are going to lose your job.

We are making them decide between getting a vaccine to which they may have a medical or a religious or some other legitimate exemption on the one hand and on the other hand becoming unemployed and unemployable. And in many instances, they are unable to even attain unemployment benefits because you know what a lot of these companies are doing—again, in order to get ahead of the mandate—they are adopting their own draconian and aggressive policies. They are already firing people. In some cases, they are not firing them. They are putting them on unpaid administrative leave, making it impossible for them to get unemployment. Is that really what we want to do?

Look, I understand the COVID-19 vaccine is a good thing. I consider it a medical miracle of sorts. What do you say to somebody whose religious beliefs make this an unacceptable choice for them? What do you say to someone with a genuinely serious medical condition, someone who has been told by his or her board-certified medical doctor, "Don't get this vaccine. You, in your case, you shouldn't get it because of medical condition X, Y, or Z"? What do you say to that person? Do you really want to tell that person that them being brought to heel with the Federal directive issued by one person, in the absence of any statutory or constitutional authority to do that, that is more important; that is so compelling, that they have to be rendered unemployed, unemployable and ineligible, in many instances, even to collect unemployment? Is that really what we have sunk to? I hope not. I don't believe we have.

The American people know better. They know that is not how we resolve disputes in this country. It is certainly not how we treat religious minorities or people with medical conditions that make them have a different set of concerns than other people. That is not how we act.

By the way, it is also a good reason why we don't make law in this country through one person because, of course, Mr. President, a law like that would never pass. It would never pass here in the Senate or in the House of Representatives. It couldn't withstand that kind of scrutiny, not the way it has been laid out—not a chance.

Deep down, the President of the United States perhaps knows this. I

can only assume—of course, I can't read another human being's subjective mindset—but I can only assume that he would have brought it to Congress and given us the opportunity to consider it and adopt it. He cut out the people's elected representatives, the people's elected lawmakers whose constitutional obligation and authority it is to make the law so we can only make assumptions from them.

But it is not as though he didn't have time to do it. Six weeks have elapsed since he made the announcement. Meanwhile, I am hearing from countless people across America, including 300 or so people from the State of Utah who are themselves being put in impossible positions.

Now, look, mind you, for most people, this isn't a big deal. Most people in America have chosen to get the vaccine, and I am glad they have, but there are a lot of people whose stories are heart-wrenching.

Just this week, I heard from a flight attendant who works with a major U.S. airline. She has religious beliefs that make her opposed to getting this vaccine or any vaccine. She is a hard-working employee. She has been a faithful flight attendant, and it is a job that she has loved and she has enjoyed throughout her entire adult professional career. It is a job that has benefited her and her family, allowed her to make a living, put food on the table. She is now being faced with this awful choice between, on the one hand, betraying her religious beliefs—which she is unwilling to do—and, on the other hand, losing a job which is her only means of earning a living, of feeding her family. How is this fair? How is this just? How is this constitutional? It is not.

Troublingly, there are now signs that the White House isn't satisfied with just making Americans who haven't received the vaccine unemployed and unemployable. The administration is reportedly also considering a medical mandate for interstate travel. Such a move would be deeply constitutionally concerning, but it would also revoke yet another freedom and make yet another group of American citizens solidly second class.

The privileges and immunities clause of the 14th Amendment, of course, protects the right to interstate travel. There is no precedent in our Nation's history of a requirement of this nature for interstate travel.

Even if those considerations were somehow untrue—they are not, but even if they were—Congress has certainly not granted such authority to the President of the United States to act unilaterally, nor would we ever.

A mandate requiring people to get the COVID-19 vaccine in order to have the privilege, the benefit, which is actually just a right, one that the American people ought to be able to rely on to travel interstate within the United States, is truly unthinkable.

But many of the Federal Government's actions over the last year have

shown Americans the real threat it poses to freedom and simply to common sense. Remember, this is the administration that has forced our 2-year-olds to wear masks for hours at a time on airplanes, buses, trains, and in bus depots, train stations, and airports—2-year-olds. For any parent out there or for anyone who has ever actually interacted with a 2-year-old human, you can certainly understand how absurd this is, especially when our peer nations have recognized there is no need to mask a 2-year-old.

But back to the mandate for a minute. If we think through this disturbing possibility of forced medical treatment as a condition precedent for visiting family in another State or traveling for business reasons or traveling for any reason at all from one State to another, the impacts are clear, and they are devastating. Businesses already hard-hit by the pandemic—the travel and hospitality sectors—would, of course, be further strained; collateral damage, I suppose, on the part of those who would push such an oppressive move.

Individuals could be marooned in States or they couldn't work, couldn't go to restaurants, and couldn't leave. And the social capital built from face-to-face interactions would be further set back.

I believe vaccines are generally safe, and they help protect people from the harms of contracting COVID-19. I have in the past and I still now continue to encourage people to get the vaccine, but we must ask what ends this administration is willing to go to to cudgel Americans to this state-sponsored health edict.

I am personally uncomfortable with such sweeping mandates, but, more importantly, I am required by my oath to protect the Constitution of the United States to oppose this action. That is why I brought forward my latest iteration of my efforts against this unlawful, unconstitutional, and still inchoate mandate. My Let Me Travel America Act would clarify the law and prohibit the Federal Government from mandating that Americans receive shots against COVID-19 as a prerequisite for interstate travel.

I am grateful that my colleagues, Senators TUBERVILLE, BRAUN, and SULLIVAN, have joined me as cosponsors of this bill.

This is a commonsense, practical, reasonable bill, one that would simply provide assurance and protection to millions of Americans whose rights are under attack.

Moments ago, I came here, and I asked unanimous consent that we pass this bill today with the understanding that I am going to continue to come back day after day, as long as it takes, to address what the President is doing.

The Senate had a chance to protect the American people from yet another unconstitutional overreach. It is disappointing to me, really, that my friend and colleague, the Senator from

Washington, chose to object to its adoption.

This shouldn't be controversial. It is really not controversial among the American people. I guarantee you, you take a poll asking people should the Federal Government ever be able to tell you that you can't travel interstate unless you receive a particular medical treatment, there is no way the American people would think that is a good idea because it is not, because it is absurd, and because it violates everything that we believe in.

Now, my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Washington, made the point that such measures can't be enacted because, according to her, they supposedly undermine vaccine efforts. Do you know what undermines the vaccine effort? What undermines the vaccine effort is when you try to use the overpowering cudgel of coercive force, a type and a level of coercive force that no other entity on planet Earth can wield more strongly than the Federal Government—you use that cudgel to tell people who haven't gotten it yet: You must get this.

Look, a lot of people have been getting the vaccine. Yes, there are some holdouts, and they have their reasons for being holdouts. There are a lot of ways that you can convince someone to do something that they don't currently want to do. One of the things that is going to make it far less likely that they get the vaccine is for them to be told that they are being threatened with their jobs. It is not how you win. Even if it were that we could somehow chalk this up as a win here, that is not who we are; that is not how we play.

And this is unprecedented. Make no mistake, the Federal Government has never undertaken anything like this. States and political subdivisions of States—meaning cities, towns, counties, so forth—States and their subdivisions have general police powers, meaning broad power to protect health, safety, and welfare; to protect life, liberty, and property in whatever manner they deem appropriate, subject, of course, to such limitations as may be placed on them either by their State Constitution or by the U.S. Constitution.

But States and their subdivisions have the ability to enact legislation like this—health, safety, welfare legislation—in a way that the Federal Government doesn't. We have to act pursuant to one of the enumerated powers in the Constitution.

I challenge anyone to identify what source of authority can fairly be said to give the Federal Government this kind of power. It doesn't exist. We have never exercised this power with respect to the U.S. population at large. It is a different thing entirely to point to vaccine requirements that we have had for certain Federal personnel, including our military servicemembers. We have never done anything like this. If we were to ever consider something like this at a Federal level, I would have

grave concerns with it because I don't think it is the prerogative of the Federal Government.

But I can tell you one thing, I am darn certain we would never give one person the authority to impose such a mandate. No, that is not how our constitutional system works. There are a lot of reasons why we no longer fly the Union Jack. A lot of them had to do with what happens when you have a dangerous accumulation of power in the hands of a few. That is one of the reasons why we put in place a rigid set of requirements saying that before you change the legal status quo, before you pass a law, you have to run it through Congress. Any Federal law, assuming it is acting in an area within the Federal Government's power and authority and jurisdiction, it can't become law, Federal law, until you run it through the House, run the same language through the Senate. Then you present it to the President for an opportunity for veto, signature, or acquiescence. Without going through that process, you have not made a Federal law.

Look, Harry Truman's effort to seize the entire steel industry in the United States was unlawful. It was unconstitutional. And, mercifully, the courts were able to dispense of that in a relatively short period of time.

We don't even have the luxury of going to court in this instance because the President hasn't had the decency to show us his work, to tell us what he is actually doing.

Meanwhile, he is bullying corporate America to do his dirty work for him. Corporate America is dutifully complying in some cases, perhaps out of allegiance or a desire to appear compliant with the President's wishes; in other instances, just for more practical reasons. They don't want to be stuck with the heavy fines that may be levied against them if they are caught flat-footed and unprepared for what may be coming. So they are doing the President's dirty work for him. They are doing the firing, rendering people unemployed, unemployable, and in some cases ineligible even to receive unemployment.

Shame on him and shame on us if we don't call this out for what it is, which is an aggressive, unconstitutional, baseless power grab.

My friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington, also pointed to what she referred to as tailored exemptions to the vaccine mandate.

What exemptions?

There is no mandate. There are no exemptions. Yeah, he has spoken in aspirational terms about certain exemptions that would be available, but corporate America doesn't know what they are. And so corporate America, acting on the advice of counsel, is understandably being very aggressive, erring on the side of firing more people and rendering more people unemployed and unemployable, and in many cases rendering them incapable of receiving unemployment.

So, no. No. Don't tell me these are tailored exemptions, when there aren't even exemptions. In order for it to be an exemption, you have got to have a mandate. There is no mandate. There is just the threatened use of the mandate that is making corporate America decide that it is in its best interest to do the President's dirty work for him, and in a way that protects him from being questioned on legal, meritorious grounds in court.

And if we can't muster the legislative will to defend that power which is rightfully ours—not ours in the sense that we personally own it, but it has been given to the people, the power to make sure that laws are passed only by their elected Representatives and Senators—we can't stand up for this, shame on us.

And if we can't stand up for even a further encroachment on that power and on the corresponding right that the American people have long come to depend upon, to be able to travel interstate without undue hindrance or interference from their government, it is a sad outcome, one that I can't countenance. That is why I am going to be back day after day, as long as it takes. The American people expect more. The American people deserve better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The majority leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tana Lin, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 254, Tana Lin, of Washington, to be United States Dis-

trict Judge for the Western District of Washington.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Amy Klobuchar, Debbie Stabenow, Martin Heinrich, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Tim Kaine, Alex Padilla, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 187.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 187, Douglas L. Parker, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich, Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Joe Manchin III, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Myrna Perez, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I proudly send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 338, Myrna Perez, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich, Cory A. Booker, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Mazie K. Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Michael F. Bennet.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, October 19, be waived.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this week, the Senate will consider Christine O'Hearn's nomination for the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey.

Ms. O'Hearn is eminently qualified to be a district court judge.

She has nearly 30 years of experience as a litigator in private practice. During that time, she has tried numerous cases to verdict and has completed more than 150 trial days as lead counsel.

Ms. O'Hearn has worked on both the plaintiff and defense sides of complex civil litigation matters, with her core focus being employment law.

In addition to representing individual clients, Ms. O'Hearn has represented both private and public entities, including a number of county and municipal governments.

Throughout her career, Ms. O'Hearn has also given back to the legal community. For example, she has served on the New Jersey Supreme Court's Committee on the Unauthorized Practice of Law; the U.S. Magistrate Judge Selection Committee for Camden, NJ; and the New Jersey Supreme Court District IV Ethics Committee.

While serving on the New Jersey Supreme Court's Ethics Committee, Ms. O'Hearn devoted hundreds of hours—pro bono—to prosecuting an attorney for violating the New Jersey Rules of Professional Conduct. After a 15-day trial before a Special Master, the attorney was found to have violated multiple Rules of Professional Conduct. Ms. O'Hearn also briefed and argued the case on appeal, where the ruling was affirmed.

Numerous groups and individuals have written letters of support for Ms. O'Hearn's nomination, including: the New Jersey State Bar Association, the Camden County Bar Association, and dozens of New Jersey Fellows with the American College of Trial Lawyers.

With her extensive experience, it is no surprise that Ms. O'Hearn was unanimously rated "well qualified" by the American Bar Association.

Ms. O'Hearn has the strong support of her home state Senators, Senators MENENDEZ and BOOKER, and she received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee.

With decades of legal experience on behalf of plaintiffs and defendants alike, Ms. O'Hearn is well prepared to serve with distinction in the District of New Jersey.

I urge my colleagues to join me voting in support of her nomination.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. SINEMA. Madam President, I was necessarily absent, but had I been present would have voted yes on roll-call vote No. 414, on the confirmation of Gustavo A. Gelpi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

#### REMEMBERING COLONEL JEFFREY B. JONES

Mr. REED. Madam President, today I honor one of the most dedicated, selfless, and accomplished leaders I have known, my late classmate, COL Jeff Jones.

Jeff passed away in 2010 after a heroic battle with brain cancer, but his legacy will be engraved in steel this November when the Army names its new Psychological Operations Headquarters Building in Fort Bragg, NC, for him. Colonel Jones dedicated his life and career to our national defense, and this tribute could not be more fitting.

Jeff and I were classmates at West Point. When you first met Jeff, you knew he had special talents. While my other classmates and I were struggling just to pass inspection, Jeff was lead-

ing rifle drill and ceremony to perfection, honed by his years of military academy upbringing in Georgia. He was a natural, inspiring leader, and we all looked up to him. As cadets and later as officers, Jeff exemplified everything we strived to be as members of the Long Grey Line, always representing what was best and most noble about West Point, the Army, and America. He was the epitome of "Duty, Honor, Country."

We graduated together in 1971, and Jeff began his career as an infantry officer in the 509th Airborne in Germany, where he climbed the Matterhorn and trained with British and French airborne troops. He later commanded an infantry company at Fort Ord, CA, and met his wonderful wife Pamela along the way. His career moved swiftly, serving as aide-de-camp to some of the top generals of the day and earning advanced degrees from prestigious institutions. Presciently, while serving on the staff of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, he authored the study recommending the creation of U.S. Central Command.

Jeff also embarked on several international tours, including with the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization in Lebanon following the Beirut bombings and working with the U.S.-Soviet Nuclear Arms Control and Space Negotiations in Geneva in the 1980s.

He especially imparted his leadership through his command of the 8th Psychological Operations Battalion and later the 4th PSYOP Group, both at Fort Bragg. Under his command, military and civilian teams deployed across more than 60 countries on six continents, gathering key intelligence throughout peacetime, crisis, war, humanitarian, refugee, and counterdrug operations.

Jeff finally retired from Active Duty in 2001, after his final assignment as a defense attache in Paris, but his retirement was short-lived as 9/11 struck just months later. He was requested to serve on the NSC in a civilian capacity in the Office of Combating Terrorism and subsequently in the Defense Policy and Arms Control Directorate, and he served with distinction.

In 2006, Jeff was diagnosed with brain cancer. He battled for years, even as he continued to work and contribute to our national security. With Pam by his side, he passed away in 2010 and was posthumously inducted into the Special Operations Command's Commando Hall of Honor in 2013.

Jeff had a quiet, fearless strength that was powerful when you were in his presence. I consider myself extremely fortunate to have served alongside him and to have learned from his intellect, skill, character, and his love and devotion to Pam. And I am proud to have known him as my friend.

The Army's new "Colonel Jeffrey Jones Psychological Operations Headquarters" bears the name of a great man, and I know great things will be achieved there.

I am proud to honor the legacy of Colonel Jones, and I know the Members of the Senate will join me in recognizing the incredible contributions he made for our Nation.

#### TRIBUTE TO KOBYE NOEL

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, today let the Senate recognize the retirement of Ms. Kobye Noel, a public servant who has worked for 23 years in the U.S. Senate.

Ms. Noel served for over a decade with the Senate Budget Committee. She has also worked for Senator Kent Conrad, Senator Heidi Heitkamp, Senator Doug Jones, and for me and for Senator Reverend RAPHAEL WARNOCK. Her leadership has shaped the work of the Senate for longer than most of us have been here. To that, we owe Ms. Noel a tremendous debt.

Ms. Noel was instrumental in establishing Senator Reverend WARNOCK's and my offices this year. Her expertise and hard work have served Georgians to the highest standard.

For her colleagues, Ms. Noel has been a source of reassurance and generosity. She consistently lends a helping hand to others.

Ms. Noel's skill, commitment, and heart for service will be irreplaceable on my team. Ms. Noel will be dearly missed, but has become a lifelong friend for so many of us.

On behalf of the Senate, I express our heartfelt gratitude for Ms. Noel's service.

Thank you for sharing your brilliance with us, Ms. Noel. You embody the promise and integrity that should define the U.S. Senate.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 3005. A bill establishing appropriate thresholds for certain budget points of order in the Senate, and for other purposes.

S. 3006. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2022 through 2031.

S. 3007. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits.



S. 3008. A bill to establish the Federal Rainy Day Fund to control emergency spending.

S. 3009. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to remove the prohibition on States and territories against lowering their taxes.

S. 3010. A bill to cap noninterest Federal spending as a percentage of potential GDP to right-size the Government, grow the economy, and balance the budget.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2382. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Conforming Changes to Canada-Specific Hazardous Waste Import-Export Recovery and Disposal Operation Codes" (FRL No. 8562-01-OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2383. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York; Part 212, Process Operations" (FRL No. 9004-02-R2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2384. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; MS; BART SIP and Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9006-02-R4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2385. A communication from the Acting Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Regulation; Unenforceable Commercial Supplier Agreement Terms, Class Deviations, and Update for Fixed Rates for Services—Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity Contract" (FRL No. 9998-55-OMS) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2386. A communication from the Vice President of River and Resources Stewardship, Natural Resources, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Floating Cabins" (RIN3316-AA24) received on October 7, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2387. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Elimination of the Voluntary Trichinae Certification Program" ((RIN0579-AE59) (Docket No. APHIS-2020-0065)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2021; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2388. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Stephen G. Fogarty, United States

Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2389. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General John M. Murray, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2390. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13894 of October 14, 2019, with respect to the situation in and in relation to Syria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2391. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13067 with respect to Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2392. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13664 with respect to South Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2393. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Eligibility of Mortgage Loan Participations as Collateral for Federal Home Loan Bank Advances" (2021-RI-01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 5, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2394. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Statement of Policy Regarding Minority Depository Institutions" (RIN3064-ZA19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2395. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "ONRR 2020 Valuation Reform and Civil Penalty Rule: Delay of Effective Date" (RIN1012-AA27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2396. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "ONRR 2020 Valuation Reform and Civil Penalty Rule: Delay of Effective Date; Request for Comment" (RIN1012-AA27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2397. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "ONRR 2020 Valuation Reform and Civil Penalty Rule: Final Withdrawal Rule" (RIN1012-AA27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2398. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance on the Treatment of Qualified Improvement Property under Sections 250(b) and 951A(d) and

Guidance Related to the Foreign Tax Credit" ((RIN1545-BP91 and RIN1545-BP70) (TD 9956)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2399. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment of Distributions of Property From a Corporation to a Shareholder" ((RIN1545-BN80) (TD 9954)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2400. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certain Non-Government Persons Not Authorized to Participate in Examinations of Books and Writings as a Section 6103(n) Contractor" ((RIN1545-B012) (TD 9952)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2401. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "User Fee for Estate Tax Closing Letter" ((RIN1545-BP75) (TD 9957)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2402. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Examinations of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of tax liability" (Rev. Proc. 2021-41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2403. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Nonresident Alien Deposit Interest Regulations" (Rev. Proc. 2020-15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2404. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Nonresident Alien Deposit Interest Regulations" (Rev. Proc. 2020-15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2405. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "COVID-19 Relief Under Sections 42, 142(d), and 147(d)" (Notice 2020-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2406. A communication from the Director of the Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance on Reporting Qualified Sick Leave Wages and Qualified Family Leave Wages Paid Pursuant to the Families First Coronavirus Response Act" (Notice 2020-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3003. An original bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Jeffrey Lane Flake, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

Nominee: Jeffrey Lane Flake.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Turkey.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$100, 12/05/2017, Doug Jones for U.S. Senate; \$100, 09/03/2019, Penzone for Sheriff.

Contributions from FlakePAC to Candidates 2017–2021: \$10,000, 02/23/2017, Heller for Senate; \$10,000, 03/06/2017, Wicker for Senate; \$10,000, 03/13/2017, Deb Fischer for Senate; \$5,000, 03/13/2017, Hatch Election Committee; \$5,000, 05/23/2017, Strange for Senate; \$5,000, 08/18/2017, Pat Roberts for Senate; \$10,000, 09/11/2017, Bob Corker for Senate; \$5,000, 09/18/2017, Strange for Senate; \$5,000, 10/26/2017, Citizens for Josh Mandel; \$2,500, 03/28/2018, Debbie Lesko for Congress; \$5,000, 12/27/2018, Cory Gardner for U.S. Senate; \$5,000, 12/27/2018, Collins for Senator; \$2,500, 09/17/2020, Collins for Senator; \$2,500, 09/17/2020, The Thom Tillis Committee; \$2,500, 09/17/2020, Joni for Iowa; \$2,500, 09/17/2020, Cory Gardner for U.S. Senate; \$2,500, 09/17/2020, Alaskans for Dan Sullivan; \$2,500, 10/04/2020, Cory Gardner for U.S. Senate; \$2,500, 10/04/2020, Collins for Senator; \$2,500, 10/04/2020, The Thom Tillis Committee; \$2,500, 10/04/2020, Joni Ernst for U.S. Senate; \$2,500, 10/04/2020, Dan Sullivan for Senate.

Contributions from FlakePAC to Party Committees 2017–2021: \$450, 03/14/2017, Coconino County GOP; \$5,000, 03/15/2017, Arizona Republican Party; \$2,000, 05/23/2017, Maricopa County Republican Committee; \$15,000, 08/31/2017, National Republican Senatorial Committee.

Spouse: Cheryl Lanae Flake: None.

Tom Udall, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Independent State of Samoa.

Nominee: Tom Udall.

Post: Ambassador to New Zealand and Samoa.

Nominated: July 22, 2021.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Tom Udall, None.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$50.00, 2018, Beto (O'Rourke) for Texas.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$500.00, 2020, Meredith Dixon for State House.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$50.00, 2020, Meredith Dixon for State House.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$100.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$50.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$100.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$100.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$100.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$50.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$100.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$25.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$50.00, 2020, Xochill, (Torres Small) for New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$100.00, 2020, Invest to Elect New Mexico.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$500.00, 2021, Meredith Dixon for State House.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$5.00, 2021, Committee to Elect Carol Romero.

Jill Cooper (spouse), \$100.00, 2021, Alan Webber for Mayor.

Steven C. Bondy, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Bahrain.

Nominee: Steven C. Bondy.

Post: Manama, Bahrain.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses, have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: Meghan M. Bondy: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Rachel J. Bondy (unmarried): \$25, 4/28/20, Actblue; \$15, 9/28/19, Actblue. Andrew C. Bondy (unmarried): \$1, 9/15/20, Actblue; \$10, 9/15/20, Actblue.

4. Parents: George B. Bondy, None; Enid R. Bondy, None.

5. Grandparents: Winfield Bondy—deceased; Cecilia Bondy—deceased; Benjamin Rothenberg—deceased; Ruth Rothenberg—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: David S. Bondy, None; Myung K. Bondy, \$50, 3/31/20, Actblue; \$50, 3/31/20, Tom Malinowski for Congress; \$250, 10/21/19, Tom Malinowski for Congress; \$250, 3/1/18, Tom Malinowski for Congress.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Susan E. Cook, None; Thomas E. Cook, None.

Michael Raynor, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

Nominee: Michael A. Raynor.

Post: Senegal/Guinea-Bissau.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses, have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Raynor, Kathleen: none.

3. Children: Raynor, Bradley J.: none; Raynor, Emma C: \$38, Oct. 2021, Joseph Biden.

Adam Scheinman, of Virginia, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Adam M. Scheinman.

Post: Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with rank of Ambassador.

Nominated: April 29, 2021.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$100, Sept 2020, Biden Victory Fund.

Spouse: Justine Fitzgerald: \$305, Aug–Oct 2020, ACTBLUE/Biden.

Nathaniel Scheinman: none;

Audra Scheinman: none;

Sela Scheinman: none.

Sharon L. Cromer, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia.

Nominee: Sharon Lee Cromer.

Post: Republic of The Gambia.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: (USD), 5.00, 12/28/2020, Act Blue; 130.00, 12/28/2020, Act Blue; 5.00, 12/22/2020, Act Blue; 50.00, 12/22/2020, Act Blue (RWarnock); 50.00, 12/22/2020, Act Blue (RWarnock); 50.00, 12/22/2020, Act Blue (JOSoff); 5.00, 11/15/2020, Act Blue; 100.00, 11/15/2020, Act Blue (RWarnock); 5.00, 11/10/2020, Act Blue; 100.00, 11/10/2020, Fair Fight; 5.00, 11/08/2020, Act Blue; 100.00, 11/08/2020, Act Blue (JOSoff); 10.00, 11/07/2020, Act Blue; 100.00, 11/07/2020, Act Blue (RWarnock); 10.00, 10/17/2020, Act Blue; 100.00, 10/17/2020, Act Blue (DNC).

2. Spouse: Arnold Stanley Sobers Jr: None.

Troy Damian Fitrell, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea.

Nominee: Troy Fitrell.

Post: Conakry, Guinea.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: Kathryn Fitrell: none.

3. Children: Madeleine Fitrell: none. Samuel Fitrell: none.

Marc Ostfield, of Pennsylvania, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Paraguay.

Nominee: Marc Ostfield.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

Spouse: (Michael Savino): None.



Julianne Smith, of Michigan, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Nominee: Julianne Smith.

Post: United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Donee, Amount, and Date:

Self: Ed Meier, \$250, 2017; Elissa Slotkin, \$250, 2017; Joe Biden, \$250, 2019; Biden Victory Fund, \$500, 2020; Joe Biden, \$1000, 2020; Joe Biden, \$250, 2020; Joe Biden, \$500, 2020.

Spouse: David Black: Christina Hartman, \$250, 2017; Christina Hartman, \$100, 2019; Joe Biden, \$250, 2020; Joe Biden, \$25, 2020; Joe Biden, \$50, 2020; Jamie Harrison, \$25, 2020; Amy McGrath, \$50, 2020.

Liam Black: (none).

Dylan Black: (none).

C.B. Sullenberger III, of Texas, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Nominee: Chesley B. Sullenberger, III.

Post: Rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$2000, 2/9/2018, Friends of Sherrod Brown.

Spouse: \$2000, 2/9/2018, Friends of Sherrod Brown; \$2800, 5/16/2019, Biden for President.

Cynthia Ann Telles, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica.

Nominee: Cynthia Ann Telles.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: 2021, \$2500, 031621, Gallego for Arizona (D-AZ); \$1250, 051721, Phil for Colorado (Phil Weiser, Atty Genl); \$250, 053021, Latino Victory Fund; \$1000, 050921, Latino Victory Fund; \$800, 032621, Dulce Vasquez for City Council (D-CA); \$1000, 050521, LVP Federal SuperPAC; \$800, 012021, Katy Young Yaroslavsky for City Council (LA, CA); 2020, \$2800, 123120, Alex Padilla for US Senate (D-CA); \$5000, 121620, Latino Victory Fund; \$390, 111220, MI Democratic State Central Cmte; \$10100, 110120, Biden Victory Fund; \$673, 110120, AZ Democratic Party; \$673, 110120, NH Democratic Party; \$673, 110120, PA Democratic Party; \$673, 110120, CO Democratic Party; \$673, 110120, MN DFL Party; \$673, 110120, TX Democratic Party; \$673, 110120, OH Democratic Party; \$673, 110120, Democratic Party of VA; \$673, 110120, NE Democratic Party; \$673, 110120, Democratic Party of WI; \$673, 110120, NV State Democratic Party; \$500, 103120, CA Democratic Party; \$134,

103020, MI Democratic State Central Cmte; \$5600, 102220, Biden Victory Fund; \$373, 102220, NH Democratic Party; \$373, 102220, AZ Democratic Party; \$373, 102220, PA Democratic Party; \$373, 102220, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$373, 102220, CO Democratic Party; \$373, 102220, MN DFL Party; \$373, 102220, Democratic Party of VA; \$373, 102220, OH Democratic Party; \$373, 102220, NE Democratic Party; \$373, 102220, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$373, 102220, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$373, 102220, Democratic Party of WI; \$373, 102220, TX Democratic Party; \$373, 102220, NV State Democratic Party; \$250, 101720, Biden Victory Fund; \$17, 101720, NH Democratic Party; \$17, 101720, AZ Democratic Party; \$17, 101720, PA Democratic Party; \$17, 101720, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$17, 101720, CO Democratic Party; \$17, 101720, MN DFL Party; \$17, 101720, Democratic Party of VA; \$17, 101720, OH Democratic Party; \$17, 101720, NE Democratic Party; \$17, 101720, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$17, 101720, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$17, 101720, Democratic Party of WI; \$17, 101720, TX Democratic Party; \$17, 101720, NV State Democratic Party; \$1000, 101420, Biden Victory Fund; \$134, 101420, PA Democratic Party; \$134, 101420, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$134, 101420, CO Democratic Party; \$134, 101420, MN DFL Party; \$134, 101420, Democratic Party of VA; \$134, 101420, OH Democratic Party; \$134, 101420, NE Democratic Party; \$134, 101420, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$134, 101420, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$134, 101420, Democratic Party of WI; \$268, 101420, TX Democratic Party; \$134, 101420, NV State Democratic Party; \$1000, 101220, Alex Padilla Ballot Measure Yes on 16 17 18; \$800, 101220, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$500, 092920, Latino Victory Fund; \$500, 092920, Latino Victory Fund; \$2800, 092820, Debbie (Mucarsel Powell) for Congress (D-FL); \$1000, 092420, Biden Victory Fund; \$67, 092420, NH Democratic Party; \$67, 092420, AZ Democratic Party; \$67, 092420, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$67, 092420, PA Democratic Party; \$67, 092420, CO Democratic Party; \$67, 092420, MN DFL Party; \$67, 092420, Democratic Party of VA; \$67, 092420, OH Democratic Party; \$67, 092420, NE Democratic Party; \$67, 092420, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$67, 092420, Democratic Party of WI; \$134, 092420, TX Democratic Party; \$67, 092420, NV State Democratic Party; \$67, 100820, MI Democratic State Central Cmte; \$134, 101420, NH Democratic Party; \$134, 101420, AZ Democratic Party; \$1700 092220, NH Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, AZ Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$2, 091420, PA Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, CO Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, MN DFL Party; \$2, 091420, Democratic Party of VA; \$2, 091420, OH Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, NE Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$2, 091420, Democratic Party of WI; \$3, 091420, TX Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, NV State Democratic Party; \$2, 091420, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$15, 091520, Joe Biden ACT BLUE; \$72, 091520, MI Democratic State Central Cmte; \$25, 091320, Biden Victory Fund; \$50, 090820, Biden Victory Fund; \$3, 090820, NH Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$3, 090820, PA Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, CO Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, AZ Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, MN DFL Party; \$3, 090820, Democratic Party of VA; \$3, 090820, OH Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, NE Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$3, 090820, Democratic Party of WI; \$7, 090820, TX Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, NV State Democratic Party; \$3, 090820, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$1700, 090420, MI Democratic State Central Cmte; \$5, 090120, Biden Victory Fund; \$1, 090120, NH Democratic

Party; \$1, 090120, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$1, 090120, PA Democratic Party; \$1, 090120, CO Democratic Party; \$1, 090120, AZ Democratic Party; \$1, 090120, MN DFL Party; \$1, 090120, Democratic Party of VA; \$1, 090120, OH Democratic Party; \$1, 090120, AZ Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$1, 090120, NE Democratic Party; \$1, 090120, Democratic Party of WI; \$1, 090120, TX Democratic Party; \$1, 090120, NV State Democratic Party; \$1, 090120, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$1000, 082420, Biden Victory Fund; \$67, 082420, NH Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$67, 082420, PA Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, CO Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, AZ Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, MN DFL Party; \$67, 082420, Democratic Party of VA; \$67, 082420, OH Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, Democratic Exec Cmte of FL; \$67, 082420, NE Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, Democratic Party of WI; \$201, 082420, TX Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, NV State Democratic Party; \$67, 082420, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$67, 082420, CA Federal Elections Cmte; \$1000, 081920, CA Democratic Party; \$500, 072320, LVP (Latino Victory Project); \$500, 071520, Latino Victory Project; \$1000, 071620, Hickenlooper Victory Fund (D-CO); \$1000, 072020, Hickenlooper for CO (D-CO); \$2800, 063020, People for Ben Ray Lujan (D-NM); \$1000, 070120, Gil Cisneros for Congress (D-CA); \$2800, 063020, Raul Ruiz for Congress (D-CA); \$40000, 061220, Biden Victory Fund; \$1700, 061220, AZ Democratic Party; \$1700, 061220, Democratic Party of VA; \$1700, 061220, GA Federal Elections Cmte; \$1700, 061220, NV State Democratic Party; \$14500 061220, DNC Services Corp/DNC; \$1700, 061220, CO Democratic Party; \$1700, 061220, OH Democratic Party; \$1700, 061220, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$1700, 061220, PA Democratic Party; \$1700, 061220, MN DFL Party; \$1700, 061220, Dem Exec Cmte of FL; \$1700, 061220, NE Democratic Party; \$1700, 061220, TX Democratic Party; \$1700, 061220, Democratic Party of WI; \$1000, 053120, Latino Victory Fund; \$35500 050320, DNC Services Corp/DNC; \$41100, 050320, Biden Victory Fund; \$1000, 020820, Avance Democratic Club; \$1000, 013120, Tony Cardenas for Congress (D-CA); 2019, \$800, 123019, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$2800, 111819, People for Ben Ray Lujan (D-NM); \$800, 101219, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$7800, 092719, Becerra for Atty General (D-CA); \$1200, 090519, Gary Peters for Senate (D-MI); \$800, 063019, Kevin DeLeon for City Council (D-CA); \$2800, 042619, Biden for President; \$5000, 040819, American Possibilities PAC; \$2800, 022819, Gil Cisneros for Congress (D-CA);

2018 \$1000, 110518, Jimmy Gomez for Congress (D-CA); \$1000 110518, Tony Cardenas for Congress (D-CA); \$500, 110518, (Keith) Ellison for Atty General (D-MN); \$2700, 100118, Delgado for Congress (D-NY); \$1000, 102118, Alex Padilla for Secy of State (D-CA); \$1150, 100118, Phil Weiser for Atty General (D-CO); \$5000, 081518, Gavin Newsom for Governor (D-CA); \$1000, 052518, Maria Elena Durazo for State Sen (D-CA); \$1000, 051018, Villaraigosa for Governor (D-CA); \$2700, 051518, Raul Ruiz for Congress (D-CA); \$2700, 040918, Jimmy Gomez for Congress (D-CA); \$5000, 030718, Latino Victory Fund; \$500, 021818, Luz Rivas for CA Assembly (D-CA).

2017 \$2700 122217, Kevin Deleon for Senate (D-CA); \$527, 121917, Xavier Becerra for Atty General (D-CA); \$1473, 121917, Xavier Becerra for Atty General (D-CA); \$2000, 101517, Fearless 4 the People PAC (Kamala Harris D-CA); \$5000 101117, VIBE PAC (Gov Gina Raimondo R-RI); \$500 100217, Nanette Barragan for Congress (D-CA); \$100 012517, Kamala Harris for US Senate (D-CA); \$1000, 031817, Kevin Deleon for Lt. Governor (D-CA); \$2000 091617, Gabriel Sandoval for Assembly (D-CA); \$1300, 091617, Gabriel Sandoval for Assembly (D-CA); \$5000, 033117, Xavier Becerra for Atty Genl (D-CA); \$1773,

033117, Xavier Becerra for Atty Genl (D-CA); \$2700, 052317, Jimmy Gomez for Congress (D-CA); \$2700, 021017, Jimmy Gomez for Congress (D-CA).

Spouse: 2021, \$2800, 010421, Alex Padilla for U.S. Senate (D-CA); \$2000, 062421, NCTAPAC; \$5000, 041921, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$10000, 041921, COMPAC-USA; \$2900, 033021, Maggie for New Hampshire (USSen) (D-NH); \$1500, 033121, Josh Gottheimer for Congress (D-NJ); \$500, 031221, Sean Patrick Maloney for Congress (D-NY); \$2900, 030821, Friends of (Chuck) Schumer (D-NY); \$2900, 022821, Friends of Lucy McBath (D-GA); \$1250, 012421, Phil for Colorado (Phil Weiser, State AG); \$250, 012021, Katy Young Yaroslavsky for City Council (LA, CA); 2020, \$500, 111520, Warnock for Georgia (D-GA); \$2000, 102120, People for Ben Ray (Lujan D-NM); \$10000, 100520, COMPAC-USA; \$10000, 092920, Biden Victory Fund; \$2800, 092920, Biden for President; \$5000, 092420, Joe Torsella for Treasurer (D-PA); \$1000, 082420, Theresa Greenfield for Senate (D-IA); \$20, 081620, Democratic Party of WI; \$20, 081620, NE Democratic Party; \$550, 081320, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$250, 080420, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$1500, 082420, Win the West (D-MT Bullock, D-AZ Kelly); \$5, 081620, Ohio Democratic Party; \$15, 081620, NC Democratic Party—Federal; \$35, 081620, AZ Democratic Party; \$15, 081620, TX Democratic Party; \$20, 081620, NV State Democratic Party; \$20, 081620, PA Democratic Party; \$500 071020, Thom Tillis for Sen Cmte (WINRED) (R-NC); \$5000, 070820, Hickenlooper Victory Fund (D-CO); \$1500, 062320, Chris Coons for Senate (D-OE); \$1000, 061320, Friends of Lucy McBath (D-GA); \$2795, 050320, Biden for President; \$250, 042720, Josh Gottheimer for Congress (D-NJ); \$3000, 041420, NCTAPAC; \$1000, 030920, GK Butterfield for Congress (D-VA); \$800, 030920, Chris Coons for Senate (D-DE); \$1000, 013020, Chris Coons for Senate (D-DE); \$800, 013020, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$1000, 012120, Joe Kennedy for Senate (D-MA); \$192, 011720, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 013121, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 021421, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 022821, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 031320, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 032720, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 041020, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 042420, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 050620, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$192, 052020, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); \$2885, 062420, Comcast & NBCUni PAC (COMPAC); 2019 \$800, 123019, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$1000, 112619, Joe Torsella for Treasurer (D-PA); \$5, 111019, Biden for President; \$2500, 110419, Democratic Senatorial Cpgn Cmte (DSCC); \$2500, 092419, Peters for Michigan (D-MI); \$1000, 063019, Hoyer for Congress (D-MD); \$2500, 063019, Dem Cong Cpgn Cmte (DCCC); \$500, 063019, Richard Neal Victory Fund (D-MA); \$39, 052119, Biden for President; \$2800, 042619, Biden for President; \$3000, 040119, NCTAPAC; \$2800, 041819, Josh Gottheimer for Congress (D-NJ); \$1000, 020619, Doug Jones for Senate (D-AR); \$1000, 012419, Hancock for Denver (Mayor, Denver, CO); \$5000, 031719, Comcast & NBCUniversal PAC (COMPAC); \$10000, 031719, COMPAC-USA; 2018 \$840, 032218, Xavier Becerra for Atty General (D-CA); \$200, 032618, Ted Deutch for Congress (D-GA); \$1000, 040518, Doug Jones for Senate (D-AR); \$1000, 040518, Bill Nelson for Senate (D-FL); \$2700, 080118, Raul Ruiz for Congress (D-CA); \$1000, 071218, Josh Gottheimer for Congress (D-NJ); \$500, 091418, Mad4PA (M Deen, Congress, D-PA); \$1000, 101518, Sinema for Arizona (D-AZ); \$1000, 101818, Benjamin for Mayor (Charleston, SC); \$1000, 101918, (Chris) Murphy Victory Cmte (Senate, D-CT); \$1000, 121118,

Friends of Bob Brady Federal PAC (D-PA); \$10000, 081518, Newsom for CA Gov 2018 (D-CA); \$800, 121318, David Ryu for City Council (LA, CA); \$3000, 041518, NCTAPAC; \$5000, 012918, Comcast & NBCUniversal PAC (COMPAC); \$10000, 012918, COMPAC-USA; 2017 \$2700, 020617, Bob Casey for Senate (D-PA); \$1000, 030317, Dianne Feinstein for Senate (D-CA); \$1000, 030317, Sheldon Whitehouse for Senate (D-RI); \$1000, 030317, Bill Nelson for Senate (D-FL); \$1000, 030317, Klobuchar for Minnesota (D-MN); \$2000, 032017, Chris Coons for Senate (D-DE); \$3000, 040317, NCTAPAC; \$1000, 040717, Josh Gottheimer for Congress (R-NJ); \$1000, 062817, Josh Gottheimer for Congress (R-NJ); \$1000, 091317, Alec Ross for Governor (D-MD); \$1000, 091317, Josh Gottheimer for Congress (D-NJ); \$1900, 090617, Cortez Masto for Senate (D-NV); \$1150, 051517, Phil for Colorado (State AG, D-CO); \$5000, 031317, Comcast & NBCUniversal PAC (COMPAC); \$10000, 031317, COMPAC-USA

Claire D. Cronin, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

Nominee: Claire D. Cronin.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$500.00, 3/11/2018, Juana Matias for Congress; \$100.00, 06/02/2018, Mass Democratic Party; \$500.00, 07/10/2018, Juana Matias for Congress; \$1,000.00, 05/28/2019, Biden for President; \$1,000.00, 6/21/2020, Biden for President; \$559.58, 2019–2020, Biden for President; \$20.00, 11/04/2020, Biden Fight Fund.

Spouse: \$56.00, 2019, Biden for President; \$125.00, 2020, Biden for President.

Claire A. Pierangelo, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Madagascar, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of the Comoros.

Nominee: Claire A. Pierangelo.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Madagascar, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of the Comoros.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.  
2. Spouse: NA.

Bathsheba Nell Crocker, of the District of Columbia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Bathsheba Nell Crocker.

Post: Representative of the United States of America to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these

persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$50, 10/26/20, Act Blue (Democratic Party of Wisconsin); \$50, 10/26/20, ActBlue (More Like America); \$100, 10/12/20, ActBlue (Gary Peters for U.S. Senate); \$250, 9/21/20, Biden for President; \$100, 9/21/20, ActBlue (Sara Gideon for Maine); \$50, 9/21/20, ActBlue (Theresa Greenfield for Iowa); \$100, 9/21/20, ActBlue (Jon Ossoff for Senate); \$50, 8/18/20, ActBlue (Theresa Greenfield for Iowa); \$50, 8/18/20, ActBlue (Biden for President); \$100, 8/18/20, ActBlue (Malinowski for Congress); \$15, 2/26/20, ActBlue (Warren for President); \$35, 2/11/20, ActBlue (Warren for President); \$100, 1/28/20, ActBlue (Evelyn Farkas for Congress); \$25, 1/11/20, ActBlue (Warren for President); \$100, 12/27/19, ActBlue (Warren for President); \$100, 4/17/19, ActBlue (Dan for Colorado); \$50, 3/14/19, ActBlue (Beto for America); \$10.10, 3/13/19, ActBlue (Pete Buttigieg for President); \$10.10, 3/13/19, AMERICAblog Action; \$25, 10/30/18, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$25, 10/9/18, ActBlue (Lauren Baer for Congress); \$25, 10/4/18, ActBlue (Heidi Heitkamp for Senate); \$25, 10/4/18, AMERICAblog Action; \$25, 9/30/18, ActBlue (Lauren Baer for Congress); \$25, 9/30/18, ActBlue (Elissa Slotkin for Congress); \$10.09, 9/28/18, ActBlue (Beto O'Rourke); \$10.09, 9/28/18, AMERICAblog Action; \$100, 9/18/18, Malinowski for Congress; \$15, 8/21/18, ActBlue (Elissa Slotkin for Congress); \$100, 5/31/18, ActBlue (Elissa Slotkin for Congress); \$100, 5/31/18, Malinowski for Congress; \$35, 4/30/18, ActBlue (Malinowski for Congress); \$50, 1/31/18, ActBlue (Malinowski for Congress); \$50, 12/11/17, ActBlue (Malinowski for Congress); \$25, 11/11/17, ActBlue (Lauren Baer for Congress); \$25, 10/11/17, ActBlue (Lauren Baer for Congress); \$25, 10/11/17, ActBlue (Malinowski for Congress); \$50, 8/30/17, ActBlue (Elissa Slotkin for Congress); \$250, 8/03/17, Dan for Colorado; \$100, 5/31/17, ActBlue (Tom Perriello).

2. Milan Vaishnav: \$50, 10/28/20, ActBlue (Hirai Tipineni for Congress); \$50, 10/27/20, ActBlue (Jon Ossoff for Senate); \$50, 10/27/20, ActBlue (Sara Gideon for Maine); \$50, 10/27/20, ActBlue (Sri Preston Kulkarni for Congress).

Michael Carpenter, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Michael R. Carpenter.

Post: U.S. Mission to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

1. Self: \$100, 2017, Elissa Slotkin; \$100, 2019, Elissa Slotkin; \$181.15, 2020, Biden Victory Fund.

2. Matias Granato: \$20.20, 2018, Democratic Candidate in Maine; \$100, 2020, Jon Ossoff; \$200, 2020, Raphael Warnock.

Jeffrey M. Hovenier, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kosovo.

Nominee: Jeffrey M. Hovenier.

Post: Pristina, Kosovo.

Nominated: July 13, 2021.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my

knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

Spouse: None.

Virginia E. Palmer, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

Nominee: Virginia Evelyn Palmer.

Post: Ghana.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

Ismail G.H. Asmal: None

Jack A. Markell, of Delaware, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Jack Markell.

Post: OECD.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$1000, 2/19/21, Maggie for NH; \$250, 10/28/20, Hickenlooper for Colorado; \$250, 10/28/20, Hickenlooper Victory Fund; \$500, 9/29/20, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress; \$1000, 9/14/20, Lisa Blunt Rochester for Congress; \$2000, 8/21/20, DNC Services Corp.; \$2000, 8/21/20, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 7/27/20, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$500, 7/24/20, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$200, 7/7/20, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$300, 7/7/20, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$1500, 5/20/20, Montana for Bullock; \$1800, 5/14/20, Biden for President; \$1000, 4/8/20, Biden for President; \$1000, 12/31/19, Finkenauer for Congress; \$1000, 11/12/19, Maya R. Cummings for Congress; \$1000, 10/28/19, DSCC; \$500, 9/5/19, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$1000, 8/22/19, Hickenlooper for Colorado; \$500, 6/21/19, Lisa Blunt Rochester for Congress; \$2800, 4/26/19, Biden for President; \$500, 2/11/19, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress; \$2000, 1/1/19, Chris Coons for Delaware; \$500, 4/20/18, Carper for Senate; \$500, 2/8/18, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress.

2. Carla Markell: \$500, 7/14/20, Biden for President; \$500, 7/13/20, Amy McGrath for Senate, Inc.; \$550, 7/7/20, Biden for President; \$1000, 6/11/20, Biden for President; \$750, 6/2/20, Biden for President; \$2800, 5/31/19, Biden for President; \$1000, 12/6/17, Lisa Blunt Rochester for Congress.

Denise Campbell Bauer, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the French Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Monaco.

Nominee: Denise Campbell Bauer.

Post: Ambassador to the French Republic and to the Principality of Monaco.

The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributor, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$500.00 8/25/17 Dan for Colorado; \$2,000.00, 7/9/17, Kaine Victory Fund; \$2,000.00,

7/31/17, Kaine for Virginia; \$1.50, 2/6/18, Randy Bryce for Congress; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Betsy Dirksen Londrigan for Congress; \$500.00, 10/1/18 Rosen for Nevada; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Susie Lee for Nevada; \$22.50, 10/14/18 Xochitl for New Mexico; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Dr. Kim Schrier for Congress; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Kristen Carlson for Congress; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Lauren Underwood for Congress; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Lauren Baer for Congress; \$500.00, 9/30/18 Rosen Victory Fund; \$500.00, 9/30/18, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$1,000.00, 7/13/18, Kaine Victory Fund; \$1,000.00, 7/31/18, Kaine for Virginia; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Max Rose for Congress; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Gina Ortiz Jones for Congress; \$22.50, 10/14/18, Carolyn for Congress; \$100.00, 9/17/18, Rosen Victory Fund; \$100.00, 5/24/19, Doug Jones for US Senate; \$2,800.00 6/21/19 Dan for Colorado; \$250.00, 9/30/19, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$2,000.00, 7/19/19, Common Ground PAC; \$250.00, 11/9/19, Amy McGrath for Senate, Inc.; \$100.00, 12/31/19, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$250.00, 11/9/19, Amy McGrath for Senate, Inc.; \$250.00, 11/9/19, Theresa Greenfield for Iowa; \$100.00, 12/31/19, Jeanne Shaheen for Senate; \$50.00, 9/30/19, Nick Colvin for Congress; \$100.00, 12/31/19, Slotkin for Congress; \$100.00, 9/16/19, Nick Colvin for Congress; \$25.00, 12/15/19, Adair for Congress; \$2,800.00, 4/25/19, Biden for President; \$100.00, 1/31/20, Slotkin for Congress; \$100.00, 2/29/20, Slotkin for Congress; \$250.00, 2/9/20, Cal for NC; \$100.00, 1/31/20, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$100.00, 2/29/20, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$100.00, 3/31/20, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$100.00, 3/31/20, Slotkin for Congress; \$100.00, 4/30/20, Slotkin for Congress; \$100.00, 4/30/20, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$500.00, 8/20/20, Jon Ossoff for Senate; \$500.00, 5/12/20, Jon Ossoff for Senate; \$500.00, 8/16/20, Ossoff Victory Fund; \$10.00, 10/21/20, Biden for President; \$1,000.00, 11/18/20, Ossoff Victory Fund; \$5.00, 10/21/20, Biden for President; \$27.00, 9/13/20, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; \$1,000.00, 11/23/20, Jon Ossoff for Senate; \$2,800.00, 4/25/20, Biden for President; \$5.00, 10/21/20, Biden for President; \$10.00, 10/21/20, Biden for President; \$2,800.00, 4/17/19, John Walsh for Colorado; \$100.00, 9/22/19, Biden for President; \$2,700.00, 10/17/19, Biden for President.

Kent Doyle Logsdon, of Pennsylvania, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Moldova.

Nominee: Kent D. Logsdon.

Post: Moldova.

Nominated: July 15, 2021.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

Michelle Logsdon (spouse): None.

Caryn R. McClelland, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brunei Darussalam.

Nominee: Caryn R. McClelland.

Post: Brunei Darussalam.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

Spouse: N/A.

Michael J. Murphy, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class

of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Nominee: Michael J. Murphy.

Post: Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

Spouse: Kimberly Michele (Haroz) Murphy: None.

Howard A. Van Vranken, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Botswana.

Nominee: Howard Andree Van Vranken.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Botswana.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.

2. Spouse: None.

Thomas R. Nides, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Israel.

Nominee: Thomas R. Nides.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the State of Israel

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$208.33, 5/28/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 5/14/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 4/30/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 4/15/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 3/31/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 3/15/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 2/26/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 2/12/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 1/29/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 1/15/2021, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 12/31/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 12/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 11/30/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 11/13/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 10/30/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2000.00, 10/29/2020, Peters for Michigan; \$2000.00, 10/29/2020, Peters for Michigan; \$208.33, 10/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 9/30/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 9/21/2020, Friends of Dan Feehan; \$208.33, 9/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 8/31/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 8/14/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 8/13/2020, The Markey Committee; \$208.33, 7/31/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 7/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 6/30/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2000.00, 6/30/2020, Elissa Slotkin for Congress;

\$1800.00, 6/18/2020, Hickenlooper for Colorado; \$208.33, 6/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 6/2/2020, Theresa Greenfield for Iowa; \$208.33, 5/29/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 5/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 4/30/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2800.00, 4/29/2020, Biden for President; \$-2325.00, 4/29/2020, Biden for President; \$208.33, 4/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 4/13/2020, RO for Congress Inc; \$1000.00, 4/3/2020, Zannetos for Congress; \$-2800.00, 4/1/2020, Amy for America; \$208.33, 3/31/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 3/31/2020, Haley Stevens for Congress; \$208.33, 3/13/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 2/28/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$5000.00, 2/20/2020, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$208.33, 2/14/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 2/10/2020, Cal for NC; \$208.33, 1/31/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 1/19/2020, Khazei for Congress; \$208.33, 1/15/2020, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 1/7/2020, RO for Congress Inc; \$208.33, 12/31/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 12/13/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 12/1/2019, Hicken Looper for Colorado; \$208.33, 11/29/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 11/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1800.00, 11/1/2019, Kennedy for Massachusetts; \$208.33, 10/31/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1783.52, 10/22/2019, Biden for President; \$208.33, 10/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 9/30/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 9/23/2019, Jeffries for Congress; \$171.48, 9/18/2019, Biden for President; \$345.00, 9/18/2019, Biden for President; \$208.33, 9/13/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 8/30/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 8/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 7/31/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 7/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 7/8/2019, Scott Cooper for Congress; \$2700.00, 6/30/2019, People Powered Action; \$208.33, 6/28/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 6/25/2019, Friends of Mark Warner; \$208.33, 6/14/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee;

\$208.33, 5/31/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 5/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 4/30/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$25.00, 4/27/2019, Actblue; \$208.33, 4/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 4/8/2019, Kennedy for Massachusetts; \$208.33, 3/29/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 3/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 2/28/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 2/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$200.00, 2/13/2019, Klobuchar for Minnesota; \$200.00, 2/12/2019, Amy for America; \$2800.00, 2/8/2019, Amy for America; \$2600.00, 2/8/2019, Amy for America; \$2600.00, 2/8/2019, Klobuchar for Minnesota; \$208.33, 1/31/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 1/15/2019, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 12/31/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 12/14/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 11/30/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 11/15/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 11/2/2018, Josh Gottheimer for Congress; \$208.33, 10/31/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 10/15/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 9/28/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 9/24/2018,

Friends of Sherrod Brown; \$1000.00, 9/20/2018, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$208.33, 9/14/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 8/31/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 8/15/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 7/31/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 7/24/2018, Friends of Lucy McBeth Inc.; \$208.33, 7/13/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 7/10/2018, Rufus Gifford for Congress; \$208.33, 6/29/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 6/15/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2000.00, 6/7/2018, Menendez for Senate; \$1000.00, 6/6/2018, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; \$208.33, 5/31/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 5/16/2018, Soderberg for Congress; \$208.33, 5/15/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 4/30/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 4/19/2018, Donna Shalala for Congress; \$208.33, 4/13/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$500.00, 4/2/2018, Elizabeth for MA, Inc; \$208.33, 3/29/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 3/28/2018, Klobuchar for Minnesota; \$208.33, 3/15/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2000.00, 3/12/2018, Beto for Texas; \$208.33, 2/28/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 2/15/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 2/14/2018, Haley Stevens for Congress; \$2000.00, 2/1/2018, Rosen for Nevada; \$208.33, 1/31/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 1/12/2018, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 1/12/2018, Friends of Chris Murphy; \$208.33, 12/29/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2000.00, 12/19/2017, Tom Malinowski for Congress; \$208.33, 12/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 12/12/2017, Bill Nelson for US Senate; \$208.33, 11/30/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 11/30/2017, Lauren Baer for Congress; \$208.33, 11/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 11/8/2017, Elissa Slotkin for Congress; \$208.33, 10/31/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 10/13/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 9/29/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1700.00, 9/27/2017, Ed Meier for Congress; \$208.33, 9/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 8/31/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2700.00, 8/23/2017, Donnelly For Indiana; \$208.33, 8/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 7/31/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 7/20/2017, Kaine for Virginia; \$208.33, 7/14/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 6/30/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 6/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$1000.00, 6/6/2017, Ed Meier for Congress; \$208.33, 5/30/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 5/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 4/28/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 4/13/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 3/31/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 3/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 2/28/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$2700.00, 2/27/2017, Klobuchar for Minnesota; \$208.33, 2/15/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 1/31/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee; \$208.33, 1/13/2017, Morgan Stanley Political Action Committee.

2. Spouse: Virginia Moseley, None.

David L. Cohen, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

Nominee: David L. Cohen.

Post: Ambassador to Canada.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, and donee:

Rhonda R. Cohen: 2/27/2017, \$3,000.00, Rebecca for Philadelphia; 3/2/2017, \$5,400.00, Bob Casey for Senate; 3/2/2017, \$4,600.00, Pennsylvania Democratic Party—Federal Account; 3/9/2017, \$5,000.00, COMPAC-Federal; 3/9/2017, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Bill Nelson for US Senate; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Bob Brady for Congress; 3/22/2017, \$10,000.00, Keeping America Competitive; 5/1/2017, \$500.00, Ceisler for PA; 5/3/2017, \$2,700.00, Donnelly for Indiana; 5/16/2017, \$33,900.00, DSCC—Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; 6/28/2017, \$2,700.00, Heidi for Senate; 6/28/2017, \$2,700.00, Manchin for West Virginia; 6/28/2017, \$2,700.00, Montanans for Tester; 8/14/2017, \$1,000.00, Moulton 2017; 9/7/2017, \$1,000.00, Kenney for Philadelphia; 3/25/2018, \$1,000.00, Friends of Shira Goodman; 3/25/2018, \$2,700.00, Scanlon for Congress; 3/27/2018, \$2,700.00, Montanans for Tester; 4/18/2018, \$2,700.00, Bill Nelson for US Senate; 4/18/2018, \$2,700.00, Conor Lamb for Congress; 4/18/2018, \$5,400.00, McCaskill for Missouri; 4/30/2018, \$2,700.00, Dwight Evans for Congress; 5/7/2018, \$1,000.00, Friends of Maggie Borski; 5/29/2018, \$2,500.00, Tom Wolf for Governor; 6/5/2018, \$500.00, Elect Danielle Mashburn-Myrick; 6/14/2018, \$1,000.00, Benjamin for Mayor; 6/14/2018, \$15,000.00, Chicago for Rahm Emanuel; 6/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Crowley for Congress; 6/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Donnelly for Indiana; 6/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Heidi for Senate; 6/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Josh Gottheimer for Congress; 6/14/2018, \$10,000.00, Pennsylvania Democratic Party—Federal Account; 6/19/2018, \$1,000.00, Lisa Blunt Rochester for Congress; 6/26/2018, \$2,700.00, Scanlon for Congress; 6/26/2018, \$2,700.00, Scanlon for Congress; 6/30/2018, \$1,000.00, Rebecca for Philadelphia; 9/4/2018, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 9/4/2018, \$5,000.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress; 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, Feinstein for Senate; 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, MAD4PA PAC (2018); 11/1/2018, \$2,700.00, Conor Lamb for Congress; 11/8/2018, \$2,700.00, Bill Nelson for US Senate; 11/19/2018, \$1,000.00, Kenney for Philadelphia; 11/27/2018, \$10,000.00, Friends of Joe Torsella; 3/10/2019, \$15,500.00, DCCC—Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; 3/10/2019, \$2,800.00, Hoyer for Congress; 3/10/2019, \$2,800.00, Walden for Congress; 4/1/2019, \$500.00, Allan Domb for City Council; 4/18/2019, \$2,800.00, Biden for President; 5/7/2019, \$1,000.00, Kahlil for Philly; 5/12/2019, \$2,800.00, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress; 5/22/2019, \$500.00, Build PA PAC; 5/28/2019, \$1,000.00, Conor Lamb for Congress; 6/6/2019, \$1,000.00, Leanne for PA; 6/11/2019, \$2,800.00, Susan Wild for Congress; 8/1/2019, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 8/1/2019, \$5,000.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 8/7/2019, \$2,800.00, Citizens for Boyle; 8/14/2019, \$500.00, Stephanie Klein for Judge Committee; 9/11/2019, \$1,000.00, Friends of Val Arkoosh; 9/18/2019, \$5,000.00, Polk County Democratic Central Committee; 9/21/2019, \$2,800.00, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; 9/21/2019, \$2,800.00, Friends of Mark Warner; 9/21/2019, \$10,000.00, Shapiro for Pennsylvania; 10/3/2019, \$2,800.00, Scanlon for Congress; 10/10/2019, \$1,000.00, Chesco Victory; 11/11/2019, \$2,800.00, Brian Fitzpatrick for Congress; 11/11/2019, \$10,000.00, Friends of Joe Torsella; 11/25/2019, \$1,000.00, Rebecca for Philadelphia; 12/2/2019, \$11,219.86 Friends of Joe Torsella; 12/8/2019,

\$750.00, Friends of Joe Torsella; 12/31/2019, \$2,800.00, Finkenauer for Congress; 2/5/2020, \$5,600.00, Chris Coons for Delaware; 2/5/2020, \$2,800.00, Scanlon for Congress; 3/23/2020, \$2,800.00, Biden for President; 3/23/2020, \$2,800.00, Susan Wild for Congress; 3/31/2020, \$2,800.00, Cartwright for Congress; 8/12/2020, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 8/12/2020, \$5,000.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 8/21/2020, \$5,000.00, Lucy Lang for NY, Inc.; 9/22/2020, \$2,800.00, CONOR LAMB FOR CONGRESS; 9/23/2020, \$500.00, Theresa Greenfield for Iowa; 9/24/2020, \$1,000.00, JAIME HARRISON FOR US SENATE; 9/27/2020, \$2,800.00, Hickenlooper for Colorado; 9/30/2020, \$2,800.00, People for Ben (Senate); 9/30/2020, \$2,800.00, Peters for Michigan; 10/18/2020, \$800.00, David Ryu for City Council 2020; 10/27/2020, \$5,000.00, PT Fund, Inc.; 12/29/2020, \$2,500.00, OUR FUTURE UNITED; 3/5/2021, \$1,000.00, Susan Wild for Congress.

2/22/2017, \$1,250.00, ChamberPHL PAC; 3/1/2017, \$5,000.00, APPAC—Associates for Pennsylvania Political Action Committee; 3/2/2017, \$4,600.00, Pennsylvania Democratic Party—Federal Account; 3/2/2017, \$5,400.00, Bob Casey for Senate; 3/9/2017, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 3/9/2017, \$5,000.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Ryan for Congress; 3/10/2017, \$(2,700.00), Ryan for Congress; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Bob Brady for Congress; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Charlie Dent for Congress; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Jeff Flake for U.S. Senate; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Hatch Election Committee, Inc.; 3/10/2017, \$2,700.00, Bill Nelson for US Senate; 3/10/2017, \$28,500.00, NRCC—National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee; 3/22/2017, \$5,000.00, NCTA—National Cable & Telecommunications Association; 3/22/2017, \$10,000.00, Keeping America Competitive; 3/24/2017, \$2,500.00, PA Future PAC; 4/17/2017, \$2,500.00, Build PA PAC; 5/3/2017, \$5,000.00, New Pioneers PAC; 5/3/2017, \$2,700.00, Walden for Congress; 5/3/2017, \$2,700.00, Wicker for Senate; 5/3/2017, \$2,700.00, Donnelly for Indiana; 5/11/2017, \$2,500.00, Mike Turzai Leadership Fund; 5/26/2017, \$2,700.00, Pat Meehan for Congress; 5/30/2017, \$5,000.00, Ed Gillespie for Governor; 6/28/2017, \$2,700.00, Manchin for West Virginia; 6/28/2017, \$2,700.00, Heidi for Senate; 6/28/2017, \$2,700.00, Montanans for Tester; 6/28/2017, \$5,000.00, Purpose PAC; 6/28/2017, \$33,900.00, NRSC—National Republican Senatorial Committee; 8/1/2017, \$1,000.00, Friends of Judge McLaughlin; 8/29/2017, \$2,500.00, Mike Duggan For Detroit Committee; 9/11/2017, \$1,000.00, Pat Meehan for Congress; 9/18/2017, \$2,500.00, Pennsylvania Future Fund; 9/18/2017, \$2,700.00, Ryan Costello for Congress; 9/18/2017, \$2,700.00, Citizens for Boyle; 9/18/2017, \$2,700.00, Kaine for Virginia; 9/19/2017, \$1,000.00, Virginians For Mark Herring; 9/28/2017, \$25,000.00, Tom Wolf for Governor; 11/29/2017, \$5,000.00, Andrew Cuomo 2018; 11/29/2017, \$2,500.00, Friends of Pat Toomey; 12/13/2017, \$5,000.00, Becerra for Attorney General 2018; 1/29/2018, \$2,500.00, Pennsylvania Future Fund; 2/20/2018, \$2,700.00, Marsha for Senate; 2/20/2018, \$2,700.00, Dwight Evans for Congress; 2/20/2018, \$33,900.00, NRCC—National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee; 3/25/2018, \$2,700.00, Scanlon for Congress; 3/27/2018, \$2,700.00, Montanans for Tester; 4/6/2018, \$1,250.00, ChamberPHL PAC; 4/11/2018, \$5,000.00, NCTA—THE INTERNET AND TELEVISION ASSOCIATION POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (NCTA PAC); 4/18/2018, \$2,700.00, Walden for Congress; 4/18/2018, \$5,000.00, New Pioneers PAC; 4/18/2018, \$5,400.00, McCaskill for Missouri; 4/18/2018, \$2,700.00, Bill Nelson for US Senate; 4/18/2018, \$2,700.00, Conor Lamb for Congress; 4/18/2018,

\$33,900.00, NRSC—National Republican Senatorial Committee; 5/25/2018, \$2,500.00, Laxalt for Nevada; 5/25/2018, \$2,500.00, Friends of Scott Walker; 6/14/2018, \$15,000.00, Chicago for Rahm Emanuel; 6/14/2018, \$1,000.00, Benjamin for Mayor; 6/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Heidi for Senate; 6/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Menendez for Senate; 6/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Crowley for Congress; 6/14/2018, \$10,000.00, Pennsylvania Democratic Party—Federal Account; 6/26/2018, \$5,000.00, Friends of Bob Brady; 6/26/2018, \$2,700.00, Scanlon for Congress; 6/26/2018, \$2,700.00, Scanlon for Congress; 8/2/2018, \$29,200.00, Newsom for California Governor 2018; 8/2/2018, \$2,700.00, Josh Gottheimer for Congress; 9/4/2018, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 9/4/2018, \$5,000.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 9/6/2018, \$1,150.00, Phil Weiser for Colorado; 9/6/2018, \$2,500.00, Citizens for Prosperity in America Today PAC; 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, Feinstein for Senate; 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, MAD4PA PAC (2018); 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress; 9/11/2018, \$10,000.00, Montana Democratic Party; 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, Citizens for Boyle; 9/11/2018, \$2,700.00, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; 9/14/2018, \$2,700.00, Heller for Senate; 9/25/2018, \$1,000.00, Turzai Leadership PAC; 10/19/2018, \$1,000.00, OMG WTF Ohio PAC; 11/8/2018, \$2,700.00, Bill Nelson for US Senate; 12/12/2018, \$2,500.00, ChamberPHL PAC; 1/14/2019, \$2,500.00, Pennsylvania Future Fund;

1/22/2019, \$5,000.00, APPAC—Associates for Pennsylvania Political Action Committee; 1/24/2019, \$3,000.00, Hancock for Denver; 2/25/2019, \$1,000.00, Scanlon for Congress; 3/10/2019, \$35,500.00, NRCC—National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee; 3/10/2019, \$10,000.00, NRSC—National Republican Senatorial Committee; 3/10/2019, \$2,800.00, Alaskans for Dan Sullivan; 3/10/2019, \$2,800.00, Walden for Congress; 3/10/2019, \$2,800.00, Hoyer for Congress; 3/10/2019, \$15,500.00, DCCC—Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; 3/12/2019, \$5,600.00, McConnell Senate Committee; 3/13/2019, \$1,000.00, Build PA PAC; 3/14/2019, \$2,500.00, Lightfoot for Chicago; 3/20/2019, \$5,000.00, NCTA—THE INTERNET AND TELEVISION ASSOCIATION POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (NCTA PAC); 3/29/2019, \$1,000.00, Susan Wild for Congress; 4/12/2019, \$2,500.00, Josh Stein for Attorney General; 4/18/2019, \$2,800.00, Biden for President; 5/7/2019, \$5,000.00, Pennsylvania Future Fund; 5/12/2019, \$2,800.00, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress; 5/24/2019, \$5,000.00, Scalise for Congress; 5/24/2019, \$5,000.00, Eye of the Tiger PAC; 5/28/2019, \$1,000.00, Coner Lamb for Congress; 6/11/2019, \$2,800.00, Thom Tillis Committee; 6/11/2019, \$2,300.00, Cory Gardner for Senate; 6/11/2019, \$5,000.00, AmeriPAC: The Fund for a Greater America; 6/11/2019, \$500.00, Cory Gardner for Senate; 6/11/2019, \$2,500.00, Sylvester Turner for Mayor; 6/11/2019, \$2,800.00, Susan Wild for Congress; 8/1/2019, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 8/1/2019, \$5,000.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 8/6/2019, \$2,500.00, Shapiro for Pennsylvania; 8/7/2019, \$2,800.00, Citizens for Boyle; 9/18/2019, \$5,000.00, Polk County Democratic Central Committee; 9/18/2019, \$2,800.00, Tina Smith for Minnesota; 9/21/2019, \$1,200.00, Friends of Kathy Jennings; 9/21/2019, \$10,000.00, Shapiro for Pennsylvania; 9/21/2019, \$2,800.00, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; 9/21/2019, \$2,800.00, Friends of Mark Warner; 9/21/2019, \$2,800.00, Josh Gottheimer for Congress; 9/21/2019, \$2,800.00, Team Graham; 9/27/2019, \$2,800.00, Shaheen for Senate; 10/28/2019, \$1,000.00, Healey Committee; 11/11/2019, \$5,000.00, PA Prosperity Fund PAC; 11/11/2019, \$2,800.00, Brian Fitzpatrick for Congress; 11/11/2019, \$10,000.00, Friends of Joe Torsella; 12/3/2019, \$10,000.00, Andrew Cuomo for New York, Inc.; 12/31/2019, \$2,800.00, Finkenauer for Congress; 1/14/2020, \$5,000.00,

Pennsylvania Future Fund; 2/5/2020, \$2,800.00, Tina Smith for Minnesota; 2/5/2020, \$2,800.00, Shaheen for Senate; 2/5/2020, \$5,600.00, Peters for Michigan; 2/5/2020, \$2,800.00, Doug Jones for Senate Committee; 2/5/2020, \$35,500.00, NRCC—National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee; 2/5/2020, \$1,000.00, Brian Fitzpatrick for Congress; 2/5/2020, \$2,800.00, Butterfield for Congress; 2/5/2020, \$5,600.00, Chris Coons for Delaware; 2/5/2020, \$5,400.00, Cooper for North Carolina; 2/5/2020, \$4,600.00, Scanlon for Congress; 3/23/2020, \$2,800.00, Biden for President; 3/23/2020, \$1,800.00, Susan Wild for Congress; 3/31/2020, \$2,800.00, Doyle for Congress Committee; 3/31/2020, \$2,800.00, Cartwright for Congress; 5/7/2020, \$35,500.00, DNC—Democratic National Committee; 5/7/2020, \$14,500.00, Biden Victory Fund; 5/24/2020, \$500.00, Khazei for Congress; 6/21/2020, \$2,300.00, Khazei for Congress; 6/21/2020, \$(200.00), Khazei for Congress; 6/21/2020, \$200.00, Khazei for Congress; 6/22/2020, \$1,000.00, Friends of Bob Mensch; 6/22/2020, \$1,000.00, Karen Bass for Congress; 6/22/2020, \$2,800.00, Friends of Dick Durbin Committee; 6/24/2020, \$5,000.00, Friends of Jake Corman; 6/29/2020, \$2,800.00, People for Ben (Senate); 6/29/2020, \$2,800.00, Hickenlooper for Colorado; 7/28/2020, \$2,800.00, Chrissy Houlahan for Congress; 7/30/2020, \$2,800.00, RICHARD E NEAL FOR CONGRESS COMMITTEE; 7/31/2020, \$2,600.00, Killion Victory Committee; 8/1/2020, \$10,000.00, DCCC—Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; 8/12/2020, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 8/12/2020, \$5,000.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 8/31/2020, \$10,000.00, Shapiro for Pennsylvania; 9/14/2020, \$5,600.00, Lisa Blunt Rochester for Congress; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Texas Democratic Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Pennsylvania Democratic Party—Federal Account; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Ohio Democratic Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, North Carolina Democratic Party—Federal; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, New Hampshire Democratic Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Nevada State Democratic Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Nebraska Democratic Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor-Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.34, Georgia Federal Elections Committee; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.33, Democratic Party of Virginia; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.34, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.34, Arizona Democratic Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.34, Colorado Democratic Party; 9/16/2020, \$3,333.34, Michigan Democratic State Central Committee; 9/18/2020, \$1,000.00, The Voter Project; 9/20/2020, \$2,800.00, Cartwright for Congress; 9/25/2020, \$500.00, Peters for Michigan; 9/25/2020, \$(500.00), Peters for Michigan; 9/26/2020, \$10,000.00, Friends of Joe Torsella; 9/28/2020, \$2,800.00, Hickenlooper for Colorado; 10/18/2020, \$800.00, David Ryu for City Council 2020; 10/26/2020, \$5,000.00, PT Fund, Inc.; 10/28/2020, \$2,500.00, Prairie PAC; 10/29/2020, \$2,800.00, Josh Gottheimer for Congress; 10/30/2020, \$5,000.00, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; 12/14/2020, \$1,000.00, Bob Casey for Senate; 3/25/2021, \$15,000.00, COMPAC-USA; 3/25/2021, \$4,500.00, COMCAST CORPORATION & NBCUNIVERSAL POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—FEDERAL; 3/31/2021, \$1,000.00, Lisa Blunt Rochester for Congress.

Mark Gitenstein, of Washington, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Nominee: Mark H. Gitenstein.

Post: US Ambassador to the European Union.

Nominated: July 28, 2021.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these



persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Mark Gitenstein: \$1000, 9/14/20, Elaine for Congress; \$100, 9/14/20, ActBlue; \$2800, 4/25/20, Biden for President; \$300, 1/09/20, Biden for President; \$1500, 7/31/19, Biden for President; \$1000, 4/25/19, Biden for President; \$1000, 1/28/19, Committee for a Democratic Future; \$400, 10/07/18, Elect Carolyn Long; \$400, 10/07/18, Lisa Brown for Congress; \$400, 10/07/18, Dr Kim Schrier for Congress; \$1200, 10/06/18, Flip Wa Blue 2018; \$100, 11/08/17, ActBlue; \$1000, 11/08/17, Doug Jones for Senate Committee; \$500, 09/24/17, Friends of Maria; \$500, 09/24/17, Cantwell-Hirona Victory Fund; \$1000, 05/25/17, Pramila for Congress; \$50, 05/25/17, Jstreet Pac; \$1000, 03/30/17, Friends of Chris Murphy; \$500, 02/16/17, Committee for a Democratic Future.

Elizabeth Gitenstein: \$150, 10/23/20, Act Blue; \$2286, 4/25/20, Biden for President; \$116, 4/19/20, Biden for President; \$1500, 7/31/19, Biden for President; \$500, 4/28/19, Biden for President; \$20, 11/2/20, Biden for President; \$20, 10/4/20, Biden for President; \$20, 9/2/20, Biden for President; \$20, 8/2/20, Biden for President; \$20, 7/2/20, Biden for President; \$25, 6/10/20, Biden for President; \$20, 6/2/20, Biden for President; \$20, 5/3/20, Biden for President; \$15, 4/19/20, Biden for President; \$50, 4/19/20, Biden for President; \$25, 4/15/20, Biden for President; \$20, 4/2/20, Biden for President; \$25, 3/31/20, Biden for President; \$25, 3/12/20, Biden for President; \$20, 3/2/20, Biden for President; \$20, 2/2/20, Biden for President; \$20, 1/2/20, Biden for President; \$20, 12/3/19, Biden for President; \$5, 11/12/19, Biden for President; \$15, 11/12/19, Biden for President; \$20, 11/3/19, Biden for President; \$25, 10/31/19, Biden for President; \$25, 10/29/19, Biden for President; \$15, 10/22/19, Biden for President; \$15, 10/10/19, Biden for President; \$20, 10/3/19, Biden for President; \$74, 9/30/19, Biden for President; \$74, 9/26/19, Biden for President; \$25, 9/8/19, Biden for President; \$25, 9/8/19, Biden for President; \$20, 9/3/19, Biden for President; \$15, 8/31/19, Biden for President; \$50, 8/29/19, Biden for President; \$50, 8/22/19, Biden for President; \$10, 8/11/19, Biden for President; \$20, 8/4/19, Biden for President; \$25, 7/31/19, Biden for President; \$5, 7/30/19, Biden for President; \$5, 7/28/19, Biden for President; \$5, 7/18/19, Biden for President; \$25, 7/18/19, Biden for President; \$25, 7/7/19, Biden for President; \$20, 7/2/19, Biden for President; \$25, 7/1/19, Biden for President; \$50, 6/24/19, Biden for President; \$25, 6/16/19, Biden for President; \$10, 6/13/19, Biden for President; \$25, 6/5/19, Biden for President; \$20, 6/2/19, Biden for President; \$5, 5/26/19, Biden for President; \$25, 5/26/19, Biden for President; \$5, 5/12/19, Biden for President; \$5, 5/9/19, Biden for President; \$5, 5/9/19, Biden for President; \$5, 5/9/19, Biden for President; \$5, 5/9/19, Biden for President; \$5, 5/5/19, Biden for President; \$20, 5/2/19, Biden for President; \$5, 4/29/19, Biden for President; \$50, 4/29/19, Biden for President; \$5, 4/28/19, Biden for President; \$50, 10/1/20, Biden Victory Fund.

Laura S. H. Holgate, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Vienna Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Laura S. H. Holgate, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Laura S. H. Holgate

Post: Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador, and Representative of the United States of America to the Vienna Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: \$100, 2017, ActBlue; \$500, 2017, Dan for Colorado; \$100, 2017, ActBlue; \$313, 2018, Biggins for Virginia; \$500, 2018, MJ for Texas; \$500, DNC Services Corp./Dem. Nat'l Committee, \$100, 2019, ActBlue, \$1000, 2019, Dan for Colorado; \$500, 2019, Dan for Colorado; \$500, 2020, Biden for President; \$100, 2020, Biden for President; \$100, 2020, ActBlue; \$500, 2020, Bollier for Kansas; \$500, 2020, Brad PAC; \$100, 2020, Biden for President; \$500, 2020, Biden for President; \$500, 2020, Biden for President; \$500, 2020, Biden for President; \$250, 2020, Biden for President; \$113.20, 2020, Biden for President; \$250, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 2020, Biden for President; \$500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$113.20, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$250, 2020, And Kim for Congress; \$250, 2020, Andy Kim for Congress; \$113.20, 2020, ActBlue; \$100, 2020, ActBlue.

Cindy Hensley McCain, of Arizona, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture.

Nominee: Cindy Hensley McCain.

Post: Rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: No federal contributions.
2. Spouse: Senator John Sidney McCain, III (deceased). No federal contributions.
3. Children: None of my children reside with me as a member of my household.

David John Young, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malawi.

Nominee: David John Young.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Malawi.

Nominated: August 9, 2021.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

David Young: \$1,000, 11/11/2020, Warnock for Georgia; David Young: \$1,000, 11/11/2020, Jon Ossoff for Senate, Diane Weisz Young: None.

Victoria Reggie Kennedy, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Austria.

Nominee: Victoria R. Kennedy.

Post: Embassy Vienna.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contribution, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$83.34, 7/31/21, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$250.00, 5/13/21, Alex Padilla; \$83.34, 4/30/21, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 3/31/21, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,800.00, 1/31/21, Maggie For NH; \$1,800.00, 1/31/21, Maggie For NH; \$124.93, 12/31/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$125.01, 11/23/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,800.00, 9/30/20, 4 MA PAC; \$83.34, 9/30/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 8/31/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$1,000.00, 8/15/20, Shaheen For Senate; \$50,000.00, 8/13/20, Biden Action Fund; \$83.34, 7/31/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,800.00, 7/7/20, Amy Kennedy For Congress; \$83.34, 6/30/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 5/31/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 4/30/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,800.00, 4/27/20, Biden For President; \$83.34, 3/31/20, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$1,000.00, 1/17/20, Maggie For NH; \$2,800.00, 1/6/20, Amy Kennedy For Congress; \$83.26, 12/31/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 11/30/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; (\$2,800.00), 11/13/19, Kennedy For Massachusetts; \$83.34, 10/31/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 9/30/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,800.00, 9/21/19, Kennedy For Massachusetts; \$83.34, 8/31/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 7/31/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 6/30/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,800.00, 5/31/19, Biden For President; \$483.34, 5/31/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,800.00, 5/31/19, Biden for President; \$1,000.00, 5/29/19, MA Democratic State Committee; \$1,000.00, 5/29/19, MA Democratic Party; \$83.34, 4/30/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 3/31/19, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$124.93, 12/31/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 11/26/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$41.67, 10/17/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 9/30/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 8/31/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,700.00, 8/31/18, Kaine For Virginia; \$2,700.00, 8/25/18, Kaine Victory Fund; \$1,000.00, 8/23/18, Markey Committee, The; \$250.00, 8/17/18, The Bill Keating Committee; \$83.34, 7/31/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$1,000.00, 7/28/18, Bob Casey For Senate Inc; \$83.34, 6/30/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 5/31/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 4/30/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 3/31/18, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.26, 12/31/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,700.00, 12/15/17, Whitehouse For Senate; \$2,700.00, 12/15/17, Whitehouse For Senate; \$83.34, 11/30/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$500.00, 11/17/17, Katherine Clark For Congress; \$83.34, 10/31/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 9/30/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$1,000.00, 9/22/17, Soderberg For Congress; \$83.34, 8/31/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$2,700.00, 8/7/17, Markey Committee, The; \$83.34, 7/31/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 6/30/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$1,000.00, 6/7/17, Annette Taddeo; \$83.34, 5/31/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$1,000.00, 5/5/17, Parity PAC; \$83.34, 4/30/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$83.34, 3/31/17, Greenberg Traurig, P.A. PAC; \$1,000.00, 3/12/17, Montanans For Tester; \$1,000.00, 2/9/17, Stabenow For US Senate.

C.S. Eliot Kang, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (International Security and Non-Proliferation).

Marcia Stephens Bloom Bernicat, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of the Minister-Counselor, to be Director General of the Foreign Service.

Julietta Valls Noyes, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Population, Refugees, and Migration).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the

RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Ninoshka Abreu Guerra and ending with Stefanie Nicole Yacubovich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 19, 2021.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Rosemary Gallant and ending with Eric Wolff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 19, 2021.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Elizabeth R. Baiocchi and ending with William K. Makaneole, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 9, 2021.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. KING):

S. 2993. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency the National Cyber Exercise Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2994. A bill to list certain perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous air pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2995. A bill to improve the provision of financial literacy training and information relating to the Blended Retirement System to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2996. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2997. A bill to prohibit a COVID-19 vaccination requirement for eligibility in nutrition programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2998. A bill to prohibit the Commissioner of Social Security and any officer or employee of the Social Security Administration from requiring that any individual be vaccinated against COVID-19 as a condition of receiving benefits under titles II or XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2999. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services, any officer or employee of the Department of Health and

Human Services, and States from requiring COVID-19 vaccination as a condition of eligibility for benefits or assistance under the Medicare, Medicaid, or CHIP programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 3000. A bill to prohibit proof of COVID-19 vaccination status as a requirement for receiving assistance under a program funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 3001. A bill to streamline enrollment in health insurance affordability programs and minimum essential coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 3002. A bill to address the surge in illegal border crossings along the southwest border by establishing new ports of entry for processing migrants in accordance with the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 362 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 3003. An original bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. WARNOCK:

S. 3004. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish new requirements for State homes for veterans that receive per diem from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 3005. A bill establishing appropriate thresholds for certain budget points of order in the Senate, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 3006. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2022 through 2031; read the first time.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 3007. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits; read the first time.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 3008. A bill to establish the Federal Rainy Day Fund to control emergency spending; read the first time.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 3009. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to remove the prohibition on States and territories against lowering their taxes; read the first time.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 3010. A bill to cap noninterest Federal spending as a percentage of potential GDP to right-size the Government, grow the economy, and balance the budget; read the first time.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 3011. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to allow States and local governments to use coronavirus relief funds provided under the American Rescue Plan Act for infrastructure projects, improve the Local Assistance and Tribal Consistency Fund, provide Tribal governments with more time to use Coronavirus Relief Fund payments, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Ms. ERNST, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 3012. A bill to provide a moratorium on all Federal research grants provided to any institution of higher education or other research institute that is conducting gain-of-function research; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. Res. 422. A resolution authorizing the use of the atrium in the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building for a bipartisan Halloween dog parade on October 27, 2021; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. Res. 423. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 2021 as "National Youth Justice Action Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 535

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 535, a bill to authorize the location of a memorial on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of the Global War on Terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 602

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 602, a bill to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 868

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 868, a bill to amend title II of



the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title and waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals with Huntington's disease.

S. 958

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 958, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the allowable use criteria for new access points grants for community health centers.

S. 996

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 996, a bill to award grants to certain intuitions of higher education to educate and train students to participate in the telecommunications workforce.

S. 1139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1139, a bill to repeal the Military Selective Service Act.

S. 1378

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the retirement of certain animals used in Federal research, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to establish a basic needs allowance for low-income regular members of the Armed Forces.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to address maternity care storages and promote optimal maternity outcomes by expanding educational opportunities for midwives, and for other purposes.

S. 1779

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1779, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines relating to preventive health services, and for other purposes.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1873, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multicancer early detection screening tests.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

COLLINS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1893, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to support rural residency training funding that is equitable for all States, and for other purposes.

S. 1986

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2011

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2011, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor the contributions of all those whose efforts led to the successful development of life saving vaccines to combat the novel coronavirus.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2013, a bill to provide for the coverage of medically necessary food and vitamins and individual amino acids for digestive and inherited metabolic disorder under Federal health programs and private health insurance, to ensure State and Federal protection for existing coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 2069

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2069, a bill to expand the Medicaid certified community behavioral health clinic demonstration program and to authorize funding for additional grants to certified community behavioral health clinics.

S. 2091

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2091, a bill to amend the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to increase appropriations to Restaurant Revitalization Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2100

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2100, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 2390

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2390, a bill to allow Americans to receive paid leave time to process and address their own health

needs and the health needs of their partners during the period following a pregnancy loss, an unsuccessful round of intrauterine insemination or of an assisted reproductive technology procedure, a failed adoption arrangement, a failed surrogacy arrangement, or a diagnosis or event that impacts pregnancy or fertility, to support related research and education, and for other purposes.

S. 2491

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2491, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Cyber Resilience Assistance Fund, to improve the ability of the Federal Government to assist in enhancing critical infrastructure cyber resilience, to improve security in the national cyber ecosystem, to address Systemically Important Critical Infrastructure, and for other purposes.

S. 2700

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2700, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to improve the detection, prevention, and treatment of mental health issues among public safety officers, and for other purposes.

S. 2706

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2706, a bill to improve diversity in clinical trials and data collection for COVID-19 and future public health threats to address social determinants of health.

S. 2729

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2729, a bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a program through which eligible individuals may obtain vouchers for the purchase of connected devices, and for other purposes.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2736, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2780

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2780, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to prohibit certain adverse personnel actions taken against members of the Armed Forces based on declining the COVID-19 vaccine.

S. 2889

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2889, a bill to amend the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 to

address the timing for the use of funds with respect to grants made to shuttered venue operators.

S. 2925

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2925, a bill to provide for a strategic plan for the domestic manufacture of necessary medical supplies or supplies needed to facilitate emergency or medical response, and for other purposes.

S. 2984

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2984, a bill to establish that a State-based education loan program is excluded from certain requirements relating to a preferred lender arrangement.

S. RES. 380

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 380, a resolution reiterating United States support for the people of the Republic of South Sudan in their quest for lasting peace, stability, and democracy after 10 years of independence and calling for a review of United States policy toward South Sudan.

S. RES. 411

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 411, a resolution designating October 6, 2021, as "Energy Efficiency Day" in celebration of the economic and environmental benefits that have been driven by private sector innovation and Federal energy efficiency policies.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2994. A bill to list certain perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous air pollutants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Prevent Release of Toxics Emissions, Contamination, and Transfer Act. The PROTECT Act would add certain PFAS chemicals to the list of hazardous air pollutants under the Clean Air Act.

The Environmental Working Group recently identified nearly 30,000 potential industrial dischargers of PFAS into the air and water. Yet there are currently no restrictions on industrial PFAS discharges under the Clean Water Act or the Clean Air Act, leaving communities vulnerable to the devastating impacts of PFAS pollution.

While it is well documented how toxic PFAS chemicals are prevalent in

the water supply, it is less well known that PFAS chemicals are also emitted into the air.

This legislation would add PFOA, PFOS, PFBS, and GenX to the list of hazardous air pollutants regulated under section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act. It would also direct the EPA to create a list of categories of major sources and area sources that emit PFAS within 2 years and give the EPA a 5-year deadline to finalize the subsequent regulations.

The EPA has acknowledged that "air emissions of PFAS from industrial sources is now recognized as a significant route for PFAS releases to the environment and is evidenced by deposition as well as their presence in rainwater." Yet PFAS air emissions aren't currently regulated under the Clean Air Act or any other anti-pollution law.

Adding PFAS to the EPA's hazardous air pollutants list would build upon work done by States to limit air emissions from industrial facilities and greatly expand the number of facilities that would have to adopt technology to reduce PFAS emissions.

I thank my colleague Senator SHAHEEN for her tireless leadership fighting PFAS contamination and protecting vulnerable communities and Congresswoman STEVENS for successfully shepherding this legislation through the House.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the PROTECT Act as quickly as possible.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 422—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ATRIUM IN THE PHILIP A. HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING FOR A BIPARTISAN HALLOWEEN DOG PARADE ON OCTOBER 27, 2021

Mr. TILLIS submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:—

S. RES. 422

*Resolved,*

SECTION 1. USE OF THE ATRIUM IN THE HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING FOR A BIPARTISAN HALLOWEEN DOG PARADE.

The atrium in the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building is authorized to be used on October 27, 2021, for a bipartisan Halloween dog parade.

SENATE RESOLUTION 423—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 2021 AS "NATIONAL YOUTH JUSTICE ACTION MONTH"

Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 423

Whereas the historical role of the juvenile court system is to rehabilitate and treat young people while holding them account-

able and maintaining public safety, and the juvenile court system is therefore better equipped to work with youth than the adult criminal justice system, which is punitive in nature;

Whereas youth are developmentally different from adults, and those differences have been—

(1) documented by research on the adolescent brain; and

(2) acknowledged by the Supreme Court of the United States, State supreme courts, and many State and Federal laws that prohibit youth under the age of 18 from taking on major adult responsibilities such as voting, jury duty, and military service;

Whereas youth who are placed under the commitment of the juvenile court system are able to access age-appropriate services and education and remain closer to their families, which reduces the likelihood that those youth will commit offenses in the future;

Whereas every year in the United States an estimated 76,000 youths are tried, sentenced, or incarcerated as adults, and most of those youth are prosecuted for nonviolent offenses;

Whereas most laws allowing the prosecution of youth as adults were enacted before the publication of research-based evidence by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice demonstrating that prosecuting youth in adult court actually decreases public safety as, on average, youth prosecuted in adult court are 34 percent more likely to commit future crimes than youth retained in the juvenile court system;

Whereas youth of color, youth with disabilities, and youth with mental health issues are disproportionately represented at all stages of the criminal justice system;

Whereas it is harmful to public safety and to young people in the legal system to confine youth in adult jails or prisons where they are significantly more likely to be physically and sexually assaulted and often placed in solitary confinement;

Whereas youth sentenced as adults receive an adult criminal record that hinders future education and employment opportunities;

Whereas youth who receive extremely long sentences deserve an opportunity to demonstrate their potential to grow and change; and

Whereas, in October, people around the United States participate in Youth Justice Action Month to increase public awareness of the need to protect the constitutional rights of youth, establish a minimum age for arresting children, remove youth from adult courts and prisons, and end the practice of sentencing children to life, and de facto life, without parole and to provide people across the United States with an opportunity to develop action-oriented events in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that the collateral consequences normally applied in the adult criminal justice system should not automatically apply to youth arrested for crimes before the age of 18;

(2) expresses support for the designation of October 2021 as "National Youth Justice Action Month";

(3) recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of National Youth Justice Action Month; and

(4) recognizes the importance of and encourages the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice to fully implement the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-385; 132 Stat. 5123) in a manner in keeping with the spirit and intent of the law.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3861. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3862. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. BOOKER) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 267, designating June 12, 2021, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day".

## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 3861.** Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2792, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2022 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

### SEC. 1064. NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES REVIEWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "TITLE X—NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES REVIEWS

##### "SEC. 1001. DEFINITIONS.

"In this title:

"(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

"(A) the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

"(B) the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

"(2) COMMITTEE.—The term 'Committee' means the Committee on National Critical Capabilities established under section 1002.

"(3) CONTROL.—The term 'control' means the power, direct or indirect, whether exercised or not exercised, to determine, direct, or decide important matters affecting an entity, subject to regulations prescribed by the Committee.

"(4) COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term 'country of concern'—

"(A) has the meaning given the term 'foreign adversary' in section 8(c)(2) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1607(c)(2)); and

"(B) may include a nonmarket economy country (as defined in section 771(18) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(18))) identified by the Committee for purposes of this paragraph by regulation.

"(5) COVERED TRANSACTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided, the term 'covered transaction' means any of the following transactions, proposed

or pending on or after the date of the enactment of this title:

"(i) Any transaction by a United States business that—

"(I) shifts or relocates to a country of concern, or transfers to an entity of concern, the design, development, production, manufacture, fabrication, supply, servicing, testing, management, operation, investment, ownership, or any other essential elements involving one or more national critical capabilities identified under subparagraph (B)(ii); or

"(II) could result in an unacceptable risk to a national critical capability.

"(ii) Any other transaction, transfer, agreement, or arrangement, the structure of which is designed or intended to evade or circumvent the application of this title, subject to regulations prescribed by the Committee.

"(B) REGULATIONS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall prescribe regulations further defining the term 'covered transaction' in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').

"(ii) IDENTIFICATION OF NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(I), the regulations prescribed by the Committee under clause (i) shall—

"(I) identify the national critical capabilities subject to that subparagraph based on criteria intended to limit application of that subparagraph to the subset of national critical capabilities that is likely to pose an unacceptable risk to the national security and crisis preparedness of the United States; and

"(II) enumerate, quantify, prioritize, and set forth sufficient allowances of, specific types and examples of such capabilities.

"(6) CRISIS PREPAREDNESS.—The term 'crisis preparedness' means preparedness for—

"(A) a public health emergency declared under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d); or

"(B) a major disaster declared under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170).

"(7) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term 'critical infrastructure' means systems and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such systems and assets would have a debilitating impact on national security, national economic security, national public health or safety, or any combination of those matters.

"(8) ENTITY OF CONCERN.—The term 'entity of concern' means an entity—

"(A) the ultimate parent entity of which is domiciled in a country of concern; or

"(B) that is directly or indirectly controlled by, owned by, or subject to the influence of a foreign person that has a substantial nexus with a country of concern.

"(9) FOREIGN ENTITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subparagraph (B), the term 'foreign entity' means any branch, partnership, group or sub-group, association, estate, trust, corporation or division of a corporation, or organization organized under the laws of a foreign country if—

"(i) its principal place of business is outside the United States; or

"(ii) its equity securities are primarily traded on one or more foreign exchanges.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The term 'foreign entity' does not include any entity described in subparagraph (A) that can demonstrate that a majority of the equity interest in such entity is ultimately owned by nationals of the United States.

"(10) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term 'foreign person' means—

"(A) any foreign national, foreign government, or foreign entity;

"(B) any entity over which control is exercised or exercisable by a foreign national, foreign government, or foreign entity; or

"(C) any entity over which control is exercised or exercisable by a person described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

"(11) NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES.—The term 'national critical capabilities', subject to regulations prescribed by the Committee—

"(A) means systems and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the inability to develop such systems and assets or the incapacity or destruction of such systems or assets would have a debilitating impact on national security or crisis preparedness; and

"(B) includes the following:

"(i) The production, in sufficient quantities, of any of the following articles:

"(I) Medical supplies, medicines, and personal protective equipment.

"(II) Articles essential to the operation, manufacture, supply, service, or maintenance of critical infrastructure.

"(III) Articles critical to infrastructure construction after a natural or manmade disaster.

"(IV) Articles that are components of systems critical to the operation of weapons systems, intelligence collection systems, or items critical to the conduct of military or intelligence operations.

"(V) Any other articles identified in regulations prescribed under section 1007.

"(ii) Supply chains for the production of articles described in clause (i).

"(iii) Essential supply chains for the Department of Defense.

"(iv) Any other supply chains identified in regulations prescribed under section 1007.

"(v) Services critical to the production of articles described in clause (i) or a supply chain described in clause (ii), (iii), or (iv).

"(vi) Medical services.

"(vii) Services critical to the maintenance of critical infrastructure.

"(viii) Services critical to infrastructure construction after a natural or manmade disaster.

"(ix) Any other services identified in regulations prescribed under section 1007.

"(12) NATIONAL SECURITY.—The term 'national security' includes—

"(A) national security, as defined in section 721(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(a));

"(B) national defense, as defined in section 702 of that Act (50 U.S.C. 4552); and

"(C) agricultural security and natural resources security.

"(13) PARTY.—The term 'party', with respect to a transaction, has the meaning given that term in regulations prescribed by the Committee.

"(14) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States' means the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

"(15) UNITED STATES BUSINESS.—The term 'United States business' means a person engaged in interstate commerce in the United States.

### "SEC. 1002. COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established a committee, to be known as the 'Committee on National Critical Capabilities', which shall carry out this title and such other assignments as the President may designate.

"(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be comprised of the head, or a designee of the head, of each of the following:

"(A) The Office of the United States Trade Representative.

“(B) The Department of Commerce.  
 “(C) The Office of Science and Technology Policy.  
 “(D) The Department of the Treasury.  
 “(E) The Department of Homeland Security.  
 “(F) The Department of Defense.  
 “(G) The Department of State.  
 “(H) The Department of Justice.  
 “(I) The Department of Energy.  
 “(J) The Department of Health and Human Services.  
 “(K) The Department of Agriculture.  
 “(L) The Department of Labor.  
 “(M) Any other Federal agency the President determines appropriate, generally or on a case-by-case basis.  
 “(2) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—  
 “(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the members of the Committee specified in paragraph (1), the following shall, except as provided in subparagraph (B), be nonvoting, ex officio members of the Committee:  
 “(i) The Director of National Intelligence.  
 “(ii) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.  
 “(iii) The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.  
 “(iv) The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.  
 “(v) The Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.  
 “(vi) The Chairperson of the Federal Communications Commission.  
 “(vii) The Chairperson of the Securities and Exchange Commission.  
 “(viii) The Chairperson of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.  
 “(ix) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.  
 “(B) DESIGNATION AS VOTING MEMBERS.—The chairperson of the Committee may designate any of the officials specified in clauses (ii) through (ix) of subparagraph (A) as voting members of the Committee.  
 “(c) CHAIRPERSON.—  
 “(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Trade Representative shall serve as the chairperson of the Committee.  
 “(2) CONSULTATIONS WITH SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE AND COMMERCE.—In carrying out the duties of the chairperson of the Committee, the United States Trade Representative shall consult with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce.  
 “(d) DESIGNATION OF OFFICIALS TO CARRY OUT DUTIES RELATED TO COMMITTEE.—The head of each agency represented on the Committee shall designate an official, at or equivalent to the level of Assistant Secretary in the Department of the Treasury, who is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to carry out such duties related to the Committee as the head of the agency may assign.  
**“SEC. 1003. REVIEW OF COVERED TRANSACTIONS.**  
 “(a) MANDATORY NOTIFICATION.—A United States business that engages in a covered transaction shall submit a written notification of the transaction to the Committee.  
 “(b) REVIEW.—  
 “(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving written notification under subsection (a) of a covered transaction, the Committee may—  
 “(A) review the transaction to determine if the transaction is likely to result in an unacceptable risk to one or more national critical capabilities, including by considering factors specified in section 1005; and  
 “(B) if the Committee determines under subparagraph (A) that the transaction poses a risk described in that subparagraph, make recommendations—  
 “(i) to the President for appropriate action that may be taken under this title or under other existing authorities to address or mitigate that risk; and

“(ii) to Congress for the establishment or expansion of Federal programs to support the production or supply of articles and services described in section 1001(a)(11)(B) in the United States.  
 “(2) UNILATERAL INITIATION OF REVIEW.—The Committee may initiate a review under paragraph (1) of a covered transaction for which written notification is not submitted under subsection (a).  
 “(3) INITIATION OF REVIEW BY REQUEST FROM CONGRESS.—The Committee shall initiate a review under paragraph (1) of a covered transaction if the chairperson and the ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees jointly request the Committee to review the transaction.  
 “(c) TREATMENT OF BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—A United States business shall submit each notification required by subsection (a) to the Committee—  
 “(1) in a form that includes business confidential information; and  
 “(2) in a form that omits business confidential information and is appropriate for disclosure to the public.  
**“SEC. 1004. ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT.**  
 “(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (d), the President may take such action for such time as the President considers appropriate to address or mitigate any unacceptable risk posed by a covered transaction to one or more national critical capabilities, including suspending or prohibiting the covered transaction.  
 “(b) ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT.—The President shall announce the decision on whether or not to take action pursuant to subsection (a) with respect to a covered transaction not later than 15 days after the date on which the review of the transaction under section 1003 is completed.  
 “(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The President may direct the Attorney General of the United States to seek appropriate relief, including divestment relief, in the district courts of the United States, in order to implement and enforce this section.  
 “(d) FINDINGS OF THE PRESIDENT.—The President may exercise the authority conferred by subsection (a) to suspend or prohibit a covered transaction only if the President finds that—  
 “(1) there is credible evidence that leads the President to believe that the transaction poses an unacceptable risk to one or more national critical capabilities; and  
 “(2) provisions of law (other than this section) do not, in the judgment of the President, provide adequate and appropriate authority for the President to protect such capabilities.  
 “(e) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—For purposes of determining whether to take action under subsection (a), the President shall consider, among other factors, each of the factors described in section 1005, as appropriate.  
**“SEC. 1005. FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.**  
 “The Committee, in reviewing and making a determination with respect to a covered transaction under section 1003, and the President, in determining whether to take action under section 1004 with respect to a covered transaction, shall consider any factors relating to national critical capabilities that the Committee or the President considers relevant, including—  
 “(1) the long-term strategic economic, national security, and crisis preparedness interests of the United States;  
 “(2) the history of distortive or predatory trade practices in each country in which a foreign person that is a party to the transaction is domiciled;  
 “(3) control and beneficial ownership (as determined in accordance with section 847 of the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2020 (Public Law 116-92; 10 U.S.C. 2509 note)) of each foreign person that is a party to the transaction; and  
 “(4) impact on the domestic industry and resulting resiliency, including the domestic skills base, taking into consideration any pattern of foreign investment in the domestic industry.  
**“SEC. 1006. SUPPLY CHAIN SENSITIVITIES.**  
 “The Committee shall determine the sensitivities and risks for sourcing of articles described in section 1001(a)(11)(B)(i), in accordance with the following:  
 “(1) The sourcing of least concern shall be articles the supply chains for which are housed in whole within countries that are allies of the United States.  
 “(2) The sourcing of greater concern shall be articles the supply chains for which are housed in part within countries of concern or from an entity of concern but for which substitute production is available from elsewhere at required scale.  
 “(3) The sourcing of greatest concern shall be articles the supply chains for which are housed wholly or in part in countries of concern or from an entity of concern and for which substitute production is unavailable elsewhere at required scale.  
**“SEC. 1007. IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES.**  
 “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Committee should prescribe regulations to identify additional articles, supply chains, and services to recommend for inclusion in the definition of ‘national critical capabilities’ under section 1001(a)(11).  
 “(b) REVIEW OF INDUSTRIES.—  
 “(1) IN GENERAL.—In identifying under subsection (a) additional articles, supply chains, and services to recommend for inclusion in the definition of ‘national critical capabilities’ under section 1001(a)(11), the Committee should conduct a review of industries identified by Federal Emergency Management Agency as carrying out emergency support functions, including the following industries:  
 “(A) Energy.  
 “(B) Medical.  
 “(C) Communications, including electronic and communications components.  
 “(D) Defense.  
 “(E) Transportation.  
 “(F) Aerospace, including space launch.  
 “(G) Robotics.  
 “(H) Artificial intelligence.  
 “(I) Semiconductors.  
 “(J) Shipbuilding.  
 “(K) Water, including water purification.  
 “(2) QUANTIFICATION.—In conducting a review of industries under paragraph (1), the Committee should specify the quantity of articles, supply chains, and services, and specific types and examples of transactions, from each industry sufficient to maintain national critical capabilities.  
**“SEC. 1008. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**  
 “(a) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—  
 “(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022, and annually thereafter, the Committee shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report—  
 “(A) on the determination under section 1006 with respect to sensitivities and risks for sourcing of articles described in section 1001(a)(11)(B)(i);  
 “(B) assessing whether identification of additional national critical capabilities under section 1007 is necessary; and  
 “(C) describing, for the year preceding submission of the report—  
 “(i) the notifications received under subsection (a) of section 1003 and reviews conducted pursuant to such notifications;  
 “(ii) reviews initiated under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (b) of that section;

“(iii) actions recommended by the Committee under subsection (b)(1)(B) of that section as a result of such reviews; and

“(iv) reviews during which the Committee determined no action was required; and

“(D) assessing the overall impact of such reviews on national critical capabilities.

“(2) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

“(b) USE OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AUTHORITIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022, the Committee shall submit to Congress a report that includes recommendations relating to use the authorities under title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4531 et seq.) to make investments to enhance national critical capabilities and reduce dependency on materials and services imported from foreign countries.

#### “SEC. 1009. REQUIREMENT FOR REGULATIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall prescribe regulations to carry out this title.

“(b) ELEMENTS.—Regulations prescribed to carry out this title shall—

“(1) provide for the imposition of civil penalties for any violation of this title, including any mitigation agreement entered into, conditions imposed, or order issued pursuant to this title; and

“(2) include specific examples of the types of—

“(A) the transactions that will be considered to be covered transactions; and

“(B) the articles, supply chains, and services that will be considered to be national critical capabilities.

“(c) COORDINATION.—In prescribing regulations to carry out this title, the Committee shall coordinate with the United States Trade Representative, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security, and the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to avoid duplication of effort.

#### “SEC. 1010. REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised to require each person that is a prospective contractor for an executive agency to disclose the supply chains the person would use to carry out the contract and the extent to which the person would depend on articles and services imported from foreign countries, including the percentage of such materials and services imported from countries of concern.

“(b) MATERIALITY.—The head of an executive agency shall consider the failure of a person to make the disclosures required by subsection (a) to be material determinants in awarding a contract to that person.

“(c) APPLICABILITY.—The revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulation required under subsection (a) shall apply with respect to contracts for which solicitations are issued on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ‘executive agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

“(2) FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—The term ‘Federal Acquisition Regulation’ means the regulation issued pursuant to section 1303(a)(1) of title 41, United States Code.

#### “SEC. 1011. MULTILATERAL ENGAGEMENT AND COORDINATION.

“The United States Trade Representa-

“(1) should, in coordination and consultation with relevant Federal agencies, conduct multilateral engagement with the governments of countries that are allies of the United States to secure coordination of protocols and procedures with respect to covered transactions with countries of concern; and

“(2) upon adoption of protocols and procedures described in paragraph (1), shall work with those governments to establish information sharing regimes.

#### “SEC. 1012. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title, including to provide outreach to industry and persons affected by this title.

#### “SEC. 1013. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO FREE AND FAIR COMMERCE.

“Nothing in this title may be construed as prohibiting or limiting the free and fair flow of commerce outside of the United States that does not pose an unacceptable risk to a national critical capability.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Trade Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “TITLE X—NATIONAL CRITICAL CAPABILITIES REVIEWS

“Sec. 1001. Definitions.

“Sec. 1002. Committee on National Critical Capabilities.

“Sec. 1003. Review of covered transactions.

“Sec. 1004. Action by the President.

“Sec. 1005. Factors to be considered.

“Sec. 1006. Supply chain sensitivities.

“Sec. 1007. Identification of additional national critical capabilities.

“Sec. 1008. Reporting requirements.

“Sec. 1009. Requirement for regulations.

“Sec. 1010. Requirements related to government procurement.

“Sec. 1011. Multilateral engagement and coordination.

“Sec. 1012. Authorization of appropriations.

“Sec. 1013. Rule of construction with respect to free and fair commerce.”.

**SA 3862.** Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. BOOKER) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 267, designating June 12, 2021, as “Women Veterans Appreciation Day”; as follows:

Beginning in the second whereas clause of the preamble, strike “Whereas women” and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of the seventh whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas women have formally been a part of the United States Armed Forces since the establishment of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901 but have informally served since the inception of the United States military;

Whereas over 3,000,000 women have served the United States honorably and with valor on land, on sea, in the air, and in space, including—

(1) as “Molly Pitchers” during the American Revolution, providing support to the Continental Army and taking their place on the artillery gun lines as soldiers fell;

(2) by passing as men to serve as soldiers during the Revolutionary War, the Early Republic, and the Civil War;

(3) as doctors, nurses, ambulance drivers, and Signal Corps telephone operator “Hello Girls” during World War I;

(4) as, during World War II—

(A) members of the Women’s Army Corps (commonly known as “WACs”);

(B) Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (commonly known as “WAVES”);

(C) members of the Coast Guard Women’s Reserve (commonly known as “SPARS”);

(D) Women Airforce Service Pilots (commonly known as “WASPs”); and

(E) nurses;

(5) as permanent members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, serving as nurses, physicians, physical therapists, air traffic controllers, intelligence specialists, communications specialists, logisticians, and clerks in the Korean War and Vietnam War; and

(6) as fixed and rotary wing combat pilots, surface warfare sailors, submariners, artilleryists, air defenders, engineers, military police, intelligence specialists, civil affairs specialists, logisticians, and, most recently, in all combat roles in the Persian Gulf, Iraq, and Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of April 2020, women constitute approximately 17 percent of United States Armed Forces personnel on active duty, including—

(1) 21 percent of active duty personnel in the Air Force and Space Force;

(2) 20 percent of active duty personnel in the Navy;

(3) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Army;

(4) 9 percent of active duty personnel in the Marine Corps; and

(5) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard;

Whereas, as of September 2019, women constitute nearly 21 percent of personnel in the National Guard and Reserves;

Whereas women have been critical to COVID-19 relief, including as part of the personnel in the National Guard and Reserves activated to support COVID-19 response efforts;

Whereas, in 2020—

(1) the population of women veterans reached nearly 2,000,000, which represents a significant increase from 713,000 women veterans in 1980; and

(2) women veterans constitute approximately 10 percent of the total veteran population;

In the eighth whereas clause of the preamble, strike “4” and insert “3”.

In the tenth whereas clause of the preamble, insert “a part of the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress,” after “Project.”.

In paragraph (2) of the eleventh whereas clause of the preamble, strike “dutiful” and insert “patriotic”.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL  
RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, immediately following the caucus lunches, to conduct a hearing.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

The Subcommittee on Intellectual Property of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, FISHERIES, CLIMATE  
CHANGE, AND MANUFACTURING

The Subcommittee on Oceans, Fisheries, Climate Change, and Manufacturing of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS,  
AND MINING

The Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

WOMEN VETERANS APPRECIATION  
DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 267.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 267) designating June 12, 2021, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the Booker amendment at the desk to the preamble be considered and agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 267) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3862) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Beginning in the second whereas clause of the preamble, strike "Whereas women" and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of the seventh whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas women have formally been a part of the United States Armed Forces since the establishment of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901 but have informally served since the inception of the United States military;

Whereas over 3,000,000 women have served the United States honorably and with valor on land, on sea, in the air, and in space, including—

(1) as "Molly Pitchers" during the American Revolution, providing support to the Continental Army and taking their place on the artillery gun lines as soldiers fell;

(2) by passing as men to serve as soldiers during the Revolutionary War, the Early Republic, and the Civil War;

(3) as doctors, nurses, ambulance drivers, and Signal Corps telephone operator "Hello Girls" during World War I;

(4) as, during World War II—

(A) members of the Women's Army Corps (commonly known as "WACs");

(B) Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (commonly known as "WAVES");

(C) members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve (commonly known as "SPARS");

(D) Women Airforce Service Pilots (commonly known as "WASPs"); and

(E) nurses;

(5) as permanent members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, serving as nurses, physicians, physical therapists, air traffic controllers, intelligence specialists, communications specialists, logisticians, and clerks in the Korean War and Vietnam War; and

(6) as fixed and rotary wing combat pilots, surface warfare sailors, submariners, artillerymen, air defenders, engineers, military police, intelligence specialists, civil affairs specialists, logisticians, and, most recently, in all combat roles in the Persian Gulf, Iraq, and Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of April 2020, women constitute approximately 17 percent of United States Armed Forces personnel on active duty, including—

(1) 21 percent of active duty personnel in the Air Force and Space Force;

(2) 20 percent of active duty personnel in the Navy;

(3) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Army;

(4) 9 percent of active duty personnel in the Marine Corps; and

(5) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard;

Whereas, as of September 2019, women constitute nearly 21 percent of personnel in the National Guard and Reserves;

Whereas women have been critical to COVID-19 relief, including as part of the personnel in the National Guard and Reserves activated to support COVID-19 response efforts;

Whereas, in 2020—

(1) the population of women veterans reached nearly 2,000,000, which represents a significant increase from 713,000 women veterans in 1980; and

(2) women veterans constitute approximately 10 percent of the total veteran population;

In the eighth whereas clause of the preamble, strike "4" and insert "3".

In the tenth whereas clause of the preamble, insert "a part of the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress," after "Project,".

In paragraph (2) of the eleventh whereas clause of the preamble, strike "dutiful" and insert "patriotic".

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

## S. RES. 267

Whereas, throughout every period of the history of the United States, women have proudly served the United States to secure and preserve freedom and liberty for—

(1) the people of the United States; and  
(2) the allies of the United States;

Whereas women have formally been a part of the United States Armed Forces since the establishment of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901 but have informally served since the inception of the United States military;

Whereas over 3,000,000 women have served the United States honorably and with valor on land, on sea, in the air, and in space, including—

(1) as "Molly Pitchers" during the American Revolution, providing support to the Continental Army and taking their place on the artillery gun lines as soldiers fell;

(2) by passing as men to serve as soldiers during the Revolutionary War, the Early Republic, and the Civil War;

(3) as doctors, nurses, ambulance drivers, and Signal Corps telephone operator "Hello Girls" during World War I;

(4) as, during World War II—

(A) members of the Women's Army Corps (commonly known as "WACs");

(B) Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (commonly known as "WAVES");

(C) members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve (commonly known as "SPARS");

(D) Women Airforce Service Pilots (commonly known as "WASPs"); and

(E) nurses;

(5) as permanent members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, serving as nurses, physicians, physical therapists, air traffic controllers, intelligence specialists, communications specialists, logisticians, and clerks in the Korean War and Vietnam War; and

(6) as fixed and rotary wing combat pilots, surface warfare sailors, submariners, artillerymen, air defenders, engineers, military police, intelligence specialists, civil affairs specialists, logisticians, and, most recently, in all combat roles in the Persian Gulf, Iraq, and Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of April 2020, women constitute approximately 17 percent of United States Armed Forces personnel on active duty, including—

(1) 21 percent of active duty personnel in the Air Force and Space Force;

(2) 20 percent of active duty personnel in the Navy;

(3) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Army;

(4) 9 percent of active duty personnel in the Marine Corps; and

(5) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard;

Whereas, as of September 2019, women constitute nearly 21 percent of personnel in the National Guard and Reserves;

Whereas women have been critical to COVID-19 relief, including as part of the personnel in the National Guard and Reserves activated to support COVID-19 response efforts;

Whereas, in 2020—



(1) the population of women veterans reached nearly 2,000,000, which represents a significant increase from 713,000 women veterans in 1980; and

(2) women veterans constitute approximately 10 percent of the total veteran population;

Whereas an estimated 1 in 3 women veterans enrolled in the healthcare system of the Department of Veterans Affairs report having experienced military sexual trauma (MST) during their military service;

Whereas the United States is proud of, and appreciates, the service of all women veterans who have demonstrated great skill, sacrifice, and commitment to defending the principles upon which the United States was founded and which the United States continues to uphold;

Whereas women veterans have unique stories and should be encouraged to share their recollections through the Veterans History Project, a part of the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress, which has worked since 2000 to collect and share the personal accounts of wartime veterans in the United States; and

Whereas, by designating June 12, 2021, as “Women Veterans Appreciation Day”, the Senate can—

(1) highlight the growing presence of women in the Armed Forces and the National Guard; and

(2) pay respect to women veterans for their patriotic military service: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate designates June 12, 2021, as “Women Veterans Appreciation Day” to recognize the service and sacrifices of women veterans who have served valiantly on behalf of the United States.

#### EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 3 THROUGH OCTOBER 9, 2021, AS NATIONAL 4-H WEEK

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 418.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 418) expressing support for the designation of October 3 through October 9, 2021, as “National 4-H Week”.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 418) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 7, 2021, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ATRIUM IN THE PHILIP A. HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING FOR A BIPARTISAN HALLOWEEN DOG PARADE ON OCTOBER 27, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 422, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 422) authorizing the use of the atrium in the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building for a bipartisan Halloween dog parade on October 27, 2021.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank God we got this one through.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 422) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

#### AMENDING TITLE VI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3011, which was introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3011) to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to allow States and local governments to use coronavirus relief funds provided under the American Rescue Plan Act for infrastructure projects, improve the Local Assistance and Tribal Consistency Fund, provide Tribal governments with more time to use Coronavirus Relief Fund payments, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 3011) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3011

*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 “State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Fiscal Recovery, Infrastructure, and Disaster Relief Flexibility Act”.

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO USE CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUNDS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), as amended by section 40909 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, is amended—

(1) in section 602—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting “(except as provided in subsection (c)(5))” after “December 31, 2024”; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (3)” and inserting “paragraphs (3), (4), and (5)”; and

(II) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) for the provision of government services up to an amount equal to the greater of—

“(i) the amount of the reduction in revenue of such State, territory, or Tribal government due to the COVID-19 public health emergency relative to revenues collected in the most recent full fiscal year of the State, territory, or Tribal government prior to the emergency; or

“(ii) \$10,000,000;”;

(III) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) to provide emergency relief from natural disasters or the negative economic impacts of natural disasters, including temporary emergency housing, food assistance, financial assistance for lost wages, or other immediate needs.”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS FOR CERTAIN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State, territory, or Tribal government receiving a payment under this section may use funds provided under such payment for projects described in subparagraph (B), including, to the extent consistent with guidance or rules issued by the Secretary or the head of a Federal agency to which the Secretary has delegated authority pursuant to subparagraph (C)(iv)—

“(i) in the case of a project eligible under section 117 of title 23, United States Code, or section 5309 or 6701 of title 49, United States Code, to satisfy a non-Federal share requirement applicable to such a project; and

“(ii) in the case of a project eligible for credit assistance under the TIFIA program under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code—

“(I) to satisfy a non-Federal share requirement applicable to such a project; and

“(II) to repay a loan provided under such program.

“(B) PROJECTS DESCRIBED.—A project referred to in subparagraph (A) is any of the following:

“(i) A project eligible under section 117 of title 23, United States Code.

“(ii) A project eligible under section 119 of title 23, United States Code.

“(iii) A project eligible under section 124 of title 23, United States Code, as added by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(iv) A project eligible under section 133 of title 23, United States Code.

“(v) An activity to carry out section 134 of title 23, United States Code.

“(vi) A project eligible under section 148 of title 23, United States Code.

“(vii) A project eligible under section 149 of title 23, United States Code.

“(viii) A project eligible under section 151(f) of title 23, United States Code, as added by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(ix) A project eligible under section 165 of title 23, United States Code.

“(x) A project eligible under section 167 of title 23, United States Code.

“(xi) A project eligible under section 173 of title 23, United States Code, as added by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(xii) A project eligible under section 175 of title 23, United States Code, as added by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(xiii) A project eligible under section 176 of title 23, United States Code, as added by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(xiv) A project eligible under section 202 of title 23, United States Code.

“(xv) A project eligible under section 203 of title 23, United States Code.

“(xvi) A project eligible under section 204 of title 23, United States Code.

“(xvii) A project eligible under the program for national infrastructure investments (commonly known as the ‘Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grant program’).

“(xviii) A project eligible for credit assistance under the TIFIA program under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code.

“(xix) A project that furthers the completion of a designated route of the Appalachian Development Highway System under section 14501 of title 40, United States Code.

“(xx) A project eligible under section 5307 of title 49, United States Code.

“(xxi) A project eligible under section 5309 of title 49, United States Code.

“(xxii) A project eligible under section 5311 of title 49, United States Code.

“(xxiii) A project eligible under section 5337 of title 49, United States Code.

“(xxiv) A project eligible under section 5339 of title 49, United States Code.

“(xxv) A project eligible under section 6703 of title 49, United States Code, as added by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(xxvi) A project eligible under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

“(xxvii) A project eligible under the bridge replacement, rehabilitation, preservation, protection, and construction program under paragraph (1) under the heading ‘HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM’ under the heading ‘FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION’ under the heading ‘DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION’ under title VIII of division J of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act.

“(C) LIMITATIONS; APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS TO BE USED FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The total amount that a State, territory, or Tribal government may use from a payment made under this section for uses described in subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the greater of—

“(aa) \$10,000,000; and

“(bb) 30 percent of such payment.

“(II) RULE OF APPLICATION.—The spending limitation under subclause (I) shall not apply to any use of funds permitted under paragraph (1), and any such use of funds shall be disregarded for purposes of applying such spending limitation.

“(ii) LIMITATION ON OPERATING EXPENSES.—Funds provided under a payment made under this section shall not be used for operating expenses of a project described in clauses (xx) through (xxiv) of subparagraph (B).

“(iii) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—Except as otherwise determined by the Secretary or the head of a Federal agency to which the Secretary has delegated authority pursuant to clause (iv) or provided in this section—

“(I) the requirements of section 60102 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act shall apply to funds provided under a payment made under this section that are used pursuant to subparagraph (A) for a project described in clause (xxvi) of subparagraph (B) that relates to broadband infrastructure;

“(II) the requirements of titles 23, 40, and 49 of the United States Code, title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall apply to funds provided under a payment made under this section that are used for projects described in subparagraph (B); and

“(III) a State government receiving a payment under this section may use funds provided under such payment for projects described in clauses (i) through (xxvii) of subparagraph (B), as applicable, that—

“(aa) demonstrate progress in achieving a state of good repair as required by the State’s asset management plan under section 119(e) of title 23, United States Code; and

“(bb) support the achievement of 1 or more performance targets of the State established under section 150 of title 23, United States Code.

“(iv) OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary may delegate oversight and administration of the requirements described in clause (iii) to the appropriate Federal agency.

“(v) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts from a payment made under this section that are used by a State, territory, or Tribal government for uses described in subparagraph (A) shall supplement, and not supplant, other Federal, State, territorial, Tribal, and local government funds (as applicable) otherwise available for such uses.

“(D) REPORTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall provide periodic reports on the use of funds by States, territories, and Tribal governments under subparagraph (A).

“(E) AVAILABILITY.—Funds provided under a payment made under this section to a State, territory, or Tribal government shall remain available for obligation for a use described in subparagraph (A) through December 31, 2024, except that no amount of such funds may be expended after September 30, 2026.”; and

(2) in subsection 603—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting “(except as provided in subsection (c)(6))” after “December 31, 2024”; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraphs (3) and (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6)”; and

(II) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

“(C) for the provision of government services up to an amount equal to the greater of—

“(i) the amount of the reduction in revenue of such metropolitan city, nonentitlement unit of local government, or county due to the COVID-19 public health emergency relative to revenues collected in the most recent full fiscal year of the metropolitan city, nonentitlement unit of local government, or county to the emergency; or

“(ii) \$10,000,000;”;

(III) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) to provide emergency relief from natural disasters or the negative economic impacts of natural disasters, including temporary emergency housing, food assistance, financial assistance for lost wages, or other immediate needs.”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS FOR CERTAIN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), notwithstanding any other provision of law, a metropolitan city, nonentitlement unit of local government, or county receiving a payment under this section may use funds provided under such payment for projects described in subparagraph (B) of section 602(c)(5), including, to the extent consistent with guidance or rules issued by the Secretary or the head of a Federal agency to which the Secretary has delegated authority pursuant to subparagraph (B)(iv)—

“(i) in the case of a project eligible under section 117 of title 23, United States Code, or section 5309 or 6701 of title 49, United States Code, to satisfy a non-Federal share requirement applicable to such a project; and

“(ii) in the case of a project eligible for credit assistance under the TIFIA program under chapter 6 of title 23, United States Code—

“(I) to satisfy a non-Federal share requirement applicable to such a project; and

“(II) to repay a loan provided under such program.

“(B) LIMITATIONS; APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—

“(i) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS TO BE USED FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The total amount that a metropolitan city, nonentitlement unit of local government, or county may use from a payment made under this section for uses described in subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the greater of—

“(aa) \$10,000,000; and

“(bb) 30 percent of such payment.

“(II) RULE OF APPLICATION.—The spending limitation under subclause (I) shall not apply to any use of funds permitted under paragraph (1), and any such use of funds shall be disregarded for purposes of applying such spending limitation.

“(ii) LIMITATION ON OPERATING EXPENSES.—Funds provided under a payment made under this section shall not be used for operating expenses of a project described in clauses (xx) through (xxiv) of section 602(c)(5)(B).

“(iii) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—Except as otherwise determined by the Secretary or the head of a Federal agency to which the Secretary has delegated authority pursuant to clause (iv) or provided in this section—

“(I) the requirements of section 60102 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act shall apply to funds provided under a payment made under this section that are used pursuant to subparagraph (A) for a project described in clause (xxvi) of section 602(c)(5)(B) that relates to broadband infrastructure; and

“(II) the requirements of titles 23, 40, and 49 of the United States Code, title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall apply to funds provided under a payment made under this section that are used for projects described in section 602(c)(5)(B).

“(iv) OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary may delegate oversight and administration of the requirements described in clause (iii) to the appropriate Federal agency.

“(v) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts from a payment made under this section that are used by a metropolitan city, nonentitlement unit of local government, or county for uses described in subparagraph (A) shall supplement, and not supplant, other Federal, State, territorial, Tribal, and local government funds (as applicable) otherwise available for such uses.

“(C) REPORTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall provide periodic reports on the use of funds by metropolitan cities, nonentitlement units of local government, or counties under subparagraph (A).

“(D) AVAILABILITY.—Funds provided under a payment made under this section to a metropolitan city, nonentitlement unit of local government, or county shall remain available for obligation for a use described in subparagraph (A) through December 31, 2024, except that no amount of such funds may be expended after September 30, 2026.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Sections 602(c)(3) and 603(c)(3) of title VI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 802(c)(3), 803(c)(3)) are each amended by striking “paragraph (17) of”.

(c) GUIDANCE AND EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) GUIDANCE OR RULE.—Within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall issue guidance or promulgate a rule to carry out the amendments made by this section, including updating reporting requirements on the use of funds under this section.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the issuance of guidance or the promulgation of a rule described in paragraph (1).

(d) DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the unobligated balances from amounts made available to the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”) for administrative expenses pursuant to the provisions specified in paragraph (2) shall be available to the Secretary (in addition to any other appropriations provided for such purpose) for any administrative expenses of the Department of the Treasury determined by the Secretary to be necessary to respond to the coronavirus emergency, including any expenses necessary to implement any provision of—

(A) the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116-136);

(B) division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260);

(C) the American Rescue Plan Act (Public Law 117-2); or

(D) title VI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 801 et seq.).

(2) PROVISIONS SPECIFIED.—The provisions specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Sections 4003(f) and 4112(b) of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116-136).

(B) Section 421(f)(2) of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260).

(C) Sections 3201(a)(2)(B), 3206(d)(1)(A), and 7301(b)(5) of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-2).

(D) Section 602(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 802(a)(2)).

### SEC. 3. LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND TRIBAL CONSISTENCY FUND.

Section 605 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 805) is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 605. LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND TRIBAL CONSISTENCY FUND.

“(a) APPROPRIATION.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated for fiscal year 2021, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$2,000,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2023, with amounts to be obligated for each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023 in accordance with subsection (b), for making payments under this section to eligible revenue sharing recipients, eligible Tribal governments, and territories.

“(b) AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.—

“(1) ALLOCATIONS AND PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE REVENUE SHARING RECIPIENTS.—

“(A) ALLOCATIONS TO REVENUE SHARING COUNTIES.—For each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, the Secretary shall reserve \$742,500,000 of the total amount appropriated under subsection (a) to allocate to each revenue sharing county and, except as provided in subparagraph (B), pay to each revenue sharing county that is an eligible revenue sharing county amounts that are determined by the Secretary taking into account the amount of entitlement land in each revenue sharing county and the economic conditions of each revenue sharing county, using such measurements of poverty, household income, and unemployment over the most recent 20-year period as of September 30, 2021, to the extent data are available, as well as other economic indicators the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(B) SPECIAL ALLOCATION RULES.—

“(1) REVENUE SHARING COUNTIES WITH LIMITED GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS.—In the case of an amount allocated to a revenue sharing county under subparagraph (A) that is a county with limited government functions, the Secretary shall allocate and pay such amount to each eligible revenue sharing local government within such county with limited government functions in an amount determined by the Secretary taking into account the amount of entitlement land in each eligible revenue sharing local government and the population of such eligible revenue sharing local government relative to the total population of such county with limited government functions.

“(ii) ELIGIBLE REVENUE SHARING COUNTY IN ALASKA.—In the case of the eligible revenue sharing county described in subparagraph (f)(3)(C), the Secretary shall pay the amount allocated to such eligible revenue sharing county to the State of Alaska. The State of Alaska shall distribute such payment to home rule cities and general law cities (as such cities are defined by the State) located within the boundaries of the eligible revenue sharing county for which the payment was received.

“(C) PRO RATA ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—The amounts otherwise determined for allocation and payment under subparagraphs (A) and (B) may be adjusted by the Secretary on a pro rata basis to the extent necessary to ensure that all available funds are allocated and paid to eligible revenue sharing recipients in accordance with the requirements specified in each such subparagraph.

“(2) ALLOCATIONS AND PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—For each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, the Secretary shall reserve \$250,000,000 of the total amount appropriated under subsection (a) to allocate and pay to eligible Tribal governments in amounts that are determined by the Secretary taking into account economic conditions of each eligible Tribe.

“(3) ALLOCATIONS AND PAYMENTS TO TERRITORIES.—For each of fiscal years 2022 and 2023, the Secretary shall reserve \$7,500,000 of the total amount appropriated under subsection (a) to allocate and pay to each territory an amount which bears the same proportion to the amount reserved in this paragraph as the population of such territory bears to the total population of all such territories.

“(c) USE OF PAYMENTS.—An eligible revenue sharing recipient, an eligible Tribal government, or a territory may use funds provided under a payment made under this section for any governmental purpose other than a lobbying activity.

“(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Any eligible revenue sharing recipient and any territory receiving a payment under this section

shall provide to the Secretary periodic reports providing a detailed accounting of the uses of fund by such eligible revenue sharing recipient or territory, as applicable, and such other information as the Secretary may require for the administration of this section.

“(e) RECOUPMENT.—Any eligible revenue sharing recipient or any territory that has failed to submit a report required under subsection (d) or failed to comply with subsection (c), shall be required to repay to the Secretary an amount equal to—

“(1) in the case of a failure to comply with subsection (c), the amount of funds used in violation of such subsection; and

“(2) in the case of a failure to submit a report required under subsection (d), such amount as the Secretary determines appropriate, but not to exceed 5 percent of the amount paid to the eligible revenue sharing recipient or the territory under this section for all fiscal years.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COUNTY.—The term ‘county’ means a county, parish, or other equivalent county division (as defined by the Bureau of the Census) in 1 of the 50 States.

“(2) COUNTY WITH LIMITED GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS.—The term ‘county with limited government functions’ means a county in which entitlement land is located that is not an eligible revenue sharing county.

“(3) ELIGIBLE REVENUE SHARING COUNTY.—The term ‘eligible revenue sharing county’ means—

“(A) a unit of general local government (as defined in section 6901(2) of title 31, United States Code) that is a county in which entitlement land is located and which is eligible for a payment under section 6902(a) of title 31, United States Code;

“(B) the District of Columbia; or

“(C) the combined area in Alaska that is within the boundaries of a census area used by the Secretary of Commerce in the decennial census, but that is not included within the boundary of a unit of general local government described in subparagraph (A).

“(4) ELIGIBLE REVENUE SHARING LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘eligible revenue sharing local government’ means a unit of general local government (as defined in section 6901(2) of title 31, United States Code) in which entitlement land is located that is not a county or territory and which is eligible for a payment under section 6902(a) of title 31, United States Code.

“(5) ELIGIBLE REVENUE SHARING RECIPIENTS.—The term ‘eligible revenue sharing recipients’ means, collectively, eligible revenue sharing counties and eligible revenue sharing local governments.

“(6) ELIGIBLE TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ‘eligible Tribal government’ means the recognized governing body of an eligible Tribe.

“(7) ELIGIBLE TRIBE.—The term ‘eligible Tribe’ means any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, community, component band, or component reservation, individually identified (including parenthetically) in the list published most recently as of March 11, 2021, pursuant to section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 5131).

“(8) ENTITLEMENT LAND.—The term ‘entitlement land’ has the meaning given to such term in section 6901(1) of title 31, United States Code.

“(9) REVENUE SHARING COUNTY.—The term ‘revenue sharing county’ means—

“(A) an eligible revenue sharing county; or

“(B) a county with limited government functions.

“(10) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(11) TERRITORY.—The term ‘territory’ means—

- “(A) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;
- “(B) the United States Virgin Islands;
- “(C) Guam;
- “(D) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; or
- “(E) American Samoa.”.

**SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF AVAILABILITY OF CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUND PAYMENTS TO TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.**

Section 601(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 801(d)(3)) is amended by inserting “(or, in the case of costs incurred by a Tribal government, during the period that begins on March 1, 2020, and ends on December 31, 2022)” before the period.

**SEC. 5. RESCISSION OF CORONAVIRUS RELIEF AND RECOVERY FUNDS DECLINED BY STATES, TERRITORIES, OR OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.**

Title VI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“SEC. 606. RESCISSION OF FUNDS DECLINED BY STATES, TERRITORIES, OR OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.**

“(a) RESCISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), if a State, territory, or other governmental entity provides notice to the Secretary of the Treasury in the manner provided by the Secretary of the Treasury that the State, territory, or other governmental entity intends to decline all or a portion of the amounts that are to be awarded to the State, territory, or other governmental entity from funds appropriated under this title, an amount equal to the unaccepted amounts or portion of such amounts allocated by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the date of such notice that would have been awarded to the State, territory, or other governmental entity shall be rescinded from the applicable appropriation account.

“(2) EXCLUSION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to funds that are to be paid to a State under section 603 for distribution to nonentitlement units of local government.

“(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not be construed as—

“(A) preventing a sub-State governmental entity, including a nonentitlement unit of local government, from notifying the Secretary of the Treasury that the sub-State governmental entity intends to decline all or a portion of the amounts that a State may distribute to the entity from funds appropriated under this title; or

“(B) allowing a State to prohibit or otherwise prevent a sub-State governmental entity from providing such a notice.

“(b) USE FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Amounts rescinded under subsection (a) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury for the sole purpose of deficit reduction.

“(c) STATE OR OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘State, territory, or other governmental entity’ means any entity to which a payment may be made directly to the entity under this title other than a Tribal government, as defined in sections 601(g), 602(g), and 604(d), and an eligible Tribal government, as defined in section 605(f).”.

**MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME, EN BLOC—S. 3005, S. 3006, S. 3007, S. 3008, S. 3009, AND S. 3010**

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand there are 6 bills at the desk, and I ask for their reading, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time, en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3005) establishing appropriate thresholds for certain budget points of order in the Senate, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 3006) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2022 through 2031.

A bill (S. 3007) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to extend the discretionary spending limits.

A bill (S. 3008) to establish the Federal Rainy Day Fund to control emergency spending.

A bill (S. 3009) to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to remove the prohibition on States and territories against lowering their taxes.

A bill (S. 3010) to cap noninterest Federal spending as a percentage of potential GDP to right-size the Government, grow the economy, and balance the budget.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time, en bloc, on the next legislative day.

**ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,  
OCTOBER 20, 2021**

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now, finally, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. Wednesday, October 20; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired and the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Lhamon nomination; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Lhamon nomination, all postcloture time expire at 1:45 p.m., and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, for the information of Senators, the first rollcall vote of the day will begin at approximately 11 a.m.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators KING and PORTMAN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

**ELECTION SECURITY**

Mr. KING. Madam President, the United States of America is an anomaly in world history. We are a 245-year experiment in self-government, which is based upon an idea that was radical in 1776. It was tested at Gettysburg, Antietam, Shiloh, and the Wilderness. It was defended at Anzio, Iwo Jima, and Normandy, and was reaffirmed in 1965. It is an idea that the people—all the people—are the ultimate source of power and can govern themselves through their elected representatives. That was a radical notion in 1776.

The historical norm is just the opposite—kings; pharaohs; dictators; czars; warlords; emperors; and, more recently, presidents for life. Throughout most of human history, and right up to the present day, in most countries, the people have little or no say in the decisions that determine their fate. And these rulers are rarely, if ever, beneficent. In fact, again, the historical norm is just the opposite—pervasive corruption, the pursuit of power for its own sake, the crushing of dissent, sham elections, and the abuse or even elimination of anyone not sufficiently loyal or useful to the leader. That is the historical norm.

There is nothing surprising about this because it reflects human nature. History fairly shouts at us that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Given the consistent history of this experience—of warlords, dictators, czars, and the abuse of their authority—it is clear that what we are doing, this experiment, is fragile. It is not the norm. It is an anomaly. What we have and take for granted is in no way guaranteed. As has been the case for democratic experiments throughout history, it can fail. Rarely can it fail from external attack. Almost always, democratic experiments fail from erosion from within.

On the surface, our democratic system protects us by resting upon our ingenuous Constitution, the primary purpose of which is to establish an effective government while at the same time dividing and dispersing power, and in Madison's evocative phrase: Obliging the government to control itself.

And of all the safeguards built into the Constitution—and there are many; two Houses of Congress, vetoes, division of the war power, advise and consent, enumerated powers, Federalism, the Bill of Rights—of all of those protections, the most fundamental and essential is regular elections, the clearest expression of the people's will.

For most of my life, I have not really thought much about how elections actually work. You go to the town office or the school gym, they cross your name off on a list, hand you a ballot, and you go into a booth and make your

choice. You then put the marked ballot into a box or hand it to a clerk—usually it is a volunteer doing their civic duty in my hometown—and then they run it through a counter. Or you can get a mail-in ballot from your town clerk, mark it at home and send it in. Or in my town you can drop it in a drop box anytime of the night or day. It is out in the front of the town office.

That is it until later that night, when the results—either from automatic counters or from hand counting the ballots themselves—are announced, precinct by precinct, town by town, city by city, and State by State.

And then you go to bed, happy or unhappy, energized or discouraged, either reveling in the victory of your preferred candidates or determined to work harder next time. And thanks to the Framers, there always is a next time, usually in 2 years hence.

The next day, you go about your business trusting—trusting—that the system was operating according to the rules and that the announced vote count accurately reflects the preference of you and your fellow citizens. The key word is “trust.”

The miraculous result of this entire process is something we completely take for granted but is exceedingly rare—exceedingly rare—in human history: the peaceful transfer of power, whether it is the city council, the Congress, or the Presidency itself.

But two interrelated things are happening right now with regard to this system that are unprecedented in my lifetime and have caused me to worry as I never have before about the future of my country. These two things are profoundly dangerous to our fragile Republic.

One is the breakdown of trust in the system itself and the other is an overtly partisan attempt to use this loss of trust as a pretext to change the results of future elections by limiting the participation of voters deemed unworthy—although that is rarely said out loud—or unlikely to vote for your particular political party.

This discussion is usually framed in terms of election integrity—the prevention of widespread voter fraud—which it is argued is tainting the outcome of our elections.

Unfortunately, these so-called election integrity measures almost invariably end up limiting the participation of a substantial number of voters, many of whom have historically been denied the right to vote by one device or another for over 100 years. It is limiting that participation either as inadvertent collateral damage or, more likely, as stone-cold partisan voter suppression.

When I used to interact with the main legislature either as a private citizen for many years or as Governor, the inevitable first question from the chair of the committee was: What is the problem we are trying to solve here? You want to change the law; what is the problem we are trying to solve? In

this case, is the problem really voter fraud, or is it election results the party in power in a particular State doesn't like?

The implicit burden that this question puts upon those who would change a law is to demonstrate by some reasonable and credible evidence that there is a problem in the first place. And simply saying—or endlessly repeating—that there is a problem doesn't make it so. To put it another way, repeating a lie doesn't make it true.

Every objective study to try to detect widespread voter fraud in this country has failed to produce credible evidence of anything but scattered and vanishingly rare cases. I am not saying it doesn't exist, but they are scattered and vanishingly rare cases.

Even the overtly partisan so-called “audit” of the votes in Maricopa County, AZ, failed to find what they were so desperately looking for—failed to find what they were so desperately looking for.

The key question is not whether such fraud exists at all but whether it is so widespread as to change the results of an election involving a substantial number of voters.

In the wake of the 2016 election, the President convened a commission to assess this very question, but the commission was disbanded within 8 months with no published finding of significant election fraud whatsoever. That was their mission—to find fraud—and they couldn't find it.

Further, as I mentioned, I know of no objective study that has ever concluded that such widespread fraud exists anywhere in our country.

Even more compelling is that in spite of Herculean efforts by the former President and his supporters over the course of the months following the 2020 election, no credible evidence has yet been produced to support his allegations, and all of the allegations have been rejected by every court—more than 60. They have been rejected by every court that has considered it. The only fraud here is the allegations themselves.

In other words, not only is there no evidence of substantial fraud, what evidence there is reaches the opposite conclusion. But here is the problem; here is what is chilling. Fully, one-third of Americans and two-thirds of members of the Republican Party now believe that the 2020 Presidential election was not legitimate, that there was widespread fraud, and that the election was somehow stolen—not based upon evidence, because there isn't any, but based upon the repeated assertions of the former President and his supporters.

The problem with this goes well beyond the wave of voter suppression legislation that is sweeping the country. The deeper problem is the massive and unprecedented erosion of trust in the electoral system itself, the beating heart of our democracy. Of all the

depravations of the former President, this is by far the worst.

In relentlessly pursuing his narrow self-interest, he has grievously wounded democracy itself. And, by the way, I mean “narrow self-interest” quite literally. He doesn't give the slightest damn about any of us, about any of us in this body. He will cast any or all of us aside whenever it suits his needs of the moment. Everyone in this room knows this to be true.

The reason this is so destructive is that if you can't trust elections, what are your options? What are your options for making the transcendent decisions upon which our society is based?

One is to change the rules to discourage your perceived enemies from voting. Check—that is in the works.

Another is to change the rules to give partisan legislators the power to override election results they don't like. Check—also in the works.

Another is to contrive pseudo legal arguments to justify the corruption of the counting of electoral votes and then to pressure the Vice President, who presides over the counting of the electoral votes, to join in the scheme. Check—we now know this was very much in the works in the days leading up to January 6.

Or, finally, tragically, try to change the results if you don't trust elections through violence or threats of violence. Check—January 6 and death threats to election officials of both parties across the country.

January 6 was not a random day on the calendar. It was the day appointed by law to finalize the results of the November election. Many of those who came to Washington that day were not there to protest but were there with the explicit purpose of disrupting and stopping this crucial final step in our democratic process.

The rallying cry that day was not “protest the steal.” It was “stop the steal.” And that is exactly what was attempted in this room on January 6.

It is important to remember that most failures of democracy, as we look at history, started with legitimate elections. But once in office, the leader manipulated the electoral process to consolidate their hold on power, just as was attempted last winter. And once power is seized, the control and reach of the modern surveillance state is truly terrifying, truly terrifying. Ask the Uighurs in China or members of the opposition in Russia, if you can find any alive.

Russia, Turkey, Venezuela, and Hungary are all examples of the slide from democracy into authoritarianism that has happened just in our living memory, just in our lifetimes. This is not a theoretical threat. We have seen it already happen in our lifetimes. Those countries still have elections, but they don't mean much.

And what if the current wave of voter suppression legislation succeeds and keeps tens or hundreds of thousands of



people from voting in 2022 or 2024? Or what if in 2024 a partisan legislature in a swing State—and they are giving themselves this power right now—votes to override the election results in their State and send their own preferred set of electors to Washington? Then it won't just be Republicans who distrust elections, and we will be left with a downward spiral toward a hollow shell of democracy, where only raw power prevails and a peaceful transfer becomes a distant memory.

There has been a great deal of talk in recent weeks and months of a possible constitutional crisis in 2022 or 2024. We don't have to wait that long. We are in the midst of such a crisis right now. One of our great political parties has embraced the idea that our last election was fraudulent, that our current President is illegitimate, that they must move legislatures across the country to "fix" the results—to "fix" the results—of future elections.

Here is the part that I think is the most tragic. A substantial portion of our population has lost faith in our democratic system because they have been repeatedly told that something important was stolen from them, even though that is untrue. And that portion of our population seems prepared to accept some version of authoritarianism. All but the most extreme sources of information have been devalued, and violence bubbles just below the surface.

But it doesn't have to be this way. We in this body, perhaps more than anyone else in this country, have the power to change direction, to pull our country back from the brink, and to begin the work of restoring our democracy, as we did in the Revolution, as we did in the Civil War, and as we did in the civil rights struggles of 60 years ago—first, by simply telling the truth and then by enacting a set of basic protections of the sacred right to vote.

It won't be easy, and it will involve risk. I am aware of that. I understand that. It will be particularly difficult when we are asked to speak hard truths that many of our most ardent supporters don't want to hear. But the alternative is worse, worse even than losing your job in this body. The alternative is the loss of our identity as a people, the loss of the miracle of self-government, the loss of the idea of America.

I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that we are at a hinge of history, that circumstances have thrust us—those of us in this body—into a moment when the fate of the American experiment hangs in the balance.

We are the heirs and trustees—I emphasize "trustees"—of a tradition that goes back to Jefferson and Lincoln, to Webster, Madison, Margaret Chase Smith, and, yes, our friend John McCain. All of them were partisans in one way or another, but all shared an overriding commitment to the idea that animates the American experiment, the idea that our government is

of, by, and for the people—all the people.

Lincoln thought that the most important word in the Declaration of Independence was "all." "All men are created equal"—all, all the people.

Now is the moment that we are called upon to reach beyond our region, our State, our party, ourselves to save and reinvigorate the sputtering flame of the American idea.

Yes, democracy is an anomaly in world history. We have to remember that what we have is unusual. It is rare, and it is fragile. It rests upon the Constitution and laws, to be sure, but it also rests even more on the trust our people place in our democratic system and in us.

Deliberately undermining that trust for short-term political advantage, which is exactly what is happening right now—undermining that trust for political advantage in the short term is exactly what is happening right now—is a tragic and dangerous game.

No election, no endorsement, no Senate seat, no Presidency is worth it. Nothing is worth destroying what our forebears fought and died for—nothing.

Several weeks ago, a bipartisan group of us went to Gettysburg and walked the battlefield with two leaders from the Army War College. I have been there before but have never been so moved by the experience as I was on this trip. The stories of valor and supreme sacrifice—the 20th Maine on Little Round Top, you know that I would mention that; the 1st Minnesota at the exposed center of the Union line; the Iron Brigade on the first day; the colossal losses on both sides, unimaginable losses on both sides in a matter of 3 days—were a sobering reminder of what it took to preserve this country.

But we learned something else that day—that it was a near thing. If a Union officer named Strong Vincent had hesitated in moving those three regiments to the top of Little Round Top, or if an officer from Minnesota named William Colvill had hesitated in leading the 1st Minnesota on a suicidal charge—82-percent casualties, a suicidal charge—into the teeth of the Confederate advance, our country would have been lost. It was a near thing. It never had struck me so hard as it did at Gettysburg several weeks ago.

And so it is today—a near thing—only, the test is not on the battlefield, and no one here is being asked to give up their lives. We are simply being asked to tell the truth, to recommit to the ideal of democracy, to keep faith with our history and our inheritance. And if we hesitate, all could be lost. This is not speculation. All could be lost.

And we now know from the events of January 6 and the relentless attempts to subvert the results of the 2020 election in the last days of the prior administration, it was and still is a near thing.

That is what is so chilling and frightening. As it is in the old Protestant

hymn I remember from my youth, so it is today:

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide.

I believe that this is that moment for each of us. The concluding words of Lincoln in his message to Congress in the dark winter of 1862 have never been more apt. They are eerily applicable to us today. Here is what Abraham Lincoln said:

Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration, will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation.

In honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. Indeed, destiny has placed us here at one of history's fateful moments. Our response to it will be our most important legacy. Of all the other things that we have done, this moment will be our most important legacy.

I believe we all know our responsibility. And whether we like it or not, history will record whether we—each one of us—meets that responsibility. Madam President, may God, working through each of us, save the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### THE ECONOMY

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am here on the floor this evening to talk about the troubling state of our economy today and what needs to be done to get it back on track. The Labor Department reported last week that the consumer price index, CPI, rose by 5.4 percent on an annualized basis. That accounts for the largest year-to-year inflationary increase in 13 years.

And we are feeling it. There is no question inflation is on the rise. We are paying more for everything—from groceries, to buying furniture, to cars, even pumpkins for Halloween. Yes, the U.S. Department of Agriculture just told us that pumpkins, year to year, are going to see an, on average, 15.7-percent increase in prices. So you might have to get a little smaller pumpkin this year.

And, of course, we are paying more at the pump, on average, a staggering 42-percent increase this year—42-percent increase. This is both because of increased demand but also because there is less supply as the new administration, the Biden administration, has put more regulations or handcuffs on American energy production.

And don't forget the higher heating bills, about 25 percent higher this year as compared to last year. Just as this cooler weather begins to come in, we are all going to be paying more on our utility bills, particularly for natural gas.

If all this isn't bad enough, workers' wages are not keeping up with these price spikes. I love to see wages going



up, but honestly, if you look at the data, it says that since President Biden took office, wages after inflation, adjusted for inflation, are down almost 2 percent—1.9 percent lower.

Remember, before the pandemic started, in February of 2020, we had the 19th straight month of wage increases of 3 percent or more on an annualized basis, well above inflation. Now, we are seeing just the opposite. This means a pay cut to the middle class.

The damaging effect of this hidden inflation is, in part, the result of actions that were taken by the Biden administration and by Democrats here in Congress to overheat the economy through unprecedented levels of government spending.

What do I mean by that? Well, you will recall that economist and former Secretary of the Treasury in the Clinton and Obama administrations, Larry Summers, said earlier this year, as Democrats were talking about this huge new spending bill that they ended up passing without a single Republican input or vote in March, he said: If you do this, it is going to cause inflation. He warned about it because he had seen this movie before.

When you have got an economy that is already improving and you overheat it with massive amounts of stimulus—remember, the \$1.9 trillion that was spent in March was the highest level ever spent. It was the biggest program ever passed by either House of Congress, \$1.9 trillion. We forget how much money that is.

He recognized that this bill contained billions in stimulus money, social service spending, the stimulus checks. And those were going to fuel the demand side of the economy. And they did—not just the stimulus checks but other things as well: COVID funds to all kinds of institutions, a continuing generous unemployment supplement that paid 42 percent of American workers more to go on unemployment than to go back to work.

All of this added up to a huge influx of social spending, government spending—borrowed money but government spending—into the economy that everyone who was looking at it objectively, I believe, knew was going to be a problem.

Earlier this year, before the Democrats passed this \$1.9 trillion spending bill, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office here on Capitol Hill told us that the economy was already recovering, and that is what outside economists were saying as well. Everybody was looking at the economy and saying, you know, in January, February, going into March, the economy was improving nicely. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office—again, nonpartisan group up here—said the economy is going to get back to its pre-pandemic level by midyear, by June 30. And it did.

The stimulus was really poorly timed. Instead of allowing the recovery to continue steadily, it effectively

poured fuel on an already hot economy, which led to the surging inflation we are seeing now. The White House likes to say that the inflation we are experiencing is transitory. That is the word that they have been using; in other words, it will pass—as Congress passes more legislation to fix the economy, I suppose. Unfortunately, it has not been transitory.

And I haven't seen anybody who is looking at this objectively say that it will be transitory. In fact, I saw an analysis today from an outside group, a nonpartisan group, that said they are, unfortunately, convinced that this high inflation is going to continue next year as well. I hope that is not true, but that seems to be the consensus. Economists across the spectrum, even the International Monetary Fund, are now saying that rising inflation is dampening future economic growth.

You would think all of this would cause a policy shift by the administration, a pulling back on the stimulus, doing things to actually help on the supply side of the economy. But rather than changing course from the policies that contributed to this high inflation and this demand-side stimulus, Democrats want to double down with a \$3.5-trillion-plus massive tax-and-spending spree that would spend trillions to fund social programs, expand government entitlements, and encourage more consumer demand, fueling more inflation.

What makes this proposal even more concerning is Democrats want to pay for it by hurting the economy more with big tax increases. Some say it is the biggest tax increase in 50 years. Some say it is the largest tax increase in history. It depends, I guess, where they end up. But we know it will increase taxes on pretty much everybody.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has done an analysis and said, yes, it is going to increase taxes on middle-income workers. Why? Because it increases taxes on businesses and they say that about 70 percent of that tax increase will be borne by workers. That is, again, the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation. So it is taxes not just on businesses, large and small, but it is also on workers, on farmers, on manufacturers.

This increased spending, combined with job-killing tax increases, could lead to the kind of stagflation, low growth, high interest rates, high inflation that we had back in the 1970s. We hoped never to see that again; yet if we don't change course, we could be heading toward that direction. It is the last thing our economy needs right now.

But surging consumer demand is not the only factor driving our current inflation crisis. The other main culprit is that we are facing a shortage of goods due to a global supply chain crisis. Almost anyone you talk to will tell you they have had some kind of shipping delay due to these supply chain issues. There are contractors you probably know who can't get lumber, can't get

steel to be able to finish a building, a home.

There are plenty of parents out there right now waiting to get their kid a gift for their birthday, only to find out that, no matter how much they pay, it is going to arrive not for the birthday but maybe 2 or 3 months later.

These issues are clearly visible if you look at our seaports, which are often the main connector between our country and the main global supply chain, consisting of manufacturers often in Asia, sometimes in China. Just last week, there were about 60 or 70 ships in a holding pattern near the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, CA. Think about that: 60 or 70 huge container ships just in a holding pattern, not being able to get in.

And even when the shipping containers are taken on shore, by the way, there aren't enough trucks to pick them up. So the containers are staying at the port. There aren't enough truck drivers because of the labor shortage. By the way, that is driven in part by this increased demand but in part by some of the rules and regulations around those transportation logistics and truckers.

Between bottlenecks and backlogs at our ports and challenges in transporting freight, there is real trouble for our supply chains just as we come into the holiday season, which is typically, of course, when people do most of their shopping. One reason for this global supply chain crisis is the ripple effects of COVID-19. No question about that. When factories shut down their operations to stem the flow of COVID among their workers, assembly lines sometimes stopped working altogether and created the shortage of goods and materials.

The companies that work in the shipping industry also were hit hard by the pandemic and had some of their operations negatively impacted. But then the pent-up demand for goods and services kicked in, and, again, much more demand was created by the \$1.9 trillion spending bill in March of this year than would have been normal.

So, yeah, you had some of these factories shutting down; you had essential workers still working; but you had less production and then all of a sudden this big surge and, therefore, the bottleneck.

Some in the Biden administration have said that this inflation and supply chain bottleneck is a problem for the rich. I don't see it that way. If they think that, they ought to talk to the factory workers I talked to in Ohio whose wages are being eaten up by inflation. I think they should say that to the mother or father who is having to ask their kid what gift they want for Christmas 2 or 3 months ahead of time. In fact, it is too late already to get some gifts for Christmas even now.

A recent college graduate who is trying to fill her car up with gas to get to work—tell it to her that this is a problem for the rich—a 42-percent increase in gas prices this year.

The supply chain is like any other chain. If you have one weak link, it is enough to cause the whole thing to fall apart, and that is exactly what has happened, and it is happening at the worst possible time. Part of the near-term solution is to stop any new stimulus spending. That is not what is needed right now in the economy. It is just terrible timing.

And stop the new tax increases because that is also what we don't need in our economy right now. We don't want to make America and American workers less competitive; we want to do just the opposite.

And part of the long-term solution to prevent a similar crisis from happening in the future is to shore up our supply chains. Instead of being so reliant on manufacturers from places like China, bring the manufacturing home; reshore it; invest more in production here in the United States. In the process, create more domestic manufacturing and transport jobs and greater supply chain security.

I think that is going to start happening. If you look at the cost to bring a product from Asia to the United States now, it has skyrocketed. That gives us a competitive advantage. The market is here. We ought to bring the manufacturing here as well.

Another solution is to improve our Nation's infrastructure. Targeted investments in increasing the capacity and operability of our ports, our waterways, fixing our roads and bridges, improving our railways, that all makes sense. For decades, we have neglected our infrastructure needs. Every President, by the way, in modern times has said that.

You know, the society of engineers who look at our infrastructure says that we have a grade of somewhere between D-plus and C-minus in this country. We are falling behind other countries. Other countries spend a lot more as a percent of their GDP on infrastructure. And it has been recognized.

Really, every President since from Bill Clinton to Donald Trump has said: Let's make a significant investment in infrastructure. Yet we didn't do it. We neglected our infrastructure. We have neglected our ports, and that is why they are so inefficient today in part and one reason we are having to pay the price.

The good news is that right now there is a bipartisan infrastructure package awaiting passage in the House of Representatives to address this and other problems. It is called the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. This is the bill that passed the U.S. Senate here in August with a 69-vote majority. That doesn't happen very often around here, particularly with big, important legislation like that.

It was bipartisan from the start. It was passed with the support of Republicans here in this Chamber, Democrats in this Chamber, and, most importantly, the American people who think it is a really good idea.

Economists think it is a good idea, too, because it improves the efficiency of our economy. Think about it. The bridge that is holding up traffic right now in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH, every day—a massive bridge where I-71 and 75 come together—it is a huge hit to our economy. It is also a huge safety problem. Fixing that bridge has been something people talked about for 30 years. It is time to do it, and we will do it if we can get this infrastructure bill passed.

It will also create hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs in industries ranging from construction and plumbing to electrical engineering and software development, with one recent study from the Association of Equipment Manufacturers finding that the legislation will create about a half a million jobs.

It will also help address issues at our ports by providing increased funding for the Port Infrastructure Development Program, investments in our freight system through rail and waterway and highway and air freight investments. So it actually addresses a real problem we have right now.

By the way, these investments are long-term investments. It won't be a lot of money spent in the next year or so; it will be a lot of money, though, spent over the next 5, 10, 15 years to improve this infrastructure. And they will be long-term assets that will last for decades. So it is a different kind of spending than the stimulus spending.

All of this will help improve the movement of goods throughout our country. That is why every business group in America is supporting this legislation, not just the chamber of commerce but every group out there—by the way, as well as all the agriculture groups. Over 30 ag groups, including the American Farm Bureau, are supporting this legislation. It is why a lot of the union members are supporting it too. In fact, the AFL-CIO Building Trades Council is strongly in support of this legislation because they know it is going to create good-paying jobs, good benefits, allowing people to get out there and build things.

Even more importantly, to me, given the recent economic news we have seen, this proposal will not cause inflation to increase. Why? Because it is spending on the supply side rather than the demand side of the economy, as economists would say. Conservative economist Doug Holtz-Eakin, who is the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, now head of the American Action Forum, and Michael Strain, who is the director of economic policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute, also a conservative scholar, have said that our bipartisan infrastructure package will slow down inflation. They said:

Improving roads, bridges, and ports would make it less costly for businesses to operate, allowing them to increase their output per hour and putting downward pressure on consumer prices.

Again, this is long-term spending capital assets. It makes the economy more efficient; therefore, more productive. That is counterinflationary. So this is the right time to do this kind of project.

To me, this bill makes all the sense in the world, given the trouble and uncertain stage of our economy. It gets relief to our supply chains. It makes long-term investments in hard assets that do boost our productivity in this country. It has a counterinflationary effect on the economy. So why hasn't it passed? What is the problem? Again, it got 69 votes here in the U.S. Senate. Well, unfortunately, the answer is politics. Democrats in the House of Representatives want to do everything they can to tie their big \$3.5 trillion-plus tax-and-spend bill we talked about earlier to the infrastructure investment because they know that is the only way their partisan bill is going to get the votes needed to pass. So they held it hostage.

Hard-core progressives don't like the bipartisan infrastructure bill because it doesn't have the tax increases; it doesn't have the Green New Deal policies; it doesn't have all the new social spending programs that are in this reconciliation bill that they really want.

But holding this investment in infrastructure hostage to this larger tax-and-spend bill is just wrong. It is playing politics. And it is playing politics with the American people.

It is also counter to the pledge that President Biden made to the bipartisan group that negotiated this agreement and made to the American people. President Biden supports this infrastructure legislation. He said he didn't get everything he wanted. Nobody did. But he supports it. He wants it to move forward. And he pledged to keep it separate—separate—from the \$3.5 trillion tax-and-spend bill, and yet what you see in the House is just the opposite.

It is not fair to the American people. They deserve to have the opportunity to have the infrastructure bill be voted on its own merits. Let it rise or fall on its own merits. Don't tie it to something else.

House Speaker NANCY PELOSI promised it would come to the House floor about 6 weeks ago. She promised that to the so-called Democrat moderates in the House, and it didn't come to the floor. Then she promised it would come to the floor 3 weeks ago. It didn't come to the floor for a vote. Now she said, on October 2, that October 31 is the date. That is Halloween. That is a Sunday. But that is fine. We can vote on Sundays, even on Halloween. It is so important, we ought to do it—and do it.

It is past time to take this bill to the floor of the House and let it be judged on its own merits. If passed, it will strengthen our economy over the long term and have a positive impact on the lives of every single American. It is counterinflationary. It makes our economy more efficient. It adds to,

again, the supply side, allowing us to see not just a short-term boost but a longer term boost to our economy.

And wouldn't it be nice to pass something that makes sense around here that is bipartisan? Instead of jamming Republicans and the country with another reckless spending bill and raising taxes on this uncertain economy, let's focus on the infrastructure bill that addresses real problems we face today. We could use a sensible, bipartisan success right now, all of us.

I yield the floor.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:56 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 20, 2021, at 10 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

PARISA SALEHI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK, VICE OSVALDO LUIS GRATACOS MUNET, RESIGNED.

### FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

BRIAN MICHAEL TOMNEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY, VICE LAURA S. WERTHEIMER, RESIGNED.

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

JOHN EDWARD PUTNAM, OF COLORADO, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE STEVEN GILL BRADBURY.

### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

BENNY R. WAGNER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, VICE RICHARD W. MOORE, RESIGNED.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARI CARMEN APONTE, OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA.

JOSEPH DONNELLY, OF INDIANA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE HOLY SEE.

DOUGLAS T. HICKEY, OF IDAHO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND.

JOHN N. NKENGASONG, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, COORDINATOR OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS GLOBALLY.

GEORGE J. TSUNIS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GREECE.

BRUCE I. TURNER, OF COLORADO, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT.

### NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

MARIA ROSARIO JACKSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE MARY ANNE CARTER.

SHELLY C. LOWE, OF ARIZONA, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JON PARRISH FEEDE.

### POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION

MICHAEL KUBAYANDA, OF OHIO, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 22, 2026. (REAPPOINTMENT)

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN D. CAINE

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

#### To be brigadier general

COL. MARCUS H. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

#### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DOUGLAS A. PAUL

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be colonel

TRACY M. SHAMBURGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### To be colonel

LIBERTAD MELENDEZ

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 7433(B) AND 7436(A):

#### To be colonel

JULIA O. COXEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

#### To be major

ANDREA N. APPLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

#### To be major

HAL E. BARKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

#### To be colonel

MATTHEW L. PARKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

#### To be major

BENJAMIN J. NETERER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

#### To be major

JOSEPH G. NUNEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

#### To be major

KERT L. ST. JOHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

#### To be major

MARK J. ZIEGLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

SCOTT J. ANDERSON

KRISTOPHER T. APPLER

CHRISTOPHER D. BASS

CURTIS R. CLINE

JOHN M. CRAWFORD

CYNTHIA A. FALLNESS

SARA R. HEGGE

MELISSA D. HEHR

DEANNA K. HOWELL

JESSICA J. HUWA

ANDREW J. KAY

NOEL L. KUBAT

BRANDEN M. MAXWELL

ANNA B. MULLINS

AMOS K. PETERSON

MATTHEW C. REED

CARA P. REITER

JASON J. THORNTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

PAUL J. E. AUCHINCLOSS

SARAH E. BAKER

BENJAMIN K. BOWER

BARBARA K. BUJAK

BRENDA D. BUSTILLOS

ALVARO CALVILLO

ANTONIO F. CHANG

ERICKA M. CISCO

SEAN DONOHUE

ROBERT J. HALLE

NATHAN E. HENRY

JASON L. JUDKINS

KARYN E. KAGEL

LEIGH A. LECHANSKI

JOHN S. MASON

CHRISTOPHER B. MERCER

RACHEL E. MORGANS

REBECCA L. MORRELL

SHAUN J. OLAUGHLIN

WILLIAM J. PITT

KAYLA O. RAMOTAR

RYAN M. RODRIGUEZ

MATTHEW Z. SAMONTE

KIMBERLI A. A. SCRUGGS

RACHEL M. SNELL

KERRI A. VANARNEM

LUIS E. VIDAL

D010110

D015278

D015356

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

NADINE M. ALONZO

ALFONSO J. ALVAREZ III

NICHOLAS J. BARANELLO

CARLOS A. BARRERA

KRISTINA L. BARTEE

JONATHAN S. BARTLETT

VALERIE S. BARTONICO

JON M. BASHAM

SEAN P. BEEMAN

JAMES F. BEHLER

MIGUEL BENZOR

JARED L. BLACK

AUDREY A. BOENKER

MELISSA M. BOYD

JEFFREY L. BROWN

DAVID W. BYRD

GABRIELLE N. CALDARA

JESSICA T. CARTHON

PABLO A. CERCENIA

ERICA L. CHABALKO

EUN S. CHOI

BRANDEN K. CHUN

BRIAN E. COAKER

JOSHUA L. CONNOR

DANA M. COOK

MICHAEL R. COOPER

JAMIE L. CULBREATH

ROBERT B. DAVIS

RICHARD A. DEMARAIS

JAMIE L. DILLASHAW

DAN T. DITZLER, JR.

BRIAN M. DOWNS

RAN DU

TODD R. EAVES

NOLAN G. ELLIS

ALEC L. FINLAY

JOSEPH E. FISHER

JESSICA L. FORMAN

MICHAEL S. FRANKEL

JEFFREY W. FROUDE II

MELISSA K. GALAZIN

MICHELLE M. GARCIA

WILLIAM P. GEHLEN

PATRICK R. GLASS

ELVIS A. GONZALEZ

SILVIE N. GUNDERSON

JAY D. HANSON

DANIEL D. HEFFNER

RICHARD A. HEIPERTZ

SEAN J. HENDERSON

RONALD R. HENRIQUEZ

QUANESHA K. HENRY

WILLIAM D. HICKEY

RONNIE HILL

CHRISTOPHER M. HINNERICHS

ADAM T. HUGHES

KEVIN A. KIRCHGRABER

PETER F. KIRKENDALL

MICHAEL J. KWON

BETHANY G. LANDECK

SPENCER D. LEE

THOMAS M. LEHMANN

MARVIN A. LEONARD

WILLIAM B. LEWIS

FRANK L. LILES

JISUN S. LIM

LUKE A. LINDAMAN

ISAAC LOPEZ

KYLE R. LUND

GREGORY C. MABRY

AARON B. MALLORY

ASHLEY L. MALTEZLAURIENTI

MARCOS MARTINEZ

DEEPAK J. MATHEW

ERIC J. MIES

ERIN E. MILNER

NOE R. MUNIZ  
BRYAN P. NOWAK  
NICHOLAS J. NUSSDORFER  
SEAN K. OBRIEN  
MICHAEL M. OGANOVICH  
VERONICA D. J. ORTIZ  
RILIWAN O. OTTUN  
STEPHEN W. OWEN, JR.  
SEAN M. PALMER  
BRANDON S. PYBUS  
CAMERON L. RICHARDSON  
VIRGIL A. RIVERA  
RONNIE P. ROBINSON  
FAUSTINO RODRIGUEZ, JR.  
KENNETH J. RODRIGUEZ  
NOLAN D. ROGGENKAMP  
RALPH T. SALAZAR  
EDILBERTO SANTOS  
TODD C. SCHWARZ  
SUSAN R. SEIMET  
JON M. SHARP  
ROXANNA E. SHEAFFER  
JULIE A. SHIN  
RYAN C. SHUBAT  
REBECCA L. SINCLAIR  
BRIAN G. SMITH  
MAXWELL H. SMITH  
LISA M. STREMELE  
JOHN T. STRINGER  
CURTIS D. STRONG  
JESSE J. TAFOYA  
DANIEL H. TENHAGEN  
AARON THOMPSON  
CRAIG E. THOMPSON  
NORMAN V. TUALA  
JAMES R. TULLIS  
ALISA M. VANLANDINGHAM  
KAYLA L. VICKERS  
ABIGAIL S. VINCENT  
KEVIN J. VOGT  
FRANK B. WANAT  
BRAD A. WESLEY  
MARK R. WESSELER  
MARK T. WILLIAMS  
ANDREW W. WILSON  
JOHN R. WOLF  
DAVID P. WRIGHTEN  
ANGELA M. YARNELL  
JOSEPH G. ZIEBELLE  
D014909  
D015627

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

MARK ACOPAN  
THOMAS C. AGNEW  
MANUSHKA ANGOY  
HOLLY R. ARCHER  
PHILLIP L. BALDWIN  
JADELYN T. BANIQUED  
REBECCA G. BARRERA  
RUTH J. BROWNE  
LISA K. BUCKLES  
MELANIE C. BUDNIK  
ADAM R. CAMPBELL  
WILLIAM J. CHAPPELL  
JESUS CHAVEZ  
SOCHARA CHUMNOEUR  
SCOTT A. COLEMAN  
JAMIE L. COLON  
YASHIKA R. COOK  
JUDY L. CRUZ  
RUBEN D. CRUZ  
TANISHA L. CURRIE  
MAYAMONA DIAKABANA  
KEDRICK A. DRAKES  
MICHAEL A. ELIE  
JOCELYN A. EVUOMWAN  
JENNIFER C. FIANDT  
ANGELIA M. FISHER  
COURTNEY A. FOLDERAUER  
KATINA M. FOXWORTH  
ERICA K. GRANT  
MONIQUE E. GRINNELL  
TRANESSIA M. HANSON  
GENO M. HERRON  
ANGELA S. HOWELL  
KENNEATTA M. JASPER  
ELIZABETH B. JUREGUI  
MONIQUE S. JESIONOWSKI  
SHARIKA D. LABRIE  
JAMES LACOMBE  
HEATHER S. LEAL  
PHILIPP T. LUCKOWSKI  
CHANTY M. MACKINS  
ALEXIS MARTINEZSUAREZ  
JOHN R. MCINERNEY  
TANYA B. MOORE  
THERESA J. NOWAK  
ANDRE J. PACHO  
SHANDEL L. PANNETON  
CHARLES A. PAUL  
TABATHA E. PEPIN  
THORBJORN K. PERSSON  
LYNAE D. PLACE  
AUDREY N. RICHERT  
ALICIA D. ROBINSON  
JOSE A. RODRIGUEZ  
JOYCE A. ROSADOHUGHES  
ANTHONY M. SABATINI  
PATRICIA M. SCHMIDT  
KELLY M. SHAMLIAN  
ADINA M. SHIPPEL

ESTHER H. SOUTHERLAND  
KYLE A. STEVENS  
JESSICA E. STONE  
KIMBERLY L. SUGG  
MARY A. G. UGADDAN  
MARIELOS VEGA  
SHEMICA M. WARD  
THOMAS M. WATERS  
STEPHEN M. WATT  
KEVIN T. WORTH  
JONATHAN G. YOST  
FRANCES R. YOUNG  
TIMOTHY R. YOURK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be major*

MAHEALANI N. MCFARLAND

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

DYLAN L. AAKER  
MATTHEW A. ABELING  
MATTHEW W. ABEYOUNIS  
TROY V. ABNEY  
JUAN E. ACOSTA  
STEPHENS P. ADAM  
NICHOLAS B. ADAMS  
AUSTIN A. ADCOCK  
KELSEY D. ADLER  
PATRICK D. AHERN  
CHRISTOPHER R. AIKEN  
LENA A. AKERSON  
ADAM K. ALBRECHT  
CHRISTOPHER D. ALESSANDRIA  
STEPHEN A. ALEX  
PETER N. ALEXAKOS  
TYLER H. ALFRIEND  
CRAIG R. ALLEN  
BRANDON L. ALLGOOD  
DANIEL E. ALMENDRALES  
BRYANT D. ALSUP  
JONATHAN A. ALVIRDE  
LISA M. AMBLE  
CHRISTOPHER A. AMES  
JACOB M. AMON  
GERALD M. ANDERSON  
JAMES M. ANTHONY  
FRANCISCHE N. ANTONIO  
WILL A. APPLING  
ERIC ARAGONE  
ANTHONY S. ARROW  
MATTHEW R. ARSENAULT  
ERIK D. ARSTEIN  
JACOB S. ARTMAN  
CHRISTIAN R. ASABAN  
MICHAEL D. ASHLEY  
HARRISON B. ASKEW  
BENJAMIN P. ASPHOLM  
MARSHALL B. ATWOOD  
MICHELLE L. AUSTIN  
MICHAEL H. VERY  
SKYE K. BABKA  
DAVID W. BABKA  
STEVEN R. BACHMAN  
BRENNAN E. BAFFER  
PATRICK P. BAGNICK  
DEREK R. BAILEY  
JONATHAN D. BAIN  
MARK A. BAKER  
JOSEPH A. BALENT  
ADAM S. BALINT  
MICHAEL A. N. BALISTRERI  
MICHAEL R. BALLESTER  
MICHAEL Y. BALUYUT  
LATIGENE R. BALVIN III  
LATOYA L. BANKS  
AARON B. BANKS  
MYLES T. BARBULA  
TERRENCE P. BARCELON  
ANDREW A. BARWELL  
BRANDON L. BARKER  
JASON B. BARKER  
MITCHELL A. BARRY  
GEORGE R. BARTLETT II  
ALEX W. BARTOW  
JACOB M. BEAN  
ALEXANDER J. BEASLEY  
DANIEL T. BEATON  
WINSTON J. BEATTY  
PAUL T. BEAUCHAMP  
MARK D. BECKER  
ALEXANDER R. BELBIN  
NICHOLAS J. BELL  
MICHAEL E. BELLAVIA  
CHRISTOPHER L. BELLAMY  
NATHANIEL D. BENDICKSON  
DANIEL J. BENNETT  
HEATHER J. BENSON  
CODY T. BERREMAN  
DANIEL J. BEVERIDGE  
BRIAN J. BIELINSKI  
ANDREW M. BILTONSMITH  
ANDREW L. BISHLINE  
WILLIAM H. BISHOP  
HAROLD D. BLACK, JR.  
MATTHEW A. BLACKMON  
JOHN L. BLACKSTONE  
BRIAN M. BLOCTON  
JONATHAN H. BLUME

ALEXANDER J. BODDIFORD  
STEPHEN E. BOGDANOWICZ  
CURTIS D. T. BOLEN  
CHRISTOPHER K. BONIWELL  
CHARLES H. BOORNAZIAN  
STEVEN J. BORDEN  
JOHN R. BORNEMAN  
JENYA S. BOSS  
TYLER J. BOSTON  
SAMUEL D. BOWEN  
ERIC J. BOWERS  
DONALD N. BOWERS III  
LEONARD G. BOWMAN  
ROBERT S. BOYLES III  
CHRISTOPHER A. BOYNTON  
SCOTT A. BRADY  
MATTHEW A. BRALLSFORD  
CHARLES F. BRAND  
MARTIN E. BRANTNER  
ISABEL R. BRAY  
PARKER W. BRAY  
KEVIN M. BRENT  
MICHAEL A. BRISKI  
LINDSAY A. BROCK  
TRACY M. BROCKINGTON  
CAITLYN M. BROGDON  
MATTHEW D. BROOKS  
WILLIAM E. BROOKS  
AARON R. BROTMAN  
MICHAEL D. BROWN  
SARAH H. BROWN  
TRACEY L. BRUCE  
KYLE M. BRUMFIELD  
JOSHUA A. BRYAN  
PATRICIA L. BRYAN  
HANNAH M. BUCK  
THOMAS G. BUCK  
BRIAN J. BUCKLEY  
SEAN T. BUCKLEY  
LARRY W. BUCKNER II  
REBECCA J. BUCZKOWSKI  
PETER E. BUFFKIN, JR.  
SEAN P. BUGGY  
MATTHEW P. BUNTING  
JOSEPH A. BUONACCORSO  
DENNIS T. BURGART  
MATTHEW A. BURGESS  
DANIEL C. BURKE  
SEAN P. BURKE  
MATTHEW G. BURNETT  
JACOB T. BUSH  
MATTHEW D. BUSS  
MATTHEW J. BUSTA  
NICHOLAS V. BYRD  
ELIJAH C. CALLAGHAN  
MICHAEL S. CALLAHAN  
JOSEPH J. CAMERY  
TRAVIS L. CAMERON  
JAMES S. CAMPBELL  
CHRISTIAN S. CAPISTRANO  
ADAM D. L. CARD  
JASON R. CARMINATI  
RYAN D. CARR  
BRYAN M. CARRIKER  
DAVID B. CARROLL  
ALBERT T. CARTER  
WILLIAM R. CARTER III  
RICHARD D. CARTER  
FELICIA M. CASCANO  
MATTHEW J. CASEY  
PHILIP J. CASTIEL  
ALEXANDER C. CASTILLO  
ANDREW N. CASTRO  
KATHERINE M. CASTRO  
MICHAEL J. CAVE  
SEAN P. CAWLEY  
RICHARD A. CERGE  
STEPHEN W. CHANG  
DANIEL K. CHAPMAN  
TRAVIS M. CHARLTON  
JAMES H. CHESSON, JR.  
SCOTT D. CHILMAN  
EVAN E. CHRISTMAN  
RYAN R. CLARIDA  
FERGUS W. CLARK  
MATTIE A. CLAVERAN  
JASON F. CLEMENTE  
JAMES D. CLENDENIN  
JOSHUA C. COHEN  
AUDREY E. COLLIER  
DYLAN M. COLLIER  
MICHAEL K. COLLIER  
JEFFREY D. COLLINS II  
AARON P. COMINS  
MATTHEW J. CONLON  
PATRICK J. CONNAWAY  
MATTHEW R. CONNERS  
THEODORE W. CONNOLLY  
ETHAN A. CONNORS  
RYAN L. CONWAY  
ZACHARY A. COPES  
KEVIN C. CORDELL  
RAMON V. CORTES  
ROBERTO E. CORTES  
MARGO G. CORTIJO  
ANNA E. COSTELLO  
KEVIN A. COSTENBADER  
KYLE P. COULLARD  
ERIN E. COULTER  
SCOTT A. COY  
KYLE D. CRATON  
WILLIAM A. CROCKER  
KYLE J. CROWDER  
CHRISTINA R. CROWE  
SEAN A. CRUZ  
THOMAS T. CULLEN  
CHASE M. CUMMINS

KAINOA CUMPSTON  
 JOSHUA R. CURRY  
 ALLEN B. CUTMAN  
 BRIAN C. CZAPLA  
 BRIAN J. DALLAIRE  
 JACK L. DALY III  
 NICHOLAS P. DALY  
 LEE V. DAM  
 CHRISTINA A. DANAI  
 BRITTANY J. DANIELS  
 TY J. DANIELS  
 BRIAN J. DANLEY  
 JOHN J. DANNEMILLER, JR.  
 ARIANA C. DARS  
 JAY C. DARLING  
 AMY E. DAVIS  
 JEFFREY W. DAVIS  
 JORDAN Q. DAVIS  
 LEHVY I. DAVIS  
 MATTHEW K. DAVIS  
 NED J. DAVIS  
 WILLIAM L. V. DAVIS  
 WILLIAM P. DAY  
 EMERY E. DEAN II  
 VINCENT J. DEBENEDETTI  
 JOSEPH T. DEIGHAN  
 CALEB M. DEMARCO  
 THOMAS R. DEMONBREUN  
 MICHAEL R. DEMOS  
 MATTHEW C. DENHERDER  
 KELLY R. DENIMARCK  
 JOEL M. DERBY  
 CALEB J. DERRINGTON  
 EDWARD J. DESCH III  
 MATTHEW S. DESROSIER  
 AARON Z. DEWITT  
 HOLLY S. DIAZ  
 SEBASTIAN DIAZ  
 MICHAEL L. DIDONATO  
 KAILA M. DIEDER  
 CHRISTOPHER W. DINGER  
 JEREMY L. DIRCKS  
 CHRISTOPHER D. DIZON  
 LOGAN C. DODDS  
 BEN H. DODGE  
 MARK D. DODSON  
 MARTIN S. DOERR  
 IAN P. DOLAN  
 LANCE H. DOLCI  
 JOHN S. DOWD  
 ZACHARY L. DRUM  
 ZACHARY J. DRYDEN  
 RYAN M. DUFFY  
 DEVIN M. DUGARD  
 SEAN Q. DULANEY  
 BRAY D. DUNAWAY  
 MADISON J. DUPOUY  
 JOSHUA C. DWORKIN  
 GREGORY D. EASTBURG  
 TYLER J. EBBITT  
 ERIC M. EDER  
 ERIN M. EDWARDS  
 DOLPH E. EICH, JR.  
 ELIZABETH A. EISER  
 ABIGAIL M. ELLIS  
 ANNA J. ELZEFTAWY  
 DAVID I. EMERT  
 SAMUEL T. ENG  
 ANUP F. ENGINEER  
 NICHOLAS L. EPPLER  
 ERIC M. ERDOS  
 GEORGE B. EVANS  
 EVAN W. EVANS IV  
 TRAVIS M. EVERT  
 THOMAS P. FACON  
 DANIEL R. FAHEY  
 JOHNATHAN R. FAIR  
 CARSON J. FAILL  
 MICHAEL M. FAULKNER  
 BENJAMIN A. FERNANDEZ  
 RUSSELL J. FERTITTA, JR.  
 THOMAS J. FICK  
 ERIN L. FIELDS  
 MATTHEW S. FIELDS  
 JACE R. FINCHER  
 GORDON C. FINLAY  
 KYLE B. FISHBURN  
 ZACHARIAH M. FISHER  
 JOSHUA A. FLANAGAN  
 DUSTIN A. FLAUM  
 MICHAEL P. FLECK  
 AUSTIN G. FLEMING  
 ROBERT C. FLINN  
 EUGENE T. FLOOD IV  
 KEVIN B. FLOOD  
 RICHARD M. FLOREZ  
 JOSEPH M. FLOYD  
 CHRISTOPHER A. FOIGHT  
 SEAN T. FORSYTH  
 WILLIAM A. FORTIN  
 MICHAEL R. FORTUNATI  
 THAD A. FOX  
 DAVID L. FOY  
 JOSHUA M. FRANKE  
 ASHER C. FRANKFURT  
 KEVIN J. FRATTIN  
 RYAN L. FREDOWITZ  
 JAMES C. FRENCH  
 DANIELLE H. FRITTS  
 JOHN D. FRITTS  
 AARON M. FRUNZI  
 JEFFREY D. FUDGE  
 ANDREW H. FULLER  
 JERRIT R. FULLER  
 PETER N. FULTZ  
 BENJAMIN L. FUNKHOUSER  
 DOUGLAS S. FURMAN

NICOLE A. GAILLIOT  
 PAUL A. GALE  
 JOHN W. GANNON  
 LOUIS GAO  
 BENJAMIN D. GARBACZ  
 MEAGAN C. GARCIA  
 KENNETH J. GARRISON  
 STEPHANIE C. GARZA  
 STEPHEN J. GASECKI  
 SHAWN M. GATEAU  
 CHRISTINA A. GATTI  
 RYAN C. GAWNE  
 ERIN D. GEHLHAUSEN  
 CHARLES E. GEHRKE  
 CARMEN M. GENTRY  
 KATELYN M. GEORGE  
 BENNETT G. GEYER  
 SCOTT J. GILDEMEYER  
 IAN M. GILLETTE  
 SHELBY P. GILLIS  
 DAVID J. GILSON  
 DARIUS G. GITTENS  
 JOSHUA S. GLAZIER  
 JENNIFER E. GLEASON  
 JOHN R. GOLDEN  
 JAMES R. GONOS  
 CRYSTAL W. GONZALEZ  
 ERIK R. GONZALEZ  
 MOISES V. GONZALEZ  
 JOHN B. GOODRICH  
 ZACHARY S. GOODRICH  
 WILLIAM F. GOODWIN III  
 ZACHARY L. GOREVIN  
 JONATHAN P. GOSSELIN  
 JEREMY T. GRAHAM  
 ROBERT M. GRAHAM  
 MARIO A. GRANATA  
 ADAM B. GRANIC  
 DEREK R. GRAVES  
 DAVID M. GREGOR  
 HARRY E. GREGORY III  
 DREW C. GRESH  
 MATTHEW A. GRIFFITH  
 TYLER C. GRIFFITH  
 SAMANTHA A. GRIMES  
 ANDREW D. GRIMM  
 MARQUES B. GRIMS  
 STUART P. GRINCH  
 JENNIFER M. GROGER  
 ERIC J. GROOTERS  
 SHANE T. GROOVER  
 ANDREW D. GSELL  
 IAN M. GUAGLIARDO  
 LOUIS C. GUAGLIARDO  
 DANIEL J. GUERNSEY  
 AUSTIN C. GUNDER  
 ERIC N. GUNN  
 JEREMY A. GUNTHER  
 DEVAN V. GURECKI  
 GRAY H. GUTHRIE  
 JACK A. GUTSCHLAG  
 MATTHEW D. GUZA  
 DOUGLAS E. HABY  
 JOHN H. HADDAD  
 KYLE E. HAHN  
 ANDREW C. HAINES  
 JACK E. HALLER  
 JAMES D. HALSELL  
 ABIGAIL R. HALMOND  
 JOSEPH E. HANACEK  
 CONOR F. HANDLEY  
 DAVID L. HANEY  
 BRADLEY A. HANSEN  
 JONATHAN C. HAPPY  
 RYAN C. HARD  
 GRAHAM B. HARMON  
 ANDREW M. HARRELL  
 PETER R. HARRIS  
 HAYDEN F. HARRISON  
 SAMUEL J. HARTLEY  
 GREGORY C. HASE  
 MELISSA L. HATLEY  
 CATLIN S. HAUGH  
 NICOLAS G. HAUPST  
 BENJAMIN T. HAYASHI  
 JARRETT B. HAYES  
 JEREMY W. HAYS  
 JESSICA R. HAYTER  
 JOSEPH P. HEALEY  
 MADELINE P. HEILMAN  
 JOHN F. HEIMERL  
 MATTHEW B. HEIN  
 DENNIS R. HEINZ  
 ROBERT M. HELLER  
 PAUL C. HELWIG  
 JEDIDIAH N. HENDERSHOT  
 KAITLYN I. HENDERSON  
 FRED A. HENDRICKS III  
 PHILIP R. HENDRIX  
 CHRISTOPHER J. HENLEY  
 MATTHEW J. HENNARD  
 MATTHEW A. HENRY  
 LOUIS E. HENRY  
 JACOB B. HENTGES  
 AARON K. HERBER  
 JOSE A. HERRERA  
 ANDREW C. HERING  
 ALEXANDER L. HESS  
 CHARLES F. HESSLER  
 CHARLES E. HETZEL  
 CODY B. HICKS  
 ROSS E. HIEATT, JR.  
 JONATHAN M. HILL  
 PAUL T. HILL  
 DANIEL E. HILT  
 DAVID M. HINKLE  
 GEORGE L. HIRNER, JR.

CHRISTOPHER E. HODSDEN  
 ALEK L. HOFFMAN  
 KEVIN M. HOFFMAN  
 KEVIN V. HOLLAND  
 BRADLEY D. HOLM  
 JI H. HONG  
 GARRETT E. HORN  
 JOHN M. HORST  
 AUSTIN J. HOWARD  
 ELIZABETH D. HOWELL  
 NICHOLAS A. HUBAN  
 CHARLESTON C. I. HUBBARD  
 CLAYTON E. HUBER  
 ROBERT M. HUBNER  
 STEVEN D. HUCKS  
 JASON R. HUGHES  
 MEGHAN A. HUGHES  
 BRIAN T. HULSE  
 AUSTIN K. HULSEY  
 JACKSON W. HUMMELDORF  
 JASON C. INGRAM  
 SIMON J. IRISH  
 BRIAN L. ISBELL  
 CHARLES R. ISON III  
 JOSEPH G. JABLONSKI  
 NATALIE R. JACKSON  
 MICHAEL JAMES  
 TRENTT E. JAMES  
 COURTNEY N. JANOWICZ  
 STEVEN P. JARDINA  
 MICHAEL M. JENDRYCKI  
 MATTHEW R. JIBILIAN  
 HENRY S. JOBE  
 ANDREW L. JOHNSON  
 ANDREW S. JOHNSON  
 COREY A. JOHNSON  
 WILLIAM T. JOHNSON III  
 SEAN W. JOHNSON  
 SPENCER G. JOHNSON  
 TRAVIS D. JOHNSON  
 JEREMY D. JONES  
 MATTHEW W. JONES  
 NICHOLAS D. JONES  
 REX C. JONES  
 SHANTE A. JONES  
 ANTHONY M. JOSEPH  
 MATTHEW D. JOSEPH  
 SHAIN A. JOWETT  
 MAX L. KAGAN  
 KEVIN T. KAISER  
 CHRISTOPHER J. KAPUSCHANSKY  
 CRAIG J. KARDUCK  
 JOHN KASHMANIAN  
 JEREMY R. KASIK  
 ANTON J. KATALINICH  
 COLTON A. KAWAMURA  
 DANIEL D. KELLY  
 JORDAN W. KELMAR  
 MARK R. KENDRICK  
 SCOTT J. KENDRICK  
 DYLAN F. KENNEDY  
 BRYAN M. KENT  
 DARLAN C. KHOSROWSHAHI  
 SCOTT T. KILISZEWSKI  
 REBECCA E. KILLINGER  
 RYAN J. KIM  
 ALEXANDER K. KING  
 PATRICK E. KING  
 KYLE M. KINGSBURY  
 BRADLEY J. KIRSCHBAUM  
 ALEXANDER W. KLEIN  
 MAXWELL M. KLEIN  
 ANTHONY J. KLINE  
 WILHELM B. KLINGER  
 CHARLES D. KLOTZ  
 BENJAMIN S. KNERR  
 STOVALL W. KNIGHT  
 REISS A. KOHL  
 CALEB L. KORVER  
 KEATON M. KOVATCH  
 BENJAMIN W. KOZLOWSKI  
 BRENT J. KRAWIECKI  
 NATHAN A. KREN  
 ALEX T. KRIEGL  
 STEVEN A. KRISTEK  
 TERRY D. KROHE  
 JOSHUA J. KROLL  
 BRETT A. KRUEHOFER  
 PHILLIP W. KUNZIG  
 SARAH L. KUPOVITS  
 DAREN A. KURT  
 JOSEPH R. KUZMICK  
 JOANNA M. KYLE  
 LAUREN E. LAESSIG  
 KEVIN T. LAMOTT  
 JAMES A. LAND  
 ADAM J. LANG  
 TAYLOR M. LANG  
 CHRISTINA A. LANOUEETTE  
 AARON B. LARGE  
 MARK T. LASCARA  
 ANDREW B. LATON  
 ADAM W. LAUER, JR.  
 JOHN E. LAUGHLIN II  
 MATTHEW L. LAVENDER  
 MICHAEL S. LAVOIE  
 JOHN A. LAWLER  
 MATTHEW A. LAWSON  
 RAYMOND T. LAZOTT  
 PATRICK K. LEAR  
 JEFFERY W. LEDFORD  
 DEREK J. LEE  
 PHILIP S. LEE  
 JUSTIN P. LEFERE  
 MARISSA K. LEGG  
 NICOLE K. LEONARD  
 ANTON LEONARDES

JONATHAN A. LEVINS  
JILLIAN J. LEWIS  
ALEX J. LICHTENFELD  
JED S. LIFA  
MATTHEW O. LINDEMAN  
KENNETH C. LINN  
GARRICK C. LIVESAY  
ALEXANDER L. LLOYD  
COLIN T. LOCKE  
REED P. LOONEY  
DAVID A. LOPEZ  
JASON C. LORENZ  
WILLIAM M. LOVE  
KENNETH O. LOVELADY  
KEVIN P. LOVELL  
BRADLEY C. LOW  
AMANDA H. LOWERY  
IVAN G. LUBENOV  
ALLAN J. LUCAS  
BRIAN C. LUCAS  
PATRIQUE J. LUDAN  
VINCENT D. LUDOVICI  
SCOTT J. LUKE  
JOSEPH R. LUNA  
ANDREW M. LUONGO  
BLAKE C. LUSTY  
ANDREA M. LYNCH  
HAN MA  
WHITNEY T. MACAULAY  
ALLEN E. MACDONALD  
NICHOLAS R. MACDONALD  
NICHOLAS J. MACKLIN  
DANIEL R. MACMILLAN  
JUSTIN B. MAGCALAS  
RYAN P. MAHON  
JOSEPH N. MAHONEY  
JOSHUA F. MALIA  
PHILLIP DANIEL D. MALIGSA  
EMMA B. MANZI  
SLADE C. MARLOW  
MARCOS A. MARRERO  
JAMESON C. MARSHALL  
MICHAEL J. MARTIN  
NICHOLAS V. MARTIN  
NICHOLAS D. MASKELL  
JOHN W. MASON II  
RYAN M. MATTI  
KEVIN P. MATOVINA  
SHANE M. MAURO  
SCOTT D. MAXFIELD  
MORGAN MAYNARD  
MICHAEL A. MAYNARD  
ANDREW C. MAYS  
PATRICK T. MCALEER  
JASON MCCABE  
JOHN P. MCCABE  
JONATHAN D. MCCLELLAN  
ROBERT A. MCCLENNING  
ANDREW K. MCCLESKEY  
MORGAN C. MCCLEVE  
TIMOTHY M. MCDANIEL  
KEVIN C. MCDERMOTT  
JOHN M. MCDONALD  
MATTHEW S. MCDONALD  
JOHN MCDONOUGH  
BRANDON D. MCGEE  
DERREK T. MCGOWEN  
RYAN A. MCGUCKIN  
BRYAN MCGUINNESS  
SARAH R. MCGUIRE  
FRANK P. MCGURK III  
MATHEW D. MCINTYRE  
JONATHAN S. MCKAY  
CAMERON T. MCKEE  
CHRISTOPHER C. MCKEE  
ALEXANDER B. MCKENNA  
RYAN P. MCLAUGHLIN  
MARK A. MCMAHON  
CHRISTOPHER B. MCMICHAEL  
CASEY E. MCMURRY  
DANIEL P. MCMURRY  
CORY W. MCMURTRIE, JR.  
BRIAN E. MCNAMARA  
ELIZABETH M. MCNAUGHT  
MARY K. MEDFORD DAVIS  
ANTHONY L. MELVIN  
CHRISTOPHER A. MENCEL  
JACOB W. MENCHHOFER  
STEFAN A. MENKE  
MACY B. MERCADO  
BRANDON C. MERRITT  
JASON D. METZGER  
MARK P. MEYER  
MATTEO J. MEZZETTI  
ANTHONY N. MICCO  
ANNA M. MIDDLETON  
COREY L. MIDDLETON  
MATTHEW H. MILAM  
KYLE R. MILDEN  
DEVIN T. MILES  
CHRISTOPHER C. MILLER  
DUNCAN M. MILLER  
MEGAN K. MILLER  
NICHOLAS C. MILLER  
SAMUEL W. MILLER  
KAILA R. MILLIS  
RYAN A. MILLS  
SIMONE M. MIMS  
DAVID A. MINA  
ZACHARY H. MINDEL  
MACKENZIE M. MINIHAN  
JOSEPH H. MINNICH  
DANIEL J. A. MINTCH  
ANTONIO B. MIRANDA  
BRIANNA L. MITCHELL  
HUGH A. MITCHELL III  
NATHAN W. V. MITCHELL

ZACHARY C. MIX  
SHANE M. MOISON  
JAMES D. MOLINARI  
RICHARD M. MOLZAHN  
MITCHELL B. MONAS  
ANTHONY C. MONTES  
DANIEL J. MONTGOMERY  
PAUL D. MONTOYA  
BRIAN P. MOORE  
DAVID T. MOORE  
GARRETT R. MORCK  
ALEXANDER W. MORGAN  
CHRISTOPHER C. MORGAN  
CRAIG A. MORGAN  
JOHN R. MORGAN III  
JOHN N. MORGAN  
WILLIAM A. MORSE  
ELIZABETH C. MOTEN  
JEFFREY A. MUENCHRATH  
KYLE G. W. MUI  
JOHN P. MULLANEY  
DANIEL P. MULLEN  
KRISTINE J. MUN  
CASEY S. MURDOCK  
EDWARD W. MURNER  
MANSFIELD C. MURPH  
PHILIP G. MURPHY  
ROBERT B. MURRAY  
PRAVEEN S. MURTHY  
ANDREW J. MUSGROVE  
NICHOLAS L. MYERS  
JOY R. NAMEETH  
MARINA K. NANARTOWICH  
DYLAN P. NELSON  
ROBERT M. NELSON  
MATTHEW L. NEMETZ  
REBECCA L. NESMITH  
HASAAD J. NEWSOME  
PHONG D. NGUYEN  
PRESTON G. NICHOLL  
THOMAS M. NIEPORTE III  
HARRY C. NIEWALD III  
JOHN R. NOOJIN  
ROBERT M. NORDLUND  
DAVID B. NORRIS  
JUSTIN E. NORRIS  
WILLIAM C. NORTON  
RONALD P. NOVAK II  
JESSICA L. OBRIEN  
CHRISTOPHER W. O'CONNELL  
FRANCIS J. O'CONNELL, JR.  
ANDREW T. ODELL  
DUSTIN S. OETTEDAL  
ALEK J. OGDEN  
MICHAEL R. OGRADY  
PATRICK L. OHARA II  
KYLE W. OLEARY  
LINDSAY M. OLSEN  
WILLIAM J. QUINN  
JAMES M. ORR  
ALEXANDER D. OSTROM  
TIMOTHY K. OSULLIVAN  
WILLIAM L. PAUL  
CHRISTOPHER H. PAGENKOPF  
ANDREW M. PAGLIARULO  
RAYMONDVICT C. PAJARILLO  
JASON T. PALANKO  
ERIC M. PALMER  
JAMES H. PALMER  
ALEXANDER P. PAPADAKOS  
IAN D. PARK  
GRANT A. PARKS  
EVAN G. PARRISH  
DYLAN O. PARROTT  
MICHAEL B. PARRY  
QUINN T. PATTERSON  
JOHN A. PAVALOK  
WILLIAM T. PEABODY, JR.  
JAMES P. PEARSON  
TRAVIS J. PECKMAN  
SEQUOIA PEDERSEN  
TREVOR J. PEDRICK  
ANDREW PENA  
SEAN M. PENEYRA  
ROBERT G. PENLEY III  
JAMES R. PENN  
JEFFREY J. PENTZ  
RANDALL A. PERKINS IV  
JAMES T. PERKINS  
DAVID A. PERRY  
ELIOTT T. PETERS  
AUSTIN R. PETERSEN  
BRICE T. PETERSEN  
SCOTT R. PETERSON  
KARL A. PETRACEK  
MICHAEL A. PETROZIELLO  
JOSEPH J. PETTY  
KEVIN A. PETTY  
ROBERT W. PFELFFER  
PARKER L. PHELPS  
JACOB A. PHILLIPS  
JOSHUA L. PIERCE  
WILLIAM E. PIKE  
LEIGHTON A. PLEASANTS  
MICHAEL T. PLUMMER  
TANNER D. POACH  
MATTHEW S. POLLLOCK  
MICHAEL A. PONESSA  
EUGENE G. PORTNER  
JOSEPH M. POTTRATZ  
CORY R. POUDDRIER  
ALLEN W. POWELL  
RICHARD M. PREVATT  
COLIN R. PRICE  
JOSHUA A. PRICE  
KEVIN P. PRIMEAU  
JON B. A. PRO

JOSEPH F. PUISHYS III  
MICHAEL K. PURCELL  
MARK L. PUTNAM  
ROBERT J. PUTRINO  
WILLIAM A. QUADRINO  
ANDREW W. QUIEL  
KEVIN J. QUINN  
DAVID A. RABA  
WILLIAM E. RACE  
KEVIN M. RAFTER  
MICHAEL R. RAGUSA  
JOEL T. RALEY, JR.  
STEPHEN F. RAMEY  
DAMIEN T. RAMIREZWOJCICK  
KELLY A. RANZ  
ISAY A. RAPOPORT  
BENJAMIN W. RATHWELL  
ALEJANDRO D. RAVELO  
STEPHEN A. RAY  
TINA L. REED  
MICHEL B. REEHER  
FREDERIC S. REES  
SEAN C. REEVES  
BENJAMIN C. REID  
MICHAEL A. REID  
JEFFREY S. REIDER  
JOHN J. REIDY  
DANIEL P. REMUS  
JOSEPH L. RENDEMONTI  
ERIC J. RENO  
KRISTOPHER S. RESTEL  
HEATHER H. RESUE  
ANDREW J. REYNOLDS  
DALLAS C. RHODES  
ROBERT H. RICE  
RANDALL M. RICHARDS  
VICTORIA P. RICHARDSON  
EMMANUEL J. RICHARDSON  
JUSTIN D. RICHARDSON  
CASEY J. RIGGS  
JORDAN J. RIGGS  
GERALDRAMIR S. RIVERA  
EMILY K. RIXEY  
JORDAN N. ROACH  
MARK A. ROACH  
BRANDON L. ROBERTS  
BRANDON S. ROBERTS  
DANIEL P. ROBERTS  
JUSTIN M. ROBERTS  
NOLAN P. ROBERTS  
SEAN C. ROBERTS  
DARREN B. ROBERTSON  
DREW M. ROBERTSON  
FARRELL ROBINS  
RYAN D. ROBINS  
WALKER C. ROBINSON  
CODY R. ROBISON  
MARCO V. ROCHE  
CHRISTOPHER M. ROCHON  
DAVID R. RODRIGUEZ  
MARCOS A. RODRIGUEZ  
NICO C. ROE  
ZACHARY M. ROECKER  
ELLEN M. ROESBERRY  
JOSHUA A. ROGERS  
MATTHEW T. ROGERS  
PHILLIP J. ROGERE  
ALEXANDER J. ROMAN  
ROBERTO S. P. ROSALES  
MOR G. ROSENBERG  
BORIS A. ROSLOV  
DILLON J. ROSSITER  
ROBERT D. ROUNTREE  
MICHAEL J. ROWLAND, JR.  
BRANDEN M. ROY  
KEVIN P. ROY  
WADE L. RUSHTON  
ROBERT J. V. RUSSELL  
SCOTT D. RUSSELL  
SATCHEL H. RYAN  
ALEC D. RYNASKI  
AVIK SAHA  
LAWRENCE E. SALAZAR, JR.  
JOSHUA J. SALE  
BRANDON T. SALES  
RAY M. SAMMONS IV  
REBECCA L. SAMUELS  
BRANDI J. SANDERS  
JENNIFER L. SANDIFER  
SALVATORE SANNUITO  
KENNETH R. SAUSE  
VENUS L. SAVAGE  
JORDAN S. SAVERSE  
KYLE B. SAVERY  
NATHAN A. SAWYER  
SEAN N. SCALES  
JONATHAN D. SCARFO  
RYAN F. SCHAEDEL  
DEVIN H. SCHAEFER  
DANIEL A. SCHAFFER  
JOHN C. SCHABLE  
JOSHUA C. SCHMIDT  
ANDREW J. SCHNUR  
MAXWELL L. SCHREIBER  
KRISTLE N. SCHREICK  
MARTIN F. SCHROEDER  
MATTHEW G. SCHUBRING  
ALEX J. SCHUECKLER  
MATTHEW T. SCHWALL  
KEVIN M. SCHWENK  
CHARLES A. SCOTT  
BENJAMIN M. SCULLEY  
JOSHUA B. SEAGRAVE  
STEVEN SEDA  
DANIEL SEDBERRY  
AMANDA R. SERFASS  
DARREN V. SETTLE



KIERAN F. SEXTON  
 CHARLES A. SHAFFER  
 EVAN P. SHALLCROSS  
 HOLDEN S. SHALOV  
 CLAYTON E. SHAW  
 CHRISTOPHER W. SHEEHAN  
 JOHN P. SHELTON III  
 PAUL B. SHEN  
 TAYLOR N. SHEPPARD  
 MICHAEL S. SHERWOOD  
 RYAN J. SHULTS  
 NATALIE N. SIEDSCHLAG  
 SEAMUS A. SIEFRING  
 ROBERT D. SILVA  
 DAVID A. SIMONE  
 JENNIFER J. SING  
 MICHAEL G. SINGER  
 GABRIEL M. SINGLETARY  
 BRAD A. SIRAGUSA  
 ISAAC J. SIRECI  
 ANTHONY SIRICO, JR.  
 MICHAEL G. SJOHOLMSIERCHIO  
 SEAN M. SKALSKI  
 PHILLIP W. SKELLEY  
 DANIEL C. SLATER  
 ALEXANDER D. SMART  
 CHRISTINA L. SMITH  
 DEVEREUX B. SMITH  
 CARLTON O. SMITH II  
 RICHARD N. SMITH, JR.  
 KAYLA J. SMITH  
 WESLEY H. SMITH  
 JONATHAN G. SMOAK  
 MATTHEW L. SMRZ  
 ANDREW P. SOBERMAN  
 PERRY J. SOLOMON  
 AMBER E. SOMMA  
 CHARITY E. SOMMA  
 CHRISTIAN R. SONCINI  
 RAN T. SONG  
 RYAN G. SORGE  
 MATTHEW R. SPAFFORD  
 DIANA E. SPIVEY  
 DEVIN Y. SPLATT  
 LOGAN G. SPRAGUE  
 ROBERT J. SQUIRES  
 RYAN R. STAGNER  
 BRIAN A. STANFIELD  
 JOSEPH B. STANFIELD  
 GRIFFIN R. STANGEL  
 GRAHAM A. STAPLETON  
 LAURA K. STARCK  
 JACOB R. STEELE  
 JOSEPH C. STEHLIN IV  
 ZACHARY D. STEIGER  
 ERIC J. STEIN  
 SETH A. STEINGRAEBER  
 JOEL W. STEVENS  
 MATTHEW A. STEVENS  
 BRADLEY R. STEVENSON  
 RYAN K. STEWART  
 TREVOR S. STICKELS  
 CRAIG A. STOCKER, JR.  
 BENJAMIN D. STOLARSKI  
 RAJIV H. STONE  
 ERIK D. STORM  
 WILLIAM J. STRAIN  
 RYLEE J. STREFF  
 NEIL J. SULLIVAN  
 TAYLOR J. SULITZ  
 GABRIEL D. SUPE  
 ROBERT E. SWAIN III  
 MICHAEL C. SWEENEY  
 MICHELLE R. SYBOUTS  
 BEATRIZ E. TALERICO  
 MICHELLE K. TANALEGA  
 ANDREW C. TAYLOR  
 BLAKE R. TAYLOR  
 PHILIP A. TAYLOR  
 ISAAC J. TEICHGRAB  
 BRANDON P. TELATOVICH  
 TIMOTHY M. TENCATE  
 BRADLEY C. TERBEEK  
 NICHOLAS M. TESSMER  
 ANTHONY P. TESTINO  
 JASON A. THILL  
 TYLER N. THOMAS  
 ZACHARY A. THOMAS  
 MICHAEL A. THOMASSON  
 CAMERON W. THOMPSON  
 ERIC R. THOMPSON  
 JEB S. THOMPSON  
 BRIAN J. THOMSON  
 CAMERON L. THORNBERRY  
 GRANT B. THORNE  
 DANIEL W. THYBERG  
 BRANDON T. TINKHAM  
 MICHAEL J. TOPT  
 MICHAEL A. TOMSIC  
 MARIANNE A. TOPP  
 KATHERINE E. TORTORICH  
 JOHN R. TORTORICH  
 JOHN P. TOUSIGNANT  
 KEVIN D. TOUW  
 PATRICK S. TRABERT  
 DANIEL J. TREIBER  
 DREW A. TRIBBLE  
 ABRAHAM J. TRINDLE  
 VICTOR M. TRISCAS  
 TYLER A. TRDMBETTA  
 ALEJANDRO R. TRUJILLO  
 MARK E. TRUNZO  
 SUNNY L. TSAO  
 PATRICK B. TUCKER  
 THOMAS P. TWOMEY II  
 NICOLE Y. UCHIDA  
 MATTHEW T. ULERY

JUSTIN W. VAGTS  
 MICHAEL J. VAHSEN  
 ROBERT J. VALENTICH  
 STEPHEN A. VANDAL  
 JON M. VANDERZWET  
 JAMES M. VANGEL  
 JEANNE L. VANGILDER  
 KARA VANSICE  
 WILLIAM A. VEGA  
 MATTHEW R. VERNAM  
 DEAN C. VIANE  
 MATTHEW A. VIGILANTE  
 TYLER P. VITTI  
 RYAN M. VOLK  
 BENJAMIN T. VONFORELL  
 CAROLYNE VU  
 JOSHUA D. WAGNER  
 KYLE H. WAGNER  
 BRANDON M. WALKER  
 DANIEL E. WALKER  
 MICHAEL G. WALKER  
 JEREMY A. WALLACE  
 PATRICK D. WALLER  
 MATTHEW R. WALLNER  
 WILLIAM R. WALLS IV  
 KENNETH C. J. WALLS  
 SHAWN P. WALSH  
 AARON D. WANNER  
 ASHLEY L. WARD  
 CLIFFORD H. WARD  
 SAMUEL J. WARD  
 JEFFREY T. WARNOCK  
 STEPHEN A. WARREN  
 RICHARD O. WATERS III  
 BENJAMIN E. WATTAM  
 BENJAMIN M. WATTERS  
 ANDREW D. WEATHERHOLT  
 ZACHARY J. WEAVER  
 ADAM T. WEBSTER  
 MARK E. WEBSTER  
 IMIR M. WEISE  
 MATTHEW T. WELLENES  
 ALEX C. WELLS  
 KENNETH J. WENZEL  
 JADE S. WEST  
 LOGAN T. WEST  
 CHAD J. WESTFALL  
 KYRIN T. WHARTON  
 JAMES K. WHEELAND  
 LARRY D. WHEELER III  
 GREGORY A. WHEELER, JR.  
 JOHN M. WHITAKER  
 DAVID L. WHITE II  
 JOHN C. WHITE  
 THOMAS J. WHITING  
 SCHYLER J. WIDMAN  
 LAWRENCE WIGGINS  
 SCOTT A. WILDER  
 BRADLEY M. WILKIN  
 ANDREW D. WILLES  
 AMY N. WILLIAMS  
 CHRISTOPHER D. WILLIAMS  
 NICHOLAS H. WILLIAMS  
 ROBERT L. WILLIAMS  
 RYAN C. WILLIAMS  
 JEREMY R. WILLIS  
 ROBERT M. WILSNACK  
 ANDREW B. WILSON  
 JARROD T. WILSON  
 SUSAN T. WIMER  
 MICHAEL W. WISSEHR  
 RYAN T. WISZ  
 JOSHUA E. WITKOWSKI  
 WILLIAM J. WOFFORD  
 ANDREW D. WOLFE  
 TROY M. WOOD  
 SHANE A. WOODARD  
 NATHAN J. WOODASON  
 DAVID J. WOODS  
 ALEXANDER S. WORDSWORTH  
 CHRISTOPHER WOROSZ  
 THOMAS V. WORTHINGTON  
 MICHAEL A. WREN  
 ALEX D. WYTKASKE  
 JONATHAN J. YAEDE  
 GREGORY J. YAMAMOTO  
 PATRICK T. YARCUSKO  
 DAVID M. YONKINGS  
 KEVIN W. YOUNG  
 PATRICK Z. X. YU  
 JEFFREY T. ZEBERLEIN  
 KEVIN S. ZWERNEMAN  
 ALISON M. ZYCHLEWICZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE NAVY RESERVE  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be captain*

HAROLD S. ZALD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE NAVY RESERVE  
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be captain*

PAUL J. WISNIEWSKI

#### IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT  
 IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR SPACE  
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

#### *To be lieutenant colonel*

HALDANE C. GILLETTE

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE COAST  
 GUARD PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF  
 FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST  
 GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14,  
 U.S.C. SECTION 1944 AND 2126:

#### *To be captain*

ROYCE W. JAMES  
 JOSEPH T. BENIN

#### *To be commander*

MATTHEW B. WILLIAMS

#### *To be lieutenant commander*

PETER H. IMBRIALE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
 IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE IN-  
 DICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E), IN-  
 CLUDING THOSE RESERVE OFFICERS WHO ARE TO BE AP-  
 POINTED AS PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS  
 PURSUANT TO 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2101:

#### *To be lieutenant commander*

BRITTANY S. AKERS  
 MELISSA E. ALMA  
 BRYAN J. ANDREWS  
 SHAWN R. ANTONELLI  
 JONATHAN B. ARDAN  
 JOSEPH M. ATKINS  
 STEPHEN C. ATWELL  
 BRANDI A. BELVEAL  
 TIFFANY L. BERRY  
 DANIEL G. BESHOAR  
 ROBERT C. BLANCO  
 ROBERT J. BICKFORD  
 CHRISTOPHER P. BODNER  
 JORDAN C. BOGDEN  
 KRISTEN R. BRADLEY  
 JOSHUA W. BRANTHOVER  
 JOHN P. BRASS  
 DUSTIN L. BRECHER  
 ANDREW N. BREEN  
 JESSIE K. BRENTON  
 KATHARINE E. BRODIE  
 KELLEN R. BROWNE  
 MICHAEL A. BROWNING  
 JAMES C. BRUCE  
 MADELINE A. BUCHERT  
 KYLE D. BURKE  
 ERIN C. CALLAHAN  
 LISA M. CAMPBELL  
 STEVEN P. CAQUETTE, JR.  
 BENJAMIN F. CARIDDI  
 CHARLES F. CASSIANO  
 MARGUERITE G. CHAMPLIN  
 FRED V. CHASE  
 ROBBY L. CHAVEZ  
 RICHARD G. CHERKAUER  
 ANDREW M. CHEVALIER  
 CRIGHTON C. CHONG  
 KIERAN S. CLAYTON  
 CHRISTOPHER L. CLIFTON  
 NATHANIEL P. CLINGER  
 THOMAS R. COGLBY  
 CASE ALEXANDER K. C. COLAW  
 CHARLES V. COLLINS  
 JACOB B. CONRAD  
 AMY L. CORREA  
 NICHOLAS F. COSENZA  
 EDWARD M. COSTA  
 ROBERT C. COSTOLO  
 ALEXANDER J. CROPLEY  
 BRENDAN J. CROWLEY  
 CHARLES M. CUMMINGS III  
 MARK R. CURRIER  
 KATELYN M. DACIMO  
 GEOFFREY M. DALY  
 JUSTIN S. DANIEL  
 MICHAEL R. DAVIS  
 BRANDON M. DECARDENAS  
 JESSE M. DEERY  
 JOSEPH C. DELLAROSA  
 TYLER J. DEWECHTER  
 CARLOS J. DIAZCOLON  
 ERICH D. DIX  
 HOLLY N. DIX  
 PHILIP W. DODSON  
 MATTHEW D. DOEPKING  
 LOGAN B. DONAHEY  
 STEVEN W. DROSS  
 BRENDAN W. DUNN  
 JONATHAN R. EGEZEINO  
 NICOLE C. EMMONS  
 AUDREY A. ESTED  
 MATTHEW J. FAHA  
 LISA M. FANNING  
 AMANDA K. FULKNER  
 BRITTANY R. FIFER  
 JEREMY B. FISHER  
 JOHN W. FLACH  
 MAX E. FRANCO  
 JAMIE K. FROST  
 MARK A. FUNKE  
 JACOB S. GAMBLE  
 MATTHEW G. GANN  
 AMAL A. GARCIA II  
 AMANDA M. GARCIA  
 THOMAS M. GARCIA  
 LAUREN N. GAROFALO  
 KIMBERLY M. GATES  
 BRETT J. GAYMAN  
 CORTLAND A. GAZDA  
 ERIC R. GERKEN

NICHOLAS L. GIANCOLA  
 CATHLEEN A. GIGUERE  
 HAYLEY B. GIPSON  
 JONATHAN R. GIROT  
 KIMBERLY A. GLORE  
 BRETT R. GODIKSEN  
 LAUREN P. GONZALES  
 MICHAEL J. GONZALES  
 RICHARD J. GONZALEZ  
 BRIAN E. GRACEY  
 DANA W. GRADY  
 SHAUN C. GRANT  
 GLENN N. GRAY  
 GEORGE T. GREENDYK  
 JAMIE Z. GREENDYK  
 MICHAEL L. GRIFFIN  
 ADAM C. GUARNO  
 YUSEN GUO  
 PETER D. HARRINGTON  
 SETH I. HARRIS  
 JEFF D. HARTMAN  
 MARGARET A. HARWARD  
 ERIC R. HATFIELD  
 WILLIAM J. HAWN  
 JASON S. HAYNES  
 KATIE M. HECKMAN  
 LLOYD W. HEFLIN  
 NABIL J. HEMMATI  
 JEFFREY C. HENKEL  
 ORLANDO HERNANDEZ, JR  
 NICHOLAS A. HERNANDORENA  
 JOSHUA A. HERRADOR  
 NATHANIEL R. HERRING  
 AMY N. HOCKENBERRY  
 MICAH D. HOWELL  
 KENT A. HUNT  
 JAMES M. HURTT  
 SAMUEL R. INGHAM  
 DAVID J. IRVING  
 JESSICA JACOBSEN DOBRY  
 RANDI J. JIMENEZ  
 ALEX D. JOHNS  
 JANIQUE M. JONES  
 ALICEN M. JORDAN  
 EDWARD P. KALANKIEWICZ  
 THOMAS J. KANE  
 DEREK M. KELLEY  
 JONATHAN W. KELLY  
 PETER J. KELLY  
 JUSTIN R. KIMREY  
 IAN D. KING  
 MICHAEL G. KLAKRING  
 DANIEL A. KNAUSS  
 MATTHEW E. KOLB  
 DANIEL J. H. KUBASCH  
 ROBERT J. LAPOLT  
 JASON F. LASSITER  
 MITCHELL A. LATTA  
 MICHAEL A. LEATH  
 MATEUSZ J. LEMANSKI  
 CAREY B. LEWIS  
 MICHAEL B. LEWIS  
 ROBERT E. LITTS  
 LISA LIU  
 ALEXANDER R. LLOYD  
 RAY J. LOPEZ  
 CLINTON J. LOUGHNER  
 CAROLYN S. MAHONEY  
 ANDERS H. MANLEY  
 ELIZABETH J. MARSHALL  
 ALEX C. MARTFELD  
 CHRISTOPHER J. MARTIN  
 NICHOLAS H. MARTIN  
 JUAN C. MARTINEZ  
 MATTHEW M. MAYER  
 TREVOR S. MAYES  
 KIERON D. MCCARTHY  
 MYLES W. MCCARTHY

DANIEL L. MILLER  
 KENNETH L. MILTENBERGER  
 JEREMIAH W. MIMS  
 JEFFREY M. MISTRICK  
 GREGORY R. MITCHELL  
 JOSHUA H. MITCHELTREE  
 CHRISTOPHER M. MONACELLI  
 MICHELLE J. MORAVEK  
 MARGARET A. MORGAN  
 BRETT A. MORRIS  
 EVIN D. MOSES  
 ALEXANDRA C. MOSTROM  
 BRIAN C. MULDOON  
 KYLE A. MURPHY  
 SEAN P. NEWMAYER  
 ERIN A. NOLAN  
 MATTHEW T. ODOM  
 ERIK W. OREDSON  
 JUAN R. OROPEZA  
 JORDAN A. ORTIZ  
 JARROD A. OWENS  
 JOHN D. PACKARD  
 BRADLEY J. PARKER  
 JUSTIN A. PARKER  
 SUSAN E. PARRISH  
 NICHOLAS O. PETERS  
 ADAM H. PETERSEN  
 JAMES D. PHILLIPS, JR  
 DANIEL J. PIAZZA  
 WILLIAM B. PIE  
 TERRY R. PLANK  
 NICHOLAS D. POEHLER  
 RACHEL E. POST  
 CORY D. PRAY  
 TARA C. PRAY  
 REBECCA F. PRENDERGAST  
 ANDREA B. PROSSER  
 RACHEL M. QUATROCHE  
 NATHAN E. QUELLHORST  
 DEVIN W. QUINN  
 KEVIN L. RALSON  
 TODD A. RAY  
 REBECCA A. REBAR  
 SHANNON P. RECK  
 DAVID W. REHFUSS  
 REGINALD W. W. REYNOLDS III  
 DENYS RIVAS  
 LEAH C. ROACH  
 AMANDA M. ROBINSON  
 SAMUEL RODRIGUEZ-GONZALEZ  
 CHRISTINE P. ROSELLI  
 STEVEN D. ROTH  
 RONAQUA A. RUSSELL  
 ANDREW J. RUSSO III  
 MICHAEL N. SALERNO  
 COLIN P. SCHEMBRI  
 SARAH E. SCHMID  
 DAVID M. SCHNEIDER  
 COLIN O. SCHUSTER  
 JOSHUA P. SCRITCHFIELD  
 REBEKAH A. SEIFER  
 CHRISTOPHER M. SENA  
 JESSICA L. SHAFER  
 BRIAN J. SHIELDS  
 CHRISTEN C. K. SHIH  
 IAN M. SIBBERSON  
 JULIA A. SIECZKOWSKI  
 SILVIA P. SIGLER  
 JUSTIN C. SIKORA  
 CONNOR B. SIMPSON  
 ANDREW B. SINCLAIR  
 TREVOR L. SIPEREK  
 STACY L. SMITH  
 ELRON P. SOLIS  
 DREW SONETIROT  
 PATRICK R. SPENCER  
 TIMOTHY W. SPERRY  
 STEPHEN N. SPOTTS

SEAN E. STADIG  
 DAVID J. STEELE  
 ELIZABETH M. STEVENS  
 ALEXANDER P. C. STEWART  
 SEAN P. STEWART  
 DAVE D. STILES  
 JOHN S. STOCKTON, JR  
 JUSTIN Z. STRASSFIELD  
 PRESTON T. STROBEL  
 MATTHEW K. STROBEL  
 JOSEPH N. SULLIVANSFRINGHETTI  
 SHELBY V. SUMINSKI  
 ASHLEY C. SWAGER  
 LOGAN M. SWAN  
 ELIZABETH M. TATUM  
 BRANDON M. TAYLOR  
 RACHEL E. THOMAS  
 KRISTOPHER M. THORNBURG  
 SARAH V. TROCH  
 JACOB A. TRONAAAS  
 COLLIN E. TUTTLE  
 EDWIN VALENTIN  
 LAMARCUS D. WALKER  
 KATHERINE E. WARD  
 MILO J. WARNER  
 HUNTER C. WARREN  
 ERIN K. WARWICK  
 JOANNE A. WARZYNSKI  
 PATRICK C. WEAVER  
 KATHERINE E. WEBB  
 WRYAN C. WEBB  
 ALEX R. WEBBER  
 RYAN T. WEBSTER  
 HILLARY S. WEISE  
 NATHANIEL D. WHITE  
 MATTHEW D. WHITNEY  
 BRIAN D. WILLIAMS  
 KATHRYN C. WILLIAMS  
 WILLIAM L. L. WILLIAMS  
 BENJAMIN S. WILLIAMSZ  
 DARRINA R. WILLIS  
 BRANDON J. WILSON  
 JOSHUA C. WOFFFORD  
 BOHDON M. WOWTSCHUK  
 EMILY M. YOUNG  
 NICHOLAS S. ZABLOTNY  
 TIFFANY M. ZEHNL

#### DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination pursuant to S. Res. 27 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

BRIAN EDDIE NELSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL CRIMES.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 19, 2021:

##### THE JUDICIARY

CHRISTINE P. O'HEARN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY.