United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2021 No. 213

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 9, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JULIA BROWNLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Create in us pure hearts, O God, and recreate within us this day new and steadfast spirits.

Be our judge. When we find ourselves caught up in the love of triumph, transform us. Redeem our appetite for fighting and winning. Beat the swords we wield against others into tools that, instead, carve out safe places for dialogue and collaboration.

Be our arbitrator. Disrupt our inclination to fight and win. Redeem our deep desire to conquer our adversaries and recast our spears into instruments that serve to reveal our best selves.

Be our guide. Teach us something other than conflict. Redeem our predisposition to demonize or demean the other and form in us habits of decency and civility, honor, and respect.

We surrender ourselves to this radical transformation and yield ourselves to the redemption that Your love offers us.

Restore to us the joy of Your salvation and grant within us a willing spirit that we would be sustained in our service to You in this time.

In Your sovereign name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. NORTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

DEMOCRATS CREATING NEW ECONOMY WITH RECORD JOBS

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, this month's job report gives Americans something to cheer about. Unemployment is down a full 2 percentage points under Democratic congressional and Presidential leadership since President Biden took office. The corollary to this impressive unemployment figure is the record 6 million jobs created, a record for a new President.

With the signing of the new transportation and infrastructure bill, more jobs, for example, in my own district, the District of Columbia, are on the way—$1.1 billion for roads and bridges.

Build Back Better promises even more economic dividends. Analysts say Build Back Better is the biggest cost-cutting bill for the middle class in modern American history. With costs down, job growth will be spurred.

Democrats are creating a new economy featuring record jobs for the American people.

HONORING THE PASSING OF CAROL JENKINS BARNETT

(Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the passing of Carol Jenkins Barnett.

Carol was the daughter of Publix Super Markets founder George Jenkins. She carried the mantle of generosity and philanthropy on behalf of the Jenkins family and Publix Super Market Charities, benefiting the residents of Lakeland, Polk County, the State of Florida, and beyond.

Carol had a remarkable love for her family and for the families of our community, advocating especially for children and early childhood education with her time and talent as well as her treasure.

She impacted so many people and so many communities in ways both seen and unseen. Quite simply, I have never known a more generous person than Carol Jenkins Barnett.

We will be praying for Carol's husband, Barney; their sons, Wesley and Nicholas; and their families as they mourn the loss of this exceptional woman.

Carol will be missed, but her legacy endures in the generations she has touched.

Printed on recycled paper.

ATTACKS ON ELECTIONS MUST BE STOPPED

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

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I have been to every nook and cranny of the region I represent. I have never spoken to anyone anywhere who thought elected officials should be able to use their public office for personal profit.

I have never spoken to anyone anywhere who believes that elected officials should be able to interfere in independent investigations or to punish whistleblowers.

I have never spoken to anyone anywhere in my district who thinks we should allow foreign countries to interfere in our elections.

Addressing these issues is what the Protecting Our Democracy Act is all about.

Importantly, this bill includes the Honest Ads Act, a bill that I led to increase accountability for online political ads. There are disclaimer requirements for print, broadcast, and radio ads, and our bipartisan bill would set those same requirements for online ads so that the American people can know who is paying for the ads they are seeing online and so we can keep foreign money out.

We know that foreign adversaries have attacked our elections in the past, and we have to stop it. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to pass this bill today.

HONORING VICTOR GARZA ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Victor Garza and to wish him a happy 100th birthday.

Victor Garza is a World War II veteran who is devoted to his family, his faith, and service to this country. He joined the United States Navy at the age of 22 and served in the Pacific theater during World War II.

During his service, he worked as a heavy equipment operator in the Seabee construction battalion and was stationed in Japan where he assisted with efforts to free prisoners of war.

After his service to his country, he devoted himself to his community, building homes and businesses across Victoria, Texas, and being an active member of the VFW and the CWV. He also devoted himself to his family, raising seven children with Amalia, his wife of 74 years.

Victor is a true hero and an example to all of us of what it means to be an American. I am proud to honor him today and hope he has a wonderful 100th birthday.

CREATING A STRONG ECONOMY FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, as the pandemic put pressure on the pockets of Americans, House Democrats worked to not only bolster our economy but to get people back to work.

The November jobs report shows that our economy is on the right track to doing just that. In fact, 6 million jobs have been created in the first 10 months of the Biden administration. No other administration has created more jobs in its first year. But during the Trump administration's mismanagement of the pandemic, we lost over 9 million jobs. So we still have work to do.

The recently House-passed Build Back Better Act will include specific and urgent measures to uplift working families, lower everyday costs, fight inflation, and generate millions of good-paying jobs.

House Democrats remain committed to creating a strong economy and an economy that works for all Americans.

BENEFITS OF VITAMIN D

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, as the Congress prepares to break for Christmas, it is important to review one more time what we can do to deal with the coronavirus.

While vaccines unquestionably have a role here, I am a little bit appalled at the lack of information coming from the public health establishment regarding vitamin D. Tests show that adequate levels of vitamin D can reduce the amount of COVID cases by up to 75 percent, which is good, including for people who have taken the vaccine.

Right now, Madam Speaker, experts feel you should have at least 30 nanograms per milliliter to have adequate amounts of vitamin D. Right now, 65 percent of our White population, 87 percent of our Hispanic population, and 96 percent of our Black population do not have adequate vitamin D levels.

The public health establishment has to be asked: Why is this not publicized? Why do we not give routine vitamin D tests to people coming in for their annual checkups? And why, if you show up at the hospital with COVID, are not vitamin D tests automatic?

I ask public health establishments to please familiarize themselves with the benefits of vitamin D and the role it plays.

EFFECTS OF CORONAVIRUS ON ECONOMY

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, the President has done an excellent job on trying to address our economic problems, and one of the main reasons we have economic problems is because of the coronavirus.

The President has an excellent vaccination program that the Republicans, unfortunately, are fighting. As people have experienced the pandemic, they have been less willing to go out and engage in commerce and travel and had to reduce some of their business activities. This has hurt the supply chain and hurt our economy. So the President's vaccine plan is also an economic plan.

Republicans in the Senate led an effort to cancel all the vaccination programs that the President has to protect us, to keep us healthy, and to move our economy forward. That is unfortunate. We need to support these vaccination plans, and we need to support the President in these efforts.

Inflation has been a problem. The President has released some oil from the reserve to help deal with gas prices. Gas prices are going down, and they will go down naturally.

One of the great reasons why inflation has increased is because of used car prices. You have to think about when used car prices go up, Madam Speaker, somebody is selling that used car, and they are getting more money to put in their pocket. Things are getting better.

God bless New Mexico.

HONORING NEWSCHANNEL 9 ANCHOR DAN CUMMINGS

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

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the renowned 37-year career of NewsChannel 9 anchor Dan Cummings.

For nearly four decades, Dan Cummings has been one of the most trusted names in local news and has earned a well-deserved reputation for his integrity and investigative prowess.

A native of Cayuga County, Dan Cummings grew up in central New York and got his start in journalism working at local radio stations. In 1984, Dan Cummings joined the NewsChannel 9 team and, in 2008, began anchoring the morning news. Notably, Dan was the driving force behind ''Newsmakers,'' a weekly public affairs program.

In these prominent roles, Dan Cummings has been celebrated for his ability to conduct smart, original reporting and communicate even the most difficult stories in a calm and straightforward manner.

I have known Dan Cummings for many years. I can unequivocally say he is one of the most fair and genuine news professionals and is an extremely generous man who is actively involved in multiple charities.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring Dan Cummings for an incredible

career in broadcast journalism and wishing him the best in his retirement.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

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

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss an important lifeline to so many North Carolina families, the child tax credit.

In North Carolina alone, millions of families have benefited from the child tax credit. The first monthly payment lifted 3 million children out of poverty and significantly reduced childhood hunger. No family should have to worry about whether they can afford their next meal.

The child tax credit also helps pay for childcare, helps pay for school supplies, helps when the car breaks down, and helps families living paycheck to paycheck.

Recently, I heard from a mother in North Carolina who told me that the child tax credit takes away a layer of stress that is inherent in trying to return to the workforce and financially plan for a new setting.

In just a few weeks, these monthly payments are set to expire unless Build Back Better is passed. We cannot fail the next generation. We must pass this transformative legislation in the Senate and have the President sign it.

□ 1215

BIDEN ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, incredibly, President Biden said Tuesday: ''We're making progress.'' And ''American people are paying their fair share for gas.''

However, the reality is Americans are paying 61 percent more for gas, and home heating oil costs will jump 54 percent.

The disastrous Biden agenda has put America in an energy crisis. He killed the Keystone pipeline with 11,000 jobs lost. And executive orders have paused new oil and gas leasing, costing over 1 million jobs. Annual Biden inflation is the highest in 40 years, destroying jobs.

The Democrat elite think they are better than everyone, and they believe Democrat voters and Democrat media are ignorant to accept $4.5 trillion ''costs zero dollars.''

In conclusion, God bless our troops who have successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism now is moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America.

Congratulations, Norma and John Jett and Roxanne Wilson on their new grandson born yesterday, Hunter Taylor Wilson, Jr., of West Columbia, South Carolina.

HONORING FRED ANDES

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my good friend, Fred Andes, of Chicago, on receiving J Street's highest honor, the Tzedek v'Shalom Award. This is the Justice and Peace Award.

No one is more deserving than Fred. I am honored to call him a good friend and be close with his family, including his lovely wife, Melanie.

He is empathetic, Fred is generous, and he is a leader in the community. Fred practices the ancient expression ''tikkun olam'' every day in repairing the world.

He serves as a co-chair of the U.S. International Advisory Committee for EcoPeace Middle East. He is also a lay co-chair of the Joint Israel Committee for the Reconstructing Judaism movement. And he has served as a critical member of J Street's Chicago Executive Committee.

Fred is one of those people whose actions speak louder than words. We are so honored by his presence in the community.

Congratulations to Fred, again, in receiving the Tzedek v'Shalom Award.

TRANSPARENT BIPARTISAN LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, the American people deserve a transparent and bipartisan legislative process, but that is apparently not what the Democrat majority wants.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continually manufacture crisis after crisis by waiting until deadlines are immediately upon us before addressing the issues at hand. And when we are up against a deadline, it gives the majority leverage to limit opposition and allows them to ram harmful bills through this House, claiming they are necessities.

They have done it with multiple continuing resolutions. They did it with the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Act. And now, after having already punted responsibility once on the issue, they are doing it again on raising the debt ceiling, as a default looms less than a week away.

We must stop fanning the flames of fires where the tools exist to extinguish them. Democrats legislating in this manner creates uncertainty and spooks the market, which contributes to the twin economic crisis and energy crisis, both of which this administration has done nothing to address.

For our economy to truly recover, we must ensure the government is working efficiently and effectively on behalf of the American people.

SUPPORT AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support American families. And as I do that, I am sad to say that the Texas workforce sent almost a two-page, small-type letter to Texans around the State to tell them that they could ignore the President's mandate on vaccines, as the omicron variant rises, and as hospitals are beginning to teem over with the delta variant.

Isn't that sad?

To my fellow Texans, do what is right for your family. Get your children vaccinated. Get your booster, or your first or second shot. Let us save lives.

I am saddened by government tax dollars being used to counter and distort the President's mandates and the President's desire to impact the lives of Americans.

To also impact the lives of Americans, I intend to introduce the Kimberly Vaughan storage bill. In light of what happened in Oakland County and the tragedy of a family leaving a gun—as they gave it to a child for a birthday—but leaving it accessible to that child, four precious lives are lost.

I think this is certainly bipartisan legislation to create the opportunity for you to buy a gun, but to have the message, storage is important. This bill will provide a variety of best practices and penalties for those that do not store their guns.

Support me in the Kimberly Vaughan storage bill to make sure that we do what is right for our children. Store your guns and make them safe.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DAVID PANKO

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an ordinary citizen of Patton Township in Centre County, David Panko.

For the past 22 years, David served as president of the Patton Township Business Association. In his role as president, he built lasting relationships between the association, the community, and the Patton Township Police.

In 2002, David worked to establish the Patton Township Children's Safety Fair, a community event focused on building trust between residents and their police officers, firefighters, and EMS responders in Centre County.

David will be remembered as a leader who worked to make his community a better place. He rebuilt the organization into a group full of gracious and welcoming members.

Through David's leadership, the Patton Township Business Association has

continued to advance the commercial, industrial, and civic interests for the people of Patton Township.

I have had the privilege of working closely with David and the Patton Township Business Association as they advocated on behalf of small businesses in Patton Township and the Centre County region.

I thank David for his years of leadership and service to the organization, Patton Township, and Centre County. His contributions cannot be overstated, and his legacy will be remembered for years to come.

UNDENIABLE CRISIS AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, what we are seeing at our southern border is an undeniable crisis. An unthinkable amount of fentanyl and fentanyl-related substances are coming across our border. There is enough fentanyl coming across our border to kill every American seven times over. Think about that.

This only exacerbates our existing drug problem in the United States, like the rising use of meth in the Central Valley of California.

In October, U.S. Customs and Border Protection apprehended over 160,000 illegal immigrants attempting to cross our southern border, the highest number of apprehensions for October on record.

I have always been supportive of immigration. After all, I am the son of immigrants. But we have to respect and enforce our laws. By refusing to enforce immigration laws, this administration is sending a dangerous message that our border is open for business to cartels and encourages people to put themselves in harm's way to cross our border.

FENTANYL CRISIS

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

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the unimaginable amount of dangerous fentanyl and related substances that are crossing our southern border, enough to kill every American seven times over.

Criminal drug cartels are capitalizing on the lack of security due to Biden's open-border policies. Since these large amounts of fentanyl are flooding in, the DEA issued its first public safety alert in 6 years, warning the public about fake pills laced with lethal doses of fentanyl, and we are seeing the devastating effects.

Synthetic opioids, primarily fentanyl, account for nearly two-thirds of the overdose deaths, including American teenagers. Many parents across our country, and including my home State of Oklahoma, have tragically lost their children to accidental fentanyl overdoses. No one should ever have to experience that sort of pain.

In February, we have the chance to respond. The emergency class-wide scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances is set to expire. Democrats want to enact only temporary extensions, while Republicans are fighting to make it permanent.

Madam Speaker, there are deadly consequences to the lack of security at the border. We must ensure law enforcement has the resources to protect our country and keep those drugs out of American hands.

CRISIS ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, it is no surprise to anyone here or throughout the United States that we have a serious crisis at our southern border. All anyone has to do is go visit the southern border to see the devastation, to see the death, to see the desperation, to see the drugs coming across, Madam Speaker.

Since President Biden has come into office, a record number, over 2 million illegal immigrants, have been apprehended: a 128 percent increase in apprehensions from the previous year.

And 1.7 million migrants were apprehended illegally just this year, while 400,000 illegally crossed the border and got away.

But the President and his administration halted the Trump administration's successful remain in Mexico policy, has reinstated catch-and-release, has refused to enforce title 42, and is providing incentives for illegals to come into our country through mass amnesty proposals, work visas, and driver's licenses. Okay?

This is a serious matter for every State, for my constituents, for my district. We have the highest level of overdose fatalities ever, and it is a direct result of the Biden administration policy. This needs to stop. This is a terrible situation caused by the Biden administration. I wish it would stop. We could stop it here.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF RALPH OWENS

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

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of an honorable public servant, Mr. Ralph Owens, of Lavonia, Georgia.

As a lifetime member of the Franklin County community, Ralph humbly answered the call to public service and played a critical role in the city of Lavonia's success. In 1987, Mr. Owens was first elected to the Lavonia City Council. Just two short years later, he became the mayor of Lavonia, where he dutifully served his local community for over three decades.

During his lifetime as a public official, Mayor Owens' leadership ushered in impressive industrial and economic growth to the city. From dramatically improving the city's police department, to bringing new businesses to the community, Ralph was a dedicated servant to the great people of Lavonia.

I am deeply saddened by the loss of such an accomplished individual that led with his servant's heart to truly make a positive difference in his community. Georgia's Ninth District will always remember Mayor Ralph Owens and his profound impact on the city of Lavonia and both Franklin and Hart Counties in northeast Georgia.

CONGRATULATING ELIZABETH RAFF

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to congratulate Mrs. Elizabeth Raff of Lancaster County, who was recently named Pennsylvania's Teacher of the Year for 2022.

Elizabeth teaches sixth grade at Pequea Elementary School, in the Penn Manor School District in Lancaster County, where she has taught since 2014. Penn Manor School District Superintendent, Dr. Mike Leichliter, described Elizabeth as a ''dynamic and creative teacher who is always looking to find new ways to reach her students'' and noted that ''she creates a space where students are encouraged to explore ideas in a supportive and respectful environment.''

There is no question that teachers and students have been impacted; they have had challenges presented by the COVID–19 pandemic over the last 2 years, and we thank our teachers for all they have done to make sure that our students are receiving the best education possible.

That is certainly true of Mrs. Raff, whose classroom is well-decorated and offers students access to a large library of books to pique their interest, and a raised stage to provide students the opportunity to present to their classmates.

Thank you to Mrs. Raff for all you have done to educate students in our community. We all appreciate your efforts and wish to congratulate you on being named Pennsylvania's 2022 Teacher of the Year.

□ 1230

PROTECTING OUR DEMOCRACY ACT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 838, I call up the bill

(H.R. 5314) to protect our democracy by preventing abuses of presidential power, restoring checks and balances and accountability and transparency in government, and defending elections against foreign interference, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STANSBURY). Pursuant to House Resolution 838, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–20, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117–205, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5314

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Protecting Our Democracy Act''.

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into divisions as follows:

(1) Division A—Preventing Abuses of Presidential Power.

(2) Division B—Restoring Checks and Balances, Accountability, and Transparency.

(3) Division C—Defending Elections Against Foreign Interference.

(4) Division D—Severability.

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

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.

DIVISION A—PREVENTING ABUSES OF PRESIDENTIAL POWER

TITLE I—ABUSE OF THE PARDON POWER PREVENTION

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Congressional oversight relating to certain pardons.
Sec. 103. Bribery in connection with pardons and commutations.
Sec. 104. Prohibition on presidential self-pardon.

TITLE II—ENSURING NO PRESIDENT IS ABOVE THE LAW

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Tolling of statute of limitations.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT OF THE FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC EMOLUMENTS CLAUSES OF THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Definitions.
Sec. 303. Prohibition on acceptance of foreign and domestic emoluments.
Sec. 304. Civil actions by Congress concerning foreign emoluments.
Sec. 305. Disclosures concerning foreign and domestic emoluments.
Sec. 306. Enforcement authority of the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.
Sec. 307. Jurisdiction of the Office of Special Counsel.

DIVISION B—RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Findings.
Sec. 403. Enforcement of congressional subpoenas.
Sec. 404. Compliance with congressional subpoenas.
Sec. 405. Rule of construction.

TITLE V—REASSERTING CONGRESSIONAL POWER OF THE PURSE

Sec. 500. Short title.

Subtitle A—Strengthening Congressional Control and Review To Prevent Impoundment

Sec. 501. Strengthening congressional control.
Sec. 502. Strengthening congressional review.
Sec. 503. Updated authorities for and reporting by the Comptroller General.
Sec. 504. Advance congressional notification and litigation.
Sec. 505. Penalties for failure to comply with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

Subtitle B—Strengthening Transparency and Reporting

PART 1—FUNDS MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING TO THE CONGRESS

Sec. 511. Expired balance reporting in the President's budget.
Sec. 512. Cancelled balance reporting in the President's budget.
Sec. 513. Lapse in appropriations—Reporting in the President's budget.
Sec. 514. Transfer and other repurposing authority reporting in the President's budget.
Sec. 515. Authorizing cancellations in indefinite accounts by appropriation.

PART 2—EMPOWERING CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW THROUGH NONPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL AGENCIES AND TRANSPARENCY INITIATIVES

Sec. 521. Requirement to respond to requests for information from the Comptroller General for budget and appropriations law decisions.
Sec. 522. Reporting requirements for Antideficiency Act violations.
Sec. 523. Department of Justice reporting to Congress for Antideficiency Act violations.
Sec. 524. Publication of budget or appropriations law opinions of the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel.

Subtitle C—Strengthening Congressional Role in and Oversight of Emergency Declarations and Designations

Sec. 531. Improving checks and balances on the use of the National Emergencies Act.
Sec. 532. National Emergencies Act declaration spending reporting in the President's budget.
Sec. 533. Disclosure to Congress of presidential emergency action documents.
Sec. 534. Congressional Designations.

TITLE VI—SECURITY FROM POLITICAL INTERFERENCE IN JUSTICE

Sec. 601. Short title.
Sec. 602. Definitions.
Sec. 603. Communications logs.
Sec. 604. Rule of construction.

TITLE VII—PROTECTING INSPECTOR GENERAL INDEPENDENCE

Subtitle A—Requiring Cause for Removal

Sec. 701. Short title.
Sec. 702. Amendment.
Sec. 703. Removal or transfer requirements.

Subtitle B—Inspectors General of Intelligence Community

Sec. 711. Independence of Inspectors General of the Intelligence Community.
Sec. 712. Authority of Inspectors General of the Intelligence Community to determine matters of urgent concern.
Sec. 713. Conforming amendments and coordination with other provisions of law.

Subtitle C—Congressional Notification

Sec. 721. Short title.
Sec. 722. Change in status of Inspector General offices.
Sec. 723. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General.

TITLE VIII—PROTECTING WHISTLEBLOWERS

Subtitle A—Whistleblower Protection Improvement

Sec. 801. Short title.
Sec. 802. Additional whistleblower protections.
Sec. 803. Enhancement of whistleblower protections.
Sec. 804. Classifying certain furloughs as adverse personnel actions.
Sec. 805. Codification of protections for disclosures of censorship related to research, analysis, or technical information.
Sec. 806. Title 5 technical and conforming amendments.

Subtitle B—Whistleblowers of the Intelligence Community

Sec. 811. Limitation on sharing of intelligence community whistleblower complaints with persons named in such complaints.
Sec. 812. Disclosures to Congress.
Sec. 813. Prohibition against disclosure of whistleblower identity as reprisal against whistleblower disclosure by employees and contractors in intelligence community.

TITLE IX—ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ACTING OFFICIALS

Sec. 901. Short title.
Sec. 902. Clarification of Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998.

TITLE X—STRENGTHENING HATCH ACT ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

Sec. 1001. Short title.
Sec. 1002. Strengthening Hatch Act enforcement and penalties against political appointees.

TITLE XI—PROMOTING EFFICIENT PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS

Sec. 1101. Short title.
Sec. 1102. Ascertainment of successful candidates in general elections for purposes of presidential transition.

TITLE XII—PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 1201. Presidential and Vice Presidential tax transparency.

DIVISION C—DEFENDING ELECTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN INTERFERENCE

TITLE XIII—REPORTING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

Sec. 1301. Federal campaign reporting of foreign contacts.
Sec. 1302. Federal campaign foreign contact reporting compliance system.
Sec. 1303. Criminal penalties.
Sec. 1304. Report to congressional intelligence committees.
Sec. 1305. Rule of construction.

TITLE XIV—ELIMINATING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

Sec. 1401. Clarification of application of foreign money ban.
Sec. 1402. Requiring acknowledgment of foreign money ban by political committees.
Sec. 1403. Prohibition on contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connections with ballot initiatives and referenda.

DIVISION D—SEVERABILITY

TITLE XV—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 1501. Severability.

DIVISION A—PREVENTING ABUSES OF PRESIDENTIAL POWER

TITLE I—ABUSE OF THE PARDON POWER PREVENTION

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Abuse of the Pardon Power Prevention Act''.

SEC. 102. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT RELATING TO CERTAIN PARDONS.

(a) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION.—In the event that the President grants an individual a pardon for a covered offense, not later than 30 days after the date of such pardon the Attorney General shall submit to the chairmen and ranking minority members of the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) all materials obtained or produced by the prosecution team, including the Attorney General and any United States Attorney, and all materials obtained or prepared by any investigative agency of the United States government, relating to the offense for which the individual was so pardoned; and

(2) all materials obtained or produced by the Department of Justice in relation to the pardon.

(b) TREATMENT OF INFORMATION.—Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure may not be construed to prohibit the disclosure of information required by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(B) if an investigation relates to intelligence or counterintelligence matters, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The term ''covered offense'' means—

(A) an offense against the United States that arises from an investigation in which the President, or a relative of the President, is a target or subject;

(B) an offense under section 192 of title 2, United States Code; or

(C) an offense under section 1001, 1505, 1512, or 1621 of title 18, United States Code, provided that the offense occurred in relation to a Congressional proceeding or investigation.

(3) The term ''pardon'' includes a commutation of sentence.

(4) The term ''relative'' has the meaning given that term in section 3110(a) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 103. BRIBERY IN CONNECTION WITH PARDONS AND COMMUTATIONS.

Section 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', including the President and the Vice President of the United States,'' after ''or an officer or employee or person''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including any pardon, commutation, or reprieve, or an offer of any such pardon, commutation, or reprieve''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting ''(including, for purposes of this paragraph, any pardon, commutation, or reprieve, or an offer of any such pardon, commutation, or reprieve)'' after ''corruptly gives, offers, or promises anything of value''.

SEC. 104. PROHIBITION ON PRESIDENTIAL SELF-PARDON.

The President's grant of a pardon to himself or herself is void and of no effect, and shall not deprive the courts of jurisdiction, or operate to confer on the President any legal immunity from investigation or prosecution.

TITLE II—ENSURING NO PRESIDENT IS ABOVE THE LAW

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''No President is Above the Law Act''.

SEC. 202. TOLLING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

(a) OFFENSES COMMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT DURING OR PRIOR TO TENURE IN OFFICE.—Section 3282 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) OFFENSES COMMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT DURING OR PRIOR TO TENURE IN OFFICE.—In the case of any person serving as President or Vice President of the United States, the duration of that person's tenure in office shall not be considered for purposes of any statute of limitations applicable to any Federal criminal offense committed by that person (including any offenses committed during any period of time preceding such tenure in office).''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any offense committed before the date of the enactment of this section, if the statute of limitations applicable to that offense had not run as of such date.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preclude the indictment or prosecution of a President or Vice President, during that President or Vice President's tenure in office, for violations of the criminal laws of the United States.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT OF THE FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC EMOLUMENTS CLAUSES OF THE CONSTITUTION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Foreign and Domestic Emoluments Enforcement Act''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) The term ''emolument'' means any profit, gain, or advantage that is received directly or indirectly from any government of a foreign country, the Federal government, or any State or local government, or from any instrumentality thereof, including payments arising from commercial transactions at fair market value.

(2) The term ''person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States'' includes the President of the United States and the Vice-President of the United States.

(3) The term ''government of a foreign country'' has the meaning given such term in section 1(e) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (22 U.S.C. 611(e)).

SEC. 303. PROHIBITION ON ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC EMOLUMENTS.

(a) FOREIGN.—Except as otherwise provided in section 7342 of title 5, United States Code, it shall be unlawful for any person holding an office of profit or trust under the United States to accept from a government of a foreign country, without first obtaining the consent of Congress, any present or emolument, or any office or title. The prohibition under this subsection applies without regard to whether the present, emolument, office, or title is—

(1) provided directly or indirectly by that government of a foreign country; or

(2) provided to that person or to any private business interest of that person.

(b) DOMESTIC.—It shall be unlawful for the President to accept from the United States, or any of them, any emolument other than the compensation for his or her services as President provided for by Federal law. The prohibition under this subsection applies without regard to whether the emolument is provided directly or indirectly, and without regard to whether the emolument is provided to the President or to any private business interest of the President.

SEC. 304. CIVIL ACTIONS BY CONGRESS CONCERNING FOREIGN EMOLUMENTS.

(a) CAUSE OF ACTION.—The House of Representatives or the Senate may bring a civil action against any person for a violation of subsection (a) of section 303.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—In any civil action described in subsection (a), the following rules shall apply:

(1) The action shall be filed before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(2) The action shall be heard by a three-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code. It shall be the duty of such court to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any such action. Such action shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal within 10 days, and the filing of a jurisdictional statement within 30 days, of the entry of the final decision.

(3) It shall be the duty of the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any such action and appeal.

(c) REMEDY.—If the court determines that a violation of subsection (a) of section 303 has occurred, the court shall issue an order enjoining the course of conduct found to constitute the violation, and such of the following as are appropriate:

(1) The disgorgement of the value of any foreign present or emolument.

(2) The surrender of the physical present or emolument to the Department of State, which shall, if practicable, dispose of the present or emolument and deposit the proceeds into the United States Treasury.

(3) The renunciation of any office or title accepted in violation of such subsection.

(4) A prohibition on the use or holding of such an office or title.

(5) Such other relief as the court determines appropriate.

(d) USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS PROHIBITED.—No appropriated funds, funds provided from any accounts in the United States Treasury, funds derived from the collection of fees, or any other Government funds shall be used to pay any disgorgement imposed by the court pursuant to this section.

SEC. 305. DISCLOSURES CONCERNING FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC EMOLUMENTS.

(a) DISCLOSURES.—Section 102(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) Any present, emolument, office, or title received from a government of a foreign country, including the source, date, type, and amount or value of each present or emolument accepted on or before the date of filing during the preceding calendar year.

''(10) Each business interest that is reasonably expected to result in the receipt of any present or emolument from a government of a foreign country during the current calendar year.

''(11) In addition, the President shall report—

''(A) any emolument received from the United States, or any of them, other than the compensation for his or her services as President provided for by Federal law; and

''(B) any business interest that is reasonably expected to result in the receipt of any emolument from the United States, or any of them.''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendments made by this section shall be construed to affect the prohibition against the acceptance of presents and emoluments under section 303.

SEC. 306. ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 402(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) The Director'' and inserting ''(a)(1) The Director''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Director shall provide overall direction of executive branch policies related to compliance with the Foreign and Domestic Emoluments Enforcement Act and the amendments made by such Act and shall have the authority to—

''(A) issue administrative fines to individuals for violations;

''(B) order individuals to take corrective action, including disgorgement, divestiture, and recusal, as the Director deems necessary; and

''(C) bring civil actions to enforce such fines and orders.''.

(b) SPECIFIC AUTHORITIES.—Section 402(b) of such Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (14);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(16) developing and promulgating rules and regulations to ensure compliance with the Foreign and Domestic Emoluments Enforcement Act and the amendments made by such Act, including establishing—

''(A) requirements for reporting and disclosure;

''(B) a schedule of administrative fines that may be imposed by the Director for violations; and

''(C) a process for referral of matters to the Office of Special Counsel for investigation in compliance with section 1216(d) of title 5, United States Code.''.

SEC. 307. JURISDICTION OF THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.

Section 1216 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (5) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) any violation of section 303 of the Foreign and Domestic Emoluments Enforcement Act or of the amendments made by section 305 of such Act.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) If the Director of the Office of Government Ethics refers a matter for investigation pursuant to section 402 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, or if the Special Counsel receives a credible complaint of a violation referred to in subsection (a)(6), the Special Counsel shall complete an investigation not later than 120 days thereafter. If the Special Counsel investigates any violation pursuant to subsection (a)(6), the Special Counsel shall report not later than 7 days after the completion of such investigation to the Director of the Office of Government Ethics and to Congress on the results of such investigation.''.

DIVISION B—RESTORING CHECKS AND BALANCES, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act''.

SEC. 402. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) As the Supreme Court has repeatedly affirmed, including in its July 9, 2020 holding in Trump v. Mazars, Congress's ''power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function''. Congress's power to obtain information, including through the issuance of subpoenas and the enforcement of such subpoenas, is ''broad and indispensable''.

(2) Congress ''suffers a concrete and particularized injury when denied the opportunity to obtain information necessary'' to the exercise of its constitutional functions, as the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit correctly recognized in its August 7, 2020 en banc decision in Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. House of Representatives v. McGahn.

(3) Accordingly, the Constitution secures to each House of Congress an inherent right to enforce its subpoenas in court. Explicit statutory authorization is not required to secure such a right of action, and the contrary holding by a divided panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in McGahn, entered on August 31, 2020, was in error.

SEC. 403. ENFORCEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1365 the following:

''§ 1365a. Congressional actions against subpoena recipients

''(a) CAUSE OF ACTION.—The United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, or a committee or subcommittee thereof, may bring a civil action against the recipient of a subpoena issued by a congressional committee or subcommittee to enforce compliance with the subpoena.

''(b) SPECIAL RULES.—In any civil action described in subsection (a), the following rules shall apply:

''(1) The action may be filed in a United States district court of competent jurisdiction.

''(2) Notwithstanding section 1657(a), it shall be the duty of every court of the United States to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any such action and appeal. Upon a showing by the plaintiff of undue delay, other irreparable harm, or good cause, a court to which an appeal of the action may be taken shall issue any necessary and appropriate writs and orders to ensure compliance with this paragraph.

''(3) If a three-judge court is expressly requested by the plaintiff in the initial pleading, the action shall be heard by a three-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284, and shall be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal within 10 days, and the filing of a jurisdictional statement within 30 days, of the entry of the final decision.

''(4) The initial pleading must be accompanied by certification that the party bringing the action has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the recipient of the subpoena to secure compliance with the subpoena without court action.

''(c) PENALTIES.—

''(1) CASES INVOLVING GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The court may impose monetary penalties directly against each head of a Government agency and the head of each component thereof held to have knowingly failed to comply with any part of a congressional subpoena, unless—

''(i) the President instructed the official not to comply; and

''(ii) the President, or the head of the agency or component thereof, submits to the court a letter confirming such instruction and the basis for such instruction.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON USE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS.—No appropriated funds, funds provided from any accounts in the Treasury, funds derived from the collection of fees, or other Government funds shall be used to pay any monetary penalty imposed by the court pursuant to this paragraph.

''(2) LEGAL FEES.—In addition to any other penalties or sanctions, the court shall require that any defendant, other than a Government agency, held to have willfully failed to comply with any part of a congressional subpoena, pay a penalty in an amount equal to that party's legal fees, including attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and other costs. If such defendant is an officer or employee of a Government agency, such fees may be paid from funds appropriated to pay the salary of the defendant.

''(d) WAIVER.—Any ground for noncompliance asserted by the recipient of a congressional subpoena shall be deemed to have been waived as to any particular information withheld from production if the court finds that the recipient failed in a timely manner to comply with the applicable requirements of section 105(b) of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to such information.

''(e) RULES OF PROCEDURE.—The Supreme Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States shall prescribe rules of procedure to ensure the expeditious treatment of actions described in subsection (a). Such rules shall be prescribed and submitted to the Congress pursuant to sections 2072, 2073, and 2074. This shall include procedures for expeditiously considering any assertion of constitutional or Federal statutory privilege made in connection with testimony by any recipient of a subpoena from a congressional committee or subcommittee. The Supreme Court shall transmit such rules to Congress within 6 months after the effective date of this section and then pursuant to section 2074 thereafter.

''(f) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'Government agency' means any office or entity described in section 105 and 106 of title 3, an executive department listed in section 101 of title 5, an independent establishment, commission, board, bureau, division, or office in the executive branch, or other agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government, including wholly or partly owned Government corporations.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1365 the following:

''1365a. Congressional actions against subpoena recipients.''.

SEC. 404. COMPLIANCE WITH CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title II of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 191 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 105. RESPONSE TO CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS.

''(a) SUBPOENA BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.—Any recipient of any subpoena from

a congressional committee or subcommittee shall appear and testify, produce, or otherwise disclose information in a manner consistent with the subpoena and this section.

''(b) FAILURE TO PRODUCE INFORMATION.—

''(1) GROUNDS FOR WITHHOLDING INFORMATION.—Unless required by the Constitution or by Federal statute, no claim of privilege or protection from disclosure shall be a ground for withholding information responsive to the subpoena or required by this section.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF INFORMATION WITHHELD.—In the case of information that is withheld, in whole or in part, by the subpoena recipient, the subpoena recipient shall, without delay provide a log containing the following:

''(A) An express assertion and description of the ground asserted for withholding the information.

''(B) The type of information.

''(C) The general subject matter.

''(D) The date, author, and addressee.

''(E) The relationship of the author and addressee to each other.

''(F) The custodian of the information.

''(G) Any other descriptive information that may be produced or disclosed regarding the information that will enable the congressional committee or subcommittee issuing the subpoena to assess the ground asserted for withholding the information.

''(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section the term 'information' includes any books, papers, documents, data, or other objects requested in a subpoena issued by a congressional committee or subcommittee.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 7 of title II of the Revised Statutes of the United States is amended by adding at the end the following:

''105. Response to congressional subpoenas.''.

SEC. 405. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title may be interpreted to limit or constrain Congress' inherent authority or foreclose any other means for enforcing compliance with congressional subpoenas, nor may anything in this title be interpreted to establish or recognize any ground for noncompliance with a congressional subpoena.

TITLE V—REASSERTING CONGRESSIONAL POWER OF THE PURSE

SEC. 500. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Congressional Power of the Purse Act''.

Subtitle A—Strengthening Congressional Control and Review To Prevent Impoundment

SEC. 501. STRENGTHENING CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PRUDENT OBLIGATION OF BUDGET AUTHORITY AND SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPIRING BUDGET AUTHORITY

''SEC. 1018. (a) SPECIAL MESSAGE REQUIREMENT.—With respect to budget authority proposed to be rescinded or that is set to be reserved or proposed to be deferred in a special message transmitted under section 1012 or 1013, such budget authority—

''(1) shall be made available for obligation in sufficient time to be prudently obligated as required under section 1012(b) or 1013; and

''(2) may not be deferred or otherwise withheld from obligation during the 90-day period before the expiration of the period of availability of such budget authority, including, if applicable, the 90-day period before the expiration of an initial period of availability for which such budget authority was provided.

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENT.—With respect to an apportionment of an appropriation (as that term is defined in section 1511 of title 31, United States Code) made pursuant to section 1512 of such title, an appropriation shall be apportioned—

''(1) to make available all amounts for obligation in sufficient time to be prudently obligated; and

''(2) to make available all amounts for obligation, without precondition (including footnotes) that shall be met prior to obligation, not later than 90 days before the expiration of the period of availability of such appropriation, including, if applicable, 90 days before the expiration of an initial period of availability for which such appropriation was provided.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 set forth in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1017 the following:

''1018. Prudent obligation of budget authority and specific requirements for expiring budget authority.''.

SEC. 502. STRENGTHENING CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.), as amended by section 501(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''REPORTING

''SEC. 1019. (a) APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Office of Management and Budget shall complete implementation of an automated system to post each document apportioning an appropriation, pursuant to section 1513(b) of title 31, United States Code, including any associated footnotes, in a format that qualifies each such document as an Open Government Data Asset (as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code), not later than 2 business days after the date of approval of such apportionment, and shall place on such website each document apportioning an appropriation, pursuant to such section 1513(b), including any associated footnotes, already approved for the fiscal year, and shall report the date of completion of such requirements to the Committees on the Budget and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

''(2) EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.—Each document apportioning an appropriation posted on a publicly accessible website under paragraph (1) shall also include a written explanation by the official approving each such apportionment (pursuant to section 1513(b) of title 31, United States Code) of the rationale for the apportionment schedule and for any footnotes for apportioned amounts.

''(3) SPECIAL PROCESS FOR TRANSMITTING CLASSIFIED DOCUMENTATION TO THE CONGRESS.—The Office of Management and Budget or the applicable department or agency shall make available classified documentation referenced in any apportionment at the request of the chair or ranking member of any appropriate congressional committee or subcommittee.

''(4) DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY REPORT.—Each department or agency shall notify the Committees on the Budget and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and any other appropriate congressional committees if—

''(A) an apportionment is not made in the required time period provided in section 1513(b) of title 31, United States Code;

''(B) an approved apportionment received by the department or agency conditions the availability of an appropriation on further action; or

''(C) an approved apportionment received by the department or agency may hinder the prudent obligation of such appropriation or the execution of a program, project, or activity by such department or agency;

and such notification shall contain information identifying the bureau, account name, appropriation name, and Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account.

''(b) APPROVING OFFICIALS.—

''(1) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this section, any delegation of apportionment authority pursuant to section 1513(b) of title 31, United States Code that is in effect as of such date shall be submitted for publication in the Federal Register. Any delegation of such apportionment authority after the date of enactment of this section shall, on the date of such delegation, be submitted for publication in the Federal Register. The Office of Management and Budget shall publish such delegations in a format that qualifies such publications as an Open Government Data Asset (as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code) on a public internet website, which shall be continuously updated with the position of each Federal officer or employee to whom apportionment authority has been delegated.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 days after any change in the position of the approving official with respect to such delegated apportionment authority for any account is made, the Office shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other appropriate congressional committee explaining why such change was made.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 set forth in section 1(b) of such Act, as amended by section 501(b), is further amended by adding after the item relating to section 1018 the following:

''1019. Reporting.''.

SEC. 503. UPDATED AUTHORITIES FOR AND REPORTING BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

(a) Section 1015 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 686) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter following paragraph (2), by striking the last sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall review compliance with this part and shall submit to the Committees on the Budget, Appropriations, and Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committees on the Budget, Appropriations, and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and any other appropriate congressional committee of the House of Representatives and Senate a report, and any relevant information related to the report, on any noncompliance with this part.

''(2) INFORMATION, DOCUMENTATION, AND VIEWS.—The President or the head of the relevant department or agency of the United States shall provide information, documentation, and views to the Comptroller General, as is determined by the Comptroller General to be necessary to determine such compliance, not later than 20 days after the date on which the request from the Comptroller General is received, or if the Comptroller General determines that a shorter or longer period is appropriate based on the specific circumstances, within such shorter or longer period.

''(3) ACCESS.—To carry out the responsibilities of this part, the Comptroller General shall also have access to interview the officers, employees, contractors, and other

agents and representatives of a department, agency, or office of the United States at any reasonable time as the Comptroller General may request.''.

(b) Section 1001 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking the ''or'' at the end of the paragraph;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) affecting or limiting in any way the authorities provided to the Comptroller General under chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code.''.

SEC. 504. ADVANCE CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION AND LITIGATION.

Section 1016 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 687) is amended to read as follows:

''SUITS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

''SEC. 1016. If, under this chapter, budget authority is required to be made available for obligation and such budget authority is not made available for obligation or information, documentation, views, or access are required to be produced and such information, documentation, views, or access are not produced, the Comptroller General is expressly empowered, through attorneys of the Comptroller General's own selection, to bring a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to require such budget authority to be made available for obligation or such information, documentation, views, or access to be produced, and such court is expressly empowered to enter in such civil action, against any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States, any decree, judgment, or order which may be necessary or appropriate to make such budget authority available for obligation or compel production of such information, documentation, views, or access. No civil action shall be brought by the Comptroller General to require budget authority be made available under this section until the expiration of 15 calendar days following the date on which an explanatory statement by the Comptroller General of the circumstances giving rise to the action contemplated is filed with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, except that expiration of such period shall not be required if the Comptroller General finds (and incorporates the finding in the explanatory statement filed) that the delay would be contrary to the public interest.''.

SEC. 505. PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 681 et seq.), as amended by section 502(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY

''SEC. 1020. (a) ADMINISTRATIVE DISCIPLINE.—An officer or employee of the Executive Branch of the United States Government violating this part shall be subject to appropriate administrative discipline including, when circumstances warrant, suspension from duty without pay or removal from office.

''(b) REPORTING VIOLATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a violation of section 1001, 1012, 1013, or 1018 of this part, or in the case that the Comptroller General issues a legal decision concluding that a department, agency, or office of the United States violated this part, the President or the head of the relevant department or agency as the case may be, shall report immediately to Congress all relevant facts and a statement of actions taken. A copy of each report shall also be transmitted to the Comptroller General and the relevant inspector general on the same date the report is transmitted to the Congress.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Any such report shall include a summary of the facts pertaining to the violation, the title and Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol of the appropriation or fund account, the amount involved for each violation, the date on which the violation occurred, the position of any individuals responsible for the violation, a statement of the administrative discipline imposed and any further action taken with respect to any officer or employee involved in the violation, a statement of any additional action taken to prevent recurrence of the same type of violation, and any written response by any officer or employee identified by position as involved in the violation. In the case that the Comptroller General issues a legal decision concluding that a department, agency, or office of the United States violated this part and the relevant department, agency, or office does not agree that a violation has occurred, the report provided to Congress, the Comptroller General, and relevant inspector general will explain its position.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 set forth in section 1(b) of such Act, as amended by section 502(b), is further amended by adding after the item relating to section 1019 the following:

''1020. Penalties for failure to comply.''.

Subtitle B—Strengthening Transparency and Reporting

PART 1—FUNDS MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 511. EXPIRED BALANCE REPORTING IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(40) for the budgets for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027, a report on—

''(A) unobligated expired balances as of the beginning of the current fiscal year and the beginning of each of the preceding 2 fiscal years by agency and the applicable Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account; and

''(B) an explanation of unobligated expired balances in any Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account that exceed the lesser of 5 percent of total appropriations made available for that account or $100,000,000.''.

SEC. 512. CANCELLED BALANCE REPORTING IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by section 511, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(41) for the budgets for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027, a report on—

''(A) cancelled balances (pursuant to section 1552(a)) for the preceding 3 fiscal years by agency and Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account;

''(B) an explanation of cancelled balances in any Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account that exceed the lesser of 5 percent of total appropriations made available for that account or $100,000,000; and

''(C) a tabulation, by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account and appropriation, of all balances of appropriations available for an indefinite period in an appropriation account available for an indefinite period that do not meet the criteria for closure under section 1555, but for which either—

''(i) the head of the agency concerned or the President has determined that the purposes for which the appropriation was made have been carried out; or

''(ii) no disbursement has been made against the appropriation—

''(I) in the prior year and the preceding fiscal year; or

''(II) in the prior year and which the budget estimates zero disbursements in the current year.''.

SEC. 513. LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS—REPORTING IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by section 512, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(42) a report on—

''(A) any obligation or expenditure made by a department or agency affected in whole or in part by any lapse in appropriations of 5 consecutive days or more during the preceding fiscal year for which amounts were not available; and

''(B) with respect to any such obligation or expenditure—

''(i) the amount so obligated or expended;

''(ii) the account affected;

''(iii) an explanation of the Antideficiency Act exception or other legal authority that permitted the department or agency, as the case may be, to incur such obligation or expenditure; and

''(iv) an explanation of any change in the application of any Antideficiency Act exception for a program, project, or activity from any explanations previously reported on pursuant to this paragraph.''.

SEC. 514. TRANSFER AND OTHER REPURPOSING AUTHORITY REPORTING IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by section 513, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(43) for the budget for fiscal year 2023, a report on—

''(A) any transfer authority or other authority to repurpose appropriations provided in a law other than an appropriation act; and

''(B) with respect to any such authority, the citation to the statute, the list of departments or agencies covered, an explanation of when such authority may be used, and an explanation on any use of such authority in the preceding 3 fiscal years.''.

SEC. 515. AUTHORIZING CANCELLATIONS IN INDEFINITE ACCOUNTS BY APPROPRIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter IV of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1555 the following:

''SEC. 1555a. CANCELLATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AVAILABLE FOR INDEFINITE PERIODS WITHIN AN ACCOUNT.

''Any remaining balance (whether obligated or unobligated) from an appropriation available for an indefinite period in an appropriation account available for an indefinite period that does not meet the requirements for closure under section 1555 shall be canceled, and thereafter shall not be available for obligation or expenditure for any purpose, if—

''(1) the head of the agency concerned or the President determines that the purposes for which the appropriation was made have been carried out; and

''(2) no disbursement has been made against the appropriation for two consecutive fiscal years.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter IV of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1555 the following:

''1555a. Cancellation of appropriations available for indefinite periods within an account.''.

PART 2—EMPOWERING CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW THROUGH NONPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL AGENCIES AND TRANSPARENCY INITIATIVES

SEC. 521. REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL FOR BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS LAW DECISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 722. REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL FOR BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS LAW DECISIONS.

''(a) If an agency receives a written request for information, documentation, or views from the Comptroller General relating to a decision or opinion on budget or appropriations law, the agency shall provide the requested information, documentation, or views not later than 20 days after receiving the written request, unless such written request specifically provides otherwise.

''(b) If an agency fails to provide the requested information, documentation, or views within the time required by this section—

''(1) the Comptroller General shall notify, in writing, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and any other appropriate congressional committee of such failure; and

''(2) the Comptroller General is hereby expressly empowered, through attorneys of the Comptroller General's own selection, to bring a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to require such information, documentation, or views to be produced, and such court is expressly empowered to enter in such civil action, against any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States, any decree, judgment, or order which may be necessary or appropriate to require such production.

''(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting or otherwise limiting the authorities provided to the Comptroller General in section 716 of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 721 the following:

''722. Requirement to respond to requests for information from the Comptroller General for budget and appropriations law decisions.''.

SEC. 522. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT VIOLATIONS.

(a) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 1341 OR 1342.—Section 1351 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''If'' and inserting ''(a) If'';

(2) by inserting ''or if the Comptroller General determines that an officer or employee of such entity violated section 1341(a) or 1342,'' before ''the head of the agency'';

(3) by striking ''the Comptroller General'' and inserting ''the Comptroller General and the Attorney General''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) Any such report shall include a statement of the provision violated, a summary of the facts pertaining to the violation, the title and Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol of the appropriation or fund account, the amount involved for each violation, the date on which the violation occurred, the position of any officer or employee responsible for the violation, a statement of the administrative discipline imposed and any further action taken with respect to any officer or employee involved in the violation, a statement of any additional action taken to prevent recurrence of the same type of violation, a statement of any determination that the violation was not knowing and willful that has been made by the entity filing the report, and any written response by any officer or employee identified by position as involved in the violation. In the case that the Comptroller General issues a legal decision concluding that section 1341(a) or 1342 was violated and the entity filing the report, does not agree that a violation has occurred, the report provided to the President, the Congress, and the Comptroller General will explain its position.''.

(b) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 1517.—Section 1517 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or if the Comptroller General determines that an officer or employee of such entity violated subsection (a),'' before ''the head of the executive agency'';

(2) by striking ''the Comptroller General'' and inserting ''the Comptroller General and the Attorney General''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) Any such report shall include a statement of the provision violated, a summary of the facts pertaining to the violation, the title and Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol of the appropriation or fund account, the amount involved for each violation, the date on which the violation occurred, the position of any officer or employee responsible for the violation, a statement of the administrative discipline imposed and any further action taken with respect to any officer or employee involved in the violation, a statement of any additional action taken to prevent recurrence of the same type of violation, a statement of any determination that the violation was not knowing and willful that has been made by the entity filing the report, and any written response by any officer or employee identified by position as involved in the violation. In the case that the Comptroller General issues a legal decision concluding that subsection (a) was violated and the entity filing the report does not agree that a violation has occurred, the report provided to the President, the Congress, and the Comptroller General will explain its position.''.

SEC. 523. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORTING TO CONGRESS FOR ANTIDEFICIENCY ACT VIOLATIONS.

(a) VIOLATIONS OF SECTIONS 1341 OR 1342.—Section 1350 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''An officer'' and inserting ''(a) An officer''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b)(1) If a report is made under section 1351 of a violation of section 1341(a) or 1342, the Attorney General shall promptly review such report and investigate to the extent necessary to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the responsible officer or employee knowingly and willfully violated such section 1341(a) or 1342, as applicable. If the Attorney General determines that there are such reasonable grounds, the Attorney General diligently shall investigate a criminal violation under this section.

''(2) The Attorney General shall submit to Congress and the Comptroller General on or before March 31 of each calendar year an annual report detailing separately for each reporting entity—

''(A) the number of reports under section 1351 transmitted to the President during the preceding calendar year;

''(B) the number of reports reviewed in accordance with paragraph (1) during the preceding calendar year;

''(C) without identification of any individual officer or employee, a description of each investigation undertaken in accordance with paragraph (1) during the preceding calendar year and an explanation of the status of any such investigation; and

''(D) without identification of any individual officer or employee, an explanation of any update to the status of any review or investigation previously reported pursuant to this subsection.''.

(b) VIOLATIONS OF SECTION 1517.—Section 1519 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''An officer'' and inserting ''(a) An officer''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b)(1) If a report is made under section 1517(b) of a violation of section 1517(a), the Attorney General shall promptly review such report and investigate to the extent necessary to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that the responsible officer or employee knowingly and willfully violated such section 1517(a). If the Attorney General determines that there are such reasonable grounds, the Attorney General diligently shall investigate a criminal violation under this section.

''(2) The Attorney General shall submit to Congress and the Comptroller General on or before March 31 of each calendar year an annual report detailing separately for each reporting entity—

''(A) the number of reports under section 1517(b) transmitted to the President during the preceding calendar year;

''(B) the number of reports reviewed in accordance with paragraph (1) during the preceding calendar year;

''(C) without identification of any individual officer or employee, a description of each investigation undertaken in accordance with paragraph (1) during the preceding calendar year and an explanation of the status of any such investigation; and

''(D) without identification of any individual officer or employee, an explanation of any update to the status of any review or investigation previously reported pursuant to this subsection.''.

SEC. 524. PUBLICATION OF BUDGET OR APPROPRIATIONS LAW OPINIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL.

(a) SCHEDULE OF PUBLICATION FOR FINAL OLC OPINIONS.—Each final opinion issued by the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice (final OLC opinion) shall be made available on its public website in a manner that is searchable, sortable, and downloadable in its entirety as soon as is practicable, but—

(1) not later than 30 days after the opinion is issued or updated if such action takes place on or after the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act for an opinion issued on or after January 20, 1993;

(3) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act for an opinion issued on or after January 20, 1981, and before or on January 19, 1993;

(4) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act for an opinion issued on or after January 20, 1969, and before or on January 19, 1981; and

(5) not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act for all other opinions.

(b) EXCEPTIONS AND LIMITATION ON PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF FINAL OLC OPINIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A final OLC opinion or part thereof may be withheld only to the extent—

(A) information contained in the opinion was—

(i) specifically authorized to be kept secret, under criteria established by an Executive order, in the interest of national defense or foreign policy;

(ii) properly classified, including all procedural and marking requirements, pursuant to such Executive order;

(iii) the Attorney General determines that the national defense or foreign policy interests protected outweigh the public's interest in access to the information; and

(iv) put through declassification review within the past two years;

(B) information contained in the opinion relates to the appointment of a specific individual not confirmed to Federal office;

(C) information contained in the opinion is specifically exempted from disclosure by statute (other than sections 552 and 552b of title 5, United States Code), if such statute—

(i) requires that the material be withheld in such a manner as to leave no discretion on the issue; or

(ii) establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of material to be withheld;

(D) information in the opinion includes trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential whose disclosure would likely cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained;

(E) the President, in his or her sole and nondelegable determination, formally and personally claims in writing that executive privilege prevents the release of the information and disclosure would cause specific identifiable harm to an interest protected by an exception or the disclosure is prohibited by law; or

(F) information in the opinion includes personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

(2) DETERMINATION TO WITHHOLD.—Any determination under this subsection to withhold information contained in a final OLC opinion shall be made by the Attorney General or a designee of the Attorney General. The determination shall be—

(A) in writing;

(B) made available to the public within the same timeframe as is required of a formal OLC opinion;

(C) sufficiently detailed as to inform the public of what kind of information is being withheld and the reason therefore; and

(D) effective only for a period of 3 years, subject to review and reissuance, with each reissuance made available to the public.

(3) FINAL OPINIONS.—For final OLC opinions for which the text is withheld in full or in substantial part, a detailed unclassified summary of the opinion shall be made available to the public, in the same timeframe as required of the final OLC opinion, that conveys the essence of the opinion, including any interpretations of a statute, the Constitution, or other legal authority. A notation shall be included in any published list of final OLC opinions regarding the extent of the withholdings.

(4) NO LIMITATION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting the availability of information under section 552 of title 5, United States Code or construed as an exemption under paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of such section.

(5) NO LIMITATION ON RELIEF.—A decision by the Attorney General to release or withhold information pursuant to this title shall not preclude any action or relief conferred by statutory or regulatory regime that empowers any person to request or demand the release of information.

(6) REASONABLY SEGREGABLE PORTIONS OF OPINIONS TO BE PUBLISHED.—Any reasonably segregable portion of an opinion shall be provided after withholding of the portions which are exempt under this section. The amount of information withheld, and the exemption under which the withholding is made, shall be indicated on the released portion of the opinion, unless including that indication would harm an interest protected by the exemption in this paragraph under which the withholding is made. If technically feasible, the amount of the information withheld, and the exemption under which the withholding is made, shall be indicated at the place in the opinion where such withholding is made.

(c) METHOD OF PUBLICATION.—The Attorney General shall publish each final OLC opinion to the extent the law permits, including by publishing the opinions on a publicly accessible website that—

(1) with respect to each opinion—

(A) contains an electronic copy of the opinion, including any transmittal letter associated with the opinion, in an open format that is platform independent and that is available to the public without restrictions;

(B) provides the public the ability to retrieve an opinion, to the extent practicable, through searches based on—

(i) the title of the opinion;

(ii) the date of publication or revision; or

(iii) the full text of the opinion;

(C) identifies the time and date when the opinion was required to be published, and when the opinion was transmitted for publication; and

(D) provides a permanent means of accessing the opinion electronically;

(2) includes a means for bulk download of all final OLC opinions or a selection of opinions retrieved using a text-based search;

(3) provides free access to the opinions, and does not charge a fee, require registration, or impose any other limitation in exchange for access to the website; and

(4) is capable of being upgraded as necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) OLC OPINION.—The term ''OLC opinion'' means views on a matter of legal interpretation communicated by the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice to any other office or agency, or person in an office or agency, in the Executive Branch, including any office in the Department of Justice, the White House, or the Executive Office of the President, and rendered in accordance with sections 511–513 of title 28, United States Code, and relating to—

(A) subtitles II, III, V, or VI of title 31, United States Code;

(B) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(C) the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974; or

(D) any appropriations Act, continuing resolution, or other provision of law providing or governing appropriations or budget authority.

(2) FINAL OLC OPINION.—The term ''final OLC opinion'' means an OLC opinion that—

(A) the Attorney General, Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel, or a Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel, has determined is final; or

(B) is cited in another Office of Legal Counsel opinion.

Subtitle C—Strengthening Congressional Role in and Oversight of Emergency Declarations and Designations

SEC. 531. IMPROVING CHECKS AND BALANCES ON THE USE OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCIES ACT.

(a) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DECLARATION AND RENEWAL OF NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.—Title II of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 201 and 202 and inserting the following:

''SEC. 201. DECLARATIONS OF NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.

''(a) AUTHORITY TO DECLARE NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.—With respect to Acts of Congress authorizing the exercise, during the period of a national emergency, of any special or extraordinary power, the President is authorized to declare such a national emergency by proclamation. Such proclamation shall immediately be transmitted to Congress and published in the Federal Register.

''(b) SPECIFICATION OF PROVISIONS OF LAW TO BE EXERCISED AND REPORTING.—No powers or authorities made available by statute for use during the period of a national emergency shall be exercised unless and until the President specifies the provisions of law under which the President proposes that the President or other officers will act in—

''(1) a proclamation declaring a national emergency under subsection (a); or

''(2) one or more Executive orders relating to the emergency published in the Federal Register and transmitted to Congress.

''(c) PROHIBITION ON SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS IF EMERGENCIES NOT APPROVED.—

''(1) SUBSEQUENT DECLARATIONS.—If a joint resolution of approval is not enacted under section 203 with respect to a national emergency before the expiration of the period described in section 202(a), or with respect to a national emergency proposed to be renewed under section 202(b), the President may not, during the remainder of the term of office of that President, declare a subsequent national emergency under subsection (a) with respect to the same circumstances.

''(2) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITIES.—If a joint resolution of approval is not enacted under section 203 with respect to a power or authority specified by the President under subsection (b) with respect to a national emergency, the President may not, during the remainder of the term of office of that President, exercise that power or authority with respect to that emergency.

''(d) EFFECT OF FUTURE LAWS.—No law enacted after the date of the enactment of the Congressional Power of the Purse Act shall supersede this title unless it does so in specific terms, referring to this title, and declaring that the new law supersedes the provisions of this title.

''SEC. 202. EFFECTIVE PERIODS OF NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.

''(a) TEMPORARY EFFECTIVE PERIODS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless previously terminated pursuant to Presidential order or Act of Congress, a declaration of a national emergency shall remain in effect for 20 session days, in the case of the Senate, and 20 legislative days, in the case of the House, from the issuance of the proclamation under section 201(a) (not counting the day on which the proclamation was issued) and shall terminate when that period expires unless there is enacted into law a joint resolution of approval under section 203 with respect to the proclamation.

''(2) EXERCISE OF POWERS AND AUTHORITIES.—Unless the declaration of national emergency has been terminated pursuant to Presidential order or Act of Congress, any emergency power or authority made available under a provision of law specified pursuant to section 201(b) may be exercised pursuant to a declaration of a national emergency for 20 session days, in the case of the Senate, and 20 legislative days, in the case of the House, from the issuance of the proclamation or Executive order (not counting the day on which such proclamation or Executive order was issued). That power or authority may not be exercised after that period expires unless there is enacted into law a joint resolution of approval under section 203 approving—

''(A) the proclamation of the national emergency or the Executive order; and

''(B) the exercise of the power or authority specified by the President in such proclamation or Executive order.

''(b) RENEWAL OF NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.—A national emergency declared by the President under section 201(a) or previously renewed under this subsection, and not already terminated pursuant to subsection (a) or (c), shall terminate on the date that is one year after the President transmitted to Congress the proclamation declaring the emergency or the enactment of a previous renewal pursuant to this subsection, unless—

''(1) the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to Congress an Executive order renewing the emergency; and

''(2) there is enacted into law a joint resolution of approval renewing the emergency pursuant to section 203 before the termination of the emergency or previous renewal of the emergency.

''(c) TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any national emergency declared by the President under section 201(a) shall terminate on the earliest of—

''(A) the date provided for in subsection (a);

''(B) the date provided for in subsection (b);

''(C) the date specified in an Act of Congress terminating the emergency; or

''(D) the date specified in a proclamation of the President terminating the emergency.

''(2) EFFECT OF TERMINATION.—Effective on the date of the termination of a national emergency under paragraph (1)—

''(A) any powers or authorities exercised by reason of the emergency shall cease to be exercised;

''(B) any amounts reprogrammed, repurposed, or transferred under any provision of law with respect to the emergency that remain unobligated on that date shall be returned and made available for the purpose for which such amounts were appropriated; and

''(C) any contracts entered into under any provision of law relating to the emergency shall be terminated.

''SEC. 203. REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF NATIONAL EMERGENCIES.

''(a) JOINT RESOLUTION OF APPROVAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'joint resolution of approval' means a joint resolution that does not have a preamble and that contains only the following provisions after its resolving clause:

''(1) A provision approving one or more—

''(A) proclamations of national emergency made under section 201(a);

''(B) Executive orders issued under section 201(b)(2); or

''(C) Executive orders issued under section 202(b).

''(2) A provision approving a list of all or a portion of the provisions of law specified by the President under section 201(b) in the proclamations or Executive orders that are the subject of the joint resolution.

''(b) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF APPROVAL.—

''(1) INTRODUCTION.—After the President transmits to Congress a proclamation declaring a national emergency under section 201(a), or an Executive order specifying emergency powers or authorities under section 201(b)(2) or renewing a national emergency under section 202(b), a joint resolution of approval may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of that House.

''(2) COMMITTEE REFERRAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, a joint resolution of approval shall be referred to the appropriate committee.

''(3) CONSIDERATION IN SENATE.—In the Senate, the following shall apply:

''(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of approval shall be referred to the appropriate committee or committees.

''(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a joint resolution of approval has been referred has not reported it at the end of 10 calendar days after its introduction, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar.

''(C) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, when a committee to which a joint resolution of approval is referred has reported the resolution, or when that committee is discharged under subparagraph (B) from further consideration of the resolution, it is at any time thereafter in order to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against the motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion to proceed shall be debatable for 4 hours evenly divided between proponents and opponents of the joint resolution of approval. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(D) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—There shall be 10 hours of consideration on a joint resolution of approval, to be divided evenly between the proponents and opponents of the joint resolution. Of that 10 hours, there shall be a total of 2 hours of debate on any debatable motions in connection with the joint resolution, to be divided evenly between the proponents and opponents of the joint resolution.

''(E) AMENDMENTS.—No amendments shall be in order with respect to a joint resolution of approval in the Senate.

''(F) MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE ON PASSAGE.—A motion to reconsider a vote on passage of a joint resolution of approval shall not be in order.

''(G) APPEALS.—Points of order and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer shall be decided without debate.

''(4) CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, the following shall apply:

''(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If any committee to which a joint resolution of approval has been referred has not reported it to the House within seven legislative days after the date of referral such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

''(B)(i) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of approval has been referred reports it to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution of approval in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution of approval. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

''(ii) MOTION.—A motion to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution of approval of an Executive order described in subsection (a)(1) or a list described in subsection (a)(2) shall not be in order prior to the enactment of a joint resolution of approval of the proclamation described in subsection (a)(1) that is the subject of such Executive order or list.

''(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution of approval shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution of approval and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution of approval to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution of approval (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution of approval shall not be in order.

''(5) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of approval of that House, that House receives from the other House a joint resolution of approval with regard to the same proclamation or Executive order, then the following procedures shall apply:

''(i) The joint resolution of approval of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(ii) With respect to a joint resolution of approval of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution of approval had been received from the other House; but

''(II) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of approval of the other House.

''(iii) Upon the failure of passage of the joint resolution of approval of the other House, the question shall immediately occur on passage of the joint resolution of approval of the receiving House.

''(B) TREATMENT OF LEGISLATION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce a joint resolution of approval under this section, the joint resolution of approval of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

''(C) APPLICATION TO REVENUE MEASURES.—The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the House of Representatives to a joint resolution of approval which is a revenue measure.

''(6) TREATMENT OF VETO MESSAGE.—Debate on a veto message in the Senate under this section shall be 1 hour evenly divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees.

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under this section shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification by Congress of statutory authority for the emergency powers of the President.

''(d) RULES OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE.—This section is enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the House in the case of joint resolutions described in this section, and supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such other rules; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"SEC. 204. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL EMERGENCIES INVOKING INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a national emergency described in subsection (b), the provisions of the National Emergencies Act, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Congressional Power of the Purse Act, shall continue to apply on and after such date of enactment.

''(b) NATIONAL EMERGENCY DESCRIBED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A national emergency described in this subsection is a national emergency pursuant to which the President proposes to exercise emergency powers or authorities made available under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), supplemented as necessary by a provision of law specified in paragraph (2).

''(2) PROVISIONS OF LAW SPECIFIED.—The provisions of law specified in this paragraph are—

''(A) the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287 et seq.);

''(B) section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)); or

''(C) any provision of law that authorizes the implementation, imposition, or enforcement of economic sanctions with respect to a foreign country.

''(c) EFFECT OF ADDITIONAL POWERS AND AUTHORITIES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a national emergency or the exercise of emergency powers and authorities pursuant to the national emergency if, in addition to the exercise of emergency powers and authorities described in subsection (b), the President proposes to exercise, pursuant to the national emergency, any emergency powers and authorities under any other provision of law.''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 401 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) REPORT ON EMERGENCIES.—The President shall transmit to Congress, with any proclamation declaring a national emergency under section 201(a) or any Executive order specifying emergency powers or authorities under section 201(b)(2) or renewing a national emergency under section 202(b), a report, in writing, that includes the following:

''(1) A description of the circumstances necessitating the declaration of a national emergency, the renewal of such an emergency, or the use of a new emergency authority specified in the Executive order, as the case may be.

''(2) The estimated duration of the national emergency, or a statement that the duration of the national emergency cannot reasonably be estimated at the time of transmission of the report.

''(3) A summary of the actions the President or other officers intend to take, including any reprogramming or transfer of funds and any contracts anticipated to be entered into, and the statutory authorities the President and such officers expect to rely on in addressing the national emergency.

''(4) In the case of a renewal of a national emergency, a summary of the actions the President or other officers have taken in the preceding one-year period, including any reprogramming or transfer of funds, to address the emergency.

''(e) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—The President shall provide to Congress such other information as Congress may request in connection with any national emergency in effect under title II.

''(f) PERIODIC REPORTS ON STATUS OF EMERGENCIES.—If the President declares a national emergency under section 201(a), the President shall, not less frequently than every 3 months for the duration of the emergency, report to Congress on the status of the emergency and the actions the President or other officers have taken and authorities the President and such officers have relied on in addressing the emergency.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NATIONAL EMERGENCIES ACT.—Title III of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1631) is repealed.

(2) INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT.—Section 207 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1706) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) In this section, the term 'National Emergencies Act' means the National Emergencies Act, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Congressional Power of the Purse Act.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect upon enactment and apply with respect to national emergencies declared under section 201 of the National Emergencies Act on or after that date.

(2) APPLICABILITY TO RENEWALS OF EXISTING EMERGENCIES.—When a national emergency declared under section 201 of the National Emergencies Act before the date of the enactment of the Congressional Power of the Purse Act would expire or be renewed under section 202(d) of that Act (as in effect on the day before such date of enactment), that national emergency shall be subject to the requirements for renewal under section 202(b) of that Act, as amended by subsection (a).

SEC. 532. NATIONAL EMERGENCIES ACT DECLARATION SPENDING REPORTING IN THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.

Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by section 514, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(44)(A) a report on the proposed, planned, and actual obligations and expenditures of funds (for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and the fiscal years for which the budget is submitted) attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities made available by statute for each national emergency declared by the President, currently active or in effect during the applicable fiscal years.

''(B) Obligations and expenditures contained in the report under subparagraph (A) shall be organized by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol or fund account and by program, project, and activity, and include—

''(i) a description of each such program, project, and activity;

''(ii) the authorities under which such funding actions are taken; and

''(iii) the purpose and progress of such obligations and expenditures toward addressing the applicable national emergency.

''(C) Such report shall include, with respect to any transfer, reprogramming, or repurposing of funds to address the applicable national emergency—

''(i) the amount of such transfer, reprogramming, or repurposing;

''(ii) the authority authorizing each such transfer, reprogramming, or repurposing; and

''(iii) a description of programs, projects, and activities affected by such transfer, reprogramming, or repurposing, including by a reduction in funding.''.

SEC. 533. DISCLOSURE TO CONGRESS OF PRESIDENTIAL EMERGENCY ACTION DOCUMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the conclusion of the process for approval, adoption, or revision of any presidential emergency action document, the President shall submit that document to the appropriate congressional committees.

(b) DOCUMENTS IN EXISTENCE BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees all presidential emergency action documents in existence before such date of enactment.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'', with respect to a presidential emergency action document submitted under subsection (a) or (b), means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Reform, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(C) any other committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over the subject matter addressed in the presidential emergency action document.

(2) PRESIDENTIAL EMERGENCY ACTION DOCUMENT.—The term ''presidential emergency action document'' refers to—

(A) each of the approximately 56 documents described as presidential emergency action documents in the budget justification materials for the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice submitted to Congress in support of the budget of the President for fiscal year 2018; and

(B) any other pre-coordinated legal document in existence before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, that—

(i) is designated as a presidential emergency action document; or

(ii) is designed to implement a presidential decision or transmit a presidential request when an emergency disrupts normal governmental or legislative processes.

SEC. 534. CONGRESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DESIGNATION.—Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the subparagraph heading, by striking ''; OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM''; and

(2) by striking ''that—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: ''that the Congress designates as emergency requirements in statute, the adjustment shall be the total of such appropriations in discretionary accounts designated as emergency requirements.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the later of October 1, 2021 or the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—SECURITY FROM POLITICAL INTERFERENCE IN JUSTICE

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Security from Political Interference in Justice Act of 2020''.

SEC. 602. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COMMUNICATIONS LOG.—The term ''communications log'' means the log required to be maintained under section 603(a).

(2) COVERED COMMUNICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''covered communication'' means any communication relating to any contemplated or ongoing investigation or litigation conducted by the Department of Justice in any civil or criminal matter (regardless of whether a civil action or criminal indictment or information has been filed); and

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term does not include a communication that is any of the following:

(i) A communication that involves contact between the President, the Vice President, the Counsel to the President, or the Principal Deputy Counsel to the President, and the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or the Associate Attorney General, except to the extent that the communication concerns a contemplated or ongoing investigation or litigation in which a target or subject is one of the following:

(I) The President, the Vice President, or a member of the immediate family of the President or Vice President.

(II) Any individual working in the Executive Office of the President who is compensated at a rate of pay at or above level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code.

(III) The current or former chair or treasurer of any national campaign committee that sought the election or seeks the reelection of the President, or any officer of such a committee exercising authority at the national level, during the tenure in office of the President.

(ii) A communication that involves contact between an officer or employee of the Department of Justice and an officer or employee of the Executive Office of the President on a particular matter, if any of the President, the Vice President, the Counsel to the President, or the Principal Deputy Counsel to the President, and if any of the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or the Associate Attorney General have designated a subordinate to carry on such contact, and the person so designating monitors all subsequent communications and the person designated keeps the designating person informed of each such communication, except to the extent that the communication concerns a contemplated or ongoing investigation or litigation in which a target or subject is one of the following:

(I) The President, the Vice President, or a member of the immediate family of the President or Vice President.

(II) Any individual working in the Executive Office of the President who is compensated at a rate of pay at or above level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code.

(III) The current or former chair or treasurer of any national campaign committee that sought the election or seeks the reelection of the President, or any officer of such a committee exercising authority at the national level, during the tenure in office of the President.

(iii) A communication that involves contact from or to the Deputy Counsel to the President for National Security Affairs, the staff of the National Security Council, and the staff of the Homeland Security Council that relates to a national security matter, except to the extent that the communication concerns a pending adversary case in litigation that may have national security implications.

(iv) A communication that involves contact between the Office of the Pardon Attorney of the Department of Justice and the Counsel to the President or the Deputy Counsels to the President relating to pardon matters.

(v) A communication that relates solely to policy, appointments, legislation, rulemaking, budgets, public relations or affairs, programmatic matters, intergovernmental relations, administrative or personnel matters, appellate litigation, or requests for legal advice.

(3) IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—The term ''immediate family of the President or Vice President'' means those persons to whom the President or Vice President—

(A) is related by blood, marriage, or adoption; or

(B) stands in loco parentis.

SEC. 603. COMMUNICATIONS LOGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall maintain a log of covered communications.

(b) CONTENTS.—A communications log shall include, with respect to a covered communication—

(1) the name and title of each officer or employee of the Department of Justice or the Executive Office of the President who participated in the covered communication;

(2) the topic of the covered communication; and

(3) a statement describing the purpose and necessity of the covered communication.

(c) OVERSIGHT.—

(1) PERIODIC DISCLOSURE OF LOGS.—Not later than January 30 and July 30 of each year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice a report containing the communications log for the 6-month period preceding that January or July.

(2) NOTICE OF INAPPROPRIATE OR IMPROPER COMMUNICATIONS.—The Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall—

(A) review each communications log received under paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) notify the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate if the Inspector General determines that a covered communication described in the communications log—

(i) is inappropriate from a law enforcement perspective; or

(ii) raises concerns about improper political interference.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the valid written assertion by the President of presidential communications privilege with regard to any material required to be submitted under this section.

SEC. 604. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title may be construed to affect any requirement to report pursuant to title I of this Act, or the amendments made by that title.

TITLE VII—PROTECTING INSPECTOR GENERAL INDEPENDENCE

Subtitle A—Requiring Cause for Removal

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Inspector General Independence Act''.

SEC. 702. AMENDMENT.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(b)—

(A) by striking ''An Inspector General'' and inserting ''(1) An Inspector General'';

(B) by inserting after ''by the President'' the following: ''in accordance with paragraph (2)''; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The President may remove an Inspector General only for any of the following grounds (and the documentation of any such ground shall be included in the communication required pursuant to paragraph (1)):

''(A) Documented permanent incapacity.

''(B) Documented neglect of duty.

''(C) Documented malfeasance.

''(D) Documented conviction of a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

''(E) Documented knowing violation of a law or regulation.

''(F) Documented gross mismanagement.

''(G) Documented gross waste of funds.

''(H) Documented abuse of authority.

''(I) Documented inefficiency.''; and

(2) in section 8G(e)(2), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''An Inspector General may be removed only for any of the following grounds (and the documentation of any such ground shall be included in the communication required pursuant to this paragraph):

''(A) Documented permanent incapacity.

''(B) Documented neglect of duty.

''(C) Documented malfeasance.

''(D) Documented conviction of a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

''(E) Documented knowing violation of a law or regulation.

''(F) Documented gross mismanagement.

''(G) Documented gross waste of funds.

''(H) Documented abuse of authority.

''(I) Documented inefficiency.''.

SEC. 703. REMOVAL OR TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REASONS FOR REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 702, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''reasons'' and inserting ''substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under paragraph (1), the written communication required under that paragraph shall—

''(A) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and

''(B) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.''.

(b) REASONS FOR REMOVAL OR TRANSFER FOR DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''reasons'' and inserting ''substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under paragraph (2), the written communication required under that paragraph shall—

''(A) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and

''(B) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.''.

Subtitle B—Inspectors General of Intelligence Community

SEC. 711. INDEPENDENCE OF INSPECTORS GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new title:

''TITLE XII—MATTERS REGARDING INSPECTORS GENERAL OF ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

''Subtitle A—Inspectors General

''SEC. 1201. INDEPENDENCE OF INSPECTORS GENERAL.

''(a) REMOVAL.—A covered Inspector General may be removed from office only by the head official. The head official may remove a covered Inspector General only for any of the following grounds:

''(1) Documented permanent incapacity.

''(2) Documented neglect of duty.

''(3) Documented malfeasance.

''(4) Documented conviction of a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

''(5) Documented knowing violation of a law or regulation.

''(6) Documented gross mismanagement.

''(7) Documented gross waste of funds.

''(8) Documented abuse of authority.

''(9) Documented Inefficiency.

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE.—A covered Inspector General may be placed on administrative leave only by the head official. The head official may place a covered Inspector General on administrative leave only for any of the grounds specified in subsection (a).

''(c) NOTIFICATION.—The head official may not remove a covered Inspector General under subsection (a) or place a covered Inspector General on administrative leave under subsection (b) unless—

''(1) the head official transmits in writing to the appropriate congressional committees a notification of such removal or placement, including an explanation of the documented grounds specified in subsection (a) for such removal or placement; and

''(2) with respect to the removal of a covered Inspector General, a period of 30 days elapses following the date of such transmittal.

''(d) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the head official notifies a covered Inspector General of being removed under subsection (a) or placed on administrative leave under subsection (b), the office of that Inspector General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing—

''(1) a description of the facts and circumstances of any pending complaint, investigation, inspection, audit, or other review or inquiry, including any information, allegation, or complaint reported to the Attorney General in accordance with section 535 of title 28, United States Code, that the Inspector General was working on as of the date of such removal or placement; and

''(2) any other significant matter that the office of the Inspector General determines appropriate.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a personnel action of a covered Inspector General otherwise authorized by law, other than transfer or removal.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE.—The term 'administrative leave' includes any other type of paid or unpaid non-duty status.

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the congressional intelligence committees; and

''(B) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

''(3) HEAD OFFICIAL.—The term 'head official' means—

''(A) with respect to the position of a covered Inspector General that requires appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the President; and

''(B) with respect to the position of a covered Inspector General that requires appointment by a head of a department or agency of the Federal Government, the head of such department or agency.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 3 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 3003) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) The term 'covered Inspector General' means each of the following:

''(A) The Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.

''(B) The Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency.

''(C) The Inspector General of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

''(D) The Inspector General of the National Reconnaissance Office.

''(E) The Inspector General of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

''(F) The Inspector General of the National Security Agency.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding after the items relating to title XI the end the following new items:

''TITLE XII—MATTERS REGARDING INSPECTORS GENERAL OF ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

''SUBTITLE A—INSPECTORS GENERAL

''Sec. 1201. Independence of Inspectors General.''.

SEC. 712. AUTHORITY OF INSPECTORS GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY TO DETERMINE MATTERS OF URGENT CONCERN.

(a) DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title XII of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 711, is amended by inserting after section 1201 the following new section:

''SEC. 1203. DETERMINATION OF MATTERS OF URGENT CONCERN.

''(a) DETERMINATION.—Each covered Inspector General shall have sole authority to determine whether any complaint or information reported to the Inspector General is a matter of urgent concern. Such determination is final and conclusive.

''(b) FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS.—In addition to any other matter which is considered an urgent concern pursuant to section 103H(k)(5)(G), section 17(d)(5)(G) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)(G)), or other applicable provision of law, the term 'urgent concern' includes a serious or flagrant problem, abuse, violation of law or Executive order, or deficiency relating to foreign interference in elections in the United States.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1201, as added by section 711, the following new item:

''Sec. 1203. Determination of matters of urgent concern.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—Section 103H(k)(5)(G) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)(5)(G)) is amended by striking ''In this paragraph'' and inserting ''In accordance with section 1203, in this paragraph''.

(2) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—Section 17(d)(5)(G) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(d)(5)(G)) is amended by striking ''In this paragraph'' and inserting ''In accordance with section 1203 of the National Security Act of 1947, in this paragraph''.

(c) REPORTS ON UNRESOLVED DIFFERENCES.—Paragraph (3) of section 103H(k) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) With respect to each report submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i), the Inspector General shall include in the report, at a minimum—

''(i) a general description of the unresolved differences, the particular duties or responsibilities of the Inspector General involved, and, if such differences relate to a complaint or information under paragraph (5), a description of the complaint or information and the entities or individuals identified in the complaint or information; and

''(ii) to the extent such differences can be attributed not only to the Director but also to any other official, department, agency, or office within the executive branch, or a component thereof, the titles of such official, department, agency, or office.''.

(d) CLARIFICATION OF ROLE OF DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—Section 102A(f)(1) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 3024(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) The authority of the Director of National Intelligence under subparagraph (A) includes coordinating and supervising activities undertaken by elements of the intelligence community for the purpose of protecting the United States from any foreign interference in elections in the United States.''.

SEC. 713. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.

(a) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—Paragraph (4) of section 103H(c) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) The provisions of title XII shall apply to the Inspector General with respect to the removal of the Inspector General and any other matter relating to the Inspector General as specifically provided for in such title.''.

(b) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.—Paragraph (6) of section 17(b) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) The provisions of title XII of the National Security Act of 1947 shall apply to the Inspector General with respect to the removal of the Inspector General and any other matter relating to the Inspector General as specifically provided for in such title.''.

(c) OTHER ELEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title XII of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 711, is further amended by inserting after section 1203, as added by section 712(a), the following new section:

''SEC. 1205. COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.

''No provision of law that is inconsistent with any provision of this title shall be considered to supersede, repeal, or otherwise modify a provision of this title unless such other provision of law specifically cites a provision of this title in order to supersede, repeal, or otherwise modify that provision of this title.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1203, as added by section 713, the following new item:

''Sec. 1205. Coordination with other provisions of law.''.

Subtitle C—Congressional Notification

SEC. 721. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Inspector General Protection Act''.

SEC. 722. CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OFFICES.

(a) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICE.—Paragraph (1) of section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,'' after ''is removed from office'';

(2) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''any such removal''; and

(3) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''before the removal''.

(b) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,'' after ''office'';

(2) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''any such removal''; and

(3) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''before the removal''.

(c) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CERTAIN CHANGES IN STATUS.—

(1) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICE.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 702(1), is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''If'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (4), if''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the President may submit the communication described in paragraph (1) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

''(A) the President determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

''(B) in the communication, the President includes—

''(i) a specification of which clause the President relied on to make the determination under subparagraph (A);

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

''(5) The President may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (1) unless the President—

''(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

''(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

''(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the President relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.''.

(2) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 702(2), is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''If'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (4), if''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the head of a designated Federal entity may submit the communication described in paragraph (2) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

''(A) the head determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

''(B) in the communication, the head includes—

''(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

''(5) The head may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (2) unless the head—

''(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

''(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

''(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.''.

(d) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to removals, transfers, and changes of status occurring on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 723. PRESIDENTIAL EXPLANATION OF FAILURE TO NOMINATE AN INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3349d the following new section:

''§ 3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General

''If the President fails to make a formal nomination for a vacant Inspector General position that requires a formal nomination by the President to be filled within the period beginning on the date on which the vacancy occurred and ending on the day that is 210 days after that date, the President shall communicate, within 30 days after the end of such period, to Congress in writing—

''(1) the reasons why the President has not yet made a formal nomination; and

''(2) a target date for making a formal nomination.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to 3349d the following new item:

''3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any vacancy first occurring on or after that date.

TITLE VIII—PROTECTING WHISTLEBLOWERS

Subtitle A—Whistleblower Protection Improvement

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act of 2021''.

SEC. 802. ADDITIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

(a) INVESTIGATIONS AS PERSONNEL ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in clause (xi), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (xii) as clause (xiii); and

(C) by inserting after the clause (xi) the following:

''(xii) for purposes of subsection (b)(8)—

''(I) the commencement, expansion, or extension of an investigation, but not including any investigation that is ministerial or nondiscretionary (including a ministerial or nondiscretionary investigation described in section 1213) or any investigation that is conducted by an Inspector General of an entity of the Government of an employee not employed by the office of that Inspector General; and

''(II) a referral to an Inspector General of an entity of the Government, except for a referral that is ministerial or nondiscretionary; and''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any investigation opened, or referral made, as described under clause (xii) of section 2302(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, as added by such paragraph, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RIGHT TO PETITION CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302(b)(9) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by adding ''or'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) the exercise of any right protected under section 7211;''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to the exercise of any right described in section 2302(b)(9)(E) of title 5, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) PROHIBITION ON DISCLOSURE OF WHISTLEBLOWER IDENTITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g)(1) No employee of an agency may willfully communicate or transmit to any individual who is not an officer or employee of the Government the identity of, or personally identifiable information about, any other employee because that other employee has made, or is suspected to have made, a disclosure protected by subsection (b)(8), unless—

''(A) the other employee provides express written consent prior to the communication or transmission of their identity or personally identifiable information;

''(B) the communication or transmission is made in accordance with the provisions of section 552a;

''(C) the communication or transmission is made to a lawyer for the sole purpose of providing legal advice to an employee accused of whistleblower retaliation; or

''(D) the communication or transmission is required or permitted by any other provision of law.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'officer or employee of the Government' means—

''(A) the President;

''(B) a Member of Congress;

''(C) a member of the uniformed services;

''(D) an employee as that term is defined in section 2105, including an employee of the United States Postal Service, the Postal Regulatory Commission, or the Department of Veterans Affairs (including any employee appointed pursuant to chapter 73 or 74 of title 38); and

''(E) any other officer or employee in any branch of the Government of the United States.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any transmission or communication described in subsection (g) of section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) RIGHT TO PETITION CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7211 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 7211. Employees' right to petition or furnish information or respond to Congress

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each officer or employee of the Federal Government, individually or collectively, has a right to—

''(1) petition Congress or a Member of Congress;

''(2) furnish information, documents, or testimony to either House of Congress, any Member of Congress, or any committee or subcommittee of the Congress; or

''(3) respond to any request for information, documents, or testimony from either House of Congress or any Committee or subcommittee of Congress.

''(b) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—No officer or employee of the Federal Government may interfere with or deny the right set forth in subsection (a), including by—

''(1) prohibiting or preventing, or attempting or threatening to prohibit or prevent, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government from engaging in activity protected in subsection (a); or

''(2) removing, suspending from duty without pay, demoting, reducing in rank, seniority, status, pay, or performance or efficiency rating, denying promotion to, relocating, reassigning, transferring, disciplining, or discriminating in regard to any employment right, entitlement, or benefit, or any term or condition of employment of, any other officer or employee of the Federal Government or attempting or threatening to commit any of the foregoing actions protected in subsection (a).

''(c) APPLICATION.—This section shall not be construed to authorize disclosure of any information that is—

''(1) specifically prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of Federal law; or

''(2) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs, unless disclosure is otherwise authorized by law.

''(d) DEFINITION OF OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term 'officer or employee of the Federal Government' includes—

''(1) the President;

''(2) a Member of Congress;

''(3) a member of the uniformed services;

''(4) an employee (as that term is defined in section 2105);

''(5) an employee of the United States Postal Service or the Postal Regulatory Commission; and

''(6) an employee appointed under chapter 73 or 74 of title 38.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 72 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item related to section 7211 and inserting the following:

''7211. Employees' right to petition or furnish information or respond to Congress.''.

SEC. 803. ENHANCEMENT OF WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.

(a) DISCLOSURES RELATING TO OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES OF AN OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Section 1213(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) If the information transmitted under this subsection disclosed a violation of law, rule, or regulation, or gross waste, gross mismanagement, abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety, by any officer or employee of an Office of Inspector General, the Special Counsel may refer the matter to the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, which shall comply with the standards and procedures applicable to investigations and reports under subsection (c).''.

(b) RETALIATORY REFERRALS TO INSPECTORS GENERAL.—Section 1214(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In any case in which the Special Counsel determines that a referral to an Inspector General of an entity of the Federal Government was in retaliation for a disclosure or protected activity described in section 2302(b)(8) or in retaliation for exercising a right described in section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), the Special Counsel shall transmit that finding in writing to the Inspector General within seven days of making the finding. The Inspector General shall consider that finding and make a determination on whether to initiate an investigation or continue an investigation based on the referral that the Special Counsel found to be retaliatory.''.

(c) ENSURING TIMELY RELIEF.—

(1) INDIVIDUAL RIGHT OF ACTION.—Section 1221 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 2302(b)(8) or section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D),'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 2302(b)(8), section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E), section 2302(b)(13), or section 2302(g),''.

(2) STAYS.—Section 1221(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) Any stay requested under paragraph (1) shall be granted within 10 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the date the request is made, if the Board determines—

''(A) that there is a substantial likelihood that protected activity was a contributing factor to the personnel action involved; or

''(B) the Board otherwise determines that such a stay would be appropriate.''.

(3) APPEAL OF STAY.—Section 1221(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) If any stay requested under paragraph (1) is denied, the employee, former employee, or applicant may, within 7 days after receiving notice of the denial, file an appeal for expedited review by the Board. The agency shall have 7 days thereafter to respond. The Board shall provide a decision not later than 21 days after receiving the appeal. During the period of appeal, both parties may supplement the record with information unavailable to them at the time the stay was first requested.''.

(4) ACCESS TO DISTRICT COURT; JURY TRIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1221(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking ''(i) Subsections'' and inserting ''(i)(1) Subsections''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2)(A) If, in the case of an employee, former employee, or applicant for employment who seeks corrective action from the Merit Systems Protection Board based on an alleged prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b)(8), section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E), section 2302(b)(13), or section 2302(g), no final order or decision is issued by the Board within 180 days after the date on which a request for such corrective action has been duly submitted to the Board, such employee, former employee, or applicant may, after providing written notice to the Special Counsel and the Board and only within 20 days after providing such notice, bring an action for review de novo before the appropriate United States district court, and such action shall, at the request of either party to such action, be tried before a jury. Upon filing of an action with the appropriate United States district court, any proceedings before the Board shall cease and the employee, former employee, or applicant for employment waives any right to refile with the Board.

''(B) If the Board certifies (in writing) to the parties of a case that the complexity of such case requires a longer period of review, subparagraph (A) shall be applied by substituting '240 days' for '180 days'.

''(C) In any such action brought before a United States district court under subparagraph (A), the court—

''(i) shall apply the standards set forth in subsection (e); and

''(ii) may award any relief which the court considers appropriate, including any relief described in subsection (g).''.

(B) APPLICATION.—

(i) The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall apply to any corrective action duly submitted to the Merit Systems Protection Board, during the five-year period preceding the date of enactment of this Act, by an employee, former employee, or applicant for employment based on an alleged prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b)(8), 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D), or 2302(b)(13) of title 5, United States Code, with respect to which no final order or decision has been issued by the Board.

(ii) In the case of an individual described in clause (i) whose duly submitted claim to the Board was made not later than 180 days before the date of enactment of this Act, such individual may only bring an action before a United States district court as described in section 1221(i)(2) of title 5, United States Code, (as added by subparagraph (A) if that individual—

(I) provides written notice to the Office of Special Counsel and the Merit Systems Protection Board not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(II) brings such action not later than 20 days after providing such notice.

(d) RECIPIENTS OF WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES.—Section 2302(b)(8)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or to the Inspector General of an agency or another employee designated by the head of the agency to receive such disclosures'' and inserting ''the Inspector General of an agency, a supervisor in the employee's direct chain of command up to and including the head of the employing agency, or to an employee designated by any of the aforementioned individuals for the purpose of receiving such disclosures''.

(e) ATTORNEY FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7703(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) If an employee, former employee, or applicant for employment is the prevailing party under a proceeding brought under this section, the employee, former employee, or applicant for employment shall be entitled to attorney fees for all representation carried out pursuant to this section. In such an action for attorney fees, the agency responsible for taking the personnel action shall be the respondent and shall be responsible for paying the fees.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—In addition to any proceeding brought by an employee, former employee, or applicant for employment on or after the date of enactment of this Act to a Federal court under section 7703 of title 5, United States Code, the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any proceeding brought by an employee, former employee, or applicant for employment under such section before the date of enactment of this Act with respect to which the applicable Federal court has not issued a final decision.

(f) EXTENDING WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302(a)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the matter following clause (xiii)—

(A) by inserting ''subsection (b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E), subsection (b)(13), or subsection (g),'' after ''subsection (b)(8),''; and

(B) by inserting after ''title 31'' the following: '', a commissioned officer or applicant for employment in the Public Health Service, an officer or applicant for employment in the commissioned officer corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and a noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 261 of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Act of 2002 (33 U.S.C. 3071) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking paragraph (8); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (26) as paragraphs (8) through (25), respectively; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking the second sentence.

(3) APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an officer or applicant for employment in the commissioned officer corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to any personnel action taken against such officer or applicant on or after the date of enactment of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Amendments Act of 2020 (Public Law 116–259) for making any disclosure protected under section 2302(8) of title 5, United States Code.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any personnel action with respect to which a complaint has been filed pursuant to section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, and a final decision has been rendered regarding such complaint.

(g) RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 7701(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''upon the making of the decision'' and inserting ''upon making of the decision, necessary to make the employee whole as if there had been no prohibited personnel practice, including training, seniority and promotions consistent with the employee's prior record''.

(2) APPLICATION.—In addition to any appeal made on or after the date of enactment of this Act to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of title 5, United States Code, the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any appeal made under such section before the date of enactment of this Act with respect to which the Board has not issued a final decision.

SEC. 804. CLASSIFYING CERTAIN FURLOUGHS AS ADVERSE PERSONNEL ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) a furlough of more than 14 days but less than 30 days; and

''(6) a furlough of 13 days or less that is not due to a lapse in appropriations;''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any furlough covered by such section 7512(5) or (6) (as amended by such subsection) occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 805. CODIFICATION OF PROTECTIONS FOR DISCLOSURES OF CENSORSHIP RELATED TO RESEARCH, ANALYSIS, OR TECHNICAL INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2302 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 802(c)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) In this subsection—

''(A) the term 'applicant' means an applicant for a covered position;

''(B) the term 'censorship related to research, analysis, or technical information' means any effort to distort, misrepresent, or suppress research, analysis, or technical information; and

''(C) the term 'employee' means an employee in a covered position in an agency.

''(2)(A) Any disclosure of information by an employee or applicant for employment that the employee or applicant reasonably believes is evidence of censorship related to research, analysis, or technical information—

''(i) shall come within the protections of subsection (b)(8)(A) if—

''(I) the employee or applicant reasonably believes that the censorship related to research, analysis, or technical information is or will cause—

''(aa) any violation of law, rule, or regulation; or

''(bb) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety; and

''(II) such disclosure is not specifically prohibited by law or such information is not specifically required by Executive order to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or the conduct of foreign affairs; and

''(ii) shall come within the protections of subsection (b)(8)(B) if—

''(I) the employee or applicant reasonably believes that the censorship related to research, analysis, or technical information is or will cause—

''(aa) any violation of law, rule, or regulation; or

''(bb) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety; and

''(II) the disclosure is made to the Special Counsel, or to the Inspector General of an agency or another person designated by the head of the agency to receive such disclosures, consistent with the protection of sources and methods.

''(3) A disclosure shall not be excluded from paragraph (2) for any reason described under subsection (f)(1) or (2).

''(4) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to imply any limitation on the protections of employees and applicants afforded by any other provision of law, including protections with respect to any disclosure of information believed to be evidence of censorship related to research, analysis, or technical information.''.

(b) REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 110 of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–199) is hereby repealed.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect any action under such section 110 commenced before the date of enactment of this Act or any protections afforded by such section with respect to such action.

SEC. 806. TITLE 5 TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1212(h), by striking ''or (9)'' each place it appears and inserting '', (b)(9), (b)(13), or (g)'';

(2) in section 1214—

(A) in subsections (a) and (b), by striking ''section 2302(b)(8) or section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 2302(b)(8), section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E), section 2302(b)(13), or section 2302(g)''; and

(B) in subsection (i), by striking ''section 2302(b)(8) or subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), or (D) of section 2302(b)(9)'' and inserting ''section 2302(b)(8), subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 2302(b)(9), section 2302(b)(13), or section 2302(g)'';

(3) in section 1215(a)(3)(B), by striking ''section 2302(b)(8), or 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 2302(b)(8), section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E), section 2302(b)(13), or section 2302(g)'';

(4) in section 2302—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or (g)'' after ''subsection (b)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(C)(i), by striking ''subsection (b)(8) or section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D)'' and inserting ''section 2302(b)(8), section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E), section 2302(b)(13), or section 2302(g)''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking ''paragraph (8) or subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (9) of subsection (b)'' and inserting ''paragraph (8), subparagraph (A)(i), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (9), or paragraph (13) of subsection (b) or subsection (g)'';

(5) in section 7515(a)(2), by striking ''paragraph (8), (9), or (14) of section 2302(b)'' and inserting ''paragraph (8), (9), (13), or (14) of section 2302(b) or section 2302(g)'';

(6) in section 7701(c)(2)(B), by inserting ''or section 2302(g)'' after ''section 2302(b)''; and

(7) in section 7703(b)(1)(B), by striking ''section 2302(b)(8), or 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D)'' and inserting ''section 2302(b)(8), section 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), (D), or (E), section 2302(b)(13), or section 2302(g)''.

Subtitle B—Whistleblowers of the Intelligence Community

SEC. 811. LIMITATION ON SHARING OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS WITH PERSONS NAMED IN SUCH COMPLAINTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XII of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 711, is further amended by inserting after section 1205, as added by section 713(c), the following new subtitle:

"Subtitle B—Protections for Whistleblowers

"SEC. 1223. LIMITATION ON SHARING OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS WITH PERSONS NAMED IN SUCH COMPLAINTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any employee or officer of the Federal Government to knowingly and willfully share any whistleblower disclosure information with any individual named as a subject of the whistleblower disclosure and alleged in the disclosure to have engaged in misconduct, unless—

''(1) the whistleblower consented, in writing, to such sharing before the sharing occurs;

''(2) a covered Inspector General to whom such disclosure is made—

''(A) determines that such sharing is necessary to advance an investigation, audit, inspection, review, or evaluation by the Inspector General; and

''(B) notifies the whistleblower of such sharing before the sharing occurs; or

''(3) an attorney for the Government—

''(A) determines that such sharing is necessary to advance an investigation by the attorney; and

''(B) notifies the whistleblower of such sharing before the sharing occurs.

''(b) WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURE INFORMATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'whistleblower disclosure information' means, with respect to a whistleblower disclosure—

''(1) the disclosure;

''(2) confirmation of the fact of the existence of the disclosure; or

''(3) the identity, or other identifying information, of the whistleblower who made the disclosure.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TRANSFER.—The National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(A) Section 1104 is—

(i) transferred to title XII of such Act, as added by section 711;

(ii) inserted before section 1223 of such Act, as added by this section; and

(iii) redesignated as section 1221.

(B) Section 1106 is—

(i) amended by striking ''section 1104'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 1221'';

(ii) transferred to title XII of such Act, as added by section 711;

(iii) inserted after section 1223 of such Act, as added by this section; and

(iv) redesignated as section 1225.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended—

(A) by striking the items relating to section 1104 and section 1106; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 1205 the following new items:

''SUBTITLE B—PROTECTIONS FOR WHISTLEBLOWERS

''Sec. 1221. Prohibited personnel practices in the intelligence community.

''Sec. 1223. Limitation on sharing of intelligence community whistleblower complaints with persons named in such complaints.

''Sec. 1225. Inspector General external review panel.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 3003), as amended by section 711, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(9) The term 'whistleblower' means a person who makes a whistleblower disclosure.

''(10) The term 'whistleblower disclosure' means a disclosure that is protected under section 1221 of this Act or section 3001(j)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 3341(j)).''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5331 of the Damon Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020 (division E of Public Law 116–92; 50 U.S.C. 3033 note) is amended by striking ''section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234)'' and inserting ''section 1221 of the National Security Act of 1947''.

SEC. 812. DISCLOSURES TO CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XII of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 711, is further amended by inserting after section 1225, as designated by section 811(b), the following new section:

"SEC. 1227. PROCEDURES REGARDING DISCLOSURES TO CONGRESS.

''(a) GUIDANCE.—

''(1) OBLIGATION TO PROVIDE SECURITY DIRECTION UPON REQUEST.—Upon the request of a whistleblower, the head of the relevant element of the intelligence community, acting through the covered Inspector General for that element, shall furnish on a confidential basis to the whistleblower information regarding how the whistleblower may directly contact the congressional intelligence committees, in accordance with appropriate security practices, regarding a complaint or information of the whistleblower pursuant to section 103H(k)(5)(D) or other appropriate provision of law.

''(2) NONDISCLOSURE.—Unless a whistleblower who makes a request under paragraph (1) provides prior consent, a covered Inspector General may not disclose to the head of the relevant element of the intelligence community—

''(A) the identity of the whistleblower; or

''(B) the element at which such whistleblower is employed, detailed, or assigned as a contractor employee.

''(b) OVERSIGHT OF OBLIGATION.—If a covered Inspector General determines that the head of an element of the intelligence community denied a request by a whistleblower under subsection (a), directed the whistleblower not to contact the congressional intelligence committees, or unreasonably delayed in providing information under such subsection, the covered Inspector General shall notify the congressional intelligence committees of such denial, direction, or unreasonable delay.

''(c) PERMANENT SECURITY OFFICER.—The head of each element of the intelligence community may designate a permanent security officer in the element to provide to whistleblowers the information under subsection (a).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1225, as added by section 811(b), the following new item:

''Sec. 1227. Procedures regarding disclosures to Congress.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 103H(k)(5)(D)(i) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)(5)(D)(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The employee may request information pursuant to section 1227 with respect to contacting such committees.''.

SEC. 813. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCLOSURE OF WHISTLEBLOWER IDENTITY AS REPRISAL AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURE BY EMPLOYEES AND CONTRACTORS IN INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 1221 of the National Security Act of 1947, as designated by section 811(b)(1)(A), is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (K); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following:

''(J) a knowing and willful disclosure revealing the identity or other personally identifiable information of such employee or such contractor employee without the express written consent of such employee or such contractor employee or if the Inspector General determines such disclosure is necessary for the exclusive purpose of investigating a complaint or information received under section 8H of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 8H); or''.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO DETAILEES.—Such subsection is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) EMPLOYEE.—The term 'employee', with respect to an agency or a covered intelligence community element, includes an individual who has been detailed to such agency or covered intelligence community element.''.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION FOR UNLAWFUL DISCLOSURE OF WHISTLEBLOWER IDENTITY.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(d) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the President shall provide for the enforcement of this section.

''(2) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION FOR UNLAWFUL, WILLFUL DISCLOSURE OF WHISTLEBLOWER IDENTITY.—In a case in which an employee of an agency, or other employee or officer of the Federal Government, takes a personnel action described in subsection (a)(3)(J) against an employee of a covered intelligence community element as a reprisal in violation of subsection (b) or in a case in which a contractor employee takes a personnel action described in such subsection against another contractor employee as a reprisal in violation of subsection (c), the employee or contractor employee against whom the personnel action was taken may bring a private action for all appropriate remedies, including injunctive relief and compensatory and punitive damages, against the employee or contractor employee who took the personnel action, in a Federal district court of competent jurisdiction within 180 days of when the employee or contractor employee first learned of or should have learned of the violation.''.

TITLE IX—ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ACTING OFFICIALS

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Accountability for Acting Officials Act''.

SEC. 902. CLARIFICATION OF FEDERAL VACANCIES REFORM ACT OF 1998.

(a) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 3345 of title 5, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end before the semi-colon the following: '', but, and except as provided in subsection (e), only if the individual serving in the position of first assistant has occupied such position for a period of at least 30 days during the 365-day period preceding the date of the death, resignation, or beginning of inability to serve''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(A) the officer or employee served in a position in such agency for a period of at least 1 year preceding the date of death, resignation, or beginning of inability to serve of the applicable officer; and''.

(2) By adding at the end the following:

''(d) For purposes of this section, a position shall be considered to be the first assistant to the office with respect to which a vacancy occurs only if such position has been designated, at least 30 days before the date of the vacancy, by law, rule, or regulation as the first assistant position. The previous sentence shall begin to apply on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of the Accountability for Acting Officials Act.

''(e) The 30-day service requirement in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to any individual who is a first assistant if—

''(1)(A) the office of such first assistant is an office for which appointment is required to be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

''(B) the Senate has approved the appointment of such individual to such office; or

''(2) the individual began serving in the position of first assistant during the 180-day period beginning on a transitional inauguration day (as that term is defined in section 3349a(a)).''.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—Section 3345(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Any individual directed to perform the functions and duties of the vacant office temporarily in an acting capacity under subsection (a)(2) or (f) shall possess the qualifications (if any) set forth in law, rule, or regulation that are otherwise applicable to an individual appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to occupy such office.''.

(c) APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUALS REMOVED FROM OFFICE.—Paragraph (2) of section 3345(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''the expiration of a term of office'' the following: ''or removal (voluntarily or involuntarily) from office''.

(d) VACANCY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL POSITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3345 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if an Inspector General position that requires appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to be filled is vacant, the first assistant of such position shall perform the functions and duties of the Inspector General temporarily in an acting capacity subject to the time limitations of section 3346.

''(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if for purposes of carrying out paragraph (1) of this subsection, by reason of absence, disability, or vacancy, the first assistant to the position of Inspector General is not available to perform the functions and duties of the Inspector General, an acting Inspector General shall be appointed by the President from among individuals serving in an office of any Inspector General, provided that—

''(A) during the 365-day period preceding the date of death, resignation, or beginning of inability to serve of the applicable Inspector General, the individual served in a position in an office of any Inspector General for not less than 90 days; and

''(B) the rate of pay for the position of such individual is equal to or greater than the minimum rate of pay payable for a position at GS–15 of the General Schedule.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply to any vacancy first occurring with respect to an Inspector General position on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) TESTIMONY OF ACTING OFFICIALS BEFORE CONGRESS.—Section 3345 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by subsection (d)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g)(1) Any individual serving as an acting officer due to a vacancy to which this section applies, or any individual who has served in such capacity and continues to perform the same or similar duties beyond the time limits described in section 3346, shall appear, at least once during any 60-day period that the individual is so serving, before the appropriate committees of jurisdiction of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

''(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived upon mutual agreement of the chairs and ranking members of such committees.''.

(f) TIME LIMITATION FOR PRINCIPAL OFFICES.—Section 3346 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''or as provided in subsection (d)'' after ''sickness''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) With respect to the vacancy of the position of head of any agency listed in subsection (b) of section 901 of title 31, or any other position that is within the President's cabinet and to which this section applies, subsections (a) through (c) of this section and sections 3348(c), 3349(b), and 3349a(b) shall be applied by substituting '120' for '210' in each instance.''.

(g) EXCLUSIVITY.—Section 3347 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

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

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), any statutory provision covered under paragraph (1) of such subsection that contains a nondiscretionary order or directive to designate an officer or employee to perform the functions and duties of a specified office temporarily in an acting capacity shall be the exclusive means for temporarily authorizing an acting official to perform the functions and duties of such office.''.

(h) REPORTING OF VACANCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3349 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''immediately upon'' in each instance and inserting ''not later than 7 days after'';

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) notification of the end of the term of service of any person serving in an acting capacity and the name of any subsequent person serving in an acting capacity and the date the service of such subsequent person began not later than 7 days after such date.''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''immediately'' and inserting ''not later than 14 days after the date of such determination''.

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of such section 3349 of such title are amended to read as follows:

''(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

''(2) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives;''.

(i) VACANCIES DURING PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL TRANSITIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 3349a of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b) Notwithstanding section 3346 (except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection) or 3348(c), with respect to any vacancy that exists on a transitional inauguration day, or that arises during the 60-day period beginning on such day, the person serving as an acting officer as described under section 3345 may serve in the office—

''(1) for no longer than 300 days beginning on such day; or

''(2) subject to subsection 3346(b), once a first or second nomination for the office is submitted to the Senate, from the date of such nomination for the period that the nomination is pending in the Senate.''.

TITLE X—STRENGTHENING HATCH ACT ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Hatch Act Accountability Act''.

SEC. 1002. STRENGTHENING HATCH ACT ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES AGAINST POLITICAL APPOINTEES.

(a) INVESTIGATIONS BY OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.—Section 1216 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 307, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking ''(1),''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(e)(1) In addition to the authority otherwise provided in this chapter, the Special Counsel—

''(A) shall conduct an investigation with respect to any allegation concerning political activity prohibited under subchapter III of chapter 73 (relating to political activities by Federal employees); and

''(B) may, regardless of whether the Special Counsel has received an allegation, conduct any investigation as the Special Counsel considers necessary concerning political activity prohibited under such subchapter.

''(2) With respect to any investigation under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Special Counsel may seek corrective action under section 1214 and disciplinary action under section 1215 in the same way as if a prohibited personnel practice were involved.

''(f)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 1215, consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection, if after an investigation under subsection (d)(1) the Special Counsel determines that a political appointee has violated section 7323 or 7324, the Special Counsel may present a complaint to the Merit Systems Protection Board under the process provided in section 1215, against such political appointee.

''(2) Notwithstanding section 7326, a final order of the Board on a complaint of a violation of section 7323 or 7324 by a political appointee may impose an assessment of a civil penalty not to exceed $50,000.

''(3) The Special Counsel may not present a complaint under paragraph (1) of this subsection—

''(A) unless no disciplinary action or civil penalty has been taken or assessed, respectively, against the political appointee pursuant to section 7326; and

''(B) until on or after the date that is 90 days after the date that the complaint regarding the political appointee was presented to the President under section 1215(b), notwithstanding whether the President submits a written statement pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection.

''(4)(A) Not later than 90 days after receiving from the Special Counsel a complaint recommending disciplinary action under section 1215(b) with respect to a political appointee for a violation of section 7323 or 7324, the President shall provide a written statement to the Special Counsel on whether the President imposed the recommended disciplinary action, imposed another form of disciplinary action and the nature of that disciplinary action, or took no disciplinary action against the political appointee.

''(B) Not later than 14 days after receiving a written statement under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph—

''(i) the Special Counsel shall submit the written statement to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

''(ii) publish the written statement on the public website of the Office of Special Counsel.

''(5) Not later than 14 days after the date that the Special Counsel determines a political appointee has violated section 7323 or 7324, the Special Counsel shall—

''(A) submit a report on the investigation into such political appointee, and any communications sent from the Special Counsel to the President recommending discipline of such political appointee, to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

''(B) publish the report and such communications on the public website of the Office of Special Counsel.

''(6) In this subsection, the term 'political appointee' means any individual, other than the President and the Vice-President, employed or holding office—

''(A) in the Executive Office of the President, the Office of the Vice President, and any other office of the White House, but not including any career employee; or

''(B) in a confidential, policy-making, policy-determining, or policy-advocating position appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (other than an individual in the Foreign Service of the United States).''.

(b) CLARIFICATION ON APPLICATION OF HATCH ACT TO EOP AND OVP EMPLOYEES.—Section 7322(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''Executive agency'' the following: '', including the Executive Office of the President, the Office of the Vice President, and any other office of the White House,''.

TITLE XI—PROMOTING EFFICIENT PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS

SEC. 1101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Efficient Transition Act of 2021''.

SEC. 1102. ASCERTAINMENT OF SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES IN GENERAL ELECTIONS FOR PURPOSES OF PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(c) of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The terms'' and inserting ''(1) The terms''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The Administrator shall make the ascertainment under paragraph (1) as soon as practicable after the general elections.

''(3) If the Administrator does not make such ascertainment within 5 days after such elections, each eligible candidate for President and Vice President shall be treated as if they are the apparent successful candidate for purposes of this Act until the Administrator makes the ascertainment or until the House of Representatives and the Senate certify the results of the elections, whichever occurs first.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall promulgate regulations that establish standards and procedures to be followed by the Administrator in making any future determination regarding ascertainment under section 3(c) of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963, as amended by subsection (a).

TITLE XII—PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 1201. Presidential and Vice Presidential tax transparency.

SEC. 1201. PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) The term ''covered candidate'' means a candidate of a major party in a general election for the office of President or Vice President.

(2) The term ''major party'' has the meaning given the term in section 9002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(3) The term ''income tax return'' means, with respect to an individual, any return (as such term is defined in section 6103(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, except that such term shall not include declarations of estimated tax) of—

(A) such individual, other than information returns issued to persons other than such individual; or

(B) of any corporation, partnership, or trust in which such individual holds, directly or indirectly, a significant interest as the sole or principal owner or the sole or principal beneficial owner (as such terms are defined in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate).

(4) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the delegate of the Secretary.

(b) DISCLOSURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.—Not later than the date that is 15 days after the date on which an individual becomes a covered candidate, the individual shall submit to the Federal Election Commission a copy of the individual's income tax returns for the 10 most recent taxable years for which a return has been filed with the Internal Revenue Service.

(B) PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.—With respect to an individual who is the President or Vice President, not later than the due date for the return of tax for each taxable year, such individual shall submit to the Federal Election Commission a copy of the individual's income tax returns for the taxable year and for the 9 preceding taxable years.

(C) TRANSITION RULE FOR SITTING PRESIDENTS AND VICE PRESIDENTS.—Not later than the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, an individual who is the President or Vice President on such date of enactment shall submit to the Federal Election Commission a copy of the income tax returns for the 10 most recent taxable years for which a return has been filed with the Internal Revenue Service.

(2) FAILURE TO DISCLOSE.—If any requirement under paragraph (1) to submit an income tax return is not met, the chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall submit to the Secretary a written request that the Secretary provide the Federal Election Commission with the income tax return.

(3) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.—The chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall make publicly available each income tax return submitted under paragraph (1) in the same manner as a return provided under section 6103(l)(23) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section).

(4) TREATMENT AS A REPORT UNDER THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.—For purposes of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, any income tax return submitted under paragraph (1) or provided under section 6103(l)(23) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) shall, after redaction under paragraph (3) or subparagraph (B)(ii) of such section, be treated as a report filed under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF RETURNS OF PRESIDENTS AND VICE PRESIDENTS AND CERTAIN CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6103(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(23) DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION OF PRESIDENTS AND VICE PRESIDENTS AND CERTAIN CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon written request by the chairman of the Federal Election Commission under section 1201(b)(2) of the Protecting Our Democracy Act, not later than the date that is 15 days after the date of such request, the Secretary shall provide copies of any return which is so requested to officers and employees of the Federal Election Commission whose official duties include disclosure or redaction of such return under this paragraph.

''(B) DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall make publicly available any return which is provided under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) REDACTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Before making publicly available under clause (i) any return, the chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall redact such information as the Federal Election Commission and the Secretary jointly determine is necessary for protecting against identity theft, such as social security numbers.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''or (22)'' and inserting ''(22), or (23)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F)(ii) by striking ''or (22)'' and inserting ''(22), or (23)''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to disclosures made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

DIVISION C—DEFENDING ELECTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN INTERFERENCE; PROHIBITING CAMPAIGNS FROM PAYING SPOUSE OF CANDIDATE

TITLE XIII—REPORTING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

SEC. 1301. FEDERAL CAMPAIGN REPORTING OF FOREIGN CONTACTS.

(a) INITIAL NOTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) DISCLOSURE OF REPORTABLE FOREIGN CONTACTS.—

''(1) COMMITTEE OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY.—Not later than 1 week after a reportable foreign contact, each political committee shall notify the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Commission of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, not later than 1 week after receiving a notification from a political committee under this paragraph, shall submit to the political committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate written or electronic confirmation of receipt of the notification.

''(2) INDIVIDUAL OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY.—Not later than 3 days after a reportable foreign contact—

''(A) each candidate and each immediate family member of a candidate shall notify the treasurer or other designated official of the principal campaign committee of such

candidate of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact; and

''(B) each official, employee, or agent of a political committee shall notify the treasurer or other designated official of the committee of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact.

''(3) REPORTABLE FOREIGN CONTACT.—In this subsection:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'reportable foreign contact' means any direct or indirect contact or communication that—

''(i) is between—

''(I) a candidate, an immediate family member of the candidate, a political committee, or any official, employee, or agent of such committee; and

''(II) an individual that the person described in subclause (I) knows, has reason to know, or reasonably believes is a covered foreign national; and

''(ii) the person described in clause (i)(I) knows, has reason to know, or reasonably believes involves—

''(I) an offer or other proposal for a contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation described in section 319; or

''(II) coordination or collaboration with, an offer or provision of information or services to or from, or persistent and repeated contact with, a covered foreign national in connection with an election.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(i) CONTACTS IN OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS ELECTED OFFICIAL.—The term 'reportable foreign contact' shall not include any contact or communication with a covered foreign national by an elected official or an employee of an elected official solely in an official capacity as such an official or employee.

''(ii) CONTACTS FOR PURPOSES OF ENABLING OBSERVATION OF ELECTIONS BY INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS.—The term 'reportable foreign contact' shall not include any contact or communication with a covered foreign national by any person which is made for purposes of enabling the observation of elections in the United States by a foreign national or the observation of elections outside of the United States by a candidate, political committee, or any official, employee, or agent of such committee.

''(iii) EXCEPTIONS NOT APPLICABLE IF CONTACTS OR COMMUNICATIONS INVOLVE PROHIBITED DISBURSEMENTS.—A contact or communication by an elected official or an employee of an elected official shall not be considered to be made solely in an official capacity for purposes of clause (i), and a contact or communication shall not be considered to be made for purposes of enabling the observation of elections for purposes of clause (ii), if the contact or communication involves a contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation described in section 319.

''(C) COVERED FOREIGN NATIONAL DEFINED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term 'covered foreign national' means—

''(I) a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b)) that is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party;

''(II) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal described in subclause (I) or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal described in subclause (I); or

''(III) any person included in the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury pursuant to authorities relating to the imposition of sanctions relating to the conduct of a foreign principal described in subclause (I).

''(ii) CLARIFICATION REGARDING APPLICATION TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.—In the case of a citizen of the United States, subclause (II) of clause (i) applies only to the extent that the person involved acts within the scope of that person's status as the agent of a foreign principal described in subclause (I) of clause (i).

''(4) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—In this subsection, the term 'immediate family member' means, with respect to a candidate, a parent, parent-in-law, spouse, adult child, or sibling.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to reportable foreign contacts which occur on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) INFORMATION INCLUDED ON REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (7);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) for any reportable foreign contact (as defined in subsection (j)(3))—

''(A) the date, time, and location of the contact;

''(B) the date and time of when a designated official of the committee was notified of the contact;

''(C) the identity of individuals involved; and

''(D) a description of the contact, including the nature of any contribution, donation, expenditure, disbursement, or solicitation involved and the nature of any activity described in subsection (j)(3)(A)(ii)(II) involved.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to reports filed on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1302. FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FOREIGN CONTACT REPORTING COMPLIANCE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30102) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) REPORTABLE FOREIGN CONTACTS COMPLIANCE POLICY.—

''(1) REPORTING.—Each political committee shall establish a policy that requires all officials, employees, and agents of such committee to notify the treasurer or other appropriate designated official of the committee of any reportable foreign contact (as defined in section 304(j)) not later than 3 days after such contact was made.

''(2) RETENTION AND PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.—Each political committee shall establish a policy that provides for the retention and preservation of records and information related to reportable foreign contacts (as so defined) for a period of not less than 3 years.

''(3) CERTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Upon filing its statement of organization under section 303(a), and with each report filed under section 304(a), the treasurer of each political committee (other than an authorized committee) shall certify that—

''(i) the committee has in place policies that meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2);

''(ii) the committee has designated an official to monitor compliance with such policies; and

''(iii) not later than 1 week after the beginning of any formal or informal affiliation with the committee, all officials, employees, and agents of such committee will—

''(I) receive notice of such policies;

''(II) be informed of the prohibitions under section 319; and

''(III) sign a certification affirming their understanding of such policies and prohibitions.

''(B) AUTHORIZED COMMITTEES.—With respect to an authorized committee, the candidate shall make the certification required under subparagraph (A).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to political committees which file a statement of organization under section 303(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30103(a)) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITION RULE FOR EXISTING COMMITTEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 shall file a certification with the Federal Election Commission that the committee is in compliance with the requirements of section 302(j) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 1303. CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

Section 309(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(d)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(E) Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of subsection (j) or (b)(9) of section 304 or section 302(j) shall be fined not more than $500,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(F) Any person who knowingly and willfully conceals or destroys any materials relating to a reportable foreign contact (as defined in section 304(j)) shall be fined not more than $1,000,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

SEC. 1304. REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report relating to notifications received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 304(j)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 1301(a) of this Act).

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following with respect to notifications described in subsection (a):

(1) The number of such notifications received from political committees during the year covered by the report.

(2) A description of protocols and procedures developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation relating to receipt and maintenance of records relating to such notifications.

(3) With respect to such notifications received during the year covered by the report, a description of any subsequent actions taken by the Director resulting from the receipt of such notifications.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''congressional intelligence committees'' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 1305. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed—

(1) to impede legitimate journalistic activities; or

(2) to impose any additional limitation on the right to express political views or to participate in public discourse of any individual who—

(A) resides in the United States;

(B) is not a citizen of the United States or a national of the United States, as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)); and

(C) is not lawfully admitted for permanent residence, as defined by section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)).

TITLE XIV—ELIMINATING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

SEC. 1401. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF PROVISION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION AS CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION OF A THING OF VALUE.—Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF PROVISION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION AS CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION OF A THING OF VALUE.—For purposes of this section, a 'contribution or donation of money or other thing of value' includes the provision of opposition research, polling, or other non-public information relating to a candidate for election for a Federal, State, or local office for the purpose of influencing the election, regardless of whether such research, polling, or information has monetary value, except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to treat the mere provision of an opinion about a candidate as a thing of value for purposes of this section.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN TO ALL CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS OF THINGS OF VALUE AND TO ALL SOLICITATIONS OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS OF THINGS OF VALUE.—Section 319(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''promise to make a contribution or donation'' and inserting ''promise to make such a contribution or donation'';

(2) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''donation'' and inserting ''donation of money or other thing of value, or to make an express or implied promise to make such a contribution or donation,''; and

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

''(2) a person to solicit, accept, or receive (directly or indirectly) a contribution or donation described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), or to solicit, accept, or receive (directly or indirectly) an express or implied promise to make such a contribution or donation, from a foreign national.''.

(c) ENHANCED PENALTY FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 309(d)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30109(d)(1)), as amended by section 1303, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G)(i) Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of section 319 which involves a foreign national which is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party, or which involves a thing of value consisting of the provision of opposition research, polling, or other non-public information relating to a candidate for election for a Federal, State, or local office for the purpose of influencing the election, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

''(ii) In clause (i), each of the terms 'government of a foreign country' and 'foreign political party' has the meaning given such term in section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as Amended (22 U.S.C. 611).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to violations committed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1402. REQUIRING ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN BY POLITICAL COMMITTEES.

(a) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.—Section 303 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30103) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN.—

''(1) NOTIFICATION BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 30 days after a political committee files its statement of organization under subsection (a), and biennially thereafter until the committee terminates, the Commission shall provide the committee with a written explanation of section 319.

''(2) ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY COMMITTEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the written explanation of section 319 under paragraph (1), the committee shall transmit to the Commission a signed certification that the committee has received such written explanation and has provided a copy of the explanation to all members, employees, contractors, and volunteers of the committee.

''(B) PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR SIGNATURE.—The certification required under subparagraph (A) shall be signed—

''(i) in the case of an authorized committee of a candidate, by the candidate; or

''(ii) in the case of any other political committee, by the treasurer of the committee.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITION FOR EXISTING COMMITTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to political committees which file statements of organization under section 303 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30103) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITION FOR EXISTING COMMITTEES.—

(A) NOTIFICATION BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall provide each political committee under such Act with the written explanation of section 319 of such Act, as required under section 303(e)(1) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

(B) ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY COMMITTEE.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the written explanation under subparagraph (A), each political committee under such Act shall transmit to the Federal Election Commission the signed certification, as required under section 303(e)(2) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

SEC. 1403. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''State, or local election'' and inserting the following: ''State, or local election, including a State or local ballot initiative or referendum''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2022 or any succeeding year.

TITLE XV—PROHIBITING CAMPAIGNS FROM PAYING SPOUSE OF CANDIDATE

SEC. 1501. PROHIBITING USE OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS TO COMPENSATE SPOUSES OF CANDIDATES; DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS MADE TO SPOUSES; DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS TO SPOUSES AND FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) PROHIBITION; DISCLOSURE.—Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30114) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) PROHIBITING COMPENSATION OF SPOUSES; DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS TO SPOUSES AND FAMILY MEMBERS.—

''(1) PROHIBITING COMPENSATION OF SPOUSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no authorized committee of a candidate or any other political committee established, maintained, or controlled by a candidate of an individual holding Federal office (other than a political committee of a political party) shall directly or indirectly compensate the spouse of the candidate or individual (as the case may be) for services provided to or on behalf of the committee.

''(2) DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS TO SPOUSES AND IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS.—In addition to any other information included in a report submitted under section 304 by a committee described in paragraph (1), the committee shall include in the report a separate statement of any payments, including direct or indirect compensation, made to the spouse or any immediate family member of the candidate or individual involved during the period covered by the report.

''(3) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'immediate family member' means the son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, mother, father, brother, sister, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, or grandchild of the candidate of individual involved.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 313(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30114(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''for otherwise'' and inserting ''subject to subsection (d), for otherwise''.

SEC. 1502. IMPOSITION OF PENALTY AGAINST CANDIDATE OR OFFICEHOLDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) In the case of a violation of section 313(d) committed by a committee described in such section, if the candidate or individual involved knew of the violation, any penalty imposed under this section shall be imposed on the candidate or individual and not on the committee.''.

(b) PROHIBITING REIMBURSEMENT BY COMMITTEE.—Section 313(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30114(d)), as added by section 1501(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) PROHIBITING REIMBURSEMENT BY COMMITTEE OF PENALTY PAID BY CANDIDATE FOR VIOLATIONS.—A committee described in paragraph (1) may not make any payment to reimburse the candidate or individual involved for any penalty imposed for a violation of this subsection which is required to be paid by the candidate or individual under section 309(e).''.

SEC. 1503. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to compensation and payments made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

DIVISION D—SEVERABILITY

TITLE XV—SEVERABILITY

SEC. 1501. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5314, the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5314, the Protecting Our Democracy Act. This sweeping package of reforms would restore integrity, accountability, and transparency to our government.

The landmark reforms in this bill would protect against future abuses, no matter who is President. This includes preventing abuses of the President's pardon power and requiring the President and Vice President to disclose their tax returns.

This bill includes many provisions that have bipartisan support. For example, the bill includes a provision based on a bill previously introduced by Representative DARRELL ISSA to make it easier for Congress to enforce subpoenas.

The bill would strengthen protections for inspectors general by only allowing an IG to be removed for specific documented causes. This reform passed the House with a bipartisan vote in June as part of a bill I introduced to increase the independence of inspectors general, and it passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support in 2007.

This bill also includes the bipartisan Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act, which I was proud to introduce. These provisions would strengthen protections for whistleblowers who are retaliated against for reporting waste, fraud, and abuse.

These reforms would provide whistleblowers the long overdue right to challenge retaliation in court. It would also prohibit agencies from launching retaliatory investigations and disclosing a whistleblower's identity; and it would make clear that no Federal employee, including the President or Vice President of the United States, may interfere with or retaliate against a whistleblower for sharing information with Congress.

The Protecting Our Democracy Act would also protect the government from political interference by strengthening the Hatch Act.

Just last month, the independent Office of Special Counsel found that 13 senior Trump administration officials, including top White House aides and Cabinet members, broke the law by using their official government position to campaign for President Trump.

This legislation would also limit who can be named an acting official and for how long. I thank Representative KATIE PORTER for her leadership on these reforms which are included in her bill, the Accountability for Acting Officials Act.

The reforms in this bill have broad support from over 150 groups, including the Brennan Center For Justice and the Project On Government Oversight.

My colleagues from across the aisle continue to claim that this bill is about punishing former President Trump, but this is simply not true.

While this bill addresses issues that were highlighted by past abuses, it is not about the past. It is about the future of our democracy, and it will strengthen our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to vote for the Protecting Our Democracy Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the bill the majority has titled the Protecting Our Democracy Act does nothing to protect anything but the swamp.

Right now, the American people are trying to prepare for the holidays with the highest inflation rate in 30 years. They are struggling to keep their gas tanks full, put food on the table, and heat their homes. They are worried about rising crime in their communities. They are concerned their children have suffered while their classrooms were closed but the borders are wide open to illegal immigrants and deadly drugs.

Democrats are ignoring these real issues facing Americans today. Instead, Democrats want to talk about former President Trump, even though a Democrat has occupied the White House for nearly a year. This is not what the American people want for Christmas.

The Democrats' playbook is about as predictable as a Hallmark Christmas special. We have all seen this movie.

The bill before us today is based on political fiction, and it is the latest attempt to resurrect Democrats' sham investigations of the past.

This bill unconstitutionally disrupts the separation of powers among the branches of government by diminishing the executive branch and ignoring the judicial branch.

For example, the legislation interferes with the President's pardon power, a power completely vested with the President. But this bill gives Congress access to sensitive White House deliberations and communications about pardons. What legislative purpose does that serve?

Congress has no authority to evaluate the President's pardon power. This bill also overrides the judicial branch by attaching partisan definitions to constitutional language that the Supreme Court has already spoken to. It would change the definition of an emolument to fit failed Democrat legal theories and indulge certain Members' false conspiracy theories—Members like, I don't know, Madam Speaker, ADAM SCHIFF.

Rewriting this technical constitutional term would keep any businessperson who has conducted business outside the U.S. from running for President. That would mean no Hunter Biden at the top of the ticket in 2024.

Democrats appear to think the skill set for running a business would not be helpful to the Federal Government. Maybe that is why Democrats' only solution to any problem is to throw American taxpayer dollars at it and not to engage in serious government reform efforts.

Democrats only want career politicians—or even better, career bureaucrats—to be able to serve as elected officials. Similarly, Democrats are determined to make the Federal Government run as inefficiently as possible by allowing incompetent or dishonest Federal employees to keep their jobs.

The so-called whistleblower protections in the bill are so expansive that if a Federal employee, even a bad or ineffective one, claims they are a whistleblower, they are almost immune from scrutiny.

The Committee on Oversight and Reform has great respect for whistleblowers. We need them to conduct true oversight. They serve an essential role in evaluating waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government. But sometimes Federal employees attempt to claim they are whistleblowers to shield themselves from scrutiny for poor performance. We should not make it impossible to vet whistleblowers' claims and their work.

Further, the policy in the Democrats' bill to entrench inspectors general is another policy that reduces the efficiency of the Federal Government and another example of the legislative branch intruding on the operations of the executive branch.

Madam Speaker, it is Christmastime. Instead of fixing the many problems created by President Biden, like the supply chain, energy, border, and economic crises, Democrats have decided to take up a sham bill and deliver a lump of coal to the American people.

Instead of spending time on Democrats' favorite obsession, President Trump, we should instead take on the issues facing Americans today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, alongside Chairman SCHIFF, on this very important legislation.

Madam Speaker, the previous administration played fast and loose with the American people's hard-earned tax dollars. And just as seriously, it exposed dangerous faults in our democratic institutions that, if left unaddressed, will erode the American people's trust in our democracy.

That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Protecting Our Democracy Act, which restrains Presidents from abusing the public trust.

Of particular importance to me as chair of the Appropriations Committee, this bill will ensure that every President, regardless of party, will be subject to the Congress' constitutional power of the purse.

It will strengthen congressional control and review over funding to ensure that Federal dollars are being used as directed by the Congress.

It will require the Office of Management and Budget to publish how it apportions the appropriations provided by the Congress to executive agencies.

Finally, the Protecting Our Democracy Act will increase reporting to Congress on the executive branch's compliance with the Impoundment Control Act and the Antideficiency Act, two bedrock laws that were enacted to protect Congress' appropriations power.

The American people deserve a voice in how their money is spent. Through their duly elected Representatives in the Congress, the Protecting Our Democracy Act gives the American people that voice.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge support for this important piece of legislation.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose this insane piece of legislation House Democrats are proposing.

This bill is yet another further attempt by the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, ADAM SCHIFF, to retroactively attack President Trump, even after the Democrats' Russian collusion allegations have been repeatedly debunked.

I want to specifically bring attention to Title XIII of this ridiculous bill. This provision requires employees, officials, and agents of a Presidential campaign to report foreign national contact and/or contributions to the FEC and to the FBI. The FBI is then required to provide notice to the campaign and to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, or HPSCI, as we call it.

Sound familiar? The FBI would be required to work with HPSCI on counterintelligence investigations into political candidates. What could possibly go wrong?

This provision is designed to further the Democrat-led FBI scheme against Republican Presidential candidates, just as they did with President Trump.

Here's how it would work: First, if a foreign government contacts a Republican campaign, the Republican campaign, in compliance with the proposed law, reports the contact to the FBI. Then the FBI notifies HPSCI Democrats, and somehow the media miraculously finds out about it and runs story after story about the Republican campaign colluding with the foreign government.

□ 1245

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Lather, rinse, repeat. I am not sure if anyone has told Chairman SCHIFF and House Democrats yet, but Donald Trump is, unfortunately, no longer President. Time to stop living in the past.

The clear intent of this bill is to weaponize the Federal Government bureaucracy against Republican candidates. If this legislation becomes law, Madam Speaker, don't be surprised if we see Russian hoaxes every 2 years.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, this bill does not look back.

Yes, we saw the abuses of Donald Trump over using the 1976 National Emergency Act in ways that it had never ever been used before to move money around to things because he couldn't get it appropriated through a Republican Senate and a Republican House. He couldn't get it done, so he moved the money around.

Anybody who works in the House of Representatives or the Senate should be insulted that you want to empower a President—what about if Joe Biden starts doing that? Don't you want to have these tools? Or any other future President of either party?

This isn't about Donald Trump. It is about the Trump era, which exposed things that need to be fixed, and this law does that.

Subpoena power—our subpoenas should be enforceable, whether they are from a Democratic Congress or a Republican Congress. They are not.

The Department of Justice needs to have a firewall between the White House and the Department of Justice. You can't have the President calling up the Department of Justice, telling them to prosecute people or make stuff up. Any President of any party shouldn't be able to do that.

Then the President embargoed, stopped money that Congress, a Republican Congress, had sent for Ukraine. Just stopped it. But apparently, on the other side of the aisle, they feel like their job is to be handmaidens in case Trump comes back.

They don't want to put in the protections now when Joe Biden is there, who they carry on about as abusive all the time. Why not put in the protections now? Because you want Donald Trump to be able to come back and continue these sorts of abuses.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, there is so much in this bill to be concerned about.

For the last 5 years, as a member of the House Intelligence Committee, I lived through the Russian hoax, I lived through impeachment 1, I lived through impeachment 2, all of which are great examples of provisions in this bill that harm our democracy. Let me talk about just one of them.

Tucked into this bill's provisions are elements which will rewrite the very nature of our democracy, whittling down the meaning of government for the people and by the people.

The President of the United States is elected by the people to run the executive branch. The President, by design, is accountable to the people. But among the many failures in this bill before us today are new sections which would severely restrict the ability of the President to remove senior government employees. This will have the effect of empowering these senior officials with the ability to paralyze a President whose policies they may not agree with, which we saw again and again during the Russian hoax, during impeachment 1, and during impeachment 2. This sets a dangerous precedent that will create a permanent bureaucratic resistance to the duly elected President.

The danger of these provisions will also set in motion a precedent to weaponize the entire intelligence community bureaucracy by allowing anonymous individuals to paralyze a President without any accountability. If you don't think it is going to happen, I refer you back to the Russian investigation hoax, to impeachment 1, and to impeachment 2. This guarantees more of this collusion.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I want to highlight an important element of reform that came out of work

a while ago from the House Administration Committee.

Most Americans believe that if a foreign adversary reaches out to interfere in our elections, the campaign ought to report that to law enforcement. Instead, as we saw in the previous administration, campaign officials welcomed and, in some cases, even solicited foreign assistance for political activities. This bill creates a duty to report illicit offers of campaign assistance from foreign governments to law enforcement.

It also clarifies what is a thing of value. It includes information sought or obtained for political advantage, like opposition research.

It ensures that individuals engaging in misconduct with foreign actors to influence our elections would be held accountable. It also ensures that foreign money cannot influence our politics through State and local ballot initiatives and referenda, closing a loophole that recently was created by the FEC.

Now, it is astounding to hear criticism of the idea that the FBI should be notified when a foreign adversary is trying to corrupt our elections. We all know that that should happen.

To distrust our law enforcement agencies when it comes to protecting our country from this kind of attack—which is what it is—from a foreign adversary is shocking. Support this bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5314.

Bringing H.R. 5314 to the House floor this week shows that the Democrats' priority is partisan politics, not policies that will directly benefit the American people.

If Democrats were serious about bipartisan reforms, they wouldn't be pushing a bill like H.R. 5314. This bill is nothing but a continuation of the Democrats' obsession with President Trump. He lives rent free in their heads.

This bill incorporates several unnecessary ''reforms'' that are nothing but an attempt to validate House Democrats' baseless investigation of the Trump administration.

It is a huge red flag that H.R. 5314 was referred to nine committees and not one Democrat-led committee has held a hearing or a markup on the legislation. This legislation is being pushed through without proper order, and I oppose it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished chair of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Protecting Our Democracy Act. I am very proud to sponsor this legislation, and I am grateful for the partnership of many chairs and Members who contributed to the effort, as well as the leadership of Speaker PELOSI.

Our system was founded upon a respect for the rule of law and a carefully constructed balance of power among the three branches. That system has, throughout history, been tested. Just as, after Watergate, Congress worked to pass reforms like campaign finance laws and new ethics rules, so we must now examine the cracks in the democratic foundation and address them.

That is precisely what this bill does. It will prevent Presidential abuses of power, ensure the independence of our justice system, and reinforce the system of checks and balances.

Specifically, among other things, it would prevent corruption or misuse of the pardon power. It would ensure that Congress may exercise its constitutionally mandated oversight responsibilities and enforce subpoenas in a timely manner. It protects whistleblowers and expands the independence of inspectors general. It reestablishes Congress' power of the purse.

This bill has garnered support from groups across the political spectrum because it is not about politics; it is about the survival of our democratic system of government. Many of the reforms included in this package are sponsored and supported by Republicans as well as Democrats.

I urge all of my colleagues in Congress to support the Protecting Our Democracy Act. The day that we were sworn into office, we made a sacred pledge of allegiance and loyalty to the United States. This bill places our oath to democracy and the Constitution above party politics. This is a moment and a vote when we have the opportunity to fulfill that oath.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I was hoping the chairman of the Intelligence Committee was going to present the evidence of Russian collusion during his time, but apparently not.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5314. The bill is simply another political attack by the Democrats on President Trump. It also destroys the separation of powers between the President and Congress.

I introduced an amendment to the bill to require Congress to be notified when the AG terminates a special counsel, but unfortunately, the Rules Committee failed to adopt it.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle spent the last several years peddling bogus allegations that President Trump colluded with Russia. Now the Durham investigation has proved these allegations were a sham that wasted years of time and resources, and now we know the Clinton campaign paid Fusion GPS to draft the dossier as opposition research.

Fusion GPS relied on information from Igor Danchenko, a Russian who worked at the Brookings Institution. Mr. Danchenko based his information on tales from Chuck Dolan, a public relations executive who worked for the Hillary Clinton campaign in the past. The whole scheme was a vicious circle that began and ended with the Clinton campaign.

We cannot have a bill that works to prevent overreach by one branch of government. I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great Commonwealth of Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, democracy is not static. It is not self-effectuating. It requires a concerted effort to keep and a willingness to stand up against those who would seek to undermine it.

The bill before us reaffirms our commitment to democracy, transparency, accountability, and a strong system of checks and balances.

Our Founders knew that the power of the purse would be fundamental to the separation of powers and to our democratic government itself, and they explicitly gave that power to Congress, the branch most responsive to the will of the people.

However, over the past few decades, the executive branch has encroached on our constitutional spending authority, and dangerous precedents have been set. Presidents and agencies of both parties have pushed the boundaries, seeking more control of spending powers. The previous administration's disregard for the rule of law and contempt for institutional norms made even more clear the need for laws that can withstand a lawless executive.

The commonsense reforms in this landmark legislation will restore Congress' central role in funding decisions, increase executive transparency, and add teeth to our budget laws. None of these provisions or the many others in this legislation is partisan. After all, this bill was introduced during the Trump administration, and it is being advanced during the Biden administration. It is solely about shoring up the separation of powers and maintaining the rule of law.

Therefore, I encourage my colleagues on both sides to uphold our sworn duty to defend the Constitution and vote ''yes'' on the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, setting aside the Democrats' neurotic obsession with all things Donald Trump, this measure has many provisions that would receive bipartisan support if the bill's author were so inclined.

But when we speak of protecting democracy, we need to remember what democracy is. It is the process by which the sovereign people, through

elections, decide who will control and direct the powers that we entrust to our government.

''The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.'' If the executive branch begins to operate independently of the President, the will of the people is thwarted and democracy is diminished.

For example, the Tenure of Office Act limited the President's authority to remove Cabinet officers, a dangerous concept ultimately repealed by the Congress and repudiated by the Supreme Court. Provisions in this bill, such as those that interfere with Presidential appointments, cross that very bright constitutional line.

□ 1300

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Transparency and accountability are the bedrock of our democratic system. They are the essential guardrails that protect against unchecked executive power. Unfortunately, the Trump administration exposed certain vulnerabilities in the fabric of our democracy by engaging in conduct that was once unthinkable, and like the reforms enacted post-Watergate, we must now act to prevent similar abuses from a future President.

Although many of these provisions were informed by our experience with the prior administration, they are pointedly not anti-Trump measures. Rather, they are forward looking, and they protect against the abuses by future Presidents of any party. Importantly, many of them are also based on proposals that have bipartisan support.

I am especially proud of the provisions in this bill that fall within the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction.

These include requiring an expedited, streamlined process for enforcing Congressional subpoenas in court. This would prevent an administration from stonewalling Congressional oversight and then evading accountability for years while the courts resolve the issue.

To address abuses of the clemency power, the bill requires additional transparency, and it reaffirms that abuses of the clemency power can form the basis of a bribery scheme and that self-pardons are prohibited.

It pauses the statute of limitations on Federal offenses during a President and Vice President's term in office to ensure that they can be held accountable for criminal conduct just like any other American.

And it addresses improper communications between the White House and the Department of Justice, an all too common occurrence under the last administration.

Madam Speaker, when the Nation's Founders wrote the Constitution, after having just fought a war against a tyrant, they stood fast to a key principle, that the executive must not be a king and must instead be accountable to Congress, to the people, and ultimately, to the rule of law. It is vital that we reassert this important principle.

The Protecting Our Democracy Act would restore these and other checks and balances that are so fundamental to our democracy.

I urge all Members to support this vital legislation.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), the ranking member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, for yielding. The bill we are debating here today, the so-called Protecting Our Democracy Act, is another attempt by the outgoing majority to relitigate many of the Democrats' sham investigations. Many of the bill's provisions are unnecessary and recycled attempts to take away individual States' sovereignty. If we were really here to talk about protecting our democracy, then we would focus on the importance of voter rolls list maintenance to ensure only eligible citizens are able to vote in Federal elections.

Congress passed the bipartisan National Voter Registration Act in 1993. That is almost 30 years ago. This law requires States to conduct regular list maintenance to ensure their voter rolls are kept up to date. This simple, commonsense requirement is incredibly important for voter confidence in our entire election process and its outcomes.

However, the Biden DOJ refuses to enforce it. Instead, Progressives focus on defunding the police and embracing lawlessness, keeping our economy and Capitol shut down while ignoring the science, labeling concerned parents as extremist threats, and weaponizing the DOJ to go after them, and pursuing reckless, unnecessary spending that is driving the inflation every single American feels in their pocketbook.

If Democrats were really focused on protecting our democracy, the Biden Justice Department would investigate States like California where the number of registered voters far exceeds the number of adults in the State. Senator ALEX PADILLA, a newly appointed Senator from the State of California, knew about the problem and refused to address it when he was Secretary of State in California during the last election cycle.

Republicans care about election integrity because our constitutional republic means nothing if our citizens don't have faith in our elections.

When everyday Americans hear more and more reports of individuals on active voter rolls who have moved to another State, died, or are noncitizens, it frustrates them because it calls into question whether their valid vote actually counts. One eligible person, one whole non-diluted vote.

It is so frustrating because the fix is so simple, but Democrats refuse time and time again to address this problem. It is common sense and has been Federal law for decades that only eligible Americans should be on our voter rolls.

Republicans want every eligible voter who wants to vote to exercise that right. Democrats dilute your vote, but Republicans restore it.

I am here today to talk about protecting our democracy, and I think the only way to do that is to make sure Americans know our elections have integrity.

So today, I am calling on the radical Biden Justice Department to do the right thing and enforce Federal law across the board. Stop investigating parents that want to be involved in their children's education. Stop supporting efforts to defund our men and women in blue resulting in the lawlessness that we see ravaging our great country.

Focus on what really matters. Protect our democracy, protect our vote, and ensure States like California conduct voter roll list maintenance so that voters know only eligible American citizens are able to vote.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a report from the Department of Justice IG detailing the DOJ's official policy not to enforce Federal voter list maintenance requirements.

[From the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, March 2013]

A REVIEW OF THE OPERATIONS OF THE VOTING SECTION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

V. ENFORCEMENT OF THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT (NVRA)

In this section we review the Voting Section's history of enforcing the National Voter Registration Act, the so-called motor-voter law. Enacted in 1993, the NVRA has. two primary purposes: to increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote in federal elections and to protect the integrity of the electoral process. 42 U.S.C. 1973gg(b). Critics have alleged that CRT leadership during the prior administration favored enforcement of the list-maintenance (electoral integrity) provisions because those provisions purportedly are more strongly supported by Republicans and remove more potential Democratic voters from the rolls. Conversely, critics of the current CRT leadership allege that it has neglected the electoral integrity provisions of the NVRA in favor of enforcing the voter access provisions, because these provisions purportedly are supported by Democratic constituencies and lead to the registration of more voters who are likely to support Democrats. Without opining on the underlying political assumptions, we examine both of these allegations in this section.

A. DATA REGARDING ENFORCEMENT TRENDS IN NVRA CASES

Figure 3. 7 below displays the number of NVRA enforcement actions initiated by the Voting Section on an annual basis since January 1995, when the statute became effective in most states. Figure 3. 7 is broken down by actions that enforced the statute's list-maintenance provision (Section 8(a)(4)), actions

that enforced the voter registration provisions (Sections 5, 6, 7, and the improper purging paragraphs of Section 8), and actions that brought both types of claims.

The most noteworthy trend in the Department's enforcement of the NVRA relates to the statute's voter list-maintenance provision, Section 8(a)(4). In the 17 years since the statute became effective, the Department has asserted list-maintenance claims on 7 occasions, 6 of which occurred in a 3-year span between 2004 and 2007. According to Hans von Spakovsky, CRT leadership initiated an effort to enforce Section 8's list-maintenance provision in late 2004. Von Spakovsky told the OIG that he recommended to Division leadership exploring those cases because he believed that the Department had never conducted a systematic review of states' list-maintenance compliance in the 10 years since the NVRA became effective. This effort ultimately resulted in the filing of a complaint alleging list-maintenance claims in 2005 and 2006. According to witnesses involved in the four other matters involving list-maintenance claims brought between 2004 and 2007, those claims arose when the Section obtained evidence suggesting a failure to comply with the list-maintenance provision during the course of ongoing investigations into other voting-related matters.

B. ENFORCEMENT OF THE NVRA DURING 2001–2008

We received allegations that the only NVRA cases that Division leadership wanted to pursue during this period were Section 8(a)(4) list-maintenance claims, at the expense of cases to protect or increase voter registration under other provisions of the NVRA. Critics further alleged that the Division's leadership was particularly focused on bringing such list-purging cases in political swing states and large Democratic jurisdictions. The Division's leadership denied any such focus and identified several cases approved by Division leadership to controvert the suggestion that NVRA enforcement decisions were driven by a partisan agenda. We examined the entire range of NVRA cases pursued during January 2001 to January 2009 in order to address this issue.

From January 2001 through January 2009, the Department was involved in 12 NVRA enforcement matters, summarized in Table 3.2.

As reflected in Table 3.2, the Voting Section began filing list-maintenance cases in 2004. As noted above, von Spakovsky confirmed that Division leadership initiated an effort in 2004 to enforce Section 8's list-maintenance provision on a systemic basis. Von Spakovsky told the OIG that he recommended exploring those cases because he believed the Department had never conducted a systematic review of states' list-maintenance compliance in the 10 years since the NVRA's enactment.

Division leadership directed the Voting Section to conduct the research effort, to review the census data and voter registration data for all 50 states to determine which states had more people registered to vote than the voting-age population, as reflected in the census data. Based on the results of this research, the Section sent letters to 12 states, stating that the Section's review of relevant data indicated that the state may not be complying with Section 8's list-maintenance provision and requesting information on their efforts to remove ineligible voters from their registration lists.

Von Spakovsky told the OIG that some of the targeted states responded to the Department's letter, explained why there was a discrepancy in the data, and established that they were complying with the NVRA's list-maintenance requirements. He also stated that a number of states failed to show that they were in compliance with Section 8(a)(4) and that the Section proceeded toward enforcement actions against those non-compliant states.

Division leadership approved the filing of two complaints as a result of this enforcement initiative. In November 2005, the Section filed a lawsuit against the state of Missouri alleging both improper purging and failure-to-purge violations. In June 2006, the Section filed a complaint against Indiana alleging that the state failed to conduct list purging as required by Section 8(a)(4). The Indiana case was resolved by a settlement agreement, but the Missouri case continued until early 2009, when the Division voluntarily dismissed the case.

In 2006 and 2007, Division leadership approved three additional complaints containing Section 8(a)(4) list-maintenance claims, against the States of Maine and New Jersey and the City of Philadelphia. According to the Voting Section attorney supervising those efforts, these complaints did not arise out of the enforcement initiative described above. Instead, the complaints were brought as a result of investigations under the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) that uncovered evidence of both HAVA and NVRA violations. The Section ultimately settled the lawsuits with Maine, New Jersey, and Philadelphia. In each settlement agreement, the jurisdiction agreed to implement specific steps to satisfy its list-maintenance obligations.

In August 2007, Voting Section Chief John Tanner initiated a program to enforce Section 7 of the NVRA, requiring states to provide voter registration opportunities in public assistance and disability offices. Section attorneys reviewed federal Election Assistance Commission (EAC) data to identify states that were not meeting Section 7's requirements and discovered 18 states that reported registering 0 voters in offices providing public assistance over the previous 2-year period. Following further investigation, the Section entered into settlement agreements with Arizona and Illinois to resolve Section 7 violations.

In 2007 and 2008, Voting Section teams reviewed EAC data and census information to identify states that might not be in compliance with the NVRA'sSection 8(a)(4) list-maintenance requirements. The teams identified states in which a significant percentage of the counties or electoral jurisdictions had more registered voters than voting-age population. The teams recommended to Division leadership that the Voting Section initiate investigations into the states that failed to meet the relevant criterion. The states that were the subject of these recommendations included some states that historically have consistently favored one party in presidential elections as well as political ''swing states.'' The 2007 recommendation was approved and the Section later issued requests for information to the relevant states. Ultimately, however, no further enforcement action was taken arising out of this effort. The investigations that were proposed in late November 2008 were never approved by either the outgoing or the incoming administrations.

C. ENFORCEMENT OF THE NVRA DURING 2009–2012

1. Division Leadership Declines To Act on Voting Section Proposal for Section 8 Investigation

In February 2009, shortly after the new administration took office, the Voting Section submitted a memorandum to Division leadership requesting approval to initiate investigations into the list-maintenance procedures of a State (''State E''). According to the State E memorandum, voter-registration data indicated that roughly 22 percent of State E's counties had more registered voters than either the voting-age population or the citizen voting-age population. The memorandum stated that the Section had been alerted to State E's potential list-maintenance failures in connection with an unrelated Section 5 investigation. We were told that the Section never received a response from Division leadership to the proposal memorandum.

2. Drafting of NVRA Guidance

In the spring of 2009, a few months after the inauguration of the new administration, the Department commenced an effort to draft public guidance concerning the requirements of NVRA Section 7. Samuel Hirsch, who joined the Department in March 2009 as a Deputy Associate Attorney General and led the NVRA guidance effort, described the project as rewriting the NVRA in plain terms and posting it on the CRT website to assist those running state governmental offices in complying with the NVRA's requirements. Hirsch told the OIG the original scope of the NVRA guidance project was limited to Section 7 because the administration believed that Section 7 had been somewhat ignored by state government officials. According to Hirsch, there was a sense in the administration that NVRA Section 8 and other provisions were working fairly well, but that Section 7 ''was slipping through the cracks.''

DAAG Julie Fernandes and AAG Thomas Perez became involved in the NVRA guidance project after they joined the Department in July and October 2009, respectively. According to Fernandes, she expressed concern to Hirsch that the project was limited to Section 7 and proposed broadening the guidance to include other NVRA provisions, such as Sections 5 and 8. Perez also told the OIG that in early 2010 he instructed that the guidance include a discussion of all NVRA provisions, including the list-maintenance provisions. Hirsch told the OIG that he did not oppose expanding the guidance to include Section 8, but stated that he may have been opposed to holding up the release of the Section 7 guidance while preparing the Section 8 segment. The Division ultimately posted guidance concerning NVRA Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 on its website in June 2010.

3. Comments by DAAG Julie Fernandes Regarding NVRA Enforcement at a November 2009 Section Meeting

DAAG Julie Fernandes told the OIG that she urged Voting Section Chief Christopher Coates to hold section-wide meetings shortly after she joined the Department in July 2009. As a result, the Voting Section held several brown-bag lunches. In addition to the September meeting at which Section 2 enforcement was discussed as outlined above, another session devoted to NVRA matters was held on November 10, 2009.

At some point during the November meeting, the discussion turned to the enforcement of the NVRA's voter list-maintenance provision in Section 8. Witnesses who recalled Fernandes's statements uniformly remembered that she said something to the effect that she was more interested in pursuing cases under NVRA Section 7 than Section 8 because Section 8 does not expand voter access. Witnesses' recollections of the context of Fernandes's statements, her precise wording, and the meaning of her comments, however, varied widely.

Thirteen witnesses told the OIG that Fernandes stated that she ''did not care about'' or ''was not interested'' in pursuing Section 8 cases, or similar formulations. For instance, Chris Herren, who was later promoted by current Division leadership to Section Chief, told the OIG that Fernandes made a controversial and ''very provocative'' statement at this brown bag lunch. In particular, Herren stated that Fernandes stated

something to the effect of ''[Section 8] does nothing to help voters. We have no interest in that.'' Herren told the OIG that he winced when he heard Fernandes's response because he believed it would raise a controversy. Two other Section attorneys took handwritten notes at the meeting, both of which quoted Fernandes saying that she did not ''care'' about Section 8.

Ten attorneys who attended the meeting told the OIG that they interpreted Fernandes's comments to be a clear directive that Division leadership would not approve Section 8 list-maintenance cases in the future. One Section attorney told the OIG that he understood Fernandes's statements to mean that proposing a Section 8 case would be futile and that he believed proposing Section 8 could be detrimental for the attorneys.

Seven Voting Section attorneys told the OIG, however, that they did not believe Fernandes said that the Division would not enforce Section 8 of the NVRA. Among these were three Deputy Chiefs who told the OIG that they believed Fernandes meant that Section 7 cases would be prioritized over Section 8 matters, but that they did not construe her statement to mean that Section 8 cases would not be approved. Those attorneys who were generally identified as being more conservative tended to recall that Fernandes took the more extreme position, while those generally identified as being more liberal tended to recall her statements as being more limited.

Fernandes told the OIG that she did not recall exactly what she said at the November brown bag lunch regarding enforcement of Section 8 of the NVRA. She said that she and the Section staff discussed the NVRA and what their approach, goals, and strategy should be. She said that she talked about how Division leadership is interested in creating equal opportunity for minority voters. Fernandes further told the OIG that she talked about wanting the Section to focus on voter access, which would involve NVRA Sections 5, 7, and 8, all of which are in the vein of ensuring that jurisdictions have a fair and accessible process for all voters. She stated that she recalled being asked about Section 8 and that her response included something to the effect that Division leadership's focus is on the provisions of the NVRA pertaining to voter access.

With respect to the comments attributed to her that she did not care about enforcing Section 8, Fernandes told the OIG that she did not think she said the words ''don't care'' about enforcing Section 8 because that is not her position. Fernandes denied saying that she or Division leadership had no interest in pursuing Section 8 cases. Fernandes said that she believed her comment about not caring was in the context of how to determine what jurisdictions they should target for enforcement, given that she believed there is widespread noncompliance with the NVRA.

Fernandes noted that the list-maintenance provision of Section 8 requires jurisdictions to employ reasonable, non-discriminatory measures to ensure that people who are eligible can vote and those who are ineligible cannot. Therefore, Fernandes stated, she does not care whether a jurisdiction's voter list is big, but rather whether it has a list-maintenance program that does not work. She explained that the fact that a jurisdiction's voter list is too big means that the Section may want to inquire about the jurisdiction's list-maintenance program, but that alone would not justify bringing a lawsuit.

Roughly one year later, in September 2010, allegations concerning Fernandes's comments at the brown bag lunch regarding NVRA enforcement surfaced in news media. Fernandes and other Division leadership personnel assisted other Department officials in preparing talking points to address the allegations and Fernandes stated in one of the relevant e-mails: ''If we are o.k. with having priorities, we should say that we have a priority on the enforcement of the NVRA, with a focus on the parts of the statute that require states to provide voter registration opportunities in a variety of settings.''

4. Approval of List-Maintenance Investigations

In September 2009, the Section submitted a memorandum to DAAG Fernandes requesting authority to initiate formal investigations into the list-maintenance procedures of eight states. The recommendation was based on the Section's review of an EAC report that contained voting-related data from each of the 50 states covering the period from November 2006 to November 2008. A Deputy Section Chief supervised a team of Section attorneys that reviewed the EAC report for anomalous entries, particularly states that reported that throughout the 2–year period they did not remove any voters from their rolls due to death or that they had not issued any voter-removal notices related to citizens who were believed to have moved out of the state. The team identified eight states that met one of those criteria, four of which reported removing zero ineligible voters from their rolls over the 2–year period for any reason, including death, change of address, disqualifying criminal conviction, or mental incapacity.

The team presented the relevant data in its memorandum to DAAG Fernandes and stated that the information suggested that the eight states in question were not fulfilling their list-maintenance obligations under Section 8. As a result, the team recommended initiating formal investigations of the states in question and directing inquiries to relevant state officials.

Fernandes told the OIG that, after receiving the proposal for the Section 8 investigations, she told Section Chief Coates that he needed to ''hold off' because she was not ready to decide whether this was the proper approach for NVRA enforcement. Fernandes told the OIG that she believed the Section's NVRA work when she became DAAG in July 2009 was disorganized and that its process for evaluating NVRA matters was ''random, unstrategic, [and] not very well thought-out.'' She said that Division leadership and Voting Section management were therefore engaged in a process of identifying what their NVRA enforcement strategy should be by reviewing where the Section had focused its enforcement efforts in the past, determining which areas had been neglected, and developing an analytical model to bring NVRA cases.

According to Fernandes, she and Division leadership believed that the NVRA enforcement efforts from January 2001 through January 2009 had focused on Section 8's list-maintenance cases, largely to the exclusion of the voter-registration provisions in Section 7, which she believed had been under-enforced and neglected. While we found no evidence that she examined any data to support this belief, it was consistent with what we found to be the prevailing belief about the prior administration's efforts in this area. Fernandes stated further that she believed the way to ''rectify this imbalance was to determine what Section 7 efforts were in process, whether they were being performed correctly, and whether the Section should expand its Section 7 enforcement further. Fernandes stated that her supervisors were pressuring her to move forward on Section 7 enforcement and that she received a clear message that they viewed enforcing Section 7 as a higher priority than Section 8. She told the OIG that she believed she had to ''scratch the Section 7 itch before turning to Section 8 matters and that her supervisors would have criticized her if she had approved Section 8 efforts first. She also noted that there was significant criticism of the Department from civil rights groups that their Section 7 enforcement efforts had been inadequate, saying they had gotten—and continued to get—''beat up all the time by [their] lefty friends not doing enough on Section 7.''

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. This is a report from the DOJ's IG. It takes this many pages to tell the American voter that they are not going to enforce Federal law in ensuring that States actually provide and exercise the required voter list maintenance. This is an affront to election integrity in our great country, and it needs to end today.

Let's protect our democracy, and let's work together to make that happen.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts). The gentleman from Kentucky has 15¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I include in the RECORD a letter of support for the Protecting Our Democracy Act listing over 150 organizations supporting this important legislation. We have widespread support across this Nation.

OCTOBER 6, 2021.

OVER 150 ORGANIZATIONS SEND JOINT LETTER URGING CONGRESS TO PASS THE PROTECTING OUR DEMOCRACY ACT

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: The undersigned organizations, on behalf of the millions of Americans our groups collectively represent, write to urge you to support and pass the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

For decades, congressional authority has been undermined by the executive branch, diminishing the ability of Congress to fulfill its constitutional duties, to protect the rule of law, and to hold all presidents accountable for overreaches and abuses of power. The last time Congress passed significant reform to protect our democracy from abuses of executive power was after the Watergate scandal. The time has come for new guardrails to reassert Congress' role as a coequal branch of government.

Today, lawmakers on both sides of the aisle and in both chambers have an interest in restoring the checks and balances entrusted to them in our Constitution. The Protecting Our Democracy Act would do just that by restoring the powers the Founders vested in the legislative branch to serve as a check on the executive without infringing upon the president's constitutional powers.

Among other reforms, this historic bill would:

Strengthen Congress's ability to oversee the executive branch by fortifying congressional subpoena power by providing expedited consideration of subpoena enforcement by courts, so the executive branch cannot run out the clock on congressional oversight;

Ensure inspectors general are qualified and empowered to hold federal agencies accountable without fear of reprisal by requiring the

president to have ''good cause'' for removing an inspector general and enhancing reporting requirements when there is a vacancy;

Ensure whistleblowers can continue shining light on corruption and abuses of power that betray the public trust by enhancing protections against retaliation, providing legal defenses for whistleblowers against civil and criminal liability, and allowing whistleblowers to have their day in court;

Reinforce Congress's constitutional powers over spending and the power of the purse by requiring the Office of Management and Budget to make public basic information about the management of federal funds, and reporting to Congress to ensure those funds are spent in accordance with the law;

Prevent political interference with the U.S. Department of Justice by putting a permanent, statutory requirement in place that will ensure transparency and accountability related to their communications with the White House;

Strengthen the Hatch Act to protect federal agencies from being used for political purposes and ensure senior political appointees are held accountable under the law the same way other federal employees are.

Prevent abuse of the president's pardon power by increasing transparency of the pardon process, prohibiting self-pardons by the president, and clarifying that pardons are ''official acts'' for the purposes of federal bribery statute;

Provide for enforcement of the domestic and foreign Emoluments Clauses of the Constitution, to prevent a president from profiting from payments by foreign or domestic governments; and

Secure our elections from foreign interference, by ensuring political campaigns are informed of the laws banning foreign interference and are prepared to comply and report any attempts of foreign interference.

In this perilous moment for our republic, we believe it should be a top priority for this Congress to repair our democracy, including ensuring that no future president is permitted to abuse the power of their office.

If enacted, the Protecting Our Democracy Act would protect against future presidential abuses of power, restore the integrity of our democratic institutions, and ensure transparency from the chief executive.

Given the urgency of this crisis and for these reasons, we call on you to swiftly pass this critical legislation.

Sincerely,

20/20 Vision, Academics Stand Against Poverty, Accountability Lab, Affiliation of Christian Engineers, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), American Oversight, American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC), Animals Are Sentient Beings, Inc., Arab American Institute (AAI), Asian Law Alliance, Asian Pacific American Labor alliance, AFL–CIO, Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Beyond Pesticides, Blacks in Law Enforcement of America, Blue Wave Postcard Movement, Brave New Films, Brennan Center for Justice.

Campaign Legal Center, Center for American Progress, Center for Common Ground, Center for International Environmental Law, Center for International Policy, Center for Media and Democracy, Center for Progressive Reform, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, Clean Elections Texas, Coalition of Labor Union Women, AFL–CIO, Columbia Legal Services, Common Cause, Communications Workers of America, Community Research, Community Science Institute, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, Constitutional Alliance, Consumer Action, Corruption kills, Council for a Livable World, CovertAction Magazine.

Demand Progress, DemCast USA, Democracy 21, Democracy Fund Voice, Democracy Matters, Demos, Disaster Accountability Project, Eco-Justice Collaborative, End Citizens United//Let America Vote Action Fund, Equal Justice Society, Equal Rights Advocates, Essential Information, Faith in Public Life, Fix Democracy First, Fix the Court, Food & Water Watch, Franciscan Action Network, Free Speech Coalition, Inc., Free Speech For People.

Geos Institute, Global Integrity, Government Accountability Project, Government Information Watch, Green Delaware, Greenpeace USA, Hanford Challenge, Heart of America NW, Hip Hop Caucus, Human Environmental and Leadership Prevalent Center (HELP Center), Indivisible, Information Trust, Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection, Georgetown Law, International Association of Whistleblowers, Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement, Iowa Institute for Public Accountability, Keep Our Republic, Kentucky Environmental Foundation, Kentucky Resources Council, Inc.

League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), League of Women Voters of the United States, Mainers for Accountable Leadership, Michiganders for Fair and Transparent Elections, Mid-Ohio Valley Climate Action, MoneyOutVA, Mormon Women for Ethical Government, MoveOn, Muslim American Law Enforcement Association (MALEA), National Center for Health Research, National Council for Occupational Safety and Health, National Education Association, National Employment Law Project, National Organization for Women, National Security Counselors, National Voter Corps, National Whistleblower Center/Whistleblower Network News, National Workrights Institute, Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

New American Leaders Action Fund, New Moral Majority, Niskanen Center, No More Guantanamos, Northwest Immigrant Rights Project, Open The Government, Our Bodies Ourselves, Pax Christi USA, People For the American Way, People's Parity Project, PRESS4WORD2020, Professional Managers Association, Project Blueprint, Project On Government Oversight (POGO), Protect All Children's Environment, Protect Democracy, Public Citizen, Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, Public Justice Center.

Republicans for the Rule of Law, Rock the Vote, RootsAction.org, S.T.O.P.—The Surveillance Technology Oversight Project, Secure Elections Network, Senior Executives Association, SIECUS: Sex Ed for Social Change, Sierra Club, SocioEnergetics Foundation, Sojourners, Stand Up America, Stand Up Republic, Strategies for Justice, BWMP LLC, Sustainable Energy & Economy Network, T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights, The Digital Democracy Project, The Ecotopian Society, The National Air Disaster Foundation, The National Vote, The Press Freedom Defense Fund of First Look Institute.

The Rutherford Institute, The Shalom Center, The Signals Network, The Workers Circle, Transparency International—U.S. Office, Truckers Justice Center, Tully Center for Free Speech, Un-PAC, Union of Concerned Scientists, Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice, UNITED SIKHS, Voices for Progress, Vote Vets, Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs, Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), WESPAC Foundation, Inc., Whistleblowers of America, Win Without War, Women's Action for New Directions (WAND), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom US, Workplace Fairness, Worksafe, X-Lab.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Worker and Family Support.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the chair for yielding me time.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5314, Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Democracy generates the notion and the idea that people will get and be engaged, involved, heard, and have their wishes met.

I agree with my colleague from Illinois when he said voters all over the country vote for us and they send us here. They vote for our colleagues in the Senate and send them there. We make laws. Then they expect those laws to be adhered to. No one is above them. No President.

And we are not obsessed with the former President, but we are obsessed with the idea and the hope that we will never have another administration like that one. And that is what this legislation is designed to do.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DONALDS).

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my firm opposition to the Protecting Our Democracy Act, otherwise known as PODA.

I don't have much time to get into a bunch of the provisions, but there are many troubling provisions that the American people should be fully aware of.

First, PODA empowers the GSA to provide highly sensitive information intended only for the President-elect to the nonvictor if the GSA administrator doesn't certify election results within 5 days. This would result in an explicit conflict of interest, and there is no reason for this political-based decision. It just simply doesn't make any sense, Madam Speaker.

Secondarily, PODA directly targets President Trump—and I know our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say it doesn't expressly go after President Trump, but it does—over his refusal not to disclose his tax records by requiring a Presidential candidate to submit their income tax returns for the prior 10 years within 15 days of their nomination.

Now, Madam Speaker, the whole purpose of looking at tax returns, quite frankly, is to see if you are in violation of tax law. There is a certain thing called a tax lien, and so if the IRS wants to yield a tax lien against an individual, that is clear proof to the American people that there is an issue with a nominee for the highest office in the land not abiding by tax law in the United States.

This is completely politically motivated, specifically against President Trump.

Last but not least, Madam Speaker, PODA massively expands FEC's jurisdiction, thereby continuing the Democrats' ongoing trend of heavy-handed Federal involvement and intrusion into State rights.

I have heard on this floor, being down here for a few minutes, about the desire for Congress to want to be able to have more leverage to hold the executive accountable. One thing Congress should be doing is stop actually yielding so much rulemaking and regulatory authority to the alphabet soup of agencies and Congress actually doing that work here, as opposed to creating a bill which is obviously targeted with one President in mind and trying to create a new rubric here in Congress.

Secondarily, and I think if we can look at some of the metrics associated with where the United States is right now versus where the United States was at the same time 4 years ago, it is without question what a successful administration looks like, one that actually always followed the law, was in constant standing with the law, as opposed to an administration who issues mandates that are unconstitutional that the Federal courts, as we speak, are undermining every single day.

This is a bad bill. I urge Members to vote ''no'' on this bill.

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, if you want to hold the executive accountable, if we want to increase Congress' role in parity with the executive there are far more things that we should be doing instead of this bill. We should be voting ''no.''

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chair of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the distinguished chairwoman of the Oversight and Reform Committee for yielding.

We just heard obfuscation on the floor of the House hoping that people watching will be distracted from the purpose of this bill, which is to counter the systematic voter suppression that is occurring in Republican-controlled States all over America.

Instead of enshrining the right to vote and enabling it, Republicans want to suppress it, they want to narrow it, they want to make it harder for you to vote. Because that is how they win elections, apparently.

This bill, the Protecting Our Democracy Act, led by Mr. SCHIFF would counter that, would enshrine and protect that sacred franchise, which is what America was founded to be.

I also want to highlight an amendment to the bill I provided. On October 21, President Trump signed Executive Order No. 13957 to undermine the merit system protection of our Federal workforce by requiring agency heads to reclassify policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating positions.

At OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, this meant 80 percent of its workforce could suddenly be fired or eligible to be fired by the executive.

The Preventing a Patronage System Act preserves congressional prerogative by freezing that executive branch ability to unilaterally remove classes of Federal employees and restore the civil service as a nonpartisan entity.

I'm proud to support and cosponsor this bill. I urge its passage.

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

It is disappointing that my friend from Virginia would spew disinformation about what States are doing. Every State is making it easier to vote but harder to cheat, and he knows that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, it is not about President Trump but it is about his behavior. But it is overall about the sanctity of democracy and the recognition that behaviors result in the final destination that challenges the very core of democracy. January 6, 2021, when Members duly sworn to take an oath to defend this Nation and to uphold the Constitution were cowering on the floor.

I stand with enormous support for the Protecting Our Democracy Act. Why? Because the Nation needs it and the world is watching. I stand to avoid the abuse of the pardon powers that existed clearly in the last administration. Need I give a long list of examples? Generals and best friends; or then enforcement of the foreign and domestic emolument clauses; the horrors of a hotel where many went to pay money into the coffers of a President of the United States or enforcement of Congressional subpoenas, the very authority that can protect democracy, reasserting Congressional power of the purse when dollars were manipulated and friends got a lot of dollars.

So I am believing that this is imperative, security from political interference injustice. I might think a noose hanging in the front to insist that Vice President Pence be arrested or hung might be an interference. I do want to acknowledge the amendment that I offered, very quickly.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The amendment indicates that violation by officeholders be treated as a violation of oath of office for purposes of ineligibility to hold public office under the 14th Amendment.

And so the collective actions, not a person, but if your actions suggest that you are violating democracy, you should not ever run again.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to this amendment becoming law, and I look forward to this bill becoming law because we must protect democracy. The Constitution says that we have been created to create a more perfect union. I insist that we create a more perfect union. Support this great legislation.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

The reforms in this bill have been needed for a long time. It is just that the previous administration only brought out those needs in sharp relief. This legislation will bolster accountability, ensure that elected officials use their offices to serve the American people, not for personal gain.

James Madison wrote, ''If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.'' If we haven't noticed, we are down a few angels.

''You must first enable the government to control the governed,'' he wrote, ''and in the next place oblige it to control itself.'' How he knew.

Madam Speaker, this bill is not about looking back, it is about learning from our mistakes of the past to prevent future abuses of power. I urge support for this bill.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Natural Resources and Subcommittee on Indigenous Peoples of the United States.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, our democracy is precious and it must be protected. The last administration did test and attack it. We know we must take action against tyranny. Tyranny battered our doors on January 6, and on this floor today, we are going to fight back and strengthen our democracy. This act restores accountability, ensures no one—no one, not even, and more importantly, never the President—is above the law.

Foreign governments are interfering in our elections. The last President welcomed and clamored for interference in his bid for reelection. This bill in contrast protects whistleblowers, it roots out corruption, it prevents Presidential abuses of power to keep our system of checks and balances sound.

These principles are not partisan, they are simply American. There is nothing more American than voting for a bill to protect our democracy and the future of our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I stand and I ask all my colleagues to stand with our Constitution.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our most basic duty of the Federal Government should be protecting the right for our citizens to vote, but we are not doing everything we can to protect that. A disturbing trend across the country is that more and more States and localities are allowing noncitizens to vote. Furthermore, many States are conducting elections that rely on wildly outdated voter lists, many of which include these noncitizens.

In some States, such as California, the voter rolls are so outdated that they have more registered voters than people who reside in the State. This creates a potential for our citizens' votes to be diluted. LA County had over 1.5 million ineligible people on their voter rolls. A suit filed by a nonpartisan watch dog alleged that LA County had 112 percent of its adult citizens registered to vote.

Under pressure, California and LA County finally agreed to clean up their voter rolls in 2019. Unfortunately, when then-California Secretary of State ALEX PADILLA appeared before my committee in 2020, he could not confirm that many of those ineligible people had actually been removed from California's unmaintained voter rolls. I do not have a lot of faith that California is doing everything it can to protect the integrity of our elections.

And then there is New York City, which just decided to allow nearly a million noncitizens to vote in city elections. New York can make its own bad decisions, but it is our job to ensure that we protect Federal elections. Common sense will tell you that combining noncitizens and eligible American voters on the same voter rolls is ripe for abuse.

I will also use a final example from my home State of Illinois. In Illinois, noncitizens cannot vote, and if they do, they face major legal consequences and could be deported. But in 2016, Illinois' automatic voter registration program mistakenly registered to vote more than 500 noncitizens who had done the right thing by checking the box stating that they are not citizens on their driver's license application. However, several of these noncitizens voted in the 2018 and 2019 elections.

This does nothing to bolster voter confidence in our elections; in fact, it does the opposite.

Not only does this undermine the integrity of our elections, the mistake by Illinois could have had dire consequences for these individuals, and it could be prevented if States were being forced to maintain accurate voter rolls. Whether intentional or not, we know this is happening. It is undermining the integrity of our elections.

This amendment would simply ensure those who are noncitizens who do not have the right to vote in Federal elections are removed from States' voter rolls. As someone who has attended many citizenship ceremonies as a Member of Congress, it is unthinkable that we have States undermining what it means to be a citizen of this great country.

My office has helped many immigrants go through the legal process to become American citizens, and there is nothing better than seeing them raise their right hand and swear to support and defend our Constitution; to swear to bear arms in defense of this Nation; to swear allegiance to this great country.

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

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, there is nothing better than to think that their vote, something they worked hard to get, the right to vote on something that they worked hard to get the right to do is being undermined. That is unthinkable.

Let's pass this amendment to ensure only citizens are voting in our elections and prevent States from putting noncitizens at risk of intentionally or unintentionally breaking the law and illegally voting in our elections.

We will offer this solution as a motion to recommit. If we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Oversight and Reform to consider an amendment to ensure States remove noncitizens from their voter rolls as part of a regular comprehensive list maintenance program.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, the blatant and corrupt actions that we saw during the Trump administration demand that Congress take action to prevent any future President or administration officials from committing these same abuses of power.

Our laws have to be equipped to protect the Office of the Presidency and hold anyone privileged enough to hold that office accountable for their actions.

The Protecting Our Democracy Act will prevent Presidential abuse, restore our system of checks and balances, strengthen accountability, and protect our elections.

I am proud that this package includes one of my pieces of legislation, the White House Open Data Act, which will make White House visitor logs and salary information easily accessible and available to the public. The Presidency demands integrity and transparency. The Protecting Our Democracy Act gives us the tools to defend and protect our democracy; our most sacred responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCHIFF for his leadership, and I thank Chairwoman MALONEY. Let's all stand up today, vote for democracy, protect the right to vote so that the world, when they watch this, knows that America remains committed and renews today its commitment to a great democracy.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

I was just sitting on the floor and it occurred to me, as I listened to the debate, that the point just has to be made that the majority is so obsessed with Donald Trump that they will run roughshod over the Constitution to continue to try to persecute him.

Do they not see that they twice-impeached him and the court of impeachment twice acquitted him?

Do they defer to the decision of our constitutional process in terms of what was just characterized that the President did? Or do they stubbornly override that and continue to pursue him endlessly, despite what our processes and constitutional provisions require and provide for?

What about the provision requiring Presidents, who the Constitution specifies the qualifications for office, that they be required to submit private tax returns in order to pursue that office? Perhaps, if you'd like it, if it is a tradition to do so, for you to impose it by law means you disregard the Constitution of the United States.

To what end will you go? To what end will you go to prevail?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, speaking of running roughshod, no President—Republican or Democrat—is above the law, but some have tried to be. The previous President and his sad followers ignored subpoenas, punished whistleblowers, and invited foreign interference in our elections. Congress—Republicans and Democrats—must act to protect our democracy from any future reckless Presidents, which is why the Protecting Our Democracy Act is crucial. This bill will strengthen our institutions against future Presidents who seek to abuse their power.

January 6 showed us that Presidential abuse can find its way to a joint session of Congress in a deadly way—140 police officers injured; several police officers dead; desecration; trauma. That is why the work of the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol is so critical. Their subpoenas cannot be ignored.

My Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act, which is included in this bill, will standardize and streamline the process so that no one can ignore a subpoena with impunity.

The previous President's abuses reveal the dangerous fault line.

□ 1330

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I introduced the Stop Foreign Interference in Ballot Measures Act to ban foreign contributions to State and local ballot initiatives and referenda. I am proud that my bill is part of the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Foreign interference in our politics ranges from social media disinformation paid for by our adversaries to dictators bankrolling lobbying on Capitol Hill. Current law permits billions of dollars of foreign influence in ballot initiatives. Last year, over $750 million was spent in California alone.

We prohibit foreign contributions to candidates because it protects our national security. That same rationale should apply to foreign contributions to ballot initiatives and referenda. That is why we must pass my bill.

Money and politics distort the will of the American people. It advantages special interests and limits the power of regular Americans. When that money is supplied by foreign countries and adversaries, it puts our democracy and our national security at risk.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), the distinguished vice chair of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of the Protecting Our Democracy Act, which ensures that our government remains of, by, and for the people.

I also rise in support of my amendment, which would establish a task force within the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute, in collaboration with State and local governments, threats to election officials.

Poll workers in my home State of North Carolina and their families have been subjected to harassment, violent threats, and intimidation, all exacerbated by baseless conspiracies like stop the steal.

We suffered critical shortages of poll workers during the 2020 elections, and over one-quarter of counties in North Carolina had understaffed polling sites. Threats to election officials are threats to our democracy and must be stopped.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support poll workers, the democratic process, my amendment, and the bill.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for her special leadership. I am so proud of my classmate.

Madam Speaker, as we gather here on the floor, it really is a somber day here at the Capitol with the remains of the former majority leader of the Senate, Senator Robert Dole. He was a man who fought for our democracy, paid for it in terms of the injuries that he sustained during the war, and came to Congress to defend our democracy.

That is what we are doing here on the floor of the House. We are working to protect our democracy. I am proud that my legislation is included in this. Let me say a few words about it.

Since Watergate, Presidential candidates and Vice Presidential candidates voluntarily put their tax returns out to the public. In 2016, there were two that were running, one on each side, that did not do that. I observed it. I was upset about it. I wrote legislation on it.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, what this legislation does is make it a requirement for those who seek the Presidency and the Vice Presidency to put out to the public their tax returns. Why? Tax returns contain vital information: whether a candidate has paid any taxes, what assets they own, how much they have borrowed, who they borrowed it from, have they taken advantage of tax loopholes of offshore tax shelters, whether they have foreign bank accounts, and if they have made charitable contributions.

Truth and transparency need to be a part of the democratic process. I am very proud and grateful that my legislation is contained in a bill that overall is called the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Madam Speaker, all colleagues should vote for this because we raised our hands and pledged to protect our democracy and defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague. We came to Congress together, and I thank her for her outstanding leadership in this body and her beautiful statement today.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, wow, I heard Donald Trump's name mentioned at least a dozen times by my colleagues across the aisle. I am sincerely glad that the Democrats spent so much time investigating the President for wrongdoing. I am glad that they issued subpoenas investigating the President for wrongdoing. I am very happy that, in all the investigations conducted by the Intelligence Committee and Oversight and Reform Committee, they did not find one ounce of wrongdoing committed by President Trump.

I am also happy that they investigated President Trump's children. I think that is fair game. I can promise the American people that very soon there will be that type of oversight for the Biden administration and the President's son, Hunter, who is in the news almost on a daily basis for things that just don't add up. They just don't look good. That oversight is coming. The American people can count on that.

Madam Speaker, after nearly a year in power, it is time for Democrats to actually start governing and abandon their obsession with Donald Trump.

H.R. 5314 is full of bad policy that diminishes the power of the executive branch and entrenches Washington bureaucrats making law based on false conspiracy theories of the bill's sponsor.

The bill has not proceeded through regular order and is a Frankenstein's monster stitched together from various committees' jurisdictions, while other whole portions have never undergone committee review at all.

There has been no attempt to seriously vet these substantial changes,

minimal cooperation with the minority, and no apparent path for the bill in the Senate.

In other words, Madam Speaker, H.R. 5314 is a messaging bill to bolster the fundraising efforts of Democrat Members in preparation for the 2022 midterms. The Democratic Party should try governing instead.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and oppose this reckless legislation. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I would like to point out to my very good friend and colleague, Mr. COMER, that President Trump is no longer President. This bill is not about President Trump. If anyone, it is about President Biden and our future Presidents and having more oversight, accountability, and transparency.

Now, addressed in this bill are past abuses that have occurred. This is not about the past; it is about the future. It is about the future of our democracy and the strength of our democracy.

Democrats are not standing alone. The reforms in this bill have broad support from over 150 outstanding groups, including the Brennan Center for Justice, the Project On Government Oversight, and many others. I have included that list in the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, the Protecting Our Democracy Act is a historic package of prodemocracy reforms to create or strengthen guardrails and prevent the abuse of executive power. Many of the provisions in our bill have broad bipartisan support and have literally been authored by Republicans.

You yourself at the Rules Committee said that the President should release his taxes. You said that.

These are issues that both sides of the aisle should be supporting. It is time for Congress to restore our authorities as a coequal branch of power.

Madam Speaker, this is about the future, the strengthening of our democracy, and I urge strong support from all of my colleagues. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in strengthening democracy and urge them to vote with Republicans for this very important reform bill.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, our government is not a piggy bank to be pilfered and pillaged by public servants. Trump appointees abused their public office to line their pockets and corruptly retain power. The crime spree by Trump and his stooges is the worst corruption ever in our government.

According to a recent Office of Special Counsel report, they made a mockery of the law. They exploited Hatch Act gaps or ignored it altogether.

My amendment in the en bloc is based on the Political CRIMES Act. I thank Congressmam MIKE QUIGLEY and Senator ELIZABETH WARREN for their leadership. The amendment enhances the underlying provisions and gives the Hatch Act sharper teeth.

The amendment ensures political appointees cannot get away with crimes. It requires disclosure of investigations. It cracks down on subpoena evaders. It allows the Special Counsel to continue investigations after government service concludes. Offenders like Kellyanne Conway and Stephen Miller, and those masquerading as public servants like Ivanka Trump and Jared Kushner, violated the Hatch Act without major consequence. No longer.

The amendment also expands the fines for violations. For the first time, repeat violators can be held criminally liable. This is real accountability.

Most important, it extends the law to the President and Vice President when conducting official duties on federal property.

You fix a leaky roof in the sun. Not in a storm. With dark clouds ahead, we must protect our democracy.

I am glad my amendment was included, and for the Presidential tax return transparency provisions in the bill. Trump and his enablers refused to follow the law. For 981 days—longer than the siege of Leningrad—our tax return request was illegally blocked by a tag-team of the Trump Department of Justice and a Trump-appointed judge.

Now that the Biden administration will comply with the law, the returns should be sent to Congress.

I urge passage of my amendment and passage of the underlying bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5314, the ''Protecting Our Democracy Act,'' spearheaded by my friend and colleague on the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, Adam Schiff.

This bill bolsters congressional oversight authority and the important powers vested in Congress by Article I of the Constitution. It also includes a host of other good-government measures to make our entire government more ethical and more accountable to the people we serve.

As chairman of both the Committee on Homeland Security and the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, I know firsthand how important congressional oversight is to our legislative process. And I have seen how dedicated the forces aligned against representative democracy are.

Protecting our democracy is protecting our homeland, and protecting our homeland means protecting our democracy.

I am particularly supportive of title IV of this bill, which amends the United States Code to reaffirm the House's right to enforce its subpoenas through civil suits in Federal court. The title would also expedite consideration of those suits in the courts and enhance penalties for noncompliance with congressional subpoenas.

While I firmly believe the House already possesses the ability to seek civil enforcement of its subpoenas, some recent court decisions have questioned it. This bill leaves no room for such doubt.

Almost a century ago, the U.S. Supreme Court said that Congress needs information to govern wisely and effectively, and it must often seek out others—often by compulsion—to obtain it. To effectively exercise our legislative duties, the Constitution implicitly grants enforcing processes.

Madam Speaker, this bill furthers our ability as legislators to do our job wisely and effectively. I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for the ''Protecting Our Democracy Act.''

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to discuss briefly the Jackson Lee Amendment No. 17 to Rules Committee Print 117–20, the Protecting Our Democracy Act (H.R. 5314), introduced by Congressman SCHIFF of California, the Chair of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

This Jackson Lee amendment improves the bill and strengthens an important guardrail in the pillars upholding and protecting our democracy by providing that any person who, having previously taken an oath as an officer of the United States, as a member of a State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, is finally convicted of violating laws prohibiting foreign interference in American elections, specifically section 304(j) of the Federal Election Campaign.

The Protecting Our Democracy Act is a sweeping package of reforms to prevent presidential abuses and to restore the Constitutional system of checks and balances.

Madam Speaker, the actions of the past Administration revealed serious vulnerabilities in our democratic systems—vulnerabilities that can and will be exploited again if we do not act urgently to address them.

The Protecting Our Democracy Act will take immediate steps to safeguard and strengthen our democracy so no future president—regardless of political party—can act as if they are above the law.

And it will restore the accountability and transparency of our institutions so that the American people can have confidence in our government's ability to address the challenges we face.

Let me briefly highlight some of the important provisions of this vitally important legislation that should be enthusiastically supported by all Members.

TITLE I—ABUSE OF THE PARDON POWER PREVENTION

The Abuse of the Pardon Prevention Act is designed to deter abuses of the pardon power, first, by requiring transparency in circumstances where the President uses that power for potentially self-serving purposes or in a manner that could undermine the functions of Congress.

And second, by amending the federal bribery statute to make explicit that offering or granting a pardon or commutation may serve as the basis for finding criminal culpability under the statute.

Finally, the Abuse of the Pardon Prevention Act makes explicit that a president may not issue a self-pardon.

TITLE II—ENSURING NO PRESIDENT IS ABOVE THE LAW

The No President is Above the Law Act would suspend the statute of limitations for any federal offense committed by a sitting president or vice president, whether it was committed before or during their terms in office and thus ensure that presidents and vice presidents can be held accountable for criminal conduct just like every other American and not use their offices as a shield to avoid legal consequences.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT EMOLUMENTS CLAUSES OF THE FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC EMOLUMENTS CLAUSES

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Emoluments Clause of the Constitution prohibits federal officers from receiving ''presents'' or ''emoluments'' from foreign nations unless Congress first provides its consent, while the Domestic Emoluments Clause bars the President from receiving any emoluments from the United States government or from any state government.

The Foreign and Domestic Emoluments Enforcement Act codifies these foundational anticorruption provisions and provides enhanced enforcement mechanisms for Congress and for entities within the Executive Branch.

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS

The Congressional Subpoena Compliance and Enforcement Act reinforces Congress's Article I powers by strengthening its tools to enforce lawfully issued subpoenas.

First, the bill affirms the House's and Senate's authority to enforce their subpoenas through civil suits and provides expedited processes for these actions, as well as enhanced penalties for noncompliance.

Second, it specifies the manner in which subpoena recipients must comply, including by creating an express requirement to testify and produce subpoenaed information and, to the extent any information is withheld, to produce a detailed log describing the basis for noncompliance.

TITLE V—REASSERTING CONGRESSIONAL POWER OF THE PURSE

Madam Speaker, in drafting the Constitution, the Framers built checks and balances into the foundation of our democracy to protect against monarchy.

Vesting Congress with the power to make funding decisions—the ''power of the purse''—is a critical component of that founding principle.

Congress has crafted longstanding, foundational laws to protect its authority like the Antideficiency Act (ADA) and the Impoundment Control Act (ICA) to prevent federal agencies from misusing federal funds.

But over time, Presidents and Executive Branch agencies have pushed the boundaries of these and other laws designed to prevent executive overreach, exploiting secrecy and limitations on enforcement to push their own agenda.

That is why as a member of the Budget Committee, I am very pleased that the reforms embodied in the Congressional Power of the Purse Act are incorporated in the legislation before us and will help Congress reclaim its Constitutional spending authority and safeguard our nation's separation of powers.

Specifically, the Act would restore Congress' central role in funding decisions by preventing the President from effectively rescinding funds without congressional approval; requiring the Office of Management and Budget (0MB) to release funding at least 90 days before it expires, whether or not the funding is part of a Presidential rescission or deferral request; and closing a budget law loophole that essentially lets the President unilaterally block the spending of enacted appropriations designated as emergency.

The Act would put an expiration date on Presidential declarations of national emergencies and any special executive authorities triggered by those declarations; declarations would expire unless Congress extends them.

The Act would increase transparency in the Executive Branch by requiring OMB to make apportionments (legally binding documents that make funding available to agencies to spend) publicly available and to publish the positions of officials with delegated apportionment authority; requiring the DOJ Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) to publish opinions instructing agencies on budget and appropriations law; requiring the Executive Branch to make public amounts and explanations of cancelled or expired fund balances, and amounts and legal justifications of obligations incurred by agencies during a lapse in their appropriations; and requiring the Executive Branch to report violations of the ICA and ADA identified by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to Congress.

The Act would also add enforcement mechanisms to budget law and deter lawbreaking by strengthening and expediting GAO's ability to obtain information from agencies to assess compliance with budget or appropriations law; expediting GAO's ability to sue agencies to release funds being impounded in violation of the ICA; authorizing administrative discipline for officials found to have violated the ICA, including suspension without pay or termination of employment; and requiring the DOJ to review reports of ADA violations and investigate whether a violation occurred knowingly and willfully.

TITLE VI—SECURITY FROM POLITICAL INTERFERENCE IN JUSTICE

Since Watergate, every Administration has issued guidance limiting contact between the White House and DOJ in order to limit political interference in criminal and civil enforcement matters.

Unfortunately, in recent years we have seen numerous instances where that norm was ignored.

The Security from Political Interference in Justice Act seeks to help ensure that these norms are followed in the future, by requiring that the Attorney General (AG) maintain a log of certain designated contacts between the White House and DOJ that is to be shared with the DOJ Inspector General (IG) on a semi-annual basis, with an additional requirement that the IG share any inappropriate or improper contacts with the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

TITLE VII—PROTECTING INSPECTOR GENERAL INDEPENDENCE

The Inspector General Independence Act would protect Inspectors General (IGs) from being removed by the President based on political retaliation.

President Trump removed or replaced numerous IGs in what appeared to be retaliation for investigating misconduct of his own Administration.

The Inspector General Independence Act would only allow an IG to be removed for a limited number of causes and would require that the President, before removing the IG, provide Congress with documentation of the cause.

TITLE VIII—PROTECTING WHISTLEBLOWERS

The Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act would strengthen the law to ensure that federal employees who blow the whistle on waste, fraud, and abuse are protected from retaliation.

The Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act would clarify that no federal official may interfere with a federal employee's ability to share information with Congress.

This measure would also limit disclosure of a whistleblower's identity, prohibit retaliatory investigations, expand whistleblower protections to all noncareer appointees in the Senior Executive Service, and provide access to jury trials for whistleblowers.

TITLE XII—PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY

Title XII requires sitting presidents and vice presidents and major party candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency to publicly disclose their 10 most recent federal income tax returns.

TITLE XIII—FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

Title XIII of the Act requires political campaigns, parties, and political committees like political action committees (PACs) and Super PACs to report attempts by foreign governments, foreign political parties, and their agents to influence our elections to the Federal Election Commission (FEC) and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

It requires the FBI to report on these notifications annually to the congressional intelligence committees.

It also requires campaigns to establish compliance mechanisms.

It ensures violations of these foreign contact reporting requirements can incur criminal or civil liability.

Title XIV of the Act works to eliminate foreign interference in U.S. elections by making clear that the Federal Election Campaign Act prohibits the acceptance of opposition research, polling, and other non-public information relating to a candidate for federal, state, or local office by foreign governments and political parties for the purpose of influencing an election.

It provides for enhanced criminal penalties for violations of this prohibition.

It ensures that members and employees of political campaigns will be on notice of this prohibition by requiring the FEC to provide a written explanation of the prohibition to political campaigns, and for campaigns to certify their receipt and understanding of the explanation.

Last, the legislation extends the ban on foreign national contributions to federal, state, and local elections to include ballot initiatives and referendums.

Madam Speaker, I believe this excellent legislation would be even stronger had Jackson Lee Amendment No. 17 been made in order.

This Jackson Lee amendment would improve the bill and strengthen an important guardrail in the pillars upholding and protecting our democracy by providing that any person who, having previously taken an oath as an officer of the United States, as a member of a State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, is finally convicted of violating laws prohibiting foreign interference in American elections, specifically section 304(j) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by section 1301(a)), section 304(b)(9) of such Act (as added by section 1301(b)), or section 302(j) of such Act (as added by section 1302), shall be deemed to have given aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States for purposes of ineligibility to hold public office under section of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

This concern is particularly salient when there is clear, convincing, and overwhelming evidence of interference by a hostile foreign

power to secure victory for its preferred candidate.

Madam Speaker, there is compelling reason for the Congress to pass the Protecting Our Democracy Act by overwhelming margins in the House and Senate to send a clear message to the world that unlike the immediately previous Administration, the current President and his Administration is determined and resolute in taking effective action to deter and prevent interference by foreign powers in American elections.

Let us remember that the Intelligence Community Assessment ("ICA") of January 2017 assessed that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election in which Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the US democratic process, denigrate Democratic presidential candidate and implacable foe of Vladimir Putin, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, facilitate the election of Vladimir Putin's preferred candidate, Donald J. Trump.

Russia's interference in the election processes of democratic countries was not new but a continuation of the "Translator Project," an ongoing information warfare effort launched by Vladimir Putin in 2014 to use social media to manipulate public opinion and voters in western democracies.

But instead of supporting the unanimous assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community, the 45th President attacked and sought to discredit and undermine the agencies and officials responsible for detecting and assessing Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election as well as those responsible for investigating and bringing to justice the conspirators who committed crimes against the United States our law enforcement.

And to add shame to insult and injury, at a meeting in Helsinki, Finland, rather than embracing the conclusions of the U.S. Intelligence Community, the 45th President of the United States sided with Russian President Vladimir Putin in heaping scorn on the IC's assessment regarding Russian interference and called the U.S. Justice Department investigation into Russia's interference led by Special Counsel Robert Mueller "the greatest political witch hunt in history."

As the Mueller Report concluded, "The Russian government interfered in the 2016 presidential election in sweeping and systematic fashion."

In his only public remarks made since he was appointed at his farewell press conference held at the Department of Justice on May 29, 2017, Special Counsel, Robert Mueller reiterated the "central allegation of our indictments—that there were multiple, systematic efforts to interfere in our election" and that "allegation deserves the attention of every American."

Madam Speaker, American elections are to be decided by American voters free from foreign interference or sabotage, and that is why any person who having previously taken an oath to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States, knowingly and willingly acts to aid, abet, or facilitate foreign interference in an American election can, should, and must be deemed to have given aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States for purposes of ineligibility to hold public office under section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 5314, the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Thank you.

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

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–205 not earlier considered as part of the amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 838, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time after debate for the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117–205, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 838, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, printed in part B of House Report 117–205, offered by Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ADAMS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 155, strike lines 10 through 19, and insert the following:

(4) TREATMENT AS A REPORT FILED UNDER THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.—Section 304(a)(11) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(a)(11)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) An income tax return filed under the Protecting Our Democracy Act of 2021 shall be filed in electronic form accessible by computers and shall be treated as a report filed under and required by this Act for purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (C), except that if it would require considerable, extensive, and significant time for the Commission to make redactions to such a return, as required under section 1201(b)(3) of the Protecting Our Democracy Act of 2021 or subparagraph (B)(ii) of section 6103(l)(23) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Commission may make the return available for public inspection more than 48 hours after receipt by the Commission, but in no event later than 30 days after receipt by the Commission.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. AGUILAR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 175, insert after line 18 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

DIVISION D—PROTECTING ELECTION OFFICIALS

TITLE XV—PROTECTING ELECTION OFFICIALS FROM DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION

SEC. 1501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Election Officials Protection Act''.

SEC. 1502. REQUIRING STATES TO MAINTAIN LIST OF ELECTION OFFICIALS PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

''SEC. 303A. MAINTENANCE OF LIST OF ELECTION OFFICIALS PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The office of the chief State election official of a State shall establish a program under which the office shall maintain a list of election officials whose personally identifiable information is protected from disclosure and kept confidential under the Election Officials Protection Act.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM.—

''(1) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—An election official is eligible to be a program participant in the program established under this section if the official submits to the office of the chief State election official an application, at such time and in such form as the official may require, which contains the following information and assurances:

''(A) Documentation showing that the applicant is to commence service as an election official in the State or is currently serving as an election official in the State.

''(B) A sworn statement that the applicant fears for his or her safety or the safety of his or her family, or the safety of the minor or incapacitated person on whose behalf the application is made, due to his or her service as an election official.

''(C) Any police, court, or other government agency records or files that show any complaints of alleged threats or acts of violence against the applicant.

''(D) The signature of the applicant and of any individual or representative of any office designated in writing who assisted in the preparation of the application, and the date on which the applicant signed the application.

''(E) Such other information and assurances as the chief State election official may require.

''(2) PERIOD OF PARTICIPATION.—Upon filing a properly completed application under this subsection, the chief State election official shall certify the applicant as a program participant for a period of 4 years following the date of filing, unless the applicant's participation in the program is terminated before that date as provided under subsection (d).

''(c) ADDITIONAL NOTICE TO PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—The office of the chief State election official shall provide each program participant a notice in clear and conspicuous font that contains all of the following information:

''(1) The program participant may create a revocable living trust and place his or her real property into the trust to protect his or her residential street address from disclosure in real property transactions.

''(2) The program participant may obtain a change of his or her legal name to protect his or her anonymity.

''(3) A list of contact information for entities that the program participant may contact to receive information on, or receive legal services for, the creation of a trust to hold real property or obtaining a name change, including county bar associations, legal aid societies, State and local agencies, or other nonprofit organizations that may be able to assist program participants.

''(d) TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION.—

''(1) GROUNDS FOR TERMINATION.—The chief State election official may terminate a program participant's participation in the program for any of the following reasons:

''(A) The program participant submits to the chief State election official written notification of withdrawal, in which case the participation shall be terminated on the date of receipt of the notification.

''(B) The program participant's certification term has expired and the participant did not complete an application for renewal of the certification.

''(C) The chief State election official determines that false information was used in the application process to qualify as a program participant or that participation in the program is being used as a subterfuge to avoid detection of illegal or criminal activity or apprehension by law enforcement.

''(D) The program participant fails to disclose a change in the participant's status as an election official.

''(2) APPEAL.—Except in the case of a termination on the grounds described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), the chief State election official shall send written notification of the intended termination to the program participant. The program participant shall have 30 business days in which to appeal the termination under procedures developed by the chief State election official.

''(3) NOTIFICATION OF LOCAL OFFICES.—The chief State election official shall notify in writing the appropriate local election officials, county clerks, and local recording offices of the program participant's termination of participation in the program. Upon receipt of this termination notification, such officials, clerks, and offices—

''(A) shall transmit to the chief State election official all appropriate administrative records pertaining to the program participant; and

''(B) shall no longer be responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of the program participant's record.

''(4) TREATMENT OF RECORDS.—

''(A) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Upon termination of a program participant's certification, the chief State election official shall retain records as follows:

''(i) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any records or documents pertaining to a program participant shall be held confidential.

''(ii) All records or documents pertaining to a program participant shall be retained for a period of three years after termination of certification and then destroyed without further notice.

''(B) EXCEPTION FOR TERMINATION BASED ON FALSE INFORMATION OR SUBTERFUGE.—In the case of a termination on the grounds described in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1), the chief State election official may disclose information contained in the participant's application.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—

''(1) ELECTION OFFICIAL.—In this section, an 'election official' with respect to a State is any individual, including a volunteer, who is authorized by the State to carry out duties relating to the administration of elections for Federal office held in the State.

''(2) MEMBER OF THE IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—In this section, the term 'member of the immediate family' means, with respect to an individual, a spouse, domestic partner, child, stepchild, parent, or any blood relative of an individual who lives in the same residence as the individual.

''(3) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term 'personally identifiable information' means, with respect to any individual—

''(A) a home address, including a primary residence or vacation home address;

''(B) a home, personal mobile, or direct telephone line to a private office or residence;

''(C) a personal email address;

''(D) a social security number, driver's license number, or voter registration information that includes a home address;

''(E) a bank account or credit or debit card information;

''(F) property tax records or any property ownership records, including a secondary residence and any investment property at which the individual resides for part of a year;

''(G) birth and marriage records;

''(H) vehicle registration information;

''(I) the identification of children of the individual under the age of 18;

''(J) the date of birth;

''(K) directions to a home of the individual or a member of the immediate family of the individual;

''(L) a photograph of any vehicle including the license plate or of a home including an address of the individual or member of the immediate family of the individual;

''(M) the name and location of a school or day care facility attended by a child of the individual or by a child of a member of the immediate family of the individual; or

''(N) the name and location of an employer of the individual or a member of the immediate family of the individual.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking ''and 303'' and inserting ''303, and 303A''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following:

''Sec. 303A. Maintenance of list of election officials protected from disclosure of personally identifiable information.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect September 1, 2022.

SEC. 1503. PROHIBITING PERSONS FROM MAKING INFORMATION ON PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS AVAILABLE.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR PERSONS RECEIVING REQUESTS FROM PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—If any person, including a business or association and a local government or other public entity, receives a written request from an individual who is a program participant under the program established by a State under section 303A of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (hereafter referred to as a ''program participant'') or the agent of a program participant to not disclose the participant's personally identifiable information—

(1) such person may not knowingly post or publicly display the participant's personally identifiable information on the Internet, including on any website or subsidiary website controlled by such person;

(2) such person may not knowingly transfer for consideration the participant's personally identifiable information to any other person, including a business or association, through any medium;

(3) if the participant or the agent of the participant includes information in the written request to indicate that the disclosure of the participant's personally identifiable information would cause or threaten to cause imminent great bodily harm to the participant or a member of the immediate family of the participant, such person may not knowingly transfer without consideration the participant's personally identifiable information to any other person, including a business or association, through any medium; and

(4) if, prior to receiving the request, such person publicly displayed the participant's personally identifiable information on the Internet on any website or subsidiary website controlled by such person, such person shall remove the information from such websites not later than 72 hours after receiving the request.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) ACTION FOR INJUNCTIVE OR DECLARATORY RELIEF.—A program participant who is aggrieved by a violation of subsection (a) or subsection (b) may bring an action seeking injunctive or declaratory relief in any court of competent jurisdiction. If the court grants injunctive or declaratory relief, the person responsible for the violation shall be required to pay the participant's costs and reasonable attorney's fees.

(2) ACTION FOR DAMAGES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A program participant who is aggrieved by a violation of subsection (a) or subsection (b) may bring an action for damages in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(B) DAMAGES.—A prevailing plaintiff in an action described in subparagraph (A) shall, for each violation, be awarded damages in an amount determined by the court, except that such amount—

(i) may not exceed 3 times the actual damages to the plaintiff; and

(ii) may not be less than $10,000.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''member of the immediate family'' and ''personally identifiable information'' have the meaning given such terms in section 303A of the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

(d) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section, or the application of a provision of this section to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this section, and the application of the provisions of this section to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE OF RHODE ISLAND

Add at the end of part 1 of subtitle B of division B the following new section:

SEC. 516. WHITE HOUSE EMPLOYEE INFORMATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and updated not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Executive Office of the President shall make available on a publicly available website in an easily searchable and downloadable format the following information:

(1) The annual salary of each White House employee, which shall be updated quarterly, and the following:

(A) The number of employees who are paid at a rate of basic pay equal to or greater than the rate of basic pay then currently paid for level V of the Executive Schedule of section 5316 of title 5 and who are employed in the White House Office, the Executive Residence at the White House, the Office of the Vice President, the Domestic Policy Staff, or the Office of Administration, and the aggregate amount paid to such employees.

(B) The number of employees employed in such offices who are paid at a rate of basic pay which is equal to or greater than the

minimum rate of basic pay then currently paid for GS–16 of the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, but which is less than the rate then currently paid for level V of the Executive Schedule of section 5316 of such title and the aggregate amount paid to such employees.

(C) The number of employees employed in such offices who are paid at a rate of basic pay which is less than the minimum rate then currently paid for GS–16 of the General Schedule of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, and the aggregate amount paid to such employees.

(D) The number of individuals detailed under section 112 of title 3, United States Code, for more than 30 days to each such office, the number of days in excess of 30 each individual was detailed, and the aggregate amount of reimbursement made as provided by the provisions of section 112 of such title.

(E) The number of individuals whose services as experts or consultants are procured under chapter 2 title 3, United States Code, for service in any such office, the total number of days employed, and the aggregate amount paid to procure such services.

(2) The most recent financial disclosure statement for each White House employee filed pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), which shall be updated annually.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 9, insert after line 12 the following:

SEC. 203. CONTRACTS BY THE PRESIDENT, THE VICE PRESIDENT, OR A CABINET MEMBER.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 431 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**the President, the Vice President, a Cabinet Member, or a**'' after ''**Contracts by**''; and

(2) in the first undesignated paragraph, by inserting ''the President, the Vice President, or any member of the Cabinet,'' after ''Whoever, being''.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 23 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 431 and inserting the following:

''431. Contracts by the President, the Vice President, a Cabinet Member, or a Member of Congress.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN OF TENNESSEE

Page 6, strike lines 17 through 20, and insert the following:

(A) an offense against the United States that arises from an investigation in which the target or subject is—

(i) the President;

(ii) a relative of the President;

(iii) any member or former member of the President's administration;

(iv) any person who worked on the President's presidential campaign as a paid employee; or

(v) in the case of an offense motivated by a direct and significant personal or pecuniary interest of any individual described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv), any person or entity;

Page 7, beginning on line 5, strike ''has the meaning'' and all that follows through ''Code.'', and insert the following: '' means any family member, up to a third degree relation to the President, or a spouse thereof.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Add at the end the following (and update the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE XVI—PREVENTING A PATRONAGE SYSTEM

SEC. 1601. LIMITATIONS ON EXCEPTION OF COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No position in the competitive service (as defined under section 2102 of title 5, United States Code) may be excepted from the competitive service unless such position is placed—

(1) in any of the schedules A through E as described in section 6.2 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on September 30, 2020; and

(2) under the terms and conditions under part 6 of such title as in effect on such date.

(b) SUBSEQUENT TRANSFERS.—No position in the excepted service (as defined under section 2103 of title 5, United States Code) may be placed in any schedule other than a schedule described in subsection (a)(1).

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 57, after line 19, insert the following (and update the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 525. TREATMENT OF REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION FROM MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Section 552(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', or any member thereof,'' after ''Congress''.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of part 1 of subtitle B of title V, add the following new section:

SEC. 516. MACHINE-READABLE FORMAT REQUIRED FOR AGENCY REPORTS.

Any report required to be submitted to Congress by an executive agency shall be submitted in machine-readable format, unless each committee of Congress to whom the report is submitted waives the requirement.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE OF WASHINGTON

Page 157, beginning on line 15, strike ''**FOREIGN INTERFERENCE**'' and insert ''**FOREIGN INTERFERENCE; CYBERSECURITY GUIDANCE FOR CAMPAIGNS**''.

Page 175, insert after line 18 the following:

TITLE XV—CYBERSECURITY GUIDANCE FOR CAMPAIGNS

SEC. 1501. ISSUANCE OF CYBERSECURITY GUIDANCE AND BEST PRACTICES FOR CAMPAIGNS BY FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 311 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30111) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) ISSUANCE OF CYBERSECURITY GUIDANCE AND BEST PRACTICES.—

''(1) ISSUANCE.—In consultation with the Directory of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security, and such other offices of the government as the Commission considers appropriate, the Commission shall issue—

''(A) guidance for political committees and vendors on cybersecurity risks, including threats to the databases of such committees; and

''(B) best practices for political committees to protect their databases from such threats.

''(2) UPDATES.—The Commission shall regularly issue updated versions of the guidance and best practices described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) DEADLINE.—The Federal Election Commission shall issue the first guidance and best practices under section 311(g) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a), not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

Add at the end of title VII of division B the following new subtitle (and update the table of contents accordingly):

Subtitle D—Inspector General for the Office of Management and Budget

SEC. 731. INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—Section 12 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph, (1) by inserting ''the Director of the Office of Management and Budget,'' after ''means'' ; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''the Office of Management and Budget,'' after ''means''.

(b) SPECIAL PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding after section 8N the following new section:

''SEC. 80. SPECIAL PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

''The Inspector General of the Office of Management and Budget shall only have jurisdiction over those matters that have been specifically assigned to the Office under law.''.

(c) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint an individual to serve as the Inspector General of the Office of Management and Budget in accordance with section 3(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 25, insert after line 7 the following:

SEC. 406. ENFORCEMENT OF REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION FROM CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.

For purposes of remedying any failure to comply with a request under section 2954 of title 5, United States Code, section 1365a of title 28, United States Code (as added by section 403), and section 105 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (as added by section 404) shall apply to such a request.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO OF ARIZONA

At the end of division A, insert the following:

TITLE IV—ACCOUNTABILITY IN ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

SEC. 401. TRANSPARENCY IN ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION DURING PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS.

The Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended in section 3(f) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Not later than 10 days after submitting an application for a security clearance for any individual, and not later than 10 days after any such individual is granted a security clearance (including an interim clearance), each eligible candidate (as that term is described in subsection (h)(4)(A)) or the President-elect (as the case may be) shall submit a report containing the name of such individual to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.''.

SEC. 402. TRANSPARENCY IN FAMILY ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 10 days after submitting an application for a security clearance for any covered individual,

and not later than 10 days after any covered individual is granted a security clearance (including an interim clearance), the President or head of the applicable agency shall submit a written notice of such application or approval (as the case may be) to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(b) COVERED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered individual'' means a spouse, child, or child-in-law (including adult children and children-in-law) of the President.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN OF MAINE

Page 14, insert after line 8 the following (and redesignate provisions accordingly):

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SPOUSES AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—Section 102(e)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting after ''paragraphs (1) through (5)'' the following: ''and paragraphs (9) through (11)''; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G) In the case of items described in paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a), all information required to be reported under these paragraphs.

''(H) In the case of items described in paragraph (11)(A) of subsection (a), any such items received by spouse or dependant child of the President other than items related to the President's services as President provided for by Federal law, and in the case of items described in paragraph (11)(B) of subsection (a), all information required to be reported under that paragraph.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 175, insert after line 18 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

DIVISION D—SECURITY CLEARANCES OF EMPLOYEES OF MEMBER OFFICES

TITLE XV—DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES WITH SECURITY CLEARANCES

SEC. 1501. EXCLUSION OF EMPLOYEES WITH EXISTING SECURITY CLEARANCES FROM DETERMINATION OF LIMIT ON NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE MEMBER OFFICES PERMITTED TO HAVE CLEARANCES.

For purposes of any Rule or regulation of the House of Representatives which limits the number of employees of the office of a Member of the House (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) who are permitted to have security clearances, an employee of the office who has a valid security clearance which the employee obtained prior to becoming an employee of the Member's office shall not be included in the determination of the number of employees of the office who have security clearances.

SEC. 1502. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

This title is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of the House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. KILMER OF WASHINGTON

Page 157, beginning on line 15, strike ''**FOREIGN INTERFERENCE**'' and insert ''**FOREIGN INTERFERENCE; HONEST ADS**''.

Page 175, insert after line 18 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

TITLE XV—HONEST ADS

SEC. 1501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Honest Ads Act''.

SEC. 1502. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to enhance the integrity of American democracy and national security by improving disclosure requirements for online political advertisements in order to uphold the Supreme Court's well-established standard that the electorate bears the right to be fully informed.

SEC. 1503. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the dramatic increase in digital political advertisements, and the growing centrality of online platforms in the lives of Americans, requires the Congress and the Federal Election Commission to take meaningful action to ensure that laws and regulations provide the accountability and transparency that is fundamental to our democracy;

(2) free and fair elections require both transparency and accountability which give the public a right to know the true sources of funding for political advertisements in order to make informed political choices and hold elected officials accountable; and

(3) transparency of funding for political advertisements is essential to enforce other campaign finance laws, including the prohibition on campaign spending by foreign nationals.

SEC. 1504. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (22) of section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(22)) is amended by striking ''or satellite communication'' and inserting ''satellite, paid internet, or paid digital communication''.

(b) TREATMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Section 301 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30101) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8)(B)(v), by striking ''on broadcasting stations, or in newspapers, magazines, or similar types of general public political advertising'' and inserting ''in any public communication''; and

(2) in paragraph (9)(B)—

(A) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) any news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any print, online, or digital newspaper, magazine, blog, publication, or periodical, unless such broadcasting, print, online, or digital facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate;''; and

(B) in clause (iv), by striking ''on broadcasting stations, or in newspapers, magazines, or similar types of general public political advertising'' and inserting ''in any public communication''.

(c) DISCLOSURE AND DISCLAIMER STATEMENTS.—Subsection (a) of section 318 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended—

(1) by striking ''financing any communication through any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of general public political advertising'' and inserting ''financing any public communication''; and

(2) by striking ''solicits any contribution through any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing, or any other type of general public political advertising'' and inserting ''solicits any contribution through any public communication''.

SEC. 1505. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.

(a) EXPANSION TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) APPLICATION TO QUALIFIED INTERNET AND DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 304(f)(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''or satellite communication'' each place it appears in clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting ''satellite, or qualified internet or digital communication''.

(B) QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATION.—Paragraph (3) of section 304(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATION.—The term 'qualified internet or digital communication' means any communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on an online platform (as defined in subsection (k)(3)).''.

(2) NONAPPLICATION OF RELEVANT ELECTORATE TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 304(f)(3)(A)(i)(III) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(A)(i)(III)) is amended by inserting ''any broadcast, cable, or satellite'' before ''communication''.

(3) NEWS EXEMPTION.—Section 304(f)(3)(B)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)(B)(i)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) a communication appearing in a news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any online or digital newspaper, magazine, blog, publication, or periodical, unless such broadcasting, online, or digital facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to communications made on or after January 1, 2022.

SEC. 1506. APPLICATION OF DISCLAIMER STATEMENTS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''shall clearly state'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting ''shall state in a clear and conspicuous manner''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following flush sentence: ''For purposes of this section, a communication does not make a statement in a clear and conspicuous manner if it is difficult to read or hear or if the placement is easily overlooked.''.

(b) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 318 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.—

''(1) SPECIAL RULES WITH RESPECT TO STATEMENTS.—In the case of any qualified internet or digital communication (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D)) which is disseminated through a medium in which the provision of all of the information specified in this section is not possible, the communication shall, in a clear and conspicuous manner—

''(A) state the name of the person who paid for the communication; and

''(B) provide a means for the recipient of the communication to obtain the remainder of the information required under this section with minimal effort and without receiving or viewing any additional material other than such required information.

''(2) SAFE HARBOR FOR DETERMINING CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER.—A statement in qualified internet or digital communication (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D)) shall be considered to be made in a clear and conspicuous manner as provided in subsection (a) if the communication meets the following requirements:

''(A) TEXT OR GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS.—In the case of a text or graphic communication, the statement—

''(i) appears in letters at least as large as the majority of the text in the communication; and

''(ii) meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c).

''(B) AUDIO COMMUNICATIONS.—In the case of an audio communication, the statement is spoken in a clearly audible and intelligible manner at the beginning or end of the communication and lasts at least 3 seconds.

''(C) VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS.—In the case of a video communication which also includes audio, the statement—

''(i) is included at either the beginning or the end of the communication; and

''(ii) is made both in—

''(I) a written format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) and appears for at least 4 seconds; and

''(II) an audible format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

''(D) OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.—In the case of any other type of communication, the statement is at least as clear and conspicuous as the statement specified in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).''.

(2) NONAPPLICATION OF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.—The exceptions provided in section 110.11(f)(1)(i) and (ii) of title 11, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor to such rules, shall have no application to qualified internet or digital communications (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971).

(c) MODIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 318(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking ''which is transmitted through radio'' and inserting ''which is in an audio format''; and

(B) by striking ''BY RADIO'' in the heading and inserting ''AUDIO FORMAT'';

(2) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by striking ''which is transmitted through television'' and inserting ''which is in video format''; and

(B) by striking ''BY TELEVISION'' in the heading and inserting ''VIDEO FORMAT''; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''transmitted through radio or television'' and inserting ''made in audio or video format''; and

(B) by striking ''through television'' in the second sentence and inserting ''in video format''.

SEC. 1507. POLITICAL RECORD REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104), as amended by section 1301(a)(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN ONLINE ADVERTISEMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.—An online platform shall maintain, and make available for online public inspection in machine readable format, a complete record of any request to purchase on such online platform a qualified political advertisement which is made by a person whose aggregate requests to purchase qualified political advertisements on such online platform during the calendar year exceeds $500.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR ADVERTISERS.—Any person who requests to purchase a qualified political advertisement on an online platform shall provide the online platform with such information as is necessary for the online platform to comply with the requirements of subparagraph (A).

''(2) CONTENTS OF RECORD.—A record maintained under paragraph (1)(A) shall contain—

''(A) a digital copy of the qualified political advertisement;

''(B) a description of the audience targeted by the advertisement, the number of views generated from the advertisement, and the date and time that the advertisement is first displayed and last displayed; and

''(C) information regarding—

''(i) the average rate charged for the advertisement;

''(ii) the name of the candidate to which the advertisement refers and the office to which the candidate is seeking election, the election to which the advertisement refers, or the national legislative issue to which the advertisement refers (as applicable);

''(iii) in the case of a request made by, or on behalf of, a candidate, the name of the candidate, the authorized committee of the candidate, and the treasurer of such committee; and

''(iv) in the case of any request not described in clause (iii), the name of the person purchasing the advertisement, the name and address of a contact person for such person, and a list of the chief executive officers or members of the executive committee or of the board of directors of such person, and, if the person purchasing the advertisement is acting as the agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), a statement that the person is acting as the agent of a foreign principal and the identification of the foreign principal involved.

''(3) ONLINE PLATFORM.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'online platform' means any public-facing website, web application, or digital application (including a social network, ad network, or search engine) which—

''(A) sells qualified political advertisements; and

''(B) has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors or users for a majority of months during the preceding 12 months.

''(4) QUALIFIED POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified political advertisement' means any advertisement (including search engine marketing, display advertisements, video advertisements, native advertisements, and sponsorships) that—

''(A) is made by or on behalf of a candidate; or

''(B) communicates a message relating to any political matter of national importance, including—

''(i) a candidate;

''(ii) any election to Federal office; or

''(iii) a national legislative issue of public importance.

''(5) TIME TO MAINTAIN FILE.—The information required under this subsection shall be made available as soon as possible and shall be retained by the online platform for a period of not less than 4 years.

''(6) SAFE HARBOR FOR PLATFORMS MAKING BEST EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY REQUESTS WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO RECORD MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.—In accordance with rules established by the Commission, if an online platform shows that the platform used best efforts to determine whether or not a request to purchase a qualified political advertisement was subject to the requirements of this subsection, the online platform shall not be considered to be in violation of such requirements.

''(7) PENALTIES.—For penalties for failure by online platforms, and persons requesting to purchase a qualified political advertisement on online platforms, to comply with the requirements of this subsection, see section 309.''.

(b) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall establish rules—

(1) requiring common data formats for the record required to be maintained under section 304(k) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)) so that all online platforms submit and maintain data online in a common, machine-readable and publicly accessible format;

(2) establishing search interface requirements relating to such record, including searches by candidate name, issue, purchaser, and date; and

(3) establishing the criteria for the safe harbor exception provided under paragraph (6) of section 304(k) of such Act (as added by subsection (a)).

(c) REPORTING.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biannually thereafter, the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission shall submit a report to Congress on—

(1) matters relating to compliance with and the enforcement of the requirements of section 304(k) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a);

(2) recommendations for any modifications to such section to assist in carrying out its purposes; and

(3) identifying ways to bring transparency and accountability to political advertisements distributed online for free.

SEC. 1508. PREVENTING CONTRIBUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES, AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN THE FORM OF ONLINE ADVERTISING.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121), as amended by section 1401(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF BROADCAST STATIONS, PROVIDERS OF CABLE AND SATELLITE TELEVISION, AND ONLINE PLATFORMS.—

''(1) RESPONSIBILITIES DESCRIBED.—Each television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform (as defined in section 304(k)(3)) shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that communications described in section 318(a) and made available by such station, provider, or platform are not purchased by a foreign national, directly or indirectly. For purposes of the previous sentence, a station, provider, or online platform shall not be considered to have made reasonable efforts under this paragraph in the case of the availability of a communication unless the station, provider, or online platform directly inquires from the individual or entity making such purchase whether the purchase is to be made by a foreign national, directly or indirectly.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR DISBURSEMENT PAID WITH CREDIT CARD.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform shall be considered to have made reasonable efforts under such paragraph in the case of a purchase of the availability of a communication which is made with a credit card if—

''(A) the individual or entity making such purchase is required, at the time of making such purchase, to disclose the credit verification value of such credit card; and

''(B) the billing address associated with such credit card is located in the United States or, in the case of a purchase made by an individual who is a United States citizen living outside of the United States, the individual provides the television or radio broadcast station, provider of cable or satellite television, or online platform with the United States mailing address the individual uses for voter registration purposes.''.

SEC. 1509. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON MEDIA LITERACY AND ONLINE POLITICAL CONTENT CONSUMPTION.

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall commission an independent study and report on media literacy with respect to online political content consumption among voting-age Americans.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study and report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An evaluation of media literacy skills, such as the ability to evaluate sources, synthesize multiple accounts into a coherent understanding of an issue, understand the context of communications, and responsibly create and share information, among voting-age Americans.

(2) An analysis of the effects of media literacy education and particular media literacy skills on the ability to critically consume online political content, including political advertising.

(3) Recommendations for improving voting-age Americans' ability to critically consume online political content, including political advertising.

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the entity conducting the study and report under subsection (a) shall submit the report to the Commission.

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the report under subsection (c), the Commission shall submit the report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, together with such comments on the report as the Commission considers appropriate.

(e) DEFINITION OF MEDIA LITERACY.—The term ''media literacy'' means the ability to—

(1) access relevant and accurate information through media;

(2) critically analyze media content and the influences of media;

(3) evaluate the comprehensiveness, relevance, credibility, authority, and accuracy of information;

(4) make educated decisions based on information obtained from media and digital sources;

(5) operate various forms of technology and digital tools; and

(6) reflect on how the use of media and technology may affect private and public life.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 157, beginning on line 15, strike ''**FOREIGN INTERFERENCE**'' and insert ''**FOREIGN INTERFERENCE; PROHIBITING USE OF DEEPFAKES IN CAMPAIGNS**''.

Page 175, insert after line 18 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly:

TITLE XV—PROHIBITING USE OF DEEPFAKES IN ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

SEC. 1501. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VISUAL MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 325. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), a person, political committee, or other entity shall not, within 60 days of a election for Federal office at which a candidate for elective office will appear on the ballot, distribute, with actual malice, materially deceptive audio or visual media of the candidate with the intent to injure the candidate's reputation or to deceive a voter into voting for or against the candidate.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—

''(1) REQUIRED LANGUAGE.—The prohibition in subsection (a) does not apply if the audio or visual media includes—

''(A) a disclosure stating: ''This _____ has been manipulated.''; and

''(B) filled in the blank in the disclosure under subparagraph (A), the term 'image', 'video', or 'audio', as most accurately describes the media.

''(2) VISUAL MEDIA.—For visual media, the text of the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer and no smaller than the largest font size of other text appearing in the visual media. If the visual media does not include any other text, the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer. For visual media that is video, the disclosure shall appear for the duration of the video.

''(3) AUDIO-ONLY MEDIA.—If the media consists of audio only, the disclosure shall be read in a clearly spoken manner and in a pitch that can be easily heard by the average listener, at the beginning of the audio, at the end of the audio, and, if the audio is greater than 2 minutes in length, interspersed within the audio at intervals of not greater than 2 minutes each.

''(c) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN ENTITIES.—This section does not apply to the following:

''(1) A radio or television broadcasting station, including a cable or satellite television operator, programmer, or producer, that broadcasts materially deceptive audio or visual media prohibited by this section as part of a bona fide newscast, news interview, news documentary, or on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events, if the broadcast clearly acknowledges through content or a disclosure, in a manner that can be easily heard or read by the average listener or viewer, that there are questions about the authenticity of the materially deceptive audio or visual media.

''(2) A radio or television broadcasting station, including a cable or satellite television operator, programmer, or producer, when it is paid to broadcast materially deceptive audio or visual media.

''(3) An internet website, or a regularly published newspaper, magazine, or other periodical of general circulation, including an internet or electronic publication, that routinely carries news and commentary of general interest, and that publishes materially deceptive audio or visual media prohibited by this section, if the publication clearly states that the materially deceptive audio or visual media does not accurately represent the speech or conduct of the candidate.

''(4) Materially deceptive audio or visual media that constitutes satire or parody.

''(d) CIVIL ACTION.—

''(1) INJUNCTIVE OR OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF.—A candidate for elective office whose voice or likeness appears in a materially deceptive audio or visual media distributed in violation of this section may seek injunctive or other equitable relief prohibiting the distribution of audio or visual media in violation of this section. An action under this paragraph shall be entitled to precedence in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

''(2) DAMAGES.—A candidate for elective office whose voice or likeness appears in a materially deceptive audio or visual media distributed in violation of this section may bring an action for general or special damages against the person, committee, or other entity that distributed the materially deceptive audio or visual media. The court may also award a prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees and costs. This paragraph shall not be construed to limit or preclude a plaintiff from securing or recovering any other available remedy.

''(3) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In any civil action alleging a violation of this section, the plaintiff shall bear the burden of establishing the violation through clear and convincing evidence.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to alter or negate any rights, obligations, or immunities of an interactive service provider under section 230 of title 47, United States Code.

''(f) MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VISUAL MEDIA DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'materially deceptive audio or visual media' means an image or an audio or video recording of a candidate's appearance, speech, or conduct that has been intentionally manipulated in a manner such that both of the following conditions are met:

''(1) The image or audio or video recording would falsely appear to a reasonable person to be authentic.

''(2) The image or audio or video recording would cause a reasonable person to have a fundamentally different understanding or impression of the expressive content of the image or audio or video recording than that person would have if the person were hearing or seeing the unaltered, original version of the image or audio or video recording.''.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 309(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(d)(1)), as amended by section 1303, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) Any person who knowingly and willfully commits a violation of section 325 shall be fined not more than $100,000, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.''.

(c) EFFECT ON DEFAMATION ACTION.—For purposes of an action for defamation, a violation of section 325 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by subsection (a), shall constitute defamation per se.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Insert after section 202 the following:

SEC. 203. FORFEITURE OF BENEFITS FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS CONVICTED OF A FELONY.

The Act entitled ''An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes'', approved August 25, 1958 (commonly known as the ''Former Presidents Act of 1958''; 3 U.S.C. 102 note), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''Each former President'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (h), each former President'';

(2) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting:

''(2) who has not been impeached by the House of Representatives and convicted by

the Senate pursuant to the impeachment.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h)(1) If a former President is finally convicted of a felony for which every act or omission that is needed to satisfy the elements of the felony is committed during or after the period such former President holds the office of President of the United States of America, or was finally convicted of such a felony while holding such office—

''(A) no monetary allowance under subsection (a) may be provided to such former President;

''(B) no funds may be obligated or expended under subsection (g) with respect to such former President except to the extent necessary to maintain the security of such former President, as determined by the Director of the Secret Service; and

''(C) such former President shall repay any amounts received under subsection (a) during the period beginning on the date on which such former President is initially convicted of the felony and ending on the date such former President is finally convicted of the felony.

''(2) The term 'finally convicted' means a conviction—

''(A) which has not been appealed and is no longer appealable because the time for taking an appeal has expired; or

''(B) which has been appealed and the appeals process for which is completed.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 59, line 18, insert ''substantially'' before ''the same''.

Page 60, after line 8, insert the following:

''(e) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any emergency powers invoked by the President pursuant to a national emergency declared under this section shall relate to the nature of, and may be used only to address, that emergency.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OR FUNDING WITHHELD.—No authority available to the President during a national emergency declared under this section may be used to provide authorization or funding for any program, project, or activity for which Congress, on or after the date of the events giving rise to the emergency declaration, has withheld authorization or funding.''.

Page 62, line 17, insert '', including a joint resolution of termination defined in section 203,'' before ''terminating the emergency''.

Page 62, line 17, strike ''; or'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 62, line 19, strike the period at the end and insert ''; or''.

Page 62, after line 19, insert the following:

''(E) the date provided for in section 204.''.

Page 64, after line 3, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly in the matter proposed to be added as section 203 of the National Emergencies Act):

''(b) JOINT RESOLUTION OF TERMINATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'joint resolution of termination' means a resolution introduced in the House or Senate to terminate—

''(1) a national emergency declared under this Act; or

''(2) the exercise of any authorities pursuant to that emergency.''.

Page 64, line 5, insert ''AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF TERMINATION'' after ''APPROVAL''.

Page 64, strike lines 14 through 16 (relating to the matter proposed to be added as a paragraph (2)) and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

Page 67, beginning line 17, strike ''a motion'' and insert ''another motion''.

Page 63, beginning line 10, through page 71, line 7, (relating to the matter proposed to be added as section 203 of the National Emergencies Act), insert ''or joint resolution of termination'' after ''joint resolution of approval'' each place it appears (except for page 68, line 2, and page 68, line 6).

Page 71, after line 7, insert the following:

''SEC. 204. BAR ON PERMANENT EMERGENCIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Any national emergency declared by the President under section 201(a), and not otherwise terminated, shall automatically terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of its declaration.

''(b) EMERGENCIES ALREADY IN EFFECT.—Any national emergency declaration that remains in force as of the date of the enactment of this section and—

''(1) has been in effect for 3 years or fewer as of such date, shall automatically terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this section; or

''(2) has been in effect for more than 3 years as of such date, shall automatically terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this section.

''(c) EFFECT OF TERMINATION.—If a national emergency declaration terminates pursuant to this section, no emergency may subsequently be declared based on substantially the same circumstances.''.

Page 71, line 8, strike ''Sec. 204.'' and insert ''Sec. 205.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ OF NEW YORK

At the end of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1003. INCLUDING EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER LIMITATION ON NEPOTISM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Section 3110(a)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', including the Executive Office of the President'' after ''Executive agency''.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ OF NEW YORK

Insert after section 1002 the following:

Subtitle B—Strengthening Ethics Enforcement and Penalties for Federal Executive Employees

SEC. 1011. ETHICS PLEDGE.

Every appointee in every executive agency appointed on or after January 20, 2021, shall sign, and upon signing shall be contractually committed to, the following pledge upon becoming an appointee:

''I recognize that this pledge is part of a broader ethics in government plan designed to restore and maintain public trust in government, and I commit myself to conduct consistent with that plan. I commit to decision-making on the merits and exclusively in the public interest, without regard to private gain or personal benefit. I commit to conduct that upholds the independence of law enforcement and precludes improper interference with investigative or prosecutorial decisions of the Department of Justice. I commit to ethical choices of post-Government employment that do not raise the appearance that I have used my Government service for private gain, including by using confidential information acquired and relationships established for the benefit of future clients.

''Accordingly, as a condition, and in consideration, of my employment in the United States Government in a position invested with the public trust, I commit myself to the following obligations, which I understand are binding on me and are enforceable under law:

''(1) Lobbyist Gift Ban.—I will not accept gifts from registered lobbyists or lobbying organizations for the duration of my service as an appointee.

''(2) Revolving Door Ban; All Appointees Entering Government.—I will not for a period of 2 years from the date of my appointment participate in any particular matter involving specific parties that is directly and substantially related to my former employer or former clients, including regulations and contracts.

''(3) Revolving Door Ban; Lobbyists and Registered Agents Entering Government.—If I was registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act, 2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq., or the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA), 22 U.S.C. 611 et seq., within the 2 years before the date of my appointment, in addition to abiding by the limitations of paragraph 2, I will not for a period of 2 years after the date of my appointment:

''(A) participate in any particular matter on which I lobbied, or engaged in registrable activity under FARA, within the 2 years before the date of my appointment;

''(B) participate in the specific issue area in which that particular matter falls; or

''(C) seek or accept employment with any executive agency with respect to which I lobbied, or engaged in registrable activity under FARA, within the 2 years before the date of my appointment.

''(4) Revolving Door Ban; Appointees Leaving Government.—If, upon my departure from the Government, I am covered by the post-employment restrictions on communicating with employees of my former executive agency set forth in section 207(c) of title 18, United States Code, and its implementing regulations, I agree that I will abide by those restrictions for a period of 2 years following the end of my appointment. I will abide by these same restrictions with respect to communicating with the senior White House staff.

''(5) Revolving Door Ban; Senior and Very Senior Appointees Leaving Government.— If, upon my departure from the Government, I am covered by the post-employment restrictions set forth in sections 207(c) or 207(d) of title 18, United States Code, and those sections' implementing regulations, I agree that, in addition, for a period of 1 year following the end of my appointment, I will not materially assist others in making communications or appearances that I am prohibited from undertaking myself by—

''(A) holding myself out as being available to engage in lobbying activities in support of any such communications or appearances; or

''(B) engaging in any such lobbying activities.

''(6) Revolving Door Ban; Appointees Leaving Government to Lobby.—In addition to abiding by the limitations of paragraph 4, I also agree, upon leaving Government service, not to lobby any covered executive branch official or non-career Senior Executive Service appointee, or engage in any activity on behalf of any foreign government or foreign political party which, were it undertaken on January 20, 2021, would require that I register under FARA, for the remainder of the Administration or 2 years following the end of my appointment, whichever is later.

''(7) Golden Parachute Ban.—I have not accepted and will not accept, including after entering Government, any salary or other cash payment from my former employer the eligibility for and payment of which is limited to individuals accepting a position in the United States Government. I also have not accepted and will not accept any non-cash benefit from my former employer that is provided in lieu of such a prohibited cash payment.

''(8) Employment Qualification Commitment.—I agree that any hiring or other employment decisions I make will be based on the candidate's qualifications, competence, and experience.

''(9) Assent to Enforcement.—I acknowledge that title XVI of the Protecting Our Democracy Act, which I have read before signing this document, defines certain of the terms applicable to the foregoing obligations and sets forth the methods for enforcing them. I expressly accept the provisions of that title as a part of this agreement and as binding on me. I understand that the terms of this pledge are in addition to any statutory or other legal restrictions applicable to me by virtue of Federal Government service.''.

SEC. 1012. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title and the pledge set forth in section 1101 of this title:

(1) ''Executive agency'' shall include each ''executive agency'' as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code, and shall include the Executive Office of the President; provided, however, that ''executive agency'' shall include the United States Postal Service and Postal Regulatory Commission, but shall exclude the Government Accountability Office.

(2) ''Appointee'' shall include every full-time, non-career Presidential or Vice-Presidential appointee, non-career appointee in the Senior Executive Service (or other SES-type system), and appointee to a position that has been excepted from the competitive service by reason of being of a confidential or policymaking character (Schedule C and other positions excepted under comparable criteria) in an executive agency. It does not include any person appointed as a member of the Senior Foreign Service or solely as a uniformed service commissioned officer.

(3) ''Gift''—

(A) shall have the definition set forth in section 2635.203(b) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

(B) shall include gifts that are solicited or accepted indirectly, as defined in section 2635.203(f) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(C) shall exclude those items excluded by sections 2635.204(b), (c), (e)(1) and (3), and (j) through (l) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) ''Covered executive branch official'' and ''lobbyist'' shall have the definitions set forth in section 1602 of title 2, United States Code.

(5) ''Registered lobbyist or lobbying organization'' shall mean a lobbyist or an organization filing a registration pursuant to section 1603(a) of title 2, United States Code, and in the case of an organization filing such a registration, ''registered lobbyist'' shall include each of the lobbyists identified therein.

(6) ''Lobby'' and ''lobbied'' shall mean to act or have acted as a registered lobbyist.

(7) ''Lobbying activities'' shall have the definition set forth in section 1602 of title 2, United States Code.

(8) ''Materially assist'' means to provide substantive assistance but does not include providing background or general education on a matter of law or policy based upon an individual's subject matter expertise, nor any conduct or assistance permitted under section 207(j) of title 18, United States Code.

(9) ''Particular matter'' shall have the same meaning as set forth in section 207 of title 18, United States Code, and section 2635.402(b)(3) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

(10) ''Particular matter involving specific parties'' shall have the same meaning as set forth in section 2641.201(h) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, except that it shall also include any meeting or other communication relating to the performance of one's official duties with a former employer or former client, unless the communication applies to a particular matter of general applicability and participation in the meeting or other event is open to all interested parties.

(11) ''Former employer'' is any person for whom the appointee has within the 2 years prior to the date of his or her appointment served as an employee, officer, director, trustee, or general partner, except that ''former employer'' does not include any executive agency or other entity of the Federal Government, State or local government, the District of Columbia, Native American tribe, any United States territory or possession, or any international organization in which the United States is a member state.

(12) ''Former client'' is any person for whom the appointee served personally as agent, attorney, or consultant within the 2 years prior to the date of his or her appointment, but excluding instances where the service provided was limited to speeches or similar appearances. It does not include clients of the appointee's former employer to whom the appointee did not personally provide services.

(13) ''Directly and substantially related to my former employer or former clients'' shall mean matters in which the appointee's former employer or a former client is a party or represents a party.

(14) ''Participate'' means to participate personally and substantially.

(15) ''Government official'' means any employee of the executive branch.

(16) ''Administration'' means all terms of office of the incumbent President serving at the time of the appointment of an appointee covered by this title.

(17) ''Pledge'' means the ethics pledge set forth in section 1011 of this title.

(18) ''Senior White House staff'' means any person appointed by the President to a position under sections 105(a)(2)(A) or (B) of title 3, United States Code, or by the Vice President to a position under sections 106(a)(1)(A) or (B) of title 3.

(19) All references to provisions of law and regulations shall refer to such provisions as are in effect on January 20, 2021.

SEC. 1013. WAIVER.

(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), in consultation with the Counsel to the President, may grant to any current or former appointee a written waiver of any restrictions contained in the pledge signed by such appointee if, and to the extent that, the Director of OMB certifies in writing:—

(1) that the literal application of the restriction is inconsistent with the purposes of the restriction; or

(2) that it is in the public interest to grant the waiver. Any such written waiver should reflect the basis for the waiver and, in the case of a waiver of the restrictions set forth in paragraphs (3)(B) and (C) of the pledge, a discussion of the findings with respect to the factors set forth in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) A waiver shall take effect when the certification is signed by the Director of OMB and shall be made public within 10 days thereafter.

(c) The public interest shall include, but not be limited to, exigent circumstances relating to national security, the economy, public health, or the environment. In determining whether it is in the public interest to grant a waiver of the restrictions contained in paragraphs (3)(B) and (C) of the pledge, the responsible official may consider the following factors—

(1) the government's need for the individual's services, including the existence of special circumstances related to national security, the economy, public health, or the environment;

(2) the uniqueness of the individual's qualifications to meet the government's needs;

(3) the scope and nature of the individual's prior lobbying activities, including whether such activities were de minimis or rendered on behalf of a nonprofit organization; and

(4) the extent to which the purposes of the restriction may be satisfied through other limitations on the individual's services, such as those required by paragraph (3)(A) of the pledge.

SEC. 1014. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) The head of every executive agency shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, establish such rules or procedures (conforming as nearly as practicable to the agency's general ethics rules and procedures, including those relating to designated agency ethics officers) as are necessary or appropriate to ensure—

(1) that every appointee in the agency signs the pledge upon assuming the appointed office or otherwise becoming an appointee;

(2) that compliance with paragraph (3) of the pledge is addressed in a written ethics agreement with each appointee to whom it applies, which agreement shall also be approved by the Counsel to the President prior to the appointee commencing work;

(3) that spousal employment issues and other conflicts not expressly addressed by the pledge are addressed in ethics agreements with appointees or, where no such agreements are required, through ethics counseling; and

(4) that the agency generally complies with this title.

(b) With respect to the Executive Office of the President, the duties set forth in subsection (a) shall be the responsibility of the Counsel to the President.

(c) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall—

(1) ensure that the pledge and a copy of this title are made available for use by agencies in fulfilling their duties under subsection (a);

(2) in consultation with the Attorney General or the Counsel to the President, when appropriate, assist designated agency ethics officers in providing advice to current or former appointees regarding the application of the pledge; and

(3) in consultation with the Attorney General and the Counsel to the President, adopt such rules or procedures as are necessary or appropriate—

(A) to carry out the foregoing responsibilities;

(B) to authorize limited exceptions to the lobbyist gift ban for circumstances that do not implicate the purposes of the ban;

(C) to make clear that no person shall have violated the lobbyist gift ban if the person properly disposes of a gift as provided by section 2635.206 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

(D) to ensure that existing rules and procedures for Government employees engaged in negotiations for future employment with private businesses that are affected by the employees' official actions do not affect the integrity of the Government's programs and operations; and

(E) to ensure, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, that the requirement set forth in paragraph (6) of the pledge is honored by every employee of the executive branch; and

(4) in consultation with the Director of OMB, report to the President on whether full compliance is being achieved with existing laws and regulations governing executive branch procurement lobbying disclosure. This report shall include recommendations

on steps the executive branch can take to expand, to the fullest extent practicable, disclosure of both executive branch procurement lobbying and of lobbying for Presidential pardons. These recommendations shall include both immediate actions the executive branch can take and, if necessary, recommendations for legislation; and

(5) provide an annual public report on the administration of the pledge and this title.

(d) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Counsel to the President, and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, report to the President on steps the executive branch can take to expand to the fullest extent practicable the revolving door ban set forth in paragraph (5) of the pledge to all executive branch employees who are involved in the procurement process such that they may not for 2 years after leaving Government service lobby any Government official regarding a Government contract that was under their official responsibility in the last 2 years of their Government service. This report shall include both immediate actions the executive branch can take and, if necessary, recommendations for legislation.

(e) All pledges signed by appointees, and all waiver certifications with respect thereto, shall be filed with the head of the appointee's agency for permanent retention in the appointee's official personnel folder or equivalent folder.

SEC. 1015. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) The contractual, fiduciary, and ethical commitments in the pledge provided for herein are solely enforceable by the United States pursuant to this section by any legally available means, including debarment proceedings within any affected executive agency or judicial civil proceedings for declaratory, injunctive, or monetary relief.

(b) Any former appointee who is determined, after notice and hearing, by the duly designated authority within any agency, to have violated his or her pledge may be barred from lobbying any officer or employee of that agency for up to 5 years in addition to the time period covered by the pledge. The head of every executive agency shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, establish procedures to implement this subsection, which procedures shall include (but not be limited to) providing for fact-finding and investigation of possible violations of this title and for referrals to the Attorney General for consideration pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.

(c) The Attorney General is authorized—

(1) upon receiving information regarding the possible breach of any commitment in a signed pledge, to request any appropriate Federal investigative authority to conduct such investigations as may be appropriate; and

(2) upon determining that there is a reasonable basis to believe that a breach of a commitment has occurred or will occur or continue, if not enjoined, to commence a civil action against the former employee in any United States District Court with jurisdiction to consider the matter.

(d) In any such civil action, the Attorney General is authorized to request any and all relief authorized by law, including but not limited to:

(1) such temporary restraining orders and preliminary and permanent injunctions as may be appropriate to restrain future, recurring, or continuing conduct by the former employee in breach of the commitments in the pledge he or she signed; and

(2) establishment of a constructive trust for the benefit of the United States, requiring an accounting and payment to the United States Treasury of all money and other things of value received by, or payable to, the former employee arising out of any breach or attempted breach of the pledge signed by the former employee.

SEC. 1016. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) If any provision of this title or the application of such provision is held to be invalid, the remainder of this title and other dissimilar applications of such provision shall not be affected.

(b) Nothing in this title shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect—

(1) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or

(2) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.

(c) This title shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

(d) This title is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 17, insert after line 9 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 308. RULEMAKING FOR ETHICS REQUIREMENTS FOR LEGAL EXPENSE FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall finalize a rule establishing ethics requirements for the establishment or operation of a legal expense fund for the benefit of the President, the Vice President, or any political appointee (as such term is defined in section 1216 of title 5, United States Code) consistent with the requirements of subsection (b).

(b) LIMITATIONS ON ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—A legal expense fund described in subsection (a) may not accept any contribution or other payment made by—

(1) an individual who is a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.); or

(2) an agent of a foreign principal.

In the case of any such contribution being made, the legal expense fund shall take appropriate remedial action and the Director of the Office of Government Ethics may assess a fine against the individual or agent. For purposes of this section, the term ''agent of a foreign principal'' has the meaning given such term under section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (2 U.S.C. 611).

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 17, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 308. LIMITATIONS AND DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN DONATIONS TO, AND DISBURSEMENTS BY, INAUGURAL COMMITTEES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR INAUGURAL COMMITTEES.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 325. INAUGURAL COMMITTEES.

''(a) PROHIBITED DONATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful—

''(A) for an Inaugural Committee—

''(i) to solicit, accept, or receive a donation from a person that is not an individual; or

''(ii) to solicit, accept, or receive a donation from a foreign national;

''(B) for a person—

''(i) to make a donation to an Inaugural Committee in the name of another person, or to knowingly authorize his or her name to be used to effect such a donation;

''(ii) to knowingly accept a donation to an Inaugural Committee made by a person in the name of another person; or

''(iii) to convert a donation to an Inaugural Committee to personal use as described in paragraph (2); and

''(C) for a foreign national to, directly or indirectly, make a donation, or make an express or implied promise to make a donation, to an Inaugural Committee.

''(2) CONVERSION OF DONATION TO PERSONAL USE.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(iii), a donation shall be considered to be converted to personal use if any part of the donated amount is used—

''(A) to fulfill a commitment, obligation, or expense of a person that would exist irrespective of the responsibilities of the Inaugural Committee; or

''(B) to benefit the personal business venture of the President or Vice President of the United States, the Inaugural Committee, or an immediate family member of such individuals.

''(3) NO EFFECT ON DISBURSEMENT OF UNUSED FUNDS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit an Inaugural Committee from disbursing unused funds to an organization which is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

''(b) LIMITATION ON DONATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for an individual to make donations to an Inaugural Committee which, in the aggregate, exceed $50,000.

''(2) INDEXING.—At the beginning of each Presidential election year (beginning with 2028), the amount described in paragraph (1) shall be increased by the cumulative percent difference determined in section 315(c)(1)(A) since the previous Presidential election year. If any amount after such increase is not a multiple of $1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $1,000.

''(c) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN DONATIONS AND DISBURSEMENTS.—

''(1) DONATIONS OVER $1,000.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An Inaugural Committee shall file with the Commission a report disclosing any donation by an individual to the committee in an amount of $1,000 or more not later than 24 hours after the receipt of such donation.

''(B) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—A report filed under subparagraph (A) shall contain—

''(i) the amount of the donation;

''(ii) the date the donation is received; and

''(iii) the name and address of the individual making the donation.

''(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 90 days after the date of the Presidential inaugural ceremony, the Inaugural Committee shall file with the Commission a report containing the following information:

''(A) For each donation of money or anything of value made to the committee in an aggregate amount equal to or greater than $200—

''(i) the amount of the donation;

''(ii) the date the donation is received; and

''(iii) the name and address of the individual making the donation.

''(B) The total amount of all disbursements, and all disbursements in the following categories:

''(i) Disbursements made to meet committee operating expenses.

''(ii) Repayment of all loans.

''(iii) Donation refunds and other offsets to donations.

''(iv) Any other disbursements.

''(C) The name and address of each person—

''(i) to whom a disbursement in an aggregate amount or value in excess of $200 is made by the committee to meet a committee operating expense, together with date, amount, and purpose of such operating expense;

''(ii) who receives a loan repayment from the committee, together with the date and amount of such loan repayment;

''(iii) who receives a donation refund or other offset to donations from the committee, together with the date and amount of such disbursement; and

''(iv) to whom any other disbursement in an aggregate amount or value in excess of $200 is made by the committee, together with the date and amount of such disbursement.

''(d) VIOLATION.—A violation of this section may be enforced pursuant to the practice and procedure described under section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109).

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of a Federal agency to enforce a Federal law with respect to an Inaugural Committee.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

''(1)(A) The term 'donation' includes—

''(i) any gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person to the committee; or

''(ii) the payment by any person of compensation for the personal services of another person which are rendered to the committee without charge for any purpose.

''(B) The term 'donation' does not include the value of services provided without compensation by any individual who volunteers on behalf of the committee.

''(2) The term 'foreign national' has the meaning given that term by section 319(b).

''(3) The term 'immediate family member' means a parent, parent-in-law, spouse, adult child, or sibling.

''(4) The term 'Inaugural Committee' has the meaning given that term by section 501 of title 36, United States Code.''.

(b) CONFIRMING AMENDMENT RELATED TO REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (h); and

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

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATED TO STATUS OF COMMITTEE.—Section 510 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 510. Disclosure of and prohibition on certain donations

''A committee shall not be considered to be the Inaugural Committee for purposes of this chapter unless the committee agrees to, and meets, the requirements of section 325 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to Inaugural Committees established under chapter 5 of title 36, United States Code, for inaugurations held in 2025 and any succeeding year.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

Page 122, line 23, insert before ''a commissioned officer'' the following: ''a fellow or intern at an agency,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. PASCRELL OF NEW JERSEY

Add at the end of section 1002 the following:

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 7326 the following:

''§ 7328. Criminal penalty for Hatch Act violations

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who knowingly violates section 7323 or 7324 shall be fined $50,000 (notwithstanding section 3571(e) of title 18), or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. Notwithstanding section 3571(e) of title 18, for each violation after the first, the fine applicable under this section shall be double the amount of the fine assessed for the previous violation.

''(b) ATTORNEY FEES.—A court may assess against the United States reasonable attorney fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred in any case under this section in which an employee has established, by a preponderance of the evidence, that a superior ordered or otherwise coerced the employee into taking any act that resulted in a violation of such section 7323 or 7324.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7326 the following:

''7328. Criminal penalty for Hatch Act violations.''.

(3) TRAINING.—After an individual's first violation of section 7323 or 7324 of title 5, United States Code, such individual shall be provided training by the employing agency on how to avoid subsequent violations of either such section.

Insert after section 1002 the following:

SEC. 1003. DISCLOSURE OF HATCH ACT INVESTIGATIONS FOR CERTAIN POLITICAL EMPLOYEES.

Section 1216 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d)(1) With respect to any investigation of an allegation of prohibited activity under subsection (a)(1) against a political employee, not later than 14 days after the Special Counsel makes a final determination under such investigation with respect to whether a violation occurred, the Special Counsel shall—

''(A) publish, on the Office of Special Counsel's website, such determination and a report on that determination; and

''(B) submit such report to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'political employee' means any individual occupying any of the following positions in the executive branch of Government (including an individual carrying out the duties of a position described in paragraph (1) in an acting capacity):

''(A) Any position required to be filled by an appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(B) Any position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(C) Any position in or under the Executive Office of the President.

''(D) Any position in or under the Office of the Vice President.

''(E) Any position in the Senior Executive Service that is not a career appointee, a limited term appointee, or a limited emergency appointee (as those terms are defined in section 3132(a)).''.

SEC. 1004. CLARIFICATION ON CANDIDATES VISITING FEDERAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7323 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) Nothing in this section or section 7324 shall be construed to prohibit an employee from allowing a Member of Congress or any other elected official from visiting Federal facilities for an official purpose, including receiving briefings, tours, or other official information.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section 7323 is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the employee's''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the employee''; and

(B) by striking ''his'' and inserting ''the employee's''.

SEC. 1005. APPLYING HATCH ACT TO PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT WHILE ON FEDERAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 1002(c), is further amended by redesignating section 7326 as section 7327 and by inserting after section 7325 the following:

''§ 7326. Limitations on political activity of president and vice president while on White House grounds

''Notwithstanding section 7322(1), the prohibitions on political activity under section 7323(a) and section 7324 shall apply to the President and Vice President while the President and Vice President are on or in any part of the White House and White House grounds that is regularly used in the discharge of official duties.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of such subchapter, as amended by section 1002(c), is fruther amended by striking the item relating to section 7326 and inserting the following:

''7326. Limitations on political activity of President and Vice President while on Federal property

''7327. Penalties''.

SEC. 1006. GRANTING THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Notwithstanding any other law, rule, or regulation, the Office of Special Counsel shall have exclusive authority to promulgate regulations with respect to authority granted to the Office under the Hatch Act.

SEC. 1007. GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY FOR POLITICAL APPOINTEES.

Section 1204(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding the previous sentences, in the case of contumacy or failure by an individual to obey a subpoena issued under subsection (b)(2)(A) or section 1214(b) with respect to an investigation into any violation of section 7323 or 7324, the Board may issue an order requiring that individual to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence.''.''.

SEC. 1008. INVESTIGATING FORMER POLITICAL EMPLOYEES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Office of Special Counsel may continue an investigation of a violation of section 7323 or 7324 of title 5, United States Code, of an individual who is a former employee but only if such investigation commenced while the individual was an employee. In this section, the term ''employee'' has the meaning given that term in section 7322(1) of such title.

SEC. 1009. GAO REVIEW OF REIMBURSABLE POLITICAL EVENTS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on reimbursable political events held at the White House or on the White House grounds during the period beginning on January 1, 1997, and

ending on the date of enactment of this Act. Such report shall include the following:

(1) Whether, during such period, the requirements in annual appropriations Acts with respect to reimbursable political events have been followed, including the requirements under the heading ''Executive Residence At the White House—Reimbursable Expenses'' in division D of Public Law 116–6.

(2) An assessment of what constitutes a political event during such period.

(3) Whether an event that was not classified as a political event during such period should have been classified as such an event.

(4) A review of any payment made by a political entity under the terms of such requirements.

(5) Recommendations for Congress on—

(A) a definition for the term ''political event''; and

(B) how to assess whether administrations are following such requirements and how to hold administrations accountable if such requirements are not followed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL PROPERTY FOR POLITICAL CONVENTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 611 the following:

''§ 612. Prohibition on use of Federal property for certain political activities

''(a) A convention of a national political party held to nominate a candidate for the office of President or Vice President may not be held on or in any Federal property.

''(b) Any candidate or the authorized committee of the candidate under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 which was responsible for a convention in violation of subsection (a) shall be subject to an assessment of a civil penalty equal to the fair market value of the cost of the convention or $50,000, whichever is greater, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

''(c) In this section, the term 'Federal property' means any building, land, or other real property owned, leased, or occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, including the White House grounds and the White House (including the Old Executive Office Building, the West Wing, the East Wing, the Rose Garden, and the Executive Residence, but not including the second floor of the Executive Residence).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 611 the following:

''612. Prohibition on use of Federal property for certain political activities.''.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply to any convention described in section 612(a) of title 18, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) TRAVEL.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to limit or otherwise prevent the President or Vice President from using vehicles (including aircraft) owned or leased by the Government for travel to or from any such convention.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 175, insert after line 18 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

DIVISION D—RANKED CHOICE VOTING

TITLE XV—ASSISTANCE FOR TRANSITION TO RANKED CHOICE VOTING

SEC. 1501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Voter Choice Act''.

SEC. 1502. ASSISTANCE FOR TRANSITION TO RANKED CHOICE VOTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title V of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subtitle B—Ranked Choice Voting Program

''SEC. 511. RANKED CHOICE VOTING PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITION OF RANKED CHOICE VOTING SYSTEM.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'ranked choice voting system' means a set of election methods which allow each voter to rank contest options in order of the voter's preference, in which votes are counted in rounds using a series of runoff tabulations to defeat contest options with the fewest votes, and which elects a winner with a majority of final round votes in a single-winner contest and provides proportional representation in multi-winner contests.

''(b) PROGRAM.—The Commission shall establish a program under which the Commission—

''(1) provides technical assistance to State and local governments that are considering whether to make, or that are in the process of making, a transition to a ranked choice voting system for Federal, State, or local elections; and

''(2) awards grants to States and local government to support the transition to a ranked choice voting system, including through the acquisition of voting equipment and tabulation software, appropriate ballot design, the development and publication of educational materials, and voter outreach.

''(c) RULES FOR GRANTS.—

''(1) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—To the extent possible, the Commission shall award grants under subsection (b)(2) to areas that represent a diversity of jurisdictions with respect to geography, population characteristics, and population density.

''(2) AWARD LIMITATION.—The amount of any grant awarded under subsection (b)(2) shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the activities covered by the grant.

''SEC. 512. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any funds authorized to be appropriated to the Commission under section 210, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2022.

''(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization under this section shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 202(6) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended by striking ''the Help America Vote College Program under title V'' and inserting ''the programs under title V''.

(2) Title V of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21121 et seq.) is amended by striking the matter preceding section 501 and inserting the following:

''TITLE V—ELECTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

''Subtitle A—Help America Vote College Program''.

(3) Section 503 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21123) is amended by striking ''title'' and inserting ''subtitle''.

(4) The table of sections of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 is amended—

(A) by striking the item relating to title V and inserting the following:

''TITLE V—ELECTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

''Subtitle A—Help America Vote College Program'';

and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 503 the following:

''Subtitle B—Ranked Choice Voting Program

''Sec. 511. Ranked choice voting program.

''Sec. 512. Authorization of appropriations.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY OF ILLINOIS

Add at the end the following: ...

SEC. ____. IMPROVING ACCESS TO INFLUENTIAL VISITOR ACCESS RECORDS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED LOCATION.—The term ''covered location'' means—

(A) the White House;

(B) the residence of the Vice President; and

(C) any other location at which the President or the Vice President regularly conducts official business.

(2) COVERED RECORDS.—The term ''covered records'' means information relating to a visit at a covered location, which shall include—

(A) the name of each visitor at the covered location;

(B) the name of each individual with whom each visitor described in subparagraph (A) met at the covered location; and

(C) the purpose of the visit.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (c), not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall establish and update, every 90 days thereafter, a publicly available database that contains covered records for the preceding 90-day period, on a publicly available website in an easily searchable and downloadable format.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall not include in the database established under subsection (b) any covered record—

(A) the posting of which would implicate personal privacy or law enforcement concerns or threaten national security;

(B) relating to a purely personal guest at a covered location; or

(C) that reveals the social security number, taxpayer identification number, birth date, home address, or personal phone number of an individual, the name of an individual who is less than 18 years old, or a financial account number.

(2) SENSITIVE MEETINGS.—With respect to a particularly sensitive meeting at a covered location, the President shall—

(A) include the number of visitors at the covered location in the database established under subsection (b);

(B) post the applicable covered records in the database established under subsection (b) when the President determines that release of the covered records is no longer sensitive; and

(C) post any reasonably segregable portion that is not covered by an exception described in subsection (c) of any such excepted record on the website described under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN OF MARYLAND

Page 9, after line 2, insert the following (and redesignate the following subsections accordingly):

''(d) DELAY IN TRIAL OR OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS.—In the case of an indictment of any person serving as President or Vice President of the United States, a trial or other legal proceeding with respect to such indictment may be delayed at the discretion of a court of competent jurisdiction to the extent that ongoing criminal proceedings

would interfere with the performance of the defendant's duties while in office.

''(e) BURDEN OF PROOF.—With respect to an exercise of discretion under subsection (d), the burden of proof shall be on the defendant to demonstrate that an ongoing criminal proceeding would pose a substantial burden on the defendant's ability to fulfill the duties of the defendant's office.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 9, insert after line 12 the following:

SEC. 203. LIMITATION ON NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENTS.

The President may not require an officer or employee of the Executive Office of the President to enter into a nondisclosure agreement that is not related to the protection of classified or controlled unclassified information as a condition of employment or upon separation from the civil service.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 176, insert after line 3 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

DIVISION E—PROTECTING ELECTION OFFICIALS

TITLE XVI—DOJ TASK FORCE

SEC. 1601. ELECTION OFFICIALS SECURITY TASK FORCE.

The Attorney General shall establish a task force, to be headed by the head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, for purposes of studying threats or acts of violence against the people responsible for ensuring the integrity of Federal and State elections in the United States, and their families, and to provide expertise and resources for the identification, investigation, and prosecution of the persons responsible for such threats and acts, including by making referrals for criminal prosecutions. The task force shall include representatives from the following:

(1) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(2) The United States Marshals Service.

(3) The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) State and local prosecutors and election officials.

(5) The Election Assistance Commission.

(6) Elections officials associations.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 86, line 12, strike ''January 30 and July 30 of each year'' and insert ''January 30, April 30, July 30, and October 30 of each year''.

Page 86, beginning on line 16, strike ''the 6-month period preceding that January or July'' and insert ''the 3-month period preceding that January, April, July, or October''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

□ 1345

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, several amendments offered would increase transparency of White House operations and personnel.

The amendment offered by Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY would require the President to publicly release White House visitor logs with certain exceptions.

The amendment offered by Congressman DAVID CICILLINE would require the White House to publicly release salary information and financial disclosure statements for White House employees.

The amendment offered by Congressman BILL PASCRELL would further strengthen the Hatch Act by increasing penalties for employees who knowingly break the law and use their position for partisan political activity. This amendment would also allow the Office of Special Counsel to continue investigations into former political employees after they leave Federal office.

The amendment offered by Congresswoman ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ would direct the Office of Government Ethics to establish ethics requirements on the establishment or use of legal expense funds for the President, Vice President, or any political appointee.

The amendment offered by Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY would protect the civil service by preventing any position in the Federal competitive service from being reclassified outside of merit system principles. Employment in the Federal workforce should be based on an individual's knowledge, skills, and abilities, not political connections.

This package of amendments will bring accountability and transparency to our government. These reforms are critical for preserving and strengthening our democratic institutions.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on this package of amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendments en bloc.

This protecting the swamp act is full of bad policy and disregards regular order. H.R. 5314 is designed purely for Democrats to talk about all of their failed conspiracy theories about the former President. In fact, this bill looks more like a fundraising campaign than an effort to provide legislative solutions.

My Democratic colleagues should be working with Republicans to address and solve the problems President Biden and his administration have created for the American people, not pushing through hyperpartisan legislation.

While this en bloc package of amendments has several legitimate, good ideas, there are too many that make this bad bill worse. While commonsense proposals such as strengthening minority rights for Oversight and Reform Committee members, Freedom of Information Act reform, and an inspector general for the Office of Management and Budget are perfectly reasonable solutions for the House to consider, most of the amendments in this bloc make a very bad bill much worse.

Overall, these amendments entrench and slow down the Federal bureaucracy, intrude on the executive branch's powers, and strip a duly elected President of the ability to effectively manage the executive branch.

I am not sure if Democrats' distrust of the executive branch is because of their hatred for the former President or their lack of faith in the current President. Either way, Republicans should not support attempts to degrade the Office of the President.

The few good amendments in this bloc proposed by Republicans are simply drowned out by bad policy. If Democrats were serious about engaging with Republicans, then they should have worked with us through the normal legislative process during which we could have effectively vetted these measures in the committees of jurisdiction.

Americans are struggling with the highest inflation in 30 years, worried about the safety of their communities, and eager to get their children back to school. The majority is flatly ignoring the American people to instead talk about former President Trump. These amendments offered by Democrats in this package only move this bill further away from addressing the immediate concerns of Americans.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. CORREA), who is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for yielding me time.

My first amendment, No. 9, will strengthen the ability of Congress to do our job of oversight of the executive branch. It closes a loophole in the Freedom of Information Act that effectively lets Federal agencies ignore congressional requests for information.

Amendment No. 10 will require all congressionally mandated reports to be transmitted to Congress in a machine-readable format. It is a commonsense way to search and find information within thousands of pages of reports.

These two amendments are about the government, and they are about transparency. Our government should not have anything to hide. Both of these are supported by the Project On Government Oversight.

Madam Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote on en bloc No. 1 and to support amendments No. 9 and No. 10.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who is the ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my two amendments in this en bloc package.

The alleged purpose of this bill is to ''protect our democracy by preventing

abuses of Presidential power, restoring checks and balances and accountability and transparency in government.''

My amendments, in fact, do exactly that and would create an office of inspector general, IG, at the Office of Management and Budget, OMB.

Pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, this independent, nonpartisan inspector general would prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse at OMB.

The underlying bill is a Democrat attempt to relitigate yesterday's issues. But today, Americans are being assailed from all sides. They are facing a Democrat President on a spending binge that is tearing this country apart. Inflation sits at a 30-year high. Gas prices are skyrocketing out of control, and now an even more reckless socialist and amnesty agenda is in the works.

My two amendments will truly bring accountability and transparency to the executive branch and protect the statutory authorities of Congress.

Last week, news broke that 40 percent or more of the $700 billion spent on unemployment benefits for COVID–19 relief went to fraud. That is nearly the size of the defense budget. An IG at OMB would be able to root out this kind of fraud, waste, and abuse and save taxpayers' dollars. The Biden administration should welcome having an OMB inspector general with the same enthusiasm they talk about transparency and accountability.

My second amendment will help protect the rights of the minority and allow the Oversight and Reform Committee to easily acquire documents from the executive branch so that we can uphold true oversight.

I look forward to working with the majority to obtain the information required by law from the administration pursuant to these Rule of 7 requests. I appreciate that Democrats agree on some level that we need rigorous oversight of the executive branch.

My only question is: Where have they been for the last 11 months?

I am also profoundly disappointed that Democrats chose to load up this en bloc package with amendments that entrench bureaucracy, hamstring Presidential appointments, and micromanage Presidential powers. This bill is supposed to restore transparency and accountability, but many of the amendments in this package move it in the opposite direction.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), who is the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, my subcommittee works on issues concerning civil rights and civil liberties, and we have had hearings on the pardon power. The pardon power is something I have been interested in since the 1970s when a Democratic Governor of Tennessee abused the pardon power, and I stood up against him. I have stood up against this previous President, Trump, who abused the pardon power even more. He gave pardons to his family, to people who were administration officials, to people who worked on his campaign, and to people who lied to the Justice Department and to the FBI because they were protecting the President from the impeachment articles that were lodged against him and which would have shown his contravention of the Constitution.

I have listened to the debate here some. It is astonishing to me. There is nothing more important in this government and this Congress than protecting democracy, and democracy was threatened by Donald Trump. This bill, which ADAM SCHIFF has sponsored with many cosponsors, protects democracy. It puts checks and balances on the President.

No person should have unfettered power, and the President tried to use the pardon power to take care of people who took care of him, to shut them up so they wouldn't testify against him: Roger Stone, Mike Flynn, you name it, Madam Speaker, down to Paul Manafort.

He pardoned people who lied, who grifted, who dealt with the Russians and who were part of the conspiracy to take over the election by communicating with Kilimnik and getting information out there in the social media to beat Hillary Clinton and elect Donald Trump, the most disgusting Presidency in the history of this country.

That is why this bill is so important, to protect our democracy and save us from abuses by a future President who doesn't have limitations on him.

Madam Speaker, I pledge allegiance to the flag and hope all of us do. I support this bill.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, they say this bill is not about President Trump, but every speaker mentioned President Trump multiple times.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN).

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COMER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this legislation and the en bloc package, particularly amendment No. 29. This amendment would continue Democratic attempts to federalize elections.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to call us Republicans seditionists, yet here they are again attempting to violate the Constitution and our democratic republic by injecting the Federal Government into State elections.

I would like to remind the Democrats that Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution reads: ''The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof''—not by Congress.

Our country is struggling with out-of-control inflation, supply chain shortages, rampant crime, and a crisis on our southern border. Yet, Democrats are focused on violating the Constitution for their own political gain.

When H.R. 1 was passed earlier this Congress, we had assumed that the Democrats were done trying to take election powers away from the States. As it turns out, they were just getting started.

Mr. Speaker, at what point are we going to start focusing on the real issues facing this country? At what point are the Democrats going to realize that America doesn't want out-of-control spending, open borders, and rampant crime?

The Founding Fathers were clear that the States are the primary managers of elections. We must address the real problems facing the American people and stop stripping States of their constitutional authorities.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS). Dr. ALMA ADAMS is the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Education and Labor Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to ensure transparency in our elections.

The American people have a right to know whether a candidate for President or Vice President has unethical foreign entanglements or compromising debts that can be leveraged against their administration—or worse.

My amendment requires the Federal Election Commission, FEC, to make an income tax return publicly available within 48 hours after receipt of return. In cases where a return requires extensive redactions, the Federal Election Commission may make the return available after 48 hours but no later than 30 days after receipt of return.

Only a full release of tax returns can ensure that our President and Vice President are working for us, the American people, not anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment and ''yes'' on H.R. 5314.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), who is the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, Americans want safer streets, affordable gas, and freedom. Instead, Democrats give us record crime levels, record inflation, and another

bill attacking President Trump sponsored by the guy who spent years misleading the Congress and, more importantly, the country on the Trump-Russia investigation, on the Mueller investigation, and on impeachments.

□ 1400

Remember when the sponsor of the bill said that his office didn't meet with the whistleblower? Found out that wasn't true.

Remember when the sponsor of the bill told us that we would hear from the whistleblower during impeachment; we would actually have real process instead of having hearings and depositions in the basement in the bunker of the Capitol?

Remember when the sponsor told us this: There was more than circumstantial evidence that President Trump colluded with Russia? That turned out to be false. Bob Mueller said it was false. Everyone knew it was false.

In fact, it was such baloney, even The Washington Post has had to retract and change things from stories because they said, oh, yeah, yeah, there was a lot of false information in that dossier that they used to go spy on President Trump's campaign.

And I think this is important to understand. The sponsor of this legislation wasn't just any Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker. He wasn't just any chairman of a committee in Congress. He was the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, the committee that gets additional information from anyone else in the country, making those claims that were not accurate.

So maybe, instead of having another bill that attacks President Trump because Democrats are afraid he is going to run and he is going to win in 2024, so they want to do everything they can to attack him—maybe instead of another bill attacking President Trump, we should actually focus on things that the American people care about.

You know, you can attack President Trump all you want. I know one thing: A year ago, the border was secure. It sure was. A year ago, cities were safe, safer than they are today. A year ago, we didn't have a 31-year high inflation. We actually had wages going up, real wages. A year ago, we didn't have a Department of Justice, attacking moms and dads, putting a label, a designation, a threat tag on parents who simply go to school board meetings and speak out against a racist, hate-America curriculum. No, we didn't have that a year ago.

But you guys can keep attacking the President all you want; not addressing the issues that the American people care about. We are going to speak about the issues they care about. We are going to try to do everything we can to slow down your crazy agenda that is driving up the price of everything. And we are going to speak out against and do everything we can to make sure the Department of Justice quits attacking parents.

God bless the whistleblower that came forward and gave us the information sent from the Counterterrorism Division of the FBI. We could be dealing with that issue today. We could be holding the Attorney General accountable, the Justice Department accountable for what they are doing.

No, no, no. We are going to attack President Trump again. Democrats, that is the only thing they can do because they can't talk about anything else.

I hope we defeat this bill.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), the distinguished vice chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, if the last few years have taught us anything, it is that we cannot take our democratic institutions for granted. And to protect them in the future, we must codify many of the rules of the road for good government which have been trampled in recent years by those more interested in personal power than the public good.

That is why I rise in support of the Protecting Our Democracy Act, which would limit future abuses of Presidential powers, strengthen our system of checks and balances, and protect against foreign interference in our elections.

I am proud to offer my amendment to this important piece of legislation which would increase the frequency with which the inspector general of the Department of Justice must report to Congress any improper communications between the Department of Justice and the White House.

We all should be concerned about the threat it poses to our country when the occupant of the White House, whether it is Nixon, whether it is Trump, or whether it is anyone else, when they treat the Department of Justice as their own personal law firm, using taxpayer dollars to advance personal or political ambitions, or to block the investigation of corruption.

We are learning more every day about the heroic public servants in the Department of Justice and elsewhere who raised their voices to push back against misconduct in the White House. My amendment would make it easier for these individuals to alert Congress to misconduct and allow us to better protect our democracy.

I urge my colleagues to do their patriotic duty to protect our Constitution, and to support both my amendment and the underlying bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished and effective Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I congratulate her on her great leadership chairing an important committee of the House, and thank her for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ADAM SCHIFF for his leadership in putting this legislation together, and I will get to that in a moment.

But first, I just want to say how proud we are today. Every day that we serve in this House, a House of the people, is a privilege. No matter what honors others may bestow on us in this House, whether we are Speaker, or leader, or whip, or whatever, nothing, no honor is greater than to be able to step on the floor and say that we speak for the people of our district; that they have chosen us to come here, as was intended by our Founders.

Mr. Speaker, 245 years ago, in an act of daring that would redefine the world, our Founders—imagine the courage they had—declared their independence from an oppressive monarch. They said: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'' The pursuit of happiness was written into the founding document.

And they continued:

> Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the people's duty to throw off such government, to provide new guards for their future security.

They were speaking about England.

Our Founders would then forge those guards for our own government, the democratic institutions enshrined in the Constitution which, for nearly 2-1/2 centuries, have safeguarded the security and well-being of the American people.

But, disturbingly, the last administration saw our democracy in crisis, with a rogue President who trampled over the guardrails protecting our Republic.

Now, Congress has the solemn responsibility and opportunity to safeguard our democracy, ensuring that past abuses can never be perpetrated by any President, of any party.

The Protecting Our Democracy Act ensures the strength and survival of a democracy of, by, and for the people, defending the rule of law, revitalizing our system of checks and balances, and restoring our democratic institutions.

Thank you to Chairman ADAM SCHIFF and the chairs of the committees of jurisdiction, Judiciary being one of those, the Committee on Oversight and Reform, another, and many cosponsors for their leadership on this transformative package of democracy reforms which will put in place essential safeguards to prevent any President from abusing the public trust, no matter what his or her party is.

This legislative package is sweeping and future-focused, looking to the future, designed to restate the rule of law now and for generations to come.

Our chairs have crafted a robust reforms package that can stand up to and prevent attempts to undermine our democracy including: The abuse of pardon power, abuse of office for personal enrichment, the solicitation of foreign assistance in our elections, retaliatory attacks on whistleblowers and inspectors general, politicization of the tools of justice, and contempt of Congress' oversight powers on behalf of the American people, including our lawful subpoena power and the power of the purse.

These steps ensure that no one, not even a President, is above the law.

During the Constitutional Convention, one of our Founders, George Mason, asked: ''Shall any man be above justice? Above all shall that man be above it, who can commit the most extensive injustice?''

In his great wisdom, George Mason knew that the injustice committed by the President erodes the rule of law, the very notion, the idea of fair justice, which is the bedrock of our democracy. And if we allow a President to be above the law, we surely do so to the peril of our Republic.

Addressing Presidential abuse, therefore, goes to the very heart, the very survival of our democracy. We are a democracy; three coequal branches government, each a check and balance on the other that cannot be undermined. Otherwise, we are a monarchy, and that is what we chose not to be.

Let me close by recalling another scene from that Constitutional Convention. On its final day, as our Constitution was adopted, Benjamin Franklin was greeted by folks as he descended the steps from Independence Hall. People know this story. Children in school learn it.

The people asked, what do we have, a republic or a monarchy? Benjamin Franklin responded, ''A republic, if you can keep it.''

This was the vision of our Founders, and we are grateful to them for it. This is what our men and women in uniform defend, freedom, our democracy, and we are grateful to them for it.

This is what we owe our children as we go forward, to meet their aspirations to live in the United States of America, with liberty and justice for all. And we are responsible it.

May we be worthy of the vision of our Founders, the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, and the aspirations of our children.

The Congress—as Article I, the first branch of government—will uphold our solemn duty to keep our Republic by passing the bill, for the people.

I say this with great appreciation to all who worked so hard to put this together. I support this bipartisan amendment that is on the floor right now, and I thank those who worked together in a bipartisan way to put that forward, and I hope that we can have a successful day for the people, again, honoring our Founders, our men and women in uniform, and for the children.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in this package will help ensure that the executive branch is accountable to the American people. This package includes amendments that were offered by both Democrats and Republicans.

These amendments bolster the many reforms in the Protecting Our Democracy Act that will protect against future abuses by the executive branch. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' on this package of amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 838, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 3 and 7, printed in part B of House Report 117–205, offered by Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS OF TEXAS

Strike title II.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. COMER OF KENTUCKY

Page 1, strike line 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Inspector General Stability Act''.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OR TRANSFER OF INSPECTORS GENERAL; PLACEMENT ON NON-DUTY STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(b)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)(A)'' after ''(b)'';

(B) in paragraph (1), as so designated—

(i) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, in the second sentence—

(I) by striking ''reasons'' and inserting the following: ''substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,''; and

(II) by inserting ''(including to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and any other congressional committee that has jurisdiction with respect to that Inspector General)'' after ''Houses of Congress''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under subparagraph (A), the written communication required under that subparagraph shall—

''(i) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and

''(ii) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2)(A) Subject to the other provisions of this paragraph, only the President may place an Inspector General on non-duty status.

''(B) If the President places an Inspector General on non-duty status, the President shall communicate in writing the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for the change in status to both Houses of Congress (including to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and any other congressional committee that has jurisdiction with respect to that Inspector General) not later than 15 days before the date on which the change in status takes effect, except that the President may submit that communication on the date on which the change in status takes effect if—

''(i) the President has made a determination that the continued presence of the Inspector General in the workplace poses a threat described in any of clauses (i) through (iv) of section 6329b(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code; and

''(ii) in the communication, the President includes a report on the determination described in clause (i), which shall include—

''(I) a specification of which clause of section 6329b(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, the President has determined applies under clause (i) of this subparagraph;

''(II) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for the determination made under clause (i);

''(III) an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, any inquiry upon which the determination under clause (i) was made; and

''(IV) in the case of an inquiry described in subclause (III) that is completed, the findings made during that inquiry.

''(C) The President may not place an Inspector General on non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (1)(A) unless the President—

''(i) has made a determination that the continued presence of the Inspector General in the workplace poses a threat described in any of clauses (i) through (iv) of section 6329b(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code; and

''(ii) not later than the date on which the change in status takes effect, submits to both Houses of Congress (including to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and any other congressional committee that has jurisdiction with respect to that Inspector General) a written communication that contains the information required under subparagraph (B), including the report required under clause (ii) of that subparagraph.

''(D) For the purposes of this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'Inspector General'—

''(I) means an Inspector General who was appointed by the President, without regard to whether the Senate provided advice and consent with respect to that appointment; and

''(II) includes the Inspector General of an establishment, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, and the Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery; and

''(ii) a reference to the removal or transfer of an Inspector General under paragraph (1), or to the written communication described in that paragraph, shall be considered to be—

''(I) in the case of the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, a reference to section 1229(c)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 379);

''(II) in the case of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, a reference to section 121(b)(4) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5231(b)(4)); and

''(III) in the case of the Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery, a reference to section 4018(b)(3) of the CARES Act (15 U.S.C. 9053(b)(3)).''; and

(2) in section 8G(e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or placement on non-duty status'' after ''a removal'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(2)'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), as so designated, in the first sentence—

(I) by striking ''reasons'' and inserting the following: ''substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,''; and

(II) by inserting ''(including to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and any other congressional committee that has jurisdiction with respect to that Inspector General)'' after ''Houses of Congress''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under subparagraph (A), the written communication required under that subparagraph shall—

''(i) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and

''(ii) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) Subject to the other provisions of this paragraph, only the head of the applicable designated Federal entity (referred to in this paragraph as the 'covered official') may place an Inspector General on non-duty status.

''(B) If a covered official places an Inspector General on non-duty status, the covered official shall communicate in writing the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for the change in status to both Houses of Congress (including to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and any other congressional committee that has jurisdiction with respect to that Inspector General) not later than 15 days before the date on which the change in status takes effect, except that the covered official may submit that communication on the date on which the change in status takes effect if—

''(i) the covered official has made a determination that the continued presence of the Inspector General in the workplace poses a threat described in any of clauses (i) through (iv) of section 6329b(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code; and

''(ii) in the communication, the covered official includes a report on the determination described in clause (i), which shall include—

''(I) a specification of which clause of section 6329b(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, the covered official has determined applies under clause (i) of this subparagraph;

''(II) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for the determination made under clause (i);

''(III) an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, any inquiry upon which the determination under clause (i) was made; and

''(IV) in the case of an inquiry described in subclause (III) that is completed, the findings made during that inquiry.

''(C) A covered official may not place an Inspector General on non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (2)(A) unless the covered official—

''(i) has made a determination that the continued presence of the Inspector General in the workplace poses a threat described in any of clauses (i) through (iv) of section 6329b(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code; and

''(ii) not later than the date on which the change in status takes effect, submits to both Houses of Congress (including to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and any other congressional committee that has jurisdiction with respect to that Inspector General) a written communication that contains the information required under subparagraph (B), including the report required under clause (ii) of that subparagraph.

''(D) Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit or otherwise modify—

''(i) any statutory protection that is afforded to an Inspector General; or

''(ii) any other action that a covered official may take under law with respect to an Inspector General.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12(3) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting ''except as otherwise expressly provided,'' before ''the term''.

SEC. 3. CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OFFICES.

(a) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICE.—Paragraph (1) of section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,'' after ''is removed from office'';

(2) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''any such removal''; and

(3) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''before the removal''.

(b) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,'' after ''office'';

(2) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''any such removal''; and

(3) by inserting '', change in status,'' after ''before the removal''.

(c) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CERTAIN CHANGES IN STATUS.—

(1) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICE.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 2(1), is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''If'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (4), if''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the President may submit the communication described in paragraph (1) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

''(A) the President determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

''(B) in the communication, the President includes—

''(i) a specification of which clause the President relied on to make the determination under subparagraph (A);

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

''(5) The President may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (1) unless the President—

''(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

''(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

''(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the President relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.''.

(2) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 2(2), is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''If'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (4), if''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the head of a designated Federal entity may submit the communication described in paragraph (2) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

''(A) the head determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

''(B) in the communication, the head includes—

''(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

''(5) The head may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (2) unless the head—

''(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

''(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

''(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

''(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

''(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

''(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

''(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

''(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

''(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.''.

(d) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to removals, transfers, and changes of status occurring on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. PRESIDENTIAL EXPLANATION OF FAILURE TO NOMINATE AN INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3349d the following new section:

''§ 3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General

''If the President fails to make a formal nomination for a vacant Inspector General position that requires a formal nomination by the President to be filled within the period beginning on the date on which the vacancy occurred and ending on the day that is 210 days after that date, the President shall communicate, within 30 days after the end of such period, to Congress in writing—

''(1) the reasons why the President has not yet made a formal nomination; and

''(2) a target date for making a formal nomination.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to 3349d the following new item:

''3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any vacancy first occurring on or after that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

□ 1415

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to these amendments.

Together, these amendments would gut the bill and strike everything in this important package of reforms.

The Protecting Our Democracy Act would make the government more transparent and accountable to the American people.

Provisions in this bill have been supported by both Democrats and Republicans. For example, my Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act in Title VII is a bipartisan bill. Many of the reforms in this bill stem from efforts by prior administrations of both parties to enhance executive power.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress should unite in reasserting congressional authority.

Representative BURGESS' amendment would strike important reforms in the bill which would ensure that Presidents and Vice Presidents can be held accountable for criminal conduct just like every other American.

Representative COMER's amendment would strike every section of the bill, including reforms to strengthen whistleblower laws that encourage Federal employees to report government waste, fraud, and abuse.

The amendment would strike protections against Federal agencies' misuse of government funds. The amendment would strike the provision in the bill that would require the President and Vice President to disclose their tax returns.

The sponsor of this amendment, Representative COMER, said at the Rules Committee recently, just 2 days ago, that he supports that very reform. Yet, his amendment would remove it from the bill.

These amendments are not a serious attempt at addressing the protections in this bill. They are simply a messaging tool that will gut the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

My colleagues from across the aisle continue to claim that this bill is about punishing former President Trump. But Joe Biden is our President now, and these bold, good-government reforms will impact his administration as well as future Presidents of both parties.

It is not about the past. It is about the future and the strengthening of our democracy. I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this package of amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendments en bloc.

In this package is my amendment, the IG Stability Act, which clearly shows where we should be able to come together and pass bipartisan inspector general reforms.

Inspectors general play a critical role in rooting out fraud, waste, and abuse in the Federal Government. They help Congress, and especially the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, in conducting oversight of executive branch offices and Federal agencies.

Yet, just like in every profession, occasionally there have been either poor performers or those who have acted outside their mandates. With respect to poor performers, we had, in my opinion, a very poor performing Election Assistance Commission IG, and she resigned after we started calling for her to do her job. In those situations, the President should have the flexibility to remove an inspector general.

The Democrats' proposal would dramatically limit the President's authority to remove an inspector general for dereliction of duty or undermining the policies of a duly elected President.

My amendment mirrors bipartisan language in the Senate which requires a detailed rationale to be provided to Congress prior to the removal of an IG. This ensures Congress has adequate oversight of the removal of an IG without preventing a President from removing an IG who is undermining them.

Further, my amendment would help remedy the ongoing concern about IG vacancies, which has been a recurring problem in Republican and Democrat administrations. My amendment requires the President to notify Congress if they fail to fill a vacancy and provide a written explanation with a target date for nomination.

This amendment ensures that the IG community is adequately staffed to conduct nonpartisan oversight over Federal agencies.

This provision has already passed the House this year as part of the bipartisan Inspector General Protection Act, H.R. 23. Yet, the Democrats are now putting this commonsense, bipartisan amendment in an en bloc designed to fail. Why? They are not interested in real reform; they are just interested in messaging, messaging campaigns for the 2022 midterm elections, which by all accounts aren't looking very bright for my friends across the aisle.

This amendment and Mr. BURGESS' amendment should be accepted, not shoved aside. I encourage support of

this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this en bloc amendment, and particularly to the Burgess amendment.

The Burgess amendment would strike one of the most important provisions in the bill, one that ensures that a sitting President or Vice President can be held accountable for their actions, just like every other American.

This provision is necessary in order to close a dangerous loophole in the law created by DOJ policy, most recently embodied in the legal opinion by the Office of Legal Counsel, which holds that a President cannot be criminally prosecuted during his or her term in office.

Under current law, throughout the entire period that a President is presumed by some to be immune from prosecution, the statute of limitations continues to run on any offenses he or she may have committed. Since most Federal criminal offenses carry a 5-year statute of limitations, a President who is not prosecuted while in office for a crime he or she may have committed could end up evading justice altogether if the statute of limitations runs out before their term is over, particularly if they are elected to a second term.

Allowing complete immunity from criminal prosecution merely because of the office a person holds would make a mockery of the rule of law. It is a maxim of our system of justice that no man is immune from the law, that no man can be a judge in his own case.

Statutes of limitations are an important element of criminal law. As a general matter, they provide a necessary balance between protecting defendants from delay and allowing prosecutors adequate time to investigate and charge cases. But the law has also long recognized that certain limited exceptions to this general rule are necessary. The case of a sitting President, whose prosecution is barred under Justice Department policy, fits comfortably among such exceptions.

It is necessary, therefore, to simply pause the statute of limitations to ensure that the Presidency is not a get-out-of-jail-free card. We must not strike this essential provision, because every person, no matter his or her title or office, must be held accountable under our laws.

I urge strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other thing. We have heard our friends across the aisle talk about Donald Trump, and they say that former President Trump did nothing wrong. Democrats, by and large, say he did a lot of things wrong. But that is irrelevant to this debate.

This bill has nothing to do with President Trump any more than the post-Watergate reforms had to do with Richard Nixon. Richard Nixon's conduct taught us certain lessons, and Donald Trump's conduct taught us certain lessons. The legislation before us is the result of those lessons.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, those lessons are for us to use to protect the future. That is what this legislation is about, to protect the future from a President, of any party, who may violate the law, who may aggrandize power. That is what this is about: the future, not the past.

So when I hear our Republican friends talk about Donald Trump and talk about how he wasn't convicted, et cetera, it is irrelevant. We are talking about the future, not the past. For the future, it is necessary to pass this bill, and for the future, it is necessary to defeat this en bloc amendment.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, again, they say it is not about Donald Trump, but every speaker on that side of the aisle spent a significant percentage of their time talking about Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I do intend to speak on my amendment to H.R. 5314, but I do have to reference the remarks recently made by the Democratic Speaker of the House on her testimony.

Look, it is no news flash that Democrats dislike the former President. Democrats dislike President Trump. The news flash is they really fear the former President, and that is what this legislation is all about, because their fear is so intense and so overreaching and so preoccupying in their lives, they can think of nothing else.

I do want to thank my friend from Kentucky for including me in this en bloc discussion. I think the amendments that Mr. COMER and I are offering are an important addition to this bill, the so-called Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Title II of this bill extends the statute of limitations for offenses allegedly committed by a sitting President or a Vice President for the duration of their tenure and any period of time preceding their tenure in office. While we can agree with the title of the section, ''No President is Above the Law,'' this section further sets our President and Vice President apart.

Under current law, elected officials, President and Vice President, may be investigated for alleged commissions of crimes, and any information can then be brought before Congress where Congress can then choose to remove that official from office via impeachment.

We know how facile our Democratic majority has been with the tool of impeachment in the past 2 years. If impeached and removed from office, that individual, the President or Vice President, would then be open to prosecution to the fullest extent of the law, well within the statute of limitations, just like every other American.

Additionally, Title II is very likely unconstitutional, as the Sixth Amendment's speedy trial clause protects the accused against unreasonable delays between an indictment and a trial. Extending the statute of limitations in Title II of this bill would only further politicize the Presidency and Vice Presidency, further politicize the impeachment process, which the Democrats have elevated to a high art, and make holders of those offices the targets of politically motivated investigations during and after their terms.

For those reasons, I urge support of this amendment and support of Mr. COMER's amendment.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for closing.

The underlying bill is about the future, the future of our democracy. It is about strengthening our democracy. These amendments would gut the underlying bill, the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

I support the bill, because it includes reforms, such as curbing the abuse of the pardon power, increasing penalties for political appointees who violate the Hatch Act, strengthening whistleblower protections and IG protections, and it would require the President and Vice President to reveal their taxes, among other reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this package of amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

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

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

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

□ 1430

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in part B of House Report 117–205.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII add the following:

SEC. 814. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE AUDITS AND INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 513. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE ANALYSES, EVALUATIONS, AND INVESTIGATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall, to the extent consistent with due regard for the protection from unauthorized disclosure of classified information relating to sensitive intelligence sources and methods, ensure that personnel of the Government Accountability Office designated by the Comptroller General are provided with access to all information in the possession of an element of the intelligence community that the Comptroller General determines is necessary for such personnel to conduct an analysis, evaluation, or investigation of a program or activity of an element of the intelligence community that is requested by a committee of Congress with jurisdiction over such program or activity.

''(b) CONFIDENTIALITY.—(1) The Comptroller General shall maintain the same level of confidentiality for information made available for an analysis, evaluation, or investigation referred to in subsection (a) as is required of the head of the element of the intelligence community from which such information is obtained. Officers and employees of the Government Accountability Office are subject to the same statutory penalties for unauthorized disclosure or use of such information as officers or employees of the element of the intelligence community that provided the Comptroller General or officers and employees of the Government Accountability Office with access to such information.

''(2) The Comptroller General shall establish procedures to protect from unauthorized disclosure all classified and other sensitive information furnished to the Comptroller General or any representative of the Comptroller General for conducting an analysis, evaluation, or investigation referred to in subsection (a). Such procedures shall be established in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the congressional intelligence committees.

''(3) Before initiating an analysis, evaluation, or investigation referred to in subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall provide the Director of National Intelligence and the head of each relevant element of the intelligence community with the name of each officer and employee of the Government Accountability Office who has obtained appropriate security clearance and to whom, upon proper identification, records and information of the element of the intelligence community shall be made available in conducting such analysis, evaluation, or investigation.

''(4) Any analysis, evaluation, or report prepared pursuant to this provision shall be unclassified but may include a classified annex, which shall be submitted to the congressional intelligence committees and, consistent with the protection of intelligence sources and methods, to the requesting committee with jurisdiction over the program or activity that is the subject of the report.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 512 the following new item:

''Sec. 513. Government Accountability Office analyses, evaluations, and investigations.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, since its creation in 1921, the Government Accountability Office has had the purview to conduct oversight of all Federal agencies with the goal of reducing waste, fraud, and abuse and holding accountable bad actors.

However, and unfortunately, most of our intelligence agencies today are not fully cooperative with the GAO, pointing to an outdated and vague 1988 Department of Justice opinion.

My amendment would allow the GAO to act as a check on this behavior—not creating new powers, but restoring the power Congress always intended the GAO to have.

This amendment is welcomed by many in the intelligence community who want to protect their important work and resources from abuse, particularly after the last Presidency we just endured.

This amendment was drafted in partnership with the community, and I am proud to have the support of Representative ADAM SCHIFF, who serves as the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. In fact, many of my colleagues have already taken a stand in support of this legislation because, in 2010, the House passed a virtually identical amendment.

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I must say that the GAO plays an important role in the legislative branch, but with matters of national security, we must ensure protocols are followed to prevent unauthorized disclosures of national security information. With this amendment, it is unclear whether those protocols are being met, creating a potential national security risk.

Further, the House Intelligence Committee already has the authority to task GAO, when necessary and appropriate, to conduct reviews of the intelligence community and to ensure GAO receives appropriate information from the intelligence community. The House Intelligence Committee has done this several times in the past, making this amendment moot.

Again, this is why we needed to go through regular order on the various bills stitched together in the underlying bill. The committees need to have an opportunity to vet bills, including amendments such as these, before they come to the floor of the House. That is how we ensure good bills are passed.

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the chairwoman of the House Oversight Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment and thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) for her leadership in offering it. This amendment would clarify the Government Accountability Office's authority to investigate the intelligence community.

As Congress' watchdog, GAO helps to improve Federal Government performance and ensure accountability for the American people. GAO has the tools and expertise to ensure that classified information is treated with appropriate care and confidentiality. They have been doing that for decades.

For example, as part of its audit work, GAO is authorized to examine highly sensitive tax return information. Strict protocols are followed to protect that information while still enabling GAO to carry out its important legislative and oversight responsibilities.

This amendment includes important safeguards to balance the protection of sensitive information with the need for oversight of the intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ's amendment.

The GAO's expertise and technical capacity are critical to Congress' oversight. This amendment by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) gives GAO access to important information in the IC's possession that is necessary for the conduct of GAO's responsibilities while also ensuring the protection of sensitive sources and methods. It strikes the right balance between security, transparency, and needed oversight.

It also imposes confidentiality restrictions; clarifies that GAO officers and employees, like their IC colleagues, are subject to penalties for unauthorized disclosure; and requires the Comptroller General to consult with the Director of National Intelligence to establish protections against such unauthorized disclosures.

In sum, the amendment will enhance congressional oversight of the IC in a manner that protects our national security. I want to thank my colleague for offering it. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, every time Chairman SCHIFF rises to speak on a bill about intelligence and security and holding the President accountable, I get excited, hoping that we are going to hear about that evidence of collusion and all the other investigations that were conducted in this House over the past year.

Mr. SCHIFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Let me ask the gentleman, are you aware, just by way of illustration, that the President's campaign chairman, Paul Manafort, secretly met with an agent of Russian intelligence and provided Russian intelligence with internal campaign polling data as well as strategic insights about their strategy in key battleground States? Are you aware of that?

Mr. COMER. I think everyone is aware of every bit of information that you all have tried to peddle over the past 4 years.

Mr. SCHIFF. Let me ask you, are you aware, while the Trump campaign chairman was providing internal polling data, that Kremlin intelligence was leading a clandestine social media campaign to elect Donald Trump? Are you aware of that?

Mr. COMER. I think we see every day. Facebook just announced that Russia was trying to do a Facebook campaign in Ukraine, if I remember reading that correctly.

Mr. SCHIFF, would you yield to a question from me?

Mr. SCHIFF. Would you like me to go on?

Mr. COMER. Would you yield to a question?

Mr. SCHIFF. Well, I am asking you. You asked me to present you with some of the information.

Mr. COMER. I think it is great. Are you aware of President Biden's son Hunter's art dealings?

Mr. SCHIFF. If you would like me to continue.

Mr. COMER. Are you aware of the President's son's dealings in Congo with the cobalt mine? Are you aware of the dealings in Ukraine?

Mr. SCHIFF. To get to the gentleman's question, I am aware of President Trump's son meeting secretly in Trump Tower in New York with the Russian delegation with the purpose of receiving dirt on Hillary Clinton, which the Russian delegation represented was part of the Russian Government's effort to help elect Donald Trump in 2016.

I am aware that Donald Trump, Jr., said in response to that Russian offer of dirt on Donald Trump's opponent that he would ''love it,'' suggested the best time would be in late summer, and had a secret meeting in Trump Tower. When asked about that secret meeting, both the President and his son lied about it. Are you aware of those facts?

Mr. COMER. I think that everyone has seen all the information, again, that you all have peddled. I am curious if you would like to take a wager on which President's child, which President's son, at the end of the day, once we have the gavel, will be the greatest security risk to our Nation, Hunter Biden or—

Mr. SCHIFF. I am happy to continue to outline the contacts between the Trump campaign and Russia, their solicitation of Russian help in the election, the former President's effort to coerce Ukraine into helping him cheat in the election. I would be happy to go chapter and verse if you would like me to use your time that way.

Right now, though, the subject of this amendment is to allow the General Accountability Office, the GAO, to help Congress oversee aspects of the intelligence community, but if you are more interested—

Mr. COMER. I reclaim my time. They spent a lot of time, a lot of time, a lot of effort, a lot of tax dollars on trying to peddle a lot of wrongdoing in the previous administration.

This bill is all about the previous administration. Every speaker on their side of the aisle has mentioned Donald Trump's name numerous times, every speaker. It is time for the majority party to focus on governing and get over their obsession with Donald Trump.

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Speaker, overall, the Protecting Our Democracy Act will do much to address the weaknesses that were exposed in light of the last administration and exploited during President Trump's Presidency.

I am proud to have four other amendments being included today that address nepotism, codify the Biden ethics pledge, and regulate defense funds as well as inaugural committees. I hope my colleagues will also see the value in protecting our Intelligence Committees from abuse and vote to include this amendment in the POD Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

The question is on the amendment.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions related to H.R. 5314 previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Amendments en bloc No. 1;

Amendments en bloc No. 2;

Amendment No. 25;

A motion to recommit, if offered;

The question on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 1, printed in part B of House Report 117–205, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 211, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—218

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)

Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—211

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

NOT VOTING—4

Gohmert
Murphy (FL)
Reschenthaler
Slotkin

□ 1519

Messrs. LUCAS, WALBERG, and JOYCE of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Gallego)
Bass (Brownley)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Courtney (Hayes)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Green (TX))
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
Fallon (Gooden)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Granger (Cole)
Guthrie (Barr)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Higgins (NY) (Connolly)
Huffman (Levin (CA))
Kim (CA) (Pfluger)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Loudermilk (Fleischmann)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (UT) (Carl)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (García (IL))
Payne (Pallone)
Posey (McHenry)
Rush (Quigley)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (NJ) (Van Drew)
Smith (WA) (Kilmer)
Speier (Thompson (CA))
Strickland (Meng)
Swalwell (Gomez)
Underwood (Casten)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Young (Spartz)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 2, printed in part B of House Report 117–205, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 218, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—211

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

NAYS—218

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan

Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Brady
Cárdenas
Murphy (FL)
Slotkin

□ 1532

Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. HUFFMAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. GALLAGHER, NEHLS, CAWTHORN, and Ms. VAN DUYNE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the en bloc amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I was reported as no, but I intended to vote yes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 437.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Gallego)
Bass (Brownley)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Courtney (Hayes)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Green (TX))
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
Fallon (Gooden)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Granger (Cole)
Guthrie (Barr)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Higgins (NY) (Connolly)
Huffman (Levin (CA))
Kim (CA) (Pfluger)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Loudermilk (Fleischmann)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (UT) (Carl)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (García (IL))
Payne (Pallone)
Posey (McHenry)
Porter (Wexton)
Reschenthaler (Meuser)
Rush (Quigley)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (NJ) (Van Drew)
Smith (WA) (Kilmer)
Speier (Thompson (CA))
Strickland (Meng)
Swalwell (Gomez)
Underwood (Casten)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Young (Spartz)

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 25, printed in part B of House Report 117–205, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 233, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

YEAS—196

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

NAYS—233

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

NOT VOTING—4

Hudson
Murphy (FL)
Nehls
Slotkin

□ 1543

Mr. BROWN of Maryland changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Gallego)
Bass (Brownley)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Courtney (Hayes)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Green (TX))
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
Fallon (Gooden)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Granger (Cole)
Guthrie (Barr)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Higgins (NY) (Connolly)
Huffman (Levin (CA))
Kim (CA) (Pfluger)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Loudermilk (Fleischmann)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (UT) (Carl)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (García (IL))
Payne (Pallone)
Posey (McHenry)
Porter (Wexton)
Reschenthaler (Meuser)
Rush (Quigley)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (NJ) (Van Drew)
Smith (WA) (Kilmer)
Speier (Thompson (CA))
Strickland (Meng)
Swalwell (Gomez)
Underwood (Casten)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Young (Spartz)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5314 to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois is as follows:

Add at the end of division C the following:

TITLE XV—REMOVAL OF NONCITIZENS FROM VOTING ROLLS

SEC. 1501. CLARIFYING AUTHORITY OF STATES TO REMOVE NONCITIZENS FROM VOTING ROLLS.

(a) AUTHORITY UNDER REGULAR REMOVAL PROGRAMS.—Section 8(a)(4) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) the registrant's status as a noncitizen of the United States; or''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ONGOING REMOVAL.—Section 8(c)(2)(B)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''(4)(A)'' and inserting ''(4)(A) or (B)''.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 217, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—212

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

NAYS—217

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

NOT VOTING—4

Fortenberry
Murphy (FL)
Slotkin
Underwood

□ 1556

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 439.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Gallego)
Bass (Brownley)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Courtney (Hayes)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Green (TX))
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
Fallon (Gooden)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Granger (Cole)
Guthrie (Barr)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Higgins (NY) (Connolly)
Huffman (Levin (CA))
Kim (CA) (Pfluger)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Loudermilk (Fleischmann)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (UT) (Carl)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (García (IL))
Payne (Pallone)
Posey (McHenry)
Porter (Wexton)
Reschenthaler (Meuser)
Rush (Quigley)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (NJ) (Van Drew)
Smith (WA) (Kilmer)
Speier (Thompson (CA))
Strickland (Meng)
Swalwell (Gomez)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Young (Spartz)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 208, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—220

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case

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

NAYS—208

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

NOT VOTING—6

Babin
Fortenberry
Green (TN)
Higgins (LA)
Murphy (FL)
Slotkin

□ 1607

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Gallego)
Bass (Brownley)
Buchanan (Waltz)
Courtney (Hayes)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Green (TX))
Fallon (Gooden)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Granger (Cole)
Guthrie (Barr)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Hice (GA) (Greene (GA))
Higgins (NY) (Connolly)
Huffman (Levin (CA))
Kim (CA) (Pfluger)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Loudermilk (Fleischmann)
Mfume (Evans)
Moore (UT) (Carl)
Napolitano (Correa)
Nehls (Cawthorn)
Newman (García (IL))
Payne (Pallone)
Posey (McHenry)
Porter (Wexton)
Reschenthaler (Meuser)
Rush (Quigley)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (NJ) (Van Drew)
Smith (WA) (Kilmer)
Speier (Thompson (CA))
Strickland (Meng)
Swalwell (Gomez)
Underwood (Casten)
Veasey (Neguse)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Young (Spartz)

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 693. An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses, and for othe purposes.

S. 2293. An Act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide certain employment rights to reservists of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes.

S. 2796. An Act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the eligibility of rural community response pilot programs for funding under the Comprehensive Opioid Abuse Grant Program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 29. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to ''COVID–19 Vacinnation and Testing; Emergency Temporary Standard''.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, today, my Michigan colleagues and members of the Congressional Black Caucus rise in honor of the life and service of Congresswoman Barbara-Rose Collins. She dedicated her life to community and broke countless barriers.

Madam Speaker, I ask that everyone rise for a moment of silence in honor of Congresswoman Barbara-Rose Collins.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5314, PROTECTING OUR DEMOCRACY ACT

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 5314, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KAPTUR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, another week, another week of gun deaths.

No matter where you live—Oxford, Michigan; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; or, most recently, in my district, Pottstown—no matter where you are—a school, a place of worship, or your parked car—gun violence hunts down far too many innocent Americans and, quite frankly, can find any one of us.

Our inaction on gun safety, ghost guns, and gun violence has created a tragic version of Groundhog Day. Too often we and our children wake up to another headline about senseless, needless gun violence; one slaughter bleeding into the next.

Last week, Oxford High School became the 30th school shooting in 2021, with four dead and seven injured. Thirty times this year alone.

These are not isolated incidents. They join a long history of our Nation's failure to have an honest discussion about guns and gun violence.

Lawmakers have the responsibility to legislate and to protect our children and our neighbors from gun violence.

When will we wake up to a new day?

□ 1615

DEMOCRATS' DRUG PRICING SCHEME JEOPARDIZES FUTURE CURES

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the Federal Government cannot be given the ability to police innovators who create lifesaving products. Top-down, government-imposed drug pricing would eliminate consumer choices, jeopardize future cures, and ultimately lead to socialized medicine.

The United States invents approximately two-thirds of the world's new medicines. Our system encourages private investments which spur innovation. This is something we should be proud of and encourage, not curtail.

But under the Democrats' radical Build Back Better Act, new drugs and cures for diseases like cancer and diabetes would be reduced. Price controls will lead to reduced access for patients and will set a dangerous precedent.

If the Federal Government has the authority to dictate the cost of prescription drugs, what else will it decide to set prices for?

COVID–19 VACCINATIONS ARE IMPORTANT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today regarding the ongoing threat posed by COVID–19.

After 22 months of this pandemic, we cannot be complacent. In order to prevent further spread of the virus, either someone has to die, which I don't consider a very good alternative, or everybody else who isn't vaccinated ought to get their vaccines. By doing so, you prevent more suffering and death.

In Ohio, COVID–19 is ripping across the State. Our emergency rooms are full of patients, and our ICU staffs are overworked. Ninety-five percent of COVID hospitalizations are among unvaccinated individuals—95 percent. This is costing our healthcare system billions of dollars and wear and tear on all of our medical professionals.

However, only 61 percent of Ohio residents have received their first dose. That means the majority aren't pulling with the crew.

I urge all of us to think about the safety of our family, our friends, and our neighbors and do what we must to assist the well-being of those who are working overtime now for almost 2 years in our healthcare facilities. They are serving on the front lines.

We all have a duty to be patriotic, and that means saving lives, not taking them, and making sure that you get your vaccine.

HOLIDAY SHOPPING IN LIBERAL CITIES

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, this holiday season, most Americans are using the conventional shopping method. They choose their item in the store and pay for it at the checkout.

However, this year, others are going with a different approach: smash and grab robberies. Thugs are ambushing stores, breaking windows, and destroying store property, then walking out with all the merchandise they can carry. Robberies at pharmacies and retail stores are on the rise this year, mostly in liberal cities like San Francisco, Chicago, and New York City. There is a clear pattern here.

Store robberies are up in Democrat-run cities that push defund the police agendas and refrain from punishing criminals in the name of equity. Criminals in these cities figured out there is no consequence for busting up a Gucci store and walking out with thousands of dollars of merchandise.

For example, in California, people can steal up to $950 worth of merchandise without being charged with a felony. Many looters in California cities who get arrested are quickly released because they don't even have to pay bail.

Unfortunately, many Democrats are willingly ignorant of this trend. They even attribute the rise in smash-and-grab robberies to the coronavirus or deny the problem exists at all. They keep pushing their antipolice, procriminal policies, and it is hard-working businessowners and employees who end up paying the price.

Madam Speaker, I always remember what my parents told me: Let's not close the barn door after the cows have already left.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES BY CHINA

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

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, we know that about 1.5 million Uyghur and Kazakh Muslims have been detained in reeducation camps and that products made in the Xinjiang region have been made with forced labor—in other words, slavery.

The House considered the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act, led by Chairman MCGOVERN, that would ban the import of goods made with forced labor and sanction people responsible for modern-day slavery.

This is ethnic cleansing happening here. The world cannot look away from one of the most egregious and deadly incidents of ongoing Islamophobia, genocide, and slavery.

I was proud to vote ''yes'' on this legislation and hope to ensure that we hold China accountable for this egregious human rights abuse.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MIKE SCHERNECK

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Michael Scherneck's selfless 18-year career with the Southeast Georgia Health System.

After nearly two decades of dedicated service to residents of Georgia's First District, Mike will retire early next year as CEO of the Southeast Georgia Health System.

In 2003, Mike began his tenure as the executive vice president and CFO. In 2015, he was named president and CEO due to his dedication and hard work ethic.

Without Mike's tireless advocacy, the Southeast Georgia Health System would not be the top-tier facility it is today.

In a tenure wrought with trials, including three hurricanes and a global pandemic, Mike's extraordinary leadership allowed the health system not just to survive but to thrive.

While we know that Mike is looking forward to retired life, we are certainly sad to see him go.

Mike is leaving the Southeast Georgia Health System better than he found it and decades of future CEOs will surely be inspired by his lasting legacy.

NICOLE MONTNA VAN VLECK HONORED AS RICE FARMER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I am here today to recognize the great work of a fellow rice farmer, Nicole Montna Van Vleck. She was just named the USA Rice Federation's 2021 Rice Farmer of the Year.

She is a third-generation rice farmer in northern California and serves as president and CEO of her Montna Farms in Sutter County.

At Montna Farms, conservation is a priority. America's rice farmers have a longstanding commitment to protect and preserve natural resources.

Not only is she involved with her family's California rice operation, but she also makes time for her passion of promoting the U.S. rice industry.

She previously served as the chair of the USA Rice Farmers board of directors, where she collaborated with growers across the country to solve difficult policy issues and strengthen the industry.

Today, U.S. rice farmers produce more rice using less land, energy, and water than they did just 20 years ago while providing critical habitats for many, many species.

With leaders such as Nicole, America's rice farmers continue to serve as leaders in farming by producing a very healthy, conservation-friendly food that generates jobs and economic opportunity in rural areas.

Congrats, Nicole, on this great honor.

SOCIAL SECURITY 2100: A SACRED TRUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KAPTUR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to use this hour to discuss ''Social Security 2100: A Sacred Trust,'' or, as Martin Luther King would remind us, the fierce urgency of now and Congress' need to act on Social Security.

Let me start with the fact that Social Security is the Nation's number one insurance program, the number one insurance program that some on the other side call an entitlement. There is nothing further from the truth, and this is easily verifiable. All you have to do is look at your pay stub. It says FICA. FICA stands for Federal Insurance Contributions Act. Whose contribution? Every citizen in the United States who pays into the program.

It is an earned benefit, and one that has never missed a payment. It is a guarantee, and that is why it is so vitally important to every American citizen.

Congress has been negligent. It has been 50 years since there has been an enhancement to the program. It has been more than 38 years since there was an attempt at solvency. Yet, 38 years ago, Congress enacted a cut that will take place this January.

The time to act is now. No more procrastination. For all of our C–SPAN listeners, make sure that you contact your Member of Congress in both Houses.

We are pleased that 200-plus people are original cosponsors of the bill. You will hear from some of them today.

We have taken the liberty of pointing out to every Member of Congress how many people in their district receive Social Security benefits and what that brings into their district on a monthly basis. I assure you, there is no more greater economic development plan for Members' districts than what happens on a monthly basis to those who need it most.

Let me reiterate again: Social Security is the number one antipoverty program for the elderly and the number one antipoverty program for children as well.

I have here, Madam Speaker, something we have done for every Member of Congress. In this case, we are illustrating our great leader, Representative JIM CLYBURN, who is a proud cosponsor of this bill.

In his district, in South Carolina's Sixth, there are 149,433 Social Security recipients who receive $189 million in monthly benefits. That is monthly benefits. There are 1.2 million Social Security recipients in South Carolina who receive $1.7 billion in monthly benefits as well.

For about half of senior beneficiaries, Social Security provides a majority of their income. Now imagine that, for half the seniors in the country, Social Security provides a majority of their benefits, yet there hasn't been an enhancement or an increase in over 50 years in a COLA. That doesn't even come remotely close to what people need.

For more than a quarter of our seniors, it provides 90 percent or more of their income, 90 percent for a quarter of our seniors. At a time when the wealth disparity is the greatest it has ever been in our country, the wealthiest nation in the world, there are 5 million of our fellow Americans, mostly women, who receive a below-poverty level check from their government.

□ 1630

Why? Because Congress hasn't acted. This isn't something the President can do through executive order, nor is this something that the Supreme Court is going to adjudicate. This is the responsibility of the United States Congress.

I am proud that we had a hearing the other day in the Ways and Means Committee that we are going to bring to a markup and ultimately to the floor of this House: Social Security 2100. I am proud of the fact that we have a President of the United States who refers to Social Security as a sacred trust, a sacred trust between the government and their people. And Social Security has never failed. It has never missed a payment.

It used to be—and Mr. CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania knows this—that we could go back to 1935 to explain why Roosevelt back then, in the midst of the Great Depression, put forward Social Security because of the devastation that had taken place in 1929 during the great crash.

But Members on this floor, Members in this Congress understand all too well that we only have to go back to 2008, 2009 during the Great Recession when people saw their 401(k) become a 101(k) where people lost their benefits. And that coupled with the great pandemic, this roller coaster of a pandemic that we are living through now has only further underscored the need for us to enhance the Nation's number one insurance program.

And during that same time, during that recession that they witnessed their funds depleted and devastated or lost altogether or during layoffs that have occurred through no fault of their own, Social Security has never missed a payment. Not a pension payment, not a spousal payment, not dependent coverage, nor disability.

Madam Speaker, it might surprise some of our viewers and listeners that more veterans depend on Social Security disability than they do on the VA. And it is because Social Security provides these benefits and especially for our veterans. People in this Chamber and in the Senate take great pride in talking about our veterans on Memorial Day and Veterans Day, and rightfully so, and saluting them and saying what a grateful Nation we are.

Well, if we are truly a grateful Nation, then it is time we end the more than 50 years of neglect and make sure that our veterans are able to get the benefits that they richly deserve without 5-month delays, in making sure that they have disability that they know they can rely on, that works for the times that we are living through currently.

Children continue to rely on Social Security, and it is the number one antipoverty program for children. And you know what, 10,000 baby boomers a day become eligible for Social Security, and millennials will need the benefit more than baby boomers. Millennials have been put in the position where they have less money to be able to afford private pensions, where they have been burdened with college loan debt, where they are unable to get the kind of mortgages their parents enjoyed, and, in fact, have incomes that are below that level, and so, Social Security becomes their salvation. But it can't be their salvation if they are locked at the bottom, and we are not making the benefit increases that will provide that opportunity for all generations to enjoy.

Madam Speaker, we are pleased also that Social Security 2100 will not only lift benefits across the board, but it will make sure that no one can work all their lives, pay into a system and retire into poverty. More than 5 million Americans get a below-poverty-level check from the government after having paid in all their lives. That is unfair. That is unjust. That is flat out wrong. We are a body that can pass out trillions of dollars of tax cuts to the Nation's wealthiest 1 percent and yet we can't take care of people who have paid into the system because Congress has not fulfilled its obligation and responsibility.

Now is the time to act, and under Democratic leadership, that will take place. People say to me often, ''Well, what is different?''

What is different is: we have a Democratic House, a Democratic Senate, and most importantly, a President who believes that this is a sacred trust. A President, as MATT CARTWRIGHT also

knows, who has said we are going to end WEP and GPO.

And for you listeners, for you viewers, that means for all you schoolteachers, for you firefighters, for you police officers, for you municipal employees that were penalized under a system who have worked hard and played by the rules, the President has called for its repeal, and that means benefits flowing to people who rightfully deserve them and should rightfully get them.

I would add that that has had bipartisan support in the Congress, and we do have bipartisan support for this bill across the Nation. No one yet on the other side has signed up, but yet, all across the Nation in large numbers more than 80 percent of Democrats, more than 68 percent of Republicans and more than 74 percent of Independents all favor increasing benefits because they know of the security and the promise and the necessity of Social Security.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) who is an original cosponsor, Madam Speaker, of this Social Security 2100, as are you, who understands how critical this is to Pennsylvanians and everyone across the Nation.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman particularly not only for authoring and helping out all the rest of us cosponsor this important legislation, but in particular for mentioning the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania here late this afternoon.

It was Pennsylvania that was instrumental in actually passing the Social Security Act back in the thirties. It was a huge fight. It was a time when Republicans called the concept of Social Security, Madam Speaker, communism. They called it that. They said it would lead to horrible things. They said it would be the ruination of the American economy and the American democracy, and it was communism. That is what the Republicans called the whole idea of Social Security when the Roosevelt administration came up with it.

And the Roosevelt administration was having a huge fight with the Republican-dominated Supreme Court of the United States. They were against it. And they kept ruling that Roosevelt's programs, the National Labor Relations Act, all of these programs that Roosevelt came up with, the Securities and Exchange Commission, all of these programs that Roosevelt came up with to try to work our way out of the Great Depression, the Supreme Court was invalidating as unconstitutional under the Commerce Clause.

And it was actually a member of the United States Supreme Court, a Republican member named Owen J. Roberts who saved the day, Congressman LARSON. He saved the day because he changed his mind about the commerce clause and how it applied to the Social Security Act.

Owen J. Roberts was a terrific trial lawyer from Philadelphia. He was a prosecutor. He was in the U.S. Attorney's Office. And he personally handled the Teapot Dome scandal. He prosecuted the criminals who perpetrated the Teapot Dome scandal back in the twenties.

And his career flourished. He started a law firm where I actually practiced for 2 years as a young lawyer myself in Philadelphia. And Owen J. Roberts went on to join the Supreme Court of the United States as an associate justice, he was one of the Republican members.

There was great controversy about whether Social Security would be ruled constitutional. Roberts thought about it, and to his great and everlasting credit and to the credit of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, he changed his mind. He changed his mind, and he validated the Social Security Act. And as a result, it was signed into law and it was held constitutional.

The Social Security Administration took off, and all of a sudden, American life included this promise, as the gentleman stated, a sacred trust. This promise that if you work your whole life, you pay into the system, you pay your FICA taxes all the way through, you continue to pay every quarter all the way through your career, that is the promise, that when you retire you will not be left destitute. You will not be relegated to poverty and to privation, that you will have food on your table and a roof over your head because you will have money coming in that is your money. It is your money. You paid into it. It is not the government, it is an insurance program, as the gentleman from Connecticut astutely noted. And it is a promise that has been kept every day, every week, every month since the 1930s. We are talking about 80 years of keeping a promise for Social Security.

In my district it makes a very big difference. The gentleman from Connecticut is right. There is an awful lot of people who are over the age of retirement who are depending entirely on Social Security checks to survive. Yes, in some places it is around 25 percent, that might be the average. But I can tell you that there are places that are hurting in this country where the people surviving on Social Security checks and nothing else coming in approaches 40 or 50 percent.

You can see who it is, and you feel for them, and you know that every year they see what they call the COLA increases, the cost-of-living adjustment increases. It is all worked out by a mathematical formula. It is called CPI, and it is the Consumer Price Index, and it rises in accordance with what formula is used.

Over the years, Social Security has been attacked by Republicans. It was attacked savagely at the outset as communism. In the first decade of this millennium, the Republicans wanted to privatize Social Security, make it so that the money went into the stock market.

Now, imagine that, into the stock market.

And then when we had this enormous stock market crash in 2008, the retirement savings of all of these people who paid into this wonderful insurance program for retirement would have been wiped out. But it was Democrats who fought day in and day out in that time. You were there, Mr. LARSON.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. During that time, our current Speaker led the fight when George Bush said he was going to use his political capital that they had just gained and were in control of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, they were going to privatize Social Security. And it was NANCY PELOSI and people like MARCY KAPTUR that led the charge in the fight that prevented the privatization of Social Security.

To your point, had that gone into effect, people's total savings and everything that is a guarantee under Social Security would have been lost in 2008.

We are beyond 2008 now, but we are still dealing with all of those things that people can't necessarily prepare for, whether it is a pandemic or whether it is the Great Recession or whether it is the vicissitudes of the stock market, as Roosevelt would have said. These are the things that people who work hard and play by the rules are subject to, and that is why this is a sacred trust. Because in the United States we will not let that happen to our citizens because nobody deserves to work all their lives and retire into poverty.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership in this area.

□ 1645

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The gentleman is exactly correct. It was an attempt to privatize Social Security in those years. And it was only by the stalwart, staunch defense of the Social Security system by the Democrats—Democrats present here in this Chamber today—who did that and fought it off. And thank God they did.

Because it is true, the stock market crash of 2000 would have thrown millions and millions of seniors right into poverty if the Republicans had got away with it, had privatized Social Security.

And it did not stop there. I was not in Congress in those years, but I came into Congress. I was elected in 2012. And in 2013, I was sworn in for the first time. And here I am, a freshman Democrat, and about 4 months into my very first term, something happened. The Republicans were pushing this scheme called chained CPI. And chained CPI was a $50 expression that means lower cost of living adjustment increases, lower increases year after year.

The idea was, well, we have to make ends meet at Social Security so let's cut increases for seniors. That was

their plan. And they called that chained CPI.

Now, there was a big fight over that, of course. And at least at that point, the Republicans weren't calling Social Security communism, but they were still trying to cut it for seniors, and that is no good. And the Democrats fought back hard against that.

Well, along comes 2013, and in the springtime, the President comes out with a budget. And President Obama at the time, he wanted to extend an olive branch to the Republicans, it might be recalled. And President Obama incorporated this chained CPI notion in his budget. He put that in his budget.

I wasn't having it. I joined a bunch of people—I think the congressman from Connecticut was with me—and we went out on the lawn of the Capitol to protest against the President of the United States, a Democratic President of the United States extending this olive branch to the Republicans by putting chained CPI in his budget. We were protesting. We Democrats were protesting against a Democratic President going along with that notion just to try to get along with the Republicans.

In the end, to his everlasting credit, President Obama withdrew that offer and never brought it up again. And now, under Social Security 2100, there is a real cost of living adjustment formula in there, something that actually takes into account the things that seniors has to buy; the things that seniors can't afford unless they get the increase; the things that seniors need to live in any kind of reasonable style of living. There is a reasonable cost of living adjustment in Social Security 2100, and I am proud to be on that bill.

Look, workers paid into this fund all their careers; it is their money. And the promise is not that you will get some money, the promise is that you are going to get enough money to make it out of poverty in your retirement. And if you have other things coming in, fine, but there are people who rely entirely—that is their sole source of support—the Social Security checks that they get.

Madam Speaker, in my district, 140,000 people, relying on those Social Security checks coming in. And my suggestion this evening, as we talk about Social Security 2100, let's pass it and keep the promise.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for joining us this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, I would point out a couple of things, something the gentleman knows—and we have been joined by the gentlewoman from Illinois, who will address us shortly—but the number of groups that are endorsing Social Security 2100:

The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Social Security Works, the Alliance for Retired Americans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the NAACP, the National Organization for Women, Latinos for Secure Retirement, the National Education Association, AFGE, the American Federation of Teachers, The Arc of the United States, National Retiree Legislative Network, the Gray Panthers, American Family Voices, The Senior Citizens League. And the list goes on and on and on, because everybody understands the importance and significance of this.

Madam Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from Illinois, who has worked tirelessly on behalf of seniors across this country, and has headed a task force for more than a decade now that was instrumental in providing us with all the detailed information with the over 17 proposals that are included in Social Security 2100, a sacred trust.

Madam Speaker, we make this point often, and I want to make it here tonight, because you are well-aware of this as well. That in legislative parlance, the bill is called H.R. 5723. But what I want our viewers, our listeners, and most importantly, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to understand, this is about your parents. This is about your brothers and sisters, your aunts and uncles. This is about your next-door neighbor, your coworker, the people that you worship with.

This is not legislative parlance, this is the reality that they are living; and the disparity that exists today, the gap that exists, can be closed if Congress does a job that it has neglected for more than 50 years in terms of enhancing a program that is a necessity for your parents, for your brothers and sisters, for your aunts and uncles. All you have to do is ask them. It confounds me that anyone can look their constituents in the eye and say that we are doing enough for you, or that you are okay.

We all know, and I have heard Jan say this many times—I know my mother said it—she says, Oh, I just care that my children are okay, and I just don't want to be a burden. Of course people feel that way. It is their humility and their kind of generation and people that we know. Nobody wants to be a burden. But I assured my mother she was no burden. She was an inspiration. And for us to stand by in the midst of this, the wealthiest Nation in the world, and not do our responsibility as a Congress and vote.

The President can't do it by executive order, nor will the Supreme Court adjudicate it. It is only Congress. And thanks to the efforts of JAN SCHAKOWSKY, we are getting there.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank my brother for yielding.

Madam Speaker, JOHN LARSON and I came into the Congress together, elected in 1998 to be here. But I want you to know, JOHN, that I have been working on issues of Social Security since the 1970s—well before I was eligible for Social Security.

When I was an organizer in Chicago, one of my first organizing efforts was to help establish Metro Seniors in Action, an organization in the city of Chicago of older Americans. I will tell you what, JOHN, I learned a lot from them. One of them was courage to stand up to power, to not be afraid of the old Mayor Daley in Chicago, not to be afraid of anyone, to stand up for rights. One of those priorities then, as well, was making sure that Social Security was solid.

Now that you have talked about the Alliance for Retired Americans, I was the executive director of the chapter of that in the State of Illinois throughout most of the 1980s until I ran for the legislature in 1990. And again, we were fighting—I remember well—to protect Social Security.

Well, guess what? Now, we are not just talking about protecting Social Security, but we did have a battle when George W. Bush decided that he thought privatizing Social Security was a good idea. Well, all over the country we organized, seniors organized, the Democrats organized, to make sure that privatizing Social Security, which would have jeopardized the security of that benefit—and actually, let me correct that for a minute.

You know, many people call Social Security an entitlement. This is something that people in every paycheck that they have had is paid for. This is a program that is paid for out of the pocket of workers and has to be there when they retire. This is not some sort of a gift from the American people. This is something that has been earned by the American people.

But we won that battle with George W. Bush because that was not the direction that the majority of Americans—Democrats, Republicans, rural, urban—wanted. They wanted to make sure that Social Security was reliably there. But it was always to protect Social Security. And now, thank you, JOHN LARSON, because now we are talking about improving Social Security benefits. And isn't it about time?

Right now, the majority of Americans get more than half of their income from Social Security. When Franklin D. Roosevelt first talked about Social Security, it was thought of as a three-legged stool.

Did you talk about that already?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. No.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Okay. So the first was people's savings. You know what? There is hardly any savings anymore for the elderly. And actually, for most Americans, hardly have any money, unfortunately, that has been put away, because average wages, compared to the wealthiest people, have gone down.

The second was pensions. Remember that? There were pensions. People would have that guaranteed retirement benefit from the work. Those are largely gone. And then, Social Security to help along. Well, now it is mostly about Social Security. More than half

of Americans rely on Social Security for more than half of their income. And a quarter of seniors now rely on Social Security for 90 percent or more of their income. You need Social Security to survive.

But let's talk about what survival is. The average monthly Social Security check is $1,543 per month. Who can live on that? I mean, it is really a struggle, at the very best, to be able to even make it. That is it—$1,543 a month.

So the gentleman's legislation is so incredibly important. And you talked about grandparents. Well, you know, plenty of us in the Congress now are also Social Security-eligible. And those who are not, are thinking about their parents and loved ones. But I also want to point out that two of my grandchildren benefited from Social Security because, sadly, their mother had died. And so they were eligible for benefits that helped them to be able to continue with their education.

So it is a family plan. Social Security is a necessity. And for a long time we have also been talking about women, particularly women, people who have left the workforce to become caregivers. But there has been no help for them, even though they haven't been able to pay into Social Security.

□ 1700

I now understand that there will be a provision for a caregiver credit?

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Correct.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank so much; for people who have taken time out of the workplace. Many of us have heard from public employees, including school teachers, who have lost Social Security benefits due to the so-called windfall elimination provision that has meant unfairly that they have lost Social Security benefits.

Finally, after years and years and years of fighting, that unfairness will be gone because of your legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, this has been bipartisan. Chairman NEAL, a Social Security recipient himself lost his father, lost his mother, his grandmother was then raising him, and then he lost his grandmother.

TOM REED, the ranking member on the Social Security Subcommittee, and TOM RICE, they both lost parents and were raised on Social Security as well.

Mr. DAVIS has put a bill in and has sponsored a bill for a number of years to eliminate the windfall elimination provision.

Finally, President Biden said we are going to repeal this in its entirety. It shows that there is an ability, a bridge to come together in so many of these things, including caregiver opportunities, that are bipartisanly-sponsored within this bill and included as part of the bill.

We have yet to have anyone endorse and support the bill, but that is a matter, I think, of voting and getting beyond what happens in this Chamber and in discussions between here and the Senate is that there is an awful lot of talk about helping veterans, but nobody actually votes one way or the other. There is an awful lot of talk about understanding what we have to do, but then nobody votes.

The time for reckoning, this is a point President Biden makes all the time, and I know, Madam Speaker, you understand this as well. Our very democracy and our Republic is at stake here because government, in an entrepreneurial capitalistic system like ours, where there has to be, by the nature of the system, risk that is taken. Well, that is important and good, but by the same token, Roosevelt and subsequent Presidents, including Eisenhower, including Nixon, and including Reagan, recognized this. We need that safety net there for people who work hard and play by the rules.

President Biden has said, yes, this is a sacred trust. Martin Luther King came to Washington, D.C. in 1963 during the famous march, and gave us the phrase, ''the fierce urgency of now.'' He was talking at the time about segregation and about the need for voting rights.

But the fierce urgency of now applies to all of our citizens that have been addressed in the remarks, who need this and who are suffering and receiving below poverty level payments from their own government after they have paid in. This is at a time when we gave the Nation's wealthiest 1 percent an 83 percent tax cut. God bless them.

It hasn't trickled down to everybody else. That is why we have the system that we do to take care of. It is the government's responsibility. And if a democracy is going to work, if we are not listening to what, as all the polls say, and we have accompanied more than six different polls talking about where the America people are, this is not partisan. This is totally bipartisan in terms of people's understanding of what their needs, their belief in a system they know that has never failed for them.

Dr. Martin Luther King said: Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy. Now is the time to make good on the promise of the Federal Government. That is what Joe Biden has said and what he so eloquently has called a sacred trust. Now is the time for us.

This is beyond urgent, though it is the fierce urgency of now. It is shameful that this body, the world looks in on this great Nation, this great democracy that we have, it looks how we treat our people; how we treat our veterans; how we treat our children. The statistics that you rallied off about what is going on in this country and how they are depending on it, and then realizing that Congress hasn't done a thing in 50 years?

This is not anything that can be done—and I repeat this again—by executive order or by adjudication from the Supreme Court. This is the responsibility of every man and woman in this Chamber, of 535 of us overall, but it is our responsibility and the time to vote is long overdue.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, let me just close with this. We are going to hear, oh, well, you know, too much money. We can't afford to increase the benefits. I think it is important to remind people that Social Security was born during the greatest depression that this country had ever seen.

It was from the understanding of the President at that time, President Roosevelt, who understood that we cannot have poorhouses for older Americans. That this country, if we can't afford to do that, then we cannot call ourselves a real democracy, a country that really cares for people.

At this point we are the richest country in the world; the richest country ever on the planet. Now is the time when we need to do this. There is absolutely no excuse. You have said about the urgency of now. This is a moment of opportunity, and we should not make the mistake of overlooking it.

We have got everything in place. We have got your bill. We have got a President. It is time now to engage everyone in this country to say yes. Let's make improvements to one of the greatest things that ever happened in the United States, the greatest treasures that we have, and that is Social Security.

Let's make it even better. God bless you for leading the way on this. I am so proud to be helpful in any way that I can to be a partner with you. We can do this.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, we can do this. I think Martin Luther King coined a phrase as well, and I am paraphrasing here: This is not the time for the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. This is not the time in the face of so much inequality and inequity. That is when problems happen in society, when the people see that their government has not lived up to its responsibility.

As noted, they pay into the system weekly, biweekly, or monthly. Our good colleague and friend, John Lewis, said: This is not only an important issue in terms of our people, this is a civil rights issue. He said and believed that with every fiber in his being because what he saw is the people that were discriminated against were the low wage earners.

Unfortunately, as you know and have spoken eloquently on, most of them are women, and specifically, women of color. So whether you had a job as a waitress or a seamstress or whether you were one of those caregivers that everybody relies on, or whether you had to go home to provide care for your family and you didn't pay into a system, or your wage level, long before pay equity, was far lower than your male counterpart, this is not a reason

you should live out your remaining days in poverty. This happens for 5 million Americans.

In a blink of an eye we can do a tax cut. In a blink of an eye we can pass a defense bill. I support both. But I fervently support the fact that we have to take care of our citizens. It is this body's responsibility, Congress' responsibility. We cannot walk away.

Every citizen in this country ought to make sure that they are holding their congressional delegations responsible for doing their job. This is nothing that should be kicked down the road again or put off to some gradual dealing with the subject matter, or yet, another study that we are going to try to look into this on.

We don't need to study this. We know what the issue is here. We have looked in the mirror, and the problem is the United States Congress, it is the body that votes and changes the policy and the direction.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for joining us.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of our Special Order today, Social Security 2100, a Special Trust.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I want to thank as well President Biden for having the temerity to not only on the campaign trail, but to speak directly to the American people and let them, and ensure them, that we understand that this is a sacred trust, a bond that will not be broken. Not on our watch. That we will fulfill that promise and make sure that they are receiving the kind of benefits that they have paid into a system for and are, yes, entitled to receive because there is no greater Nation in the world than the United States of America.

When this body sets its mind to it, as witnessed how bipartisan the public feels about this on the outside and a number of the great inclusions that both Democrats and Republicans feel about, now is the time for us to act on behalf of the citizens we are sworn to serve.

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

□ 1715

REFLECTING ON AND HONORING THE ACTIONS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. DOLE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for all Members to have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, tonight lying in state in the rotunda of this Capitol Building is Robert Joseph Dole. Bob Dole was an American statesman, a former Member of this House of Representatives, a former U.S. Senator, a World War II veteran, a tireless fighter for what is right, and, last but not least, a Kansan.

Tonight, we want to reflect on and honor the actions and accomplishments of this great American hero. Today, I am here with my colleagues from the Sunflower State and other Members of the House of Representatives to honor Robert Joseph Dole, one of the finest Americans to ever serve in this institution.

Bob Dole has a record of devotion and service to this country—a World War II hero, the majority leader of the Senate, and a Republican nominee for President. But to truly understand the man Bob was, Madam Speaker, you have to know a bit about where he was from because out of all the things Bob did and accomplished through his long life, I know that Bob always epitomized what it meant to be a son of Kansas.

Our State is situated in the very heart of our great Nation, more than 1,000 miles west of Washington. It is imbibed with a strong sense of freedom and with great compassion for our fellow man. The vivid sunsets of amber waves of grain are a constant reminder of the beauty and grace that only come from a loving God. And our climate, which can include some of the harshest winters or cloudless summers, produces hardy people who are resolute, undeterred, and quick to adapt to any challenges they may face.

It is from Kansas where Bob Dole first entered the world in the summer of 1923.

A natural athlete, he was recruited by famed basketball coach Phog Allen and was a Jayhawk basketball player and football player, and he ran track at the University of Kansas. But the grave threats against our freedom and our Nation called Bob away from his studies at KU and placed him in battle overseas during World War II.

His enlistment in the United States Army would take him far from the flat plains of Kansas to another continent, and he returned to the shores of America with two Purple Hearts, a Bronze Star, and scars of war.

Permanent damage would restrict him to a hospital for more than a year and limit the mobility in his right arm for the rest of his life. Bob Dole's service to our country during World War II is more than most of us will ever give back to the country in our entire lifetime.

But Bob wasn't done yet. After returning to school, this time at Washburn University in Topeka, he served in the Kansas House of Representatives and then as Russell County attorney.

In 1961, Bob Dole brought his grit, optimism, and wit to the Chamber we are standing in today, having been elected by Kansans of the Sixth District, and then again by the First District after redistricting. He represented Kansas in the people's House for 8 years before the entire Sunflower State sent him across the Capitol to the Senate. His passion for the United States, ability to bring colleagues together, and sense of humor elevated him to lead the Republican Party.

But Dole would also seek to serve the American people from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. He was the running mate to President Gerald Ford and eventually earned the respect of voters across the country to be the Republican nominee for President. It was at that time that he left the Senate, noting that the next chapter of his life would either be in the White House or a return to his beloved home State of Kansas. As votes were tallied on November 5, 1996, it became clear that Russell, Kansas, would welcome their son home.

But I can tell you with certainty, Madam Speaker, that his commitment to the United States did not end with electoral defeat, as he continued to stay active in the causes he fought for as a public servant and remained a critical activist in Kansas politics.

Madam Speaker, most of the Representatives in this Chamber are familiar with Bob Dole as a war hero, a statesman, and a Presidential nominee. But I had the privilege of traveling throughout Kansas with him. While the country has gotten to know Bob on the Senate floor or the campaign trail, I saw Bob in small towns and coffee shops with small business owners and farmers.

My wife, Susan, and I were blessed to have known Bob and his wife, Elizabeth—another dedicated public servant—and to witness his genuine warmth and devotion firsthand.

In his farewell address to the Senate on June 11, 1996, Senator Dole quoted the opening verse to Ecclesiastes chapter 3, saying: ''To everything there is a season.'' He went on to say that his season in the Senate was about to end. Today, we recognize that another season for Bob Dole has come to a close.

The Scripture that Bob started to read from continues, saying, ''a time to be born and a time to die.'' And later, it says, ''a time to weep and a time to laugh; a time to mourn and a time to dance.''

This week is a time for mourning. We grieve the loss of our friend, and we pray for his beloved wife, Elizabeth, and daughter, Robin.

This is also a time to honor, which is why my colleagues and I were humbled to introduce the resolution that formally allowed for Bob Dole to lie in state at the United States Capitol rotunda. During his nearly four decades of service in the House and Senate, I know Bob Dole walked through the rotunda with Kansans and colleagues, working to protect our liberties and make our country better for all Americans.

It is fitting that he be honored in that space today. I can think of no other person right now who deserves to lie in state more than my friend and fellow Kansan, Senator Bob Dole, and I believe it will be a long time before we see someone of his stature again.

In the meantime, it is up to the rest of us to carry on his legacy, advance freedom, and maybe even provide some humor to our Nation and our world.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN), who is my friend, colleague, and the current Representative of Senator Dole's hometown of Russell, Kansas.

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Congressman ESTES, for hosting this tonight and for really doing this to further the memory and legacy of Bob Dole.

Bob Dole's passing leaves a void for America. I think maybe it hits those of us in Kansas especially hard, so I thank my friend for doing this.

Madam Speaker, America has lost a statesman, a noble war hero, and a service-minded Kansan who never forgot where he came from.

Senator Bob Dole died peacefully at the age of 98, leaving his district, State, and country better off for his many contributions over 79 years of public life.

My prayers and gratitude for Senator Dole go out to his family.

In World War II, Bob Dole was struck in the back and nearly killed by a German shell just months before the war ended. He described his experience later in a 1987 speech as ''a sting in the shoulder,'' and he said the first thing he thought about was his home, Russell, Kansas.

He was expected to die in the hospital, but he lived. He was told that he would never recover from his injuries, which included paralysis from the neck down, but his unquenchable spirit carried him through.

He simply refused to take no for an answer and chose to fight for his life and recovery, the scars of which he carried with him for the rest of his life. He was awarded two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star for his military service.

Before he became a United States Senator, Bob Dole was the Congressman representing the Big First District of Kansas. After serving in the House of Representatives for 8 years, Kansans sent him to the United States Senate where he served for 27 years, acted as the majority leader twice, and became his party's nominee for the highest office in the land in 1996. It is inspiring and humbling to stand on the shoulders of such greatness.

A few weeks ago, I was blessed to spend some time with Senator Dole. His love for Kansas and her people were on full display in his excited curiosity about our plans for the Big First. On that day, he was a thoughtful, committed, and energetic champion for our Nation and our way of life in rural Kansas.

He always treated others with respect and kindness, especially his fellow veterans, as he attended nearly every Honor Flight that came to D.C. to the World War II Memorial.

He was a fierce advocate for his political views, but he was equally committed to cross-aisle friendship and camaraderie. In our meeting, he spoke about his idea of the Kansas approach, the markers of which he identified as honesty, hard work, respect for your roots, common sense, service, simplicity, and genuine, thoughtful care for people.

I left our time together inspired and commissioned, as Senator Dole made it clear we must never forget where we come from. He knew deep down that the heartbeat of our Nation lies in places like his hometown of Russell, Kansas.

I know we all are working actively for ways to honor Bob Dole's legacy. One way is by supporting the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, which aims to address childhood hunger, improve literacy, train teachers, and make the world a better place for young people across the globe. The program is named in part after Senator Dole to honor his work toward eliminating childhood hunger. Earlier this year, I was proud to offer an appropriations request for the McGovern-Dole program, and I look forward to its continued success.

Yesterday, in another effort to honor his legacy, I introduced a resolution to name the post office in Russell, Kansas, the Robert J. Dole Memorial Post Office. I was quickly joined by my other colleagues from Kansas.

Senator Dole stayed true to his roots in rural Kansas and embodied its core values of faith, family, and freedom. Naming a post office after one of Kansas' favorite sons in the town that he grew up in is a small but meaningful way to pay tribute to this Kansas giant and American hero. I look forward to this resolution's swift passage commemorating the life of Senator Dole.

A few nights ago, I talked to my 8-year-old son, Austin, about Senator Dole. After I finished sharing some stories about his life and work, Austin said: Dad, I think God had a special plan for Bob Dole.

That is so true, and God had a special plan for all of us when he gave Senator Dole the faith, values, longevity, and leadership platform that he stewarded so well.

Madam Speaker, I want to close by quoting Senator Dole, who often said: ''I offer a willingness to work hard, to hang tough, to go the distance. I offer the strength and determination—molded in America's small town heartland and tempered during a career of public service—to bring commonsense answers to the complex problems facing America.''

Senator Dole's legacy will echo into the future, and his patriotic spirit serves as a benchmark for anyone who believes that our brightest days are yet to come.

Madam Speaker, I thank Senator Dole for working tirelessly to make the world a better place. May he rest in peace.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, it is great and commendable that the current Representative for his hometown is here to be able to speak as a fellow Kansan and representative for Bob.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. LATURNER). The gentleman is one of my other fellow colleagues from the State of Kansas who represents the Second Congressional District and was a former State treasurer as I was before I came to Congress.

Mr. LATURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor, remember, and celebrate the life of a true American hero who was the very personification of service.

I am proud and humbled to stand in for the over 700,000 Kansans in my district who wish they could be in the Capitol today to pay tribute to Senator Bob Dole.

Senator Dole grew up in a small town called Russell, Kansas, at a time when many hardworking families were being burdened by the Great Depression and the Dust Bowl. The Doles were not immune to these hardships, living in their basement so they could rent out the top of their house to make ends meet.

Bob Dole attended the University of Kansas where he was a star athlete playing under the famous Phog Allen on the Jayhawks basketball team and began his service when he enlisted in the Army.

Like many of the Greatest Generation, Bob Dole dropped everything at the age of 21 when he was called to Active Duty and shipped off to Italy to fight for freedom across the world.

Toward the end of the war, Senator Dole was struck in the upper back and right arm by shrapnel from a German shell while fighting in the mountains of northern Italy and was paralyzed from the neck down. He was sent to the Percy Jones Army Hospital in Battle Creek, Michigan, where he met some fellow soldiers who would have an impact on the rest of his life.

They ended up calling themselves the Percy Jones Alumni Caucus, which consisted of Senator Dole; the ward's ranking officer Colonel Philip Hart, who later became Senator Phil Hart; and a longtime friend of Bob Dole, Daniel Inouye, who represented Hawaii in the United States Senate.

Many doctors, like Dr. Kelikian of Chicago, and medical professionals

thought Senator Dole wouldn't survive his injuries, and if he did, they thought he would never walk again. But he proved them wrong.

The hospital was turned into a Federal building and renamed the Hart-Dole-Inouye Federal Center in 2003. Senator Dole spent the rest of his life fighting for veterans and those who served our Nation and was instrumental in making the World War II Memorial in Washington, D.C., a reality.

After being awarded two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star for his selfless service in World War II, Senator Dole served in the Kansas statehouse and as county attorney before being elected to the House of Representatives where he served for 8 years. He then moved across the Capitol to represent all Kansans in the United States Senate for almost three decades, serving as Republican majority leader twice and then becoming the Republican nominee for President in 1996.

Senator Dole was a giant in Congress. He fought to preserve freedom and democracy while also working across the aisle to champion legislation that has impacted millions of Americans from all walks of life.

□ 1730

Many Americans know and recognize his major legislative achievements such as the Americans with Disabilities Act and the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education Program, but many do not realize the impact he had on passing legislation that his name was not on at all, and how good he was at getting things done and moving the ball down the field for Kansas and for our Nation. Bob Dole truly embodied what it means to be a statesman and never wavered from his passion for a better and stronger America.

I urge my colleagues to join me in praying for his wife, Elizabeth, his daughter, Robin, and the entire Dole family as they mourn the loss of not just one of our Nation's greatest public servants, but also a devoted husband and father.

I want to close on something that Senator Dole once said. He said: It's not who you were, it's whether you made a difference. May we all remember that every single day in this building and across this country.

Senator Dole will be dearly missed.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, Congressman LATURNER, for being here to be able to talk about our fellow Kansan and such a great American hero.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his recognition, and I thank him for hosting us this evening with this Special Order to honor a real hero in our country, Bob Dole.

I also thank the gentleman for what he did for the bereavement resolution, enabling us to have the use of the rotunda, which takes an act of Congress to use the rotunda, and to have the catafalque that was constructed for Abraham Lincoln to lie on so that Bob Dole could lie on that, a true hero for our country.

I take great pride, Mr. ESTES, in the fact that Senator Dole served in the House of Representatives as his first step in the Congress of the United States. I was teased by some of the Senators saying, you are laying claim to him. He was only there 4 years. He was in the Senate over 24 years. And yet we do because, again, his service here is a source of pride to us.

But not only that, when he turned 90, we had his birthday party in Statuary Hall on the House side of the Capitol, and so many of his friends and colleagues that served with him and friends and staff who had served with him came, and I was happy to be invited by him to participate in the ceremony. It was his 90th birthday, fully pledging to be there to honor him for his 100th birthday. Well, we made it to 98 and nearly a half.

A great life, beautifully lived, one that is justified by his lying in state and, as I said today at our ceremony, wrapped in the American flag. It is hard to think of anyone who deserves that honor more than Bob Dole, super patriot.

As a young, young person, he fought for our freedom in World War II. He has been a champion for our men and women in uniform ever since, along with Elizabeth Dole, Senator Dole also. Senator Elizabeth Dole took up the cause of hidden heroes, those who care for our men and women in uniform when they come home and need care.

The beautiful love between the two of them is a joy to all who knew and love them—know and love them, still in the present. And they are prayerful, patriotic, lovely Americans.

Indeed, it was just 4 years, almost 4 years ago and we gathered under the very dome where we were in the rotunda to present him with a Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor that Congress can bestow. We knew then, as we do today, that Bob Dole belongs among the pantheons of patriots memorialized in the rotunda.

And I couldn't help but thinking, watching him lying in state there, he felt very comfortable under the dome of the Capitol, where he spent so much time, but time beautifully spent in leadership, making a difference. As his casket lies in this temple of democracy right now, draped in the American flag, we are so proud.

From his heroism in World War II to his leadership in the House and the Senate, he served our Nation with legendary courage, dignity and integrity. Duty was a word that sort of guided his actions, his duty to our country and its military and the elective office and as an elder statesman in this country.

He was greatly admired on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the Capitol, and across the country because he was a person of integrity, a person of his word. He worked in a bipartisan way, whether it was addressing hunger in America, respect for people with disabilities, and advocates for troops, veterans and our hidden heroes and, of course, he took great pride in his work on Social Security.

He continued his powerful legacy beyond his retirement from Congress, alongside, again, his loving wife and prayerful partner, Senator Elizabeth Dole. His life and legacy will forever challenge us to act worthy of him. As he said, we shouldn't try to change the ideals of our country. We should try to be worthy of them.

May it be a comfort to his beloved wife, Elizabeth, his dear, dear daughter, Robin, his longtime colleagues and friends, and the people of Kansas that a grateful Nation joins them and prays for them at this sad time as we mourn with him.

May he rest in a very much-deserved peace.

Thank you, Senator Dole, for your leadership to our country, for being a leader, exemplary leader, one that everyone would want to be like. We are going to miss him, his humor. He was very funny and very serious and very patriotic.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ESTES for bringing us together to say some more words about Senator Robert Dole. It is such an honor to have him lie in state under the rotunda, an honor shared by very few people, but one very much deserved by Senator Dole.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman saying those kind words about a son of Kansas and a fellow American hero that we appreciate so much.

We have spent a lot of time tonight talking about all of the great things about Bob Dole and his relationship with Kansas, but he had a bigger impact on people across the country, including his relationship with his wife, Elizabeth, and all the relationships there.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), a former policy adviser for Senator Elizabeth Dole.

Mr. ROUZER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Senator Bob Dole, one of America's greatest. I have so many different memories from over the years, it is hard to know where to start or where to finish.

Though I first came to Capitol Hill when Senator Dole was still in the U.S. Senate, my first extended interaction with him was when his wife, Elizabeth, was running for the U.S. Senate to succeed my current boss at the time, U.S. Senator Jesse Helms, who was retiring.

There was one day I remember so well. I had taken time off from my work to help with Elizabeth's campaign. And of course, Bob Dole, no stranger to North Carolina, came to town several times to campaign for her.

On this particular occasion, we had lined up a number of visits for Bob Dole that included a stop at a tobacco receiving station in Smithfield, and then on to several other stops in Goldsboro.

As is the case with any campaign, there was little down time, which is just how Bob Dole liked it. He had a real knack for retail campaigning. He was never at a loss for words, always had a quip, and always left everyone laughing.

As I recall, it was about 11:30 a.m. that day, and we had just finished up the stop at the tobacco receiving station where we had met with a number of tobacco farmers. Now we were on our way to Goldsboro. I wasn't that hungry, but I could tell the campaign staffer driving Bob Dole was ready to find some lunch somewhere.

Well, Bob Dole was hungry too, but had a little bit different of an idea about it. So once we leave the tobacco receiving station, he directs the young man to stop at a local convenience store. Bob Dole goes in, talks it up with the lady running the cash register, buys a Krispy Kreme doughnut, and comes back out.

Sensing this was the only lunch stop Bob Dole wanted to make, the young staffer turned to him and said: ''Senator, don't you want to stop and get a real lunch somewhere?''

The Senator replied: ''Bob Dole doesn't eat lunch until after the election; as only Bob Dole can say it. And of course, he often talked in third person.

I would see Bob Dole from time to time after that election, but I didn't get to really know him until I came to Washington as a new Member of this House of Representatives. He would call from time to time to talk about my campaign; to see if I had an opponent; to talk about what was going on in the House and the Senate; or just to talk life and politics in general. I will always cherish those conversations.

A great Kansan from humble roots, Senator Bob Dole answered the call to serve his country, fighting for liberty for 79 years. It wasn't long ago that I got to visit the site where he was so badly injured in Italy.

As I looked around the landscape of that, that spot where he was wounded, so far from home in a foreign land, here was this very young man and so many others like him facing evil head-on.

Several years previous to that trip, I had gotten the opportunity to travel abroad to take a look at implementation of our country's food aid programs. I will never forget being in a very remote area of Ethiopia, looking at thousands of children who were eating porridge during lunch at school, and only because of the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. It was the only real meal those children received during the day.

Through his final years, months, and even until his final days, Senator Dole remained so involved and passionate for the principles that made this country great, while caring for our most vulnerable. The number of veterans and their families he greeted at the World War II Memorial during his final years would be far too many to count. And that is just a tiny glimpse of what he did to support, lift up, and encourage others.

There is no way to properly measure his impact, not just in America, but around the world. He was the embodiment of the American spirit and what it means to be a true patriot and statesman. His lifetime of commitment, dedication, and perseverance for this country was and is unmatched. His legacy of service and statesmanship will only grow greater through the prism of history.

Madam Speaker, there are those special individuals you get to know in life who help you keep it all in perspective. I will always be so appreciative of Bob Dole, the man, and what a giant of a man he was.

May God's peace and grace embrace his wife, Elizabeth, and daughter, Robin, as well as the rest of his family in the hours, days, and months to come.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, it is great to be able to have broader reflections of Bob Dole and all of the things and the people that he has touched. He served, obviously, a long time in the Senate, including as majority and minority leader, and with his wife, Elizabeth as well.

Madam Speaker, I actually have a couple of quotes from our current Senators from Kansas, and I wanted to just mention those as part of this Special Order hour tonight.

The senior Senator from Kansas, JERRY MORAN, said: Whether it was on the battlefields, in the Halls of Congress, or in his everyday life, Senator Dole's passion and dedication to his fellow Kansans and to his country was a steady reminder that a single person can make a difference and change the world.

He held an unmatched patriotism born out of wartime sacrifice that marked every day of his existence. Yet rather than ask for help, he offered it. Senator Dole used his horrific wartime experience to be a champion every day for those with disabilities and for veterans, and I thank him for his service to Kansas and to this country.

□ 1745

Senator ROGER MARSHALL shared: ''As one the heroes from our Greatest Generation, you would be hard-pressed to find somebody with a bigger heart and more resilience than Senator Dole. He was an American hero, a statesman of the highest order, and one of the greatest legislators of all time. While he had incredible negotiating skills and was tough as nails, it was his huge heart and ability to work across the aisle that constantly led the way and delivered results for all Americans.''

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER), a U.S. Army veteran and a friend of mine.

Mr. MEIJER. Madam Speaker, this week, we bid farewell to Senator Bob Dole, a great leader with not only an incredible political mind, but more importantly, an unwavering dedication to public service. He was not only a dedicated war hero who exemplified the very best of what it means to be an American, but also someone who set an example for others with a commitment to pragmatism, bipartisanship, and governing in the best interest of the American people.

After being wounded in combat, Bob Dole recuperated in my district, in west Michigan, at the former Battle Creek Sanitarium, pressed into wartime service as the Percy Jones Army Hospital. That facility no longer exists in that form, and I am proud to say today, it is the Hart-Dole-Inouye Federal Center, a long-lasting testament to not only his wartime service but also his connection to west Michigan, where, as my colleague, Mr. LATURNER, mentioned, his survival was questioned and his recuperation was long and lengthy, but also where he built friendships and ties, especially with Mr. Inouye, that would go on to last for over a half century.

During those nearly three decades that he spent in the United States Senate, Senator Dole was a voice for the veteran community. His career-long efforts to help the men and women who served in uniform culminated in office with the Veterans' Benefit Improvement Act of 1996.

He also did not forget, even after he left office, that he had attended college on the GI Bill in the post-World War II period. He helped a young upstart organization that I volunteered with called Student Veterans of America, and many others, who campaigned for and passed the post-9/11 GI Bill so that our generation of veterans could receive the same educational benefits that he had.

He made tangible improvements to the lives of our veterans through focusing on substance. Throughout his career, he never lost sight of the job that he was sent here to do. His service is an example of how government can truly function and serve when we are committed to prioritizing results over politics.

Tonight, my wife, Gabrielle, and I extend our heartfelt condolences to his wife, Senator Elizabeth Dole, and all of those who grieve Senator Dole's passing. His memory and legacy will live on in the contributions he made to our Republic.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. MEIJER bringing that up. As we talk about different stories about Bob Dole, his time in the hospital, when he spent 39 months going through and recovering from his injuries, obviously there are some in-depth stories of his time there as well as others.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for doing this tonight. This is very, very special.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of a political giant, an American icon, and a World War II hero, Senator Bob Dole.

Senator Dole was a remarkable man and a driven public servant who I personally strive to emulate. Why wouldn't we? What a great example he set for all of us.

I had the pleasure of spending some time with Senator Dole, who even in his old age would brave the cold D.C. winters to sit out front of the World War II Memorial and thank those there to pay tribute to fallen soldiers.

I remember being over there. It was cold, and they would set up a stool for Senator Dole to sit on. He would sit there, draped in blankets, and he would not leave until every veteran came by and he spoke to them and he thanked them and he shook their hand. That had to be so special to them.

There are not many people, let alone those as accomplished as Senator Dole, who can set aside their ego to thank perfect strangers, but he did just that.

He left an unforgettable impression, not only on those that knew him or those he served, but on this entire country.

Senator Dole was a generational leader and voice that was heard by all, even those across the aisle. His zest for life and making our country better was infectious. Not everyone can curry favor with those of a different political ideology, but Senator Dole was not like every other Member of Congress.

When describing his time in the Senate, he quipped: If you are hanging around with nothing to do and the zoo is closed, come over to the Senate. You will get the same kind of feeling and you won't have to pay.

Didn't we love his humor?

I imagine he felt the same about his 8 years in the House of Representatives, and I can almost attest to that myself.

Senator Dole set an example of conservatism and of bravery. There is no one more deserving of the honor of lying in state at the U.S. Capitol than Senator Bob Dole.

An outstanding example of what a public servant should be, his loss devastates us all.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Senator Elizabeth Dole, his daughter, Robin, his family and friends, as well as this country, as we all come together to mourn this tremendous loss.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, as a fellow Kansan, Bob Dole was able to reach out and have such an impact on so many people's lives across the country and, in some cases, across the world.

I do want to make one comment about just one of the other people that Bob Dole actually touched in his life. There are countless Kansans that worked for Bob Dole and people from Kansas that were involved in the work that he did in the House and the Senate during his time there. It is amazing the number of people around D.C. or back in Kansas or elsewhere in the country.

One particular staff member, David Spears, served for 3 years in Senator Dole's D.C. office as an agriculture legislative assistant and 4 years as state director in Kansas. He wrote me saying: ''It was an honor and privilege of a lifetime to serve on Senator Dole's staff and to serve the constituents of Kansas. I learned many leadership lessons from him that carried over into my additional years of public service as well as my career in the private sector. Senator Dole provided great examples of strong leadership that included listening to all sides and an ability to build a consensus on very difficult and divisive issues. He was a statesman and great American. He made a huge difference in my life and will be missed.''

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ESTES for holding this Special Order. We really appreciate his remembrances and so many Members remembering Senator Robert Dole as his body lies in state at our Nation's Capitol. This is an honor we reserve for only the most deserving Americans who have rendered such great service to our country. Senator Dole has rightfully earned this honor.

Bob Dole's life displayed courage of the highest order. As a young man, he fought in World War II and was wounded in northern Italy. He carried his wounds for the rest of his life with grace, dignity, and great compassion. Bob Dole became a champion for veterans and those living with disabilities.

The shadow of Senator Dole's political career looms large. His tremendous influence on American political life over the last half century does not need to be restated. For now, I will say this: That from Presidential campaigns to the Senate floor, Bob Dole was an unyielding opponent, a steadfast ally, a fearless leader, and also a person with a tremendous sense of humor.

Even in that generation we call the Greatest Generation, Bob Dole stood above the rest. He was a paragon of courage, class, and patriotism. As a stalwart conservative, he was able to work with both Democrats and Republicans to enact positive legislation that improved life for all Americans.

Senator Dole's compass was never swayed by popular opinion or political expedience. He stayed the course and kept his focus on the eternal principles our Founders set forth, principles of liberty, integrity, and dignity. His unwavering commitment to these principles propelled him to great heights on the national and world stages, but this humble Kansan never allowed himself to grow haughty or self-absorbed. If anything, his historic career only made him even more modest.

This week, we lost Senator Dole at the age of 98. His body lies in the Capitol rotunda, and it is fitting for us to honor him in this way. His death is a reminder that each of us in this body must do what we can to carry on his work of protecting and defending the United States with integrity, compassion, courage, and honor.

Bob Dole was a patriot, a public servant, and a gentleman, and this Nation will always be grateful for the incredible life he led.

World War II veterans are also special in my heart, particularly in my community where I had the privilege of being involved with bringing veterans to the World War II Memorial in many trips that we had in the 2000s when President Bush was in office.

We took them to the World War II Memorial, where I know that Bob Dole greeted them. We also took them on a nice dinner cruise on the Potomac, which they enjoyed, and also visits to the White House. Like all of these wonderful World War II veterans, they were much like Senator Dole, really, truly of the Greatest Generation.

I just want to say to Senator Dole: We salute you. May God rest your soul. May God bless your family and this great Nation.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. TENNEY, and I appreciate that tribute to our great Senator from Kansas.

Bob Dole touched so many people's lives around the country and around the world. I do want to just mention some of those folks that we have some comments from. So I will refer to some of those.

Kansas is an agriculture State. Senator Dole served as the ranking member on the Senate Agriculture Committee from 1975 to 1978. The Kansas Association of Wheat Growers president, Justin Knopf, said, in part: ''Wheat farmers across Kansas are pausing to reflect and honor the life and legacy of Senator Bob Dole, a lifetime friend to Kansas wheat growers. Wheat fields planted to the variety bearing his name will carry extra significance this season as I and other farmers tend to them along their journey in producing grain to feed and nourish people. Senator Dole was an endless champion for farmers and also for those who were food insecure, and saw the potential in connecting grain from Kansas wheat fields to those here at home and around the world who were in need.''

Another thing, as we talk about Senator Dole, obviously we talk a lot about his involvement during World War II. As a World War II veteran, Bob Dole spent a great deal of time working to thank and assist the men and women who sacrificed for our country.

Paralyzed Veterans of America National President Charles Brown released a statement saying, in part: ''PVA joins the Nation in mourning the

passing of Senator Bob Dole and extends our heartfelt prayers to Senator Elizabeth Dole and the entire Dole family. Prior to becoming one of America's longest-serving U.S. Senators, Dole served in the U.S. Army and later became a decorated World War II veteran and two-time Purple Heart recipient. A champion of the Americans with Disabilities Act, he devoted his entire life to advancing the cause of people with disabilities as well as advocating for servicemen and women who sacrificed their lives for this Nation. Following his tenure in Congress, Dole worked tirelessly on seeking U.S. ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.''

The effects of war left Senator Dole with lasting challenges in his life, something that strengthened his resolve to help Americans with disabilities.

Maria Town, president and CEO of the American Association of People with Disabilities, said in a statement: ''The world as we know it today is more accessible and inclusive for people with disabilities because of Senator Bob Dole. Senator Dole worked to elevate the voices and perspective of people with disabilities, encouraging greater leadership opportunities for disabled people, and sharing his experience of disability with his colleagues to build bipartisan consensus for disability policy issues. His passing represents an enormous loss for AAPD, the disability community at large, and the Nation.''

Senator Dole, through all of his work and his life activities, has earned the respect of countless leaders, including our former Presidents from both sides of the aisle.

Former President Donald Trump released a statement saying: ''Bob Dole was an American war hero and true patriot for our Nation. He served the great State of Kansas with honor, and the Republican Party was made stronger by his service. Our Nation mourns his passing, and our prayers are with Elizabeth and his wonderful family.''

Former President Barack Obama said in part: ''His sharp wit was matched only by his integrity, and he lived his life in a way that made it clear just how proud he was to be an American and how committed he was to making this country everything he knew it could be.''

□ 1800

Many of us recall the moving moment when former President George H. W. Bush was lying in State and Senator Dole stood and saluted his friend. It was a moment that reminded us of patriotism, camaraderie, and devotion.

His son and former President George W. Bush said: ''Laura and I are saddened by the passing of a great patriot, Senator Bob Dole. This good man represented the finest of American values. He defended them in uniform during World War II. He advanced them in the United States Senate, and he lived them out as a father, husband, and friend. Our entire family benefited from that friendship, including my father. I will always remember Bob's salute to my late dad at the Capitol, and now we Bushes salute Bob and give thanks for his life of principled service. Laura and I send our heartfelt condolences to Elizabeth and join our fellow citizens in prayer for her comfort.''

Former President Bill Clinton, his political rival, who would later honor the late Senator with a Presidential Medal of Freedom said: ''Bob Dole dedicated his entire life to serving the American people, from his heroism in World War II to the 35 years he spent in Congress. After all he gave in the war, he didn't have to give more. But he did. His example should inspire people today and for generations to come.''

Tonight, I and a lot of the speakers here have talked a lot about the life of Bob Dole, and we have talked about different things regarding his life in Russell, Kansas, the small town that he was born in and grew up in, and his early outlook as a football, basketball, and track star before the war cut that plan short for him.

We talked a lot about his war service, talked a lot about how he was injured in the line of duty trying to rescue somebody else and suffered consequences of war, and the time it took for him to recover in the field, the hospitalization.

His small town of Russell, Kansas, started a crowdfunding process to help him with his recovery, and there was actually a cigar box where friends and family members made donations to help with the 39 months that it took for Bob to go through his hospitalizations and his recovery.

We have talked tonight about his years of service in the House and the Senate. We have talked some about his involvement with the World War II Memorial and how he was a big driving force on making sure that that memorial got implemented and was available for us as a country to see and recognize the work that the Greatest Generation did in keeping and providing the freedoms for us.

We have talked some about the Honor Flights and the effort that Bob took. Even when the weather wasn't good, even when he may not have been feeling well himself, he would come out and greet all these World War II veterans and veterans from other wars who were coming to the memorial that he had helped implement.

My father, before he passed away, was one of those veterans who was able to come and attend an Honor Flight and participate in that process. It meant so much to watch those veterans as they come through that process. They are actually like little kids again when they get off the bus and tour through the monuments. In some cases, they relive some past life, but in other cases, they just reconnect with their brothers in arms.

We have talked some about Kansas, and we talked about the friends and family of Bob Dole. One of his favorite sayings was: ''Remember where you are from.'' That is important for us, particularly as Kansans, to remember where we are from and what we should do and what we should stand up for and be responsible for.

I had the honor as State treasurer to participate in a lot of the stops through the counties that Bob Dole participated in, and it was a time for him to reconnect with old friends. It was amazing to see the respect and admiration that came from his fellow Kansans as they sat down and talked with their friend Bob.

The funny thing about that, or the inspiring thing maybe is a better word for me to use, was just to watch his interaction with fellow Kansans, people who he may not have seen for years or in some cases decades, but he could talk about the same issues with them. He could talk about their family members, be able to connect with the stories that they had and be able to ask questions about: Now, do you still have that big rock on the hill that was in the way when you were trying to work through with the cropland?

It was an interesting life to be able to watch and watch him lead.

He has had an impact on not just Kansas but Americans and internationally. The influence on people who he has been able to touch throughout his life will never be known by all of us, but his engagement, his ability to win friends, his ability to help lead and solve problems will be forever admired.

There is maybe a small army, if you want to call it that, of people who have worked with Senator Dole throughout his life and were engaged with him either as an intern or a staffer in his office or connected with one of his campaigns or connected with one of his causes that he got engaged in. It is important that all of us recognize the value that he has created for the world today.

Last but not least, let's not forget his humor and wit. I mean, we talk about all the commentary, and several of the stories that were told tonight talked about the way he approached life and the comments that he made that were just reflective of what type of man he was.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, may God bless Bob Dole and care for his wife, Elizabeth, and daughter, Robin. Kansans, Americans, and people throughout the world will miss him, but we are better off for having known him and for his years of service that he provided to us.

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

SOLVING OUR COUNTRY'S PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, forgive me for taking a moment to sort of get organized. That is the hazard when you use far too many boards.

I want to do a couple of things this evening. First, I am going to offer a solution because I believe particularly my brothers and sisters on the left and the administration are in a very bad place on one issue, and I think there is a genuine solution coming maybe within the next couple of weeks.

Then we are going to spend some time talking about something that is often uncomfortable around here, and that is the debt ceiling and the reality of the math and why it is a sin that we are not going to actually engage in the stressor and use that stressor, which is the debt ceiling, to make a couple steps toward reality on what the math looks like.

First off, a little of this is going to come across as a bit sarcastic because I mean it to. But what happened? A year and a half ago, 2 years ago, when COVID came to our shores, came to the world, we had discussions here, often on Zoom. We were going to do the science. We were going to follow the facts and also accept that what we know today will be different tomorrow. We were going to slow down the spread not because we thought we could avoid the virus but because we were worried about emergency rooms and others being overflowed with our brothers and sisters who were sick.

Here we are, approaching almost 2 years later. We have multiple vaccines. We have antibodies. You saw the data, particularly on the Pfizer antiviral therapeutic pill. There is a pill coming—if the data is real, if what we read is real—that is about 89 percent effective. Now, it is a lot of pills you have to take over 5 days, but there is a therapeutic coming that you can take at home. And we have home test kits.

If you will go back to our own rhetoric and the conversations with the scientists and experts, it was always: We don't have a therapeutic.

If it is true, in about 3 weeks, we are going to have a protease inhibitor. If you read the science on it, it is really neat how it snips the protein, keeps it from attaching to the cell. It is remarkable science. It is also going to help us on all sorts of other future viruses. But the ultimate antiviral is almost here.

If this is almost here, why isn't it time to have a simple policy discussion saying: Wasn't this the standard that we were all hoping and waiting for, the technology, the belief in science that would allow us to declare the pandemic over?

By doing that, the dystopian sort of fight that is going on in our society, where the Senate yesterday said no vaccine mandates—what is it now? Five different Federal courts have said it is unconstitutional. Brother after brother, sister after sister, neighbor after neighbor, Republican v. Democrat, where now we have turned it into an article of faith.

The left lives in a ball of fear over the disease, and the right lives in frustration and anger that they believe freedoms are being stripped away in the country.

How about we embrace science? The fact of the matter is, go back a year and a half ago. This was the miracle we were waiting for. It is almost here. Why wouldn't we pass a simple piece of legislation that functionally says: Hey, when the FDA says that we have a successful therapeutic, an antiviral that is really effective, let's declare the pandemic over. Let's get ourselves away from this dystopian polarization that is not based on science anymore.

We have turned it into a religion.

I think we are better than this. The fact of the matter is, we dropped a piece of legislation weeks ago that basically said that. It basically said, when science is victorious, we will embrace the science, declare the pandemic over.

Now, it doesn't mean the virus goes away. It doesn't mean some of our brothers and sisters aren't going to get sick. But the fact of the matter is, the math is the math. We have had more of our brothers and sisters die this year than we did last year.

Do you remember the political rhetoric? Maybe I shouldn't go there. But maybe it really is the moment to consider this, to my brothers and sisters on the left. I am extending you a lifeline. I am giving you a chance to back away from a society of fear and hate to a society that says we conquered.

Please, for anyone who is listening, for my brothers and sisters here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, yourself, give it consideration. Has science won? And if it has, let's embrace it. Let's declare this pandemic over because it stops the cascade effect of removing troops that want to serve to the chaos around here of, you know, we play this fake virtue-signaling game where there are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of us sitting here for hours. We are wearing our little masks, but we are all sitting right next to each other talking, and then pulling our masks down to have a drink of water. Come on, it is theater. Let's get back to science.

□ 1815

A few years ago, I remember being here on the floor, and the then Democrat leader got behind the microphone and basically called those of us, who made it very clear we would not vote for a clean debt ceiling, arsonists. And that has bothered me ever since. Because I think actually, in many ways, those of us who did not believe in a clean debt ceiling, raising the debt ceiling once again without some attempt to slow the chaos, slow the spending down, I actually think those of us who wanted to bend the debt curve, we weren't the arsonists. We were actually in some ways the fire prevention crew. We were trying to save the country, save the society.

So first off, does everyone understand how bad the math is? We are functionally borrowing $47,000 every second. We borrow $2,841,000 a minute. Okay. I am going to speak for, what, a half an hour. $2,800,000 is $84 million in the half an hour I am going to speak will be borrowed. $84 million will be borrowed during the half an hour that I speak. But we are functionally borrowing over $4 billion every single day. And we are not heading towards ever paying this off.

And the perverse thing is: Do you understand in a decade that number almost doubles? It almost doubles.

And back to the rhetoric of arson, let's go back over our history over the last 50 years. The only times—well, except for one where, God bless them, in the eighties, they actually took on the shortfalls in Social Security—but you look at the different deals that have been made to bend the debt curve, almost every single one was associated with a debt ceiling. It was that one stressor.

We have all heard over and over, Congress will not do something unless they feel the pressure, unless they feel there is a crisis, unless they are up against the wall. And the game that was played here saying, oh, let's just change the rules for the Senate. Let's make it so they can do it with 50 votes and that way we can just pass this. We won't have to deal with the reality of burying people's future retirements and destroying my little girl's future in debt. We can just avoid it and go home and have a nice Christmas.

But the fact of the matter is, almost every agreement we have had has been associated with the stressor that was brought on by a debt ceiling.

Gramm-Rudman, 1985 and functionally again in 1987. Debt limit increase associated with it. Deficit reduction and automatic spending and budget triggers.

Paygo. I can't tell you how many times the Democrats here preach paygo to me, except for the fraud that paygo really is, where on the fifth year we will just pretend it no longer costs anything, therefore, it doesn't fall under the paygo rules. But the paygo rules functionally every time—four times was associated with changing the borrowing limits of the country, the debt ceiling. It was supposed to create deficit reduction, and it did create some. Spending increases must be offset, and that is the ultimate cultural change that paygo produced. But remember, it came about because of a debt ceiling fight, multiple debt ceiling fights.

Budget Control Act. Do you remember how controversial this one was? We actually had a government shutdown and other things associated with this. But the Budget Control Act, the sequestration that came with that, if you look at it, it was the most successful in modern times of bending the spending curve. The problem is it is all on discretionary. And we all know the fraud around here is discretionary is now down to, what? 10 percent or so. Actually, no. Fifteen percent of what we actually spend, if you strip military out.

Military is now 10 percent. The rest of discretionary is 15 percent. The other 70-plus percent is functionally on autopilot.

But this is the truth. Democrats have control of this place. They control the White House. They control the Senate. They control the House. Okay. Bless their precious hearts. But we could have used this as a stressor, and there have been lots of, oh, my hair is on fire. The world is coming to an end. I am worried about the stock market, oh, wink, wink, nod, nod. And the stock market just goes on because they know we will fix something. But used it as an excuse, even if we have to tell our constituents why we are trying to do something tough. Because remember, the lobbyists here in this town aren't here to help us reduce spending. They are here with their hands out wanting more spending.

This place is functionally, structurally designed to get everything you can, and hell be damned one day when we hit that failed bond auction. And you all saw today, it wasn't a big deal, but today's bond auction was slightly undersubscribed when U.S. sovereign debt was being sold. I am not saying it is a canary in a coal mine, but the canary did have a little cough.

And so here is what we are going to do today. I think the Senate may be voting at this moment. We are just functionally going to do a debt increase, probably we come back on Tuesday, we still don't know what the number is going to be or maybe we do the fraud of just do it to a date. Will there be any deficit reduction? Any attempt, any anything to force some rational math of what is going on?

No. Because it is uncomfortable because we have to tell the truth about the drivers of our debt.

And what are the drivers of our debt? Okay. I have said this over and over, but we need to be honest. The left will say, oh, it is military, it is rich people not paying enough taxes. The right, we have our sins, too. We will say, oh, it is foreign aid, oh, it is waste and fraud.

No, it is not.

The primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt is, we are getting old. It is demographics. And demographics aren't Republican or Democrat, it is math. And you have got to understand how sharp this curve is.

We are functionally right here. So here is 2022. Functionally 17 percent of our population is over 65 today. You do see how fast we start getting up to close to 22 percent of our population being over 65. This is the driver of our debt.

Remember the math. And I am going to do it a couple of times here. And I am sorry this upsets people because they don't want us to tell the truth.

The primary driver of U.S. sovereign debt is Medicare. Simply Medicare. And then Social Security. And the rest of the budget actually is in balance. So the next 30 years the rest of the budget is actually in balance. It is demographics.

If you made a pledge when you ran for office around here that you were going to protect people's retirement, you were going to protect Social Security, you were going to protect Medicare, letting it be buried in debt, how is that protecting it? Tell the truth.

And there are solutions. I have come behind this mike so many times and said: There is technology out there. There are things we can do to crash the price of healthcare. There are policies we can do to grow the economy. Everything should be fixated on what maximizes economic growth.

And then the left moves something, Build Back Better, their social entitlement spending that the data says it slows down the economy. We will be poorer and smaller, and the working poor will be poorer at the end of the decade because of the way they designed their social entitlement spending legislation.

We are doing everything half-assed backwards. If you lay out, sort of the holistic theory, sort of the integrated model, yes, you have to fix immigration, but you focus on immigration being about maximizing economic expansion, not importing poverty; adoption of technology that maximizes people being healthy, and cures.

Remember last week, we came here and talked about the miracle from last week that we have cured someone of type 1 diabetes? Because remember, 31 percent of all our spending in Medicare is just on type 2 diabetes. What happens if you do cures and end people's misery? Oh, by the way, you get amazing benefits on our debt.

The immediate reaction you will get from people on the left is, well, SCHWEIKERT got behind the mike and wanted to cut entitlements. No, I am trying to find a way to save them. But you save them by changing the cost curve. You save them by having a moment.

Pretend you are at a 12-step group. Isn't the first step to admit you have a problem? This place can't make it to step one.

So let's do a little math.

And I am sorry, I do this over and over, but I continue to be just shocked at the number of staff around here who will grab me in the elevator and say, Is that number real? Is this real? And you say this is the single biggest issue policywise facing Washington, facing this country? And we will chase shiny objects because shiny objects don't make your brain hurt. We will have asinine discussions about, oh, there is a vaccine database, there is this, there is that, and you realize it is a con. That is part of the scam this place does is look at the shiny object. We chase that because this hurts.

Reality. And this number is worse today. This is based on last year's math. $112 trillion inflation-adjusted public borrowing in 29 years. $112 trillion of borrowing will be our publicly held debt in 29 years, 77.7 of that is just Medicare, 34.8 is Social Security, the rest of the Federal budget is in balance.

This is just demographics. The cure is economic growth and crashing the price of healthcare. This will drive every bit of public policy, and it is coming very fast.

If you look at our borrowing curve, in a decade we go from what is projected these days where we are going to be borrowing a trillion dollars a year to a couple trillion dollars a year. The debt will and the borrowing will and the interest will drive all policy. And this place right now the policy is worrying about how to get reelected than saving the country and the future.

Do you understand, a 2-point increase in interest rates from nominal interest rates that have been projected, if we go up just 2 percent—and that is getting us actually closer to what the historic mean is—in 2051, 100 percent of revenues go just to pay interest. How come this isn't the number one discussion here?

Now the left may have different ways to approach it than those of us on the right, but you would think this would be all we could talk about. And it is avoided around here like a virus, except we haven't figured out how to put a mask on it and give it social distancing, have we?

And for my brothers and sisters on the left, the number of times I will try to sit down in working groups with my Democratic colleagues—and I believe their heart may be in the right place, they don't own a calculator, their math isn't there, but we make public policy by our feelings in this place. We make public policy because it feels good, it has a great title. We get judged by our intentions, not by our outcomes. And that is incredibly dangerous.

So think about some of the rhetoric. And I have done presentations here where I walk through every single revenue, the proper term is receipts generating proposal from the left. And if you did all of them and pretended they had no economic effects, no secondary effects—all of them—you still can't come close to raising enough revenues. Even a 100 percent tax rate on small businesses and upper-income families could not come close to balancing the long-term budget. You can take all the rich people's money and all the revenues from those small businesses that they own. You can take every dime.

This is a percentage of the GDP number. When you get into these sorts of numbers, you start doing the percentage to GDP. We are heading towards 15 percent of GDP functionally being borrowing. And if you take every dime, you only get about 5 percent to GDP.

We are screwed. And I am sorry, I know that is crass, but I just don't know how to get folks to want to pay attention to it. This is the single-most important thing going on here. If you care about education, if you care about health, if you care about science, if you care about space, if you care about

equality, if you care about these things, when there is no more money, when every dime of resources goes, so we survive and do our best to avoid that failed bond auction—which God forbid, if it does and interest rates spike, do you have any idea how fragile we have made our society?

□ 1830

And this isn't often the future. This is today. We will kiss up close to, what is it, $30 trillion in borrowing, probably in the next few months. These are unthinkable numbers, and it is here.

And you have got to understand, these projections are based on this concept, a really simple one: There is going to be no more wars. There is not going to be another pandemic. There is not going to be an economic collapse. There is not going to be a mortgage collapse.

We have done this to ourselves. And then the left comes here and we do things like the Build Back Better, the social spending bill, which ultimately—and we have different numbers because God knows what the Senate is going to do—but the simple scoring from CBO basically said at year 5 it has borrowed another $800 billion.

Oh, by the way, wink wink, nod nod, after year 5, we will actually stop all these programs and we will start to raise revenues to pay it off. We are functionally going to add another $4 trillion-plus from borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, the social spending bill, at the end of the decade, you realize the economy will have missed tremendous amounts of economic growth, some of the best models coming from the Tax Foundation. We are actually making ourselves poorer because of the design of the spending. When you tell people, I am going to send you a check but you don't have to work. When I am putting money into things that don't actually create productivity.

Remember, what are the two ways you pay people more money? Inflation. Well, that doesn't get you anywhere. Or productivity. That was one of the miracles at the end of the 2017 tax reform, is the resources that went for companies to buy equipment to be more productive so they could pay their workers more. And you saw it. You saw a miracle of employment and wage growth.

And then the cynicism that when two-thirds of millionaires get tax cuts under the Democrat's build back better plan. So you tell us the rich need to pay their fair share and then you design pieces of legislation that give hundreds of billions of dollars to rich people. And then you tell us, oh, by the way, we should put State and local back into it, but most of it goes to really rich people.

You want revenues. We did a whole presentation here a few months ago that said we can show you over 10 years $1.4 trillion you can get. Stop subsidizing really really rich people. Instead, the left does a piece of legislation to subsidize them more. I guess my intense frustration is we are heading—it may not be the bubble where the economy blows up—but we are heading to a type of rot because so much of this Nation's resources will be used to survive the amount of debt we have piled up. And then we are adopting policies that don't create any type of escape philosophy of, we are curing diseases that drive the debt because most of the debt is driven by healthcare. We are doing investments in things that grow the economy. We are getting immigration codes and regulatory codes and other things. We are modernizing them so they maximize economic opportunity because we actually give a darn about poor people. We give a darn about the working poor. We give a darn about people who are heading toward retirement. We give a darn about young people having a future. And not one of those things is actually in the math; it is in the rhetoric. People spin some great stories here but it is not in the math. It is just not in the math. It is not in the economic analysis.

The universities that have looked at what is going on right now tell us that at the end of the decade, the poor are going to be poorer. Come on. What type of economic violence is this place willing to subject the working poor, the middle class to? We are better than this. And there is a path.

Mr. Speaker, you are not going to pay off the debt, but we could adopt enough policies to flatten the curve that my 6-year-old daughter actually has a future. And doesn't she deserve one.

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

THE DANGERS FACING OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for being willing to stand on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, when unfortunately so many of my colleagues are not, this evening to talk about the danger facing our country. And the gentleman outlines, I believe if I am correct, that we will be facing $112 trillion of debt come 2050, if we do not change course. If we do not take the steps necessary to make changes with respect to our healthcare spending and make wise policy choices—like any family, any budget that you have to maintain, if you are running a business, nonprofit, a university, virtually everybody in the world, or at least everybody in the country—except this body right here—that has to maintain and balance a budget and make determinations and make tough choices.

If the gentleman would indulge me for a minute or two, for a couple more minutes on the floor. When was the last time the gentleman recalls we have had the ability to amend a piece of legislation on the floor of this body? Truly amend it?

Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Brilliant question. And I cannot actually think of something that was substantive, where there was a collective idea from my brothers and sisters on the left or the right that there was actual intellectual battle here where we made something better.

This place is functionally an intellectual dictatorship.

Mr. ROY. Would it surprise the gentleman that it was May of 2016, the last time that an amendment was offered on the floor of this body in open debate?

Now, to be clear, that is an assessment of leadership in both parties. But how on earth can we actually solve the problems, I would ask the Speaker, if we don't come down and sit at this table, stop looking up at the C–SPAN cameras and just sit around this table and start with a budget—like any family or any business—and say, Here is how much money we have. Here is how we can responsibly spend for the betterment of the people. Have disagreements about what those priorities are and make choices.

When was the last time that we have done that? It is a rhetorical question, but I know one data point is that May of 2016 was the last time that any Member of this body was able to walk on to this floor and offer an amendment that wasn't precooked up in the Committee on Rules previously and already set up by the leadership structure of either party.

Would the gentleman agree that that is no way for the people's House to operate?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Would the gentleman yield to allow me just a quick colloquy with him?

Mr. ROY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The process is broken. It is why I come here almost every week—and you do, too—and we try to just focus on what is ahead of us. I just spent a half an hour sort of focusing on debt and deficit. That is not Republican or Democrat, it is what is ahead of us.

You have been here a few years. How many actual real discussions—other than theater of, We should do a study commission. We should write a strongly worded memo; the theater of this place—instead of doing what is really hard, and understand, you can't just do one thing. That is the great fraud now. We have gotten ourselves in such a difficult position, it has got to be everything.

A couple years ago I came here, and we brought in 19 attributes that you had to do almost at the exact same time to maximize enough economic growth, enough technology disruption, all the things to make it work. You actually helped me on some of that. But my fear, those are really uncomfortable, and you will have an army of lobbyists really unhappy with you when you tell the truth about the math.

Mr. ROY. Well, the gentleman is completely correct, and there is no debate about that. You want to have a conversation about solving the Medicare crisis driving $112 trillion, then you have to have a conversation about solving the healthcare crisis. And to solve the healthcare crisis, you need to actually be willing, both sides of the aisle, to take on the army of lobbyists representing the insurance companies, the hospitals, pharmaceutical companies—all minting money right now, by the way, literally minting money—and you have got to be willing to have a conversation about that to actually figure out how we can transform our healthcare system to be patient-centered, doctor-centered, and not have to go to an insurance bureaucrat or a government bureaucrat to figure out what your healthcare looks like and then get competition, transparency, and drive down prices. Because if you drive down prices, we can actually solve the Medicare crisis.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The gentleman knows in many quarters I am a bit of a heretic on this. I actually believe we are on the cusp of miracles, if it is true that we just found a cure for Type 1 diabetes. If the math is true, about one-third of all U.S. healthcare spending is just Type 2 diabetes—for my Native American populations, for my urban poor, for my rural Anglo poor—the amount of diabetes, the misery, the suffering, wouldn't it be one of the most elegant, noble things we can do is say, screw this noise we are doing, we are going to do our Operation Warp Speed.

Now we see there is a stem cell to the islet-producing insulin. There is a path, but it requires intellectual discipline, telling the truth, and saying no to a lot of people who are going to be upset because a cure ends the misery. It also ends the manipulation.

Mr. ROY. Well, I would agree with the gentleman. And to your point, you asked me a question about how many times we have had a real substantive debate. The closest I can remember was I made this point about amendments on the floor of the House. And the gentleman from Maryland, the leader, said in an agreement, Yeah, I wish we had more debate on the floor. And I would say to the leader, let's do it. Right? Let's start.

Let's drop a bill on the floor, instead of a 2000-page monstrosity that costs X-trillions of dollars that was passed by the Committee on Rules, was brought to the floor, that we then offer an MTR, and then we go and give press conferences about why we can't support it. That is no way to actually do the work of the people.

The NDAA bill last week, let's put a bill here on the table and then let's offer amendments. Right? We had a whole fight about, draft our daughters, about vaccine mandates, all these things. Well just start with the NDAA and then offer some amendments. Let the votes work. Let the people speak.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. CHIP, you are a heretic.

Mr. ROY. I am, I am.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Before I leave you, I am still hopeful. I think there is a path that saves us, but the window for that escape is getting very narrow.

Mr. ROY. It's shrinking.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The speed of debt accumulation, the unwillingness to deal with complex problems with complex solutions—because that is reality—is closing fast on us. And the number of Members who are like you, who are willing to come to the floor and say very difficult things that are truthful, they are becoming rare. I thank the gentleman for the colloquy.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman. I appreciate your steadfast commitment to try and speak the truth and come down to the floor and speak to the American people, and unfortunately all too often, an empty Chamber.

I appreciate that my colleagues, many of whom were able to get a flight and go home—and God bless them—but we have problems to solve. And we ought to be here debating in this Chamber rather than posturing.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that previously my colleagues were eulogizing and remembering Senator Bob Dole. As we all know, he was a World War II veteran who was injured in combat; a man of great distinction who served in public life pretty much since his service in World War II. And he is a reminder, as we all know, of losing that generation. There are precious few remaining.

Both of my grandfathers have passed who served in World War II. We lost Senator Dole this week. I was on a flight to Austin, Texas, earlier this week, on Monday, with an honor flight, with eight veterans of World War II who came up for Pearl Harbor Day on December 7. None of those eight had been present at Pearl. Two of them were over 100 years old. One of the men, I sat next to him on the plane flying up to D.C., had served and been in combat in Iwo Jima. There is only a few of these folks left.

And what I want to spend a minute focusing on, as we are heading out, and I know we will be back next week for a day, but we are getting close to winding down and heading home for Christmas. I want to remember what that generation did.

□ 1845

Joe Crute and Jim Swartz remember vividly the merciless, frigid cold they survived during the Battle of the Bulge: ice, wind, snow, frozen ground, frostbite, amputations, pneumonia, Americans dying from hypothermia in a land far away from their homes.

Approximately 1 million Allied forces endured the inhospitable conditions during the fight that lasted from December 16, 1944, until January 25, 1945, a span which, of course, surrounded Christmas.

This was the Germans making their last major offensive strike on the Western Front during World War II. Almost 90,000 of them ended up wounded, missing, captured, or dead from battle injuries.

Seventy-seven years later—this was written 2 years ago—when recalling the bitter conditions of the Battle of the Bulge, Swartz stared at his large hands, rubbing them together as if to warm them. I have something to show for it, he said when sharing his experiences. I have the results of that cold. My hands are almost to the place where they are useless from the frostbite.

You couldn't drink the water from the lakes due to the fact of dead animals and dead bodies in the water, so we had to purify that. Some of the boys couldn't get to the water. Some of them, the water was frozen in their canteens. So what did they do? They ate the snow to keep their body liquefied.

We attempted to make shelter in the ground, but to no avail. You tried to dig little holes in the ground to sleep. The ground was so hard you couldn't dig a hole. So what you did is you got pine branches off of the pine trees, laid them down on the ground and laid there and covered yourself up with half of your pup tent. That is how you tried to keep warm.

One day, a fellow soldier was mortally wounded. He was a little bit bigger than I was, Crute said. He was shot in the back. I ran and got his mackinaw off. It fit him perfect, but when I put it on it was an overcoat. It felt good. I pitied the poor guy, but it was so cold.

At that time in 1944, there is the famous exchange that happened when the German commander wrote our commander, General McAuliffe, basically saying battalions are ready to annihilate the United States troops in and near Bastogne. The order for firing will be given immediately after this 2 hours term. General McAuliffe replied, famously, ''nuts,'' and they fought on. They battled on.

Many of the soldiers spent Christmas 1944 celebrating the best they could. The American soldiers were within Bastogne. Christmas services were held by the Army chaplain. Some in the country went and visited with others. One story:

We were out in the outskirts of Bastogne and we found this farmhouse. Inside was a man and a woman and a little boy and a little girl. The wife, she gave us some soup and some black bread. We stayed there all night in this farmhouse. The war was going on fiercely outside, and for some reason the farmhouse never got hit.

We were there Christmas Eve. We sang Christmas songs that night with this Belgian family. We sang Jingle Bells and Silent Night. The words were different, but the music was the same.

The thing that strikes me as we think about that generation and think about what they did in World War II in response to Pearl Harbor, signing up and enlisting and going out into the Pacific and going into Europe to stand up against tyranny around the globe

and defend our country, but also others around the world, for an idea and for something bigger than they.

They signed up without a question. Churchill famously observed that once we were bombed by the Japanese on that December day in 1941 that caused then-President Roosevelt to come into this room and give that famous speech about that day that will live in infamy—Churchill observed that the war would be won.

The sleeping giant had been awakened because the world knew who we were. The world knew what America stood for. It knew that that sleeping giant had been awakened. Nothing could be assumed. It took a massive ramp-up, massive sacrifice, rationing, women enlisting, Rosie the Riveter, men enlisting, going across, 400,000 dead, represented on those stars at that memorial here on The Mall.

The world knew what we would do. The question I would ask my colleagues today: Does the world know what we would do today? Does the world know who we are? Does the world know what we will do as we watch China on the rise, Russia rattling against Ukraine, Iran rattling about nuclear capability in an unstable Middle East, threatening our friend and ally Israel?

The cartels in violence and unrest on our southern border—does the world know whether we have the resolve to stand up in defense of the rule of law and in defense of freedom and against tyranny around the globe but with the resolve necessary to win it?

When President Reagan stood athwart the Soviet Union and talked about peace through strength and told Mr. Gorbachev to tear down these walls, the world knew our resolve. Do they today? Can we accomplish the objectives of defending this country and standing up in the world when we refuse to do the basic job of managing our own affairs and our own country responsibly?

We amassed a mountain of debt in World War II: 125 percent of GDP by 1946 coming out of the Depression. We got back and got busy growing our economy. We grew out of it and got that down. We are sitting here today in relative peacetime with $30 trillion in debt, barreling toward $112 trillion in debt as my colleague just articulately illustrated on the floor of the House to an empty Chamber, minus myself and the Speaker. We are doing nothing about it. Nothing. Literally.

Just last night, there was wailing and gnashing of teeth among my colleagues because we dared force votes on 30 suspension votes. Oh, no, we might miss a Christmas dinner or a Christmas party. Oh, no, we might not catch our flight home early enough.

Madam Speaker, $2.7 billion was authorized last night in suspension votes, all bills that often just sound good in the headlines. Three of us voted against a bill that would provide $500 million over 5 years to support research and funding for therapies for ALS. I was one of those three ''no'' votes.

Do you think I want to go back and talk to people and families that are afflicted by ALS? Where are the rest of my colleagues in explaining where that $500 million is going to come from? When we are faced with a conflict like our forefathers were facing, when Pearl Harbor was bombed, when Hitler was on the march, and we resolved to fight, we could because our economy was strong enough, and we were disciplined enough to try to do the right thing. Are we able to do that today when we are not even disciplined enough to sit here and figure out how to manage the budget and the spending of the United States so we don't drive our country into complete and total bankruptcy and destroy it for our kids and our grandkids?

Literally, everybody, both sides of the aisle, say, well, it is just some votes. Some people today were giving me trouble because one of those suspension votes might be used as a political weapon by one of my Democratic opponents or one of our Democratic colleagues because they managed to pass some bill with a 375–40 bipartisan vote.

Oh, no, don't give somebody a political weapon so they can go run an ad. Nowhere was there concern about another $2 billion or $3 billion just passed through on suspension bills that we hardly debated.

When we talk about and venerate men like Bob Dole and men serving in World War II, and we look at our grandfathers and our great-grandfathers who sat there in the frigid cold or stormed Iwo Jima or stormed the cliffs at Normandy, can we fight those fights tomorrow? Are we capable of it? Do we have the resources to do it, much less the resolve, if we can't even resolve in this body to preserve and protect the actual foundation of this country to be economically and financially firm and stable?

If we don't resolve, the 435 Members of this body, to do the hard work, as my colleague from Arizona was pointing out, of making tough decisions about Medicare and Social Security and mandatory spending, but also the discretionary spending that I talked about last night, but also the National Defense Authorization Act that we just threw $25 billion at the Defense Department with no real reforms or changes to how they spend money, how are we ever going to save this Republic?

I said last week in a speech that this is the United States House of free stuff because that is what it has become. It has become an entity that doles out money to whatever cause because it sounds good and feels good.

There was $500 million for ALS research. God bless them. I am glad that research is going to occur. But someone has to sit on the floor of the House, and say: Where are we going to get the money? Not just print it.

I can't go next door to my neighbor and knock on the door, and say: Hey, it is time for you to give me your check. What check? Well, the check for ALS. Well, what do you mean? Well, it is a good cause. The check for cancer, I am a cancer survivor. The check for polio, my dad is a polio survivor—whatever it might be.

Not one of us in this Chamber has the right to knock on our neighbor's door, and say: Give me a check to go give to another thing. You wouldn't do that. But through the power of this body as a whole we print money, borrow money, and then dole it out for political benefit and nothing more. It is cowardly. It is embarrassing. It is destroying the Republic.

Thread by thread, the flag is getting tattered because we refuse to do the hard work, as my friend from Arizona said, of making tough decisions to ensure that we can sustain this Republic.

We will come back in next week and the debt ceiling will get raised. That is as true as the Sun coming up in the east. Not a thing will be done to right the ship of the massive amount of debt piling up around the ears of our kids and our grandkids. Nothing will be done next week to solve that problem.

Republicans will blame Democrats using a crazy procedural ploy in the Senate, passing a bill to blow up the filibuster to allow the debt ceiling on a supposed one-time basis to be raised with a 51-vote threshold so that they can go back to the American people, and say: I didn't vote to raise the debt ceiling, but you did.

Don't let them hide. They did. They concocted the scheme. They voted to make sure that that happened, and the debt ceiling will be raised. Not a thing will change about how we carry out our work. Nothing will be done to make this country fiscally sound again.

Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MANNING). The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, let me take a minute to thank the staff, the floor staff. We come down here and speak into late hours. We have votes like last night that go until 9 p.m. or 10 p.m. because some of us forced some votes. I appreciate all of your hard work. As a former staffer, I know it is not easy.

□ 1900

The American people are a great people. The American people want this body, the Senate, and their leadership in Washington to actually represent them again. I am going to keep giving this speech over and over again, and I am going to keep calling for this body to do the hard work of representation. We don't govern; we represent.

Those men who sat in the freezing cold—frostbite, amputations, pneumonia, death, and picking up jackets off of their fallen compatriot to stay warm to defeat Hitler's Germany—

those men who responded to Pearl Harbor 80 years ago this week, and President Washington overlooking this Chamber here in that portrait crossing the Delaware Christmas Eve night 1776, what will we do to honor their memories?

What will we do to carry forward this Republic for which they fought, died, bled, and lost limbs? Senator Dole carrying a pen in his crippled hand, what will we do to honor that sacrifice?

That is our calling as we embark on the second half of this Congress. I don't accept that just because my party is not in control of this Chamber for the next year that we can't find a way to actually do the hard work of representation.

My ask of the Speaker, the leader, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and my colleagues on this side of the aisle: restore regular order on this floor. Bring bills to the floor and allow us to vote, debate, amend, and do the work the American people expect us to do.

It is the least that we can do to honor the memory of those World War II veterans whom we are losing by the day, all of those who have sacrificed to defend this country, and all of those who sat there on that Christmas Eve day in Bastogne singing Christmas carols hoping to get back to this great country.

Let's fight to save that great country.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, December 13, 2021.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 13, 2021, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–2909. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General John E. Hyten, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2910. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report to Congress on U.S. Compliance with the Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq Section 4 of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107-243) (50 USC 1541) for the period from July 5, 2021, to September 4, 2021, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2911. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification that no United Nations agency or United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 287e note; Public Law 103-236, Sec. 102(g) (as amended by Public Law 103-415, Sec. 1(o)); (108 Stat. 4301); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2912. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 14024 of April 15, 2020, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2913. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2914. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on the methods employed by the Government of Cuba to enforce the United States-Cuba September 1994 ''Joint Communique'', the treatment by the Government of Cuba of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 ''Joint Statement'', and an update on the implementation of the United States-Cuba January 2017 ''Joint Statement'', together known as the Migration Accords, April 2021 to October 2021, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, Sec. 2245; (112 Stat. 2681-824); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2915. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus Dispute covering the period of April 1, 2021, through May 31, 2021; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2916. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective October 10, 2021 the Department authorized danger pay for Drug Enforcement Administration employees assigned to Embassy Tanzania and Embassy Nicaragua; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2917. A letter from the General Manager, Woods Hole, Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket Steamship Authority, transmitting the Authority's Annual Report for 2020; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2918. A letter from the Chief Human Capitol Officer, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting one discontinuation of service in an acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2919. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2920. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's FY 2019 Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period April 1, 2021 through, September 30, 2021; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2921. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's Fiscal Year 2021 Agency Financial Report and the FY 2021 Annual Performance Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049) and 31 U.S.C. 1116(h)(1)(A); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 4; (124 Stat. 3872); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2922. A letter from the Chair, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2021, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2923. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Agency Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2021; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2924. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2021 Annual Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2925. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Performance, Planning, and the Chief Financial Officer, Small Business Administration, transmitting he Administration's Agency Financial Report for FY 2021, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2926. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2021, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–2927. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting notification of the Secretary's determination that, by reason of the statutory debt limit, the Secretary will be unable to fully invest the portion of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSRDF) not immediately required to pay beneficiaries, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 8348(l)(2); Public Law 89-554, Sec. 8348(l)(2) (as added by Public Law 99-509, Sec. 6002(c)); (100 Stat. 1933); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. LESKO, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SMITH of

Nebraska, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. WILD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 6202. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements for the provision of certain high-cost durable medical equipment and laboratory testing; to extend and expand access to telehealth services; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BACON:

H.R. 6203. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to allow for blended workforces to carry out the supplemental nutrition assistance program under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARSON, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. SIRES, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. DEAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CORREA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TRONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CHU, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. WILD, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 6204. A bill to establish in the Department of State the Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. LAMB, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 6205. A bill to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HERN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. VAN DUYNE, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 6206. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the H-1B visa program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COOPER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KATKO, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LIEU, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LAMB, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. CHU, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. TRAHAN):

H.R. 6207. A bill to substantially restrict the use of animal testing for cosmetics; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. WALTZ, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 6208. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide administrative support to providers of dental care who provide such care to veterans that is not furnished under such title, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program for the provision of dental care to certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 6209. A bill to improve information collection and reporting on sexual assaults and racial and ethnic demographics in the military justice system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 6210. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the status of the implementation of certain recommendations of the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 6211. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct annual surveys on military community belonging and support in military communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. MACE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. MANN, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 6212. A bill to analyze the impacts of establishing U.S. Customs and Border Protection Preclearance facilities in Taiwan and in other Indo-Pacific countries; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SWALWELL):

H.R. 6213. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to restrict the ability of a person whose Federal license to import, manufacture, or deal in firearms has been revoked, whose application to renew such a license has been denied, or who has received a license revocation or renewal denial notice, to transfer business inventory firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 6214. A bill to effectively staff the high-need public elementary schools and secondary schools of the United States with school-based mental health services providers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 6215. A bill to prohibit air carriers from imposing fees that are not reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 6216. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a demonstration project to improve outpatient clinical care for individuals with sickle cell disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 6217. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to license lending institutions to make loans under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. HAGEDORN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 6218. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 317 Blattner Drive in Avon, Minnesota, as the ''W.O.C. Kort Miller Plantenberg Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MENG, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CASE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 6219. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to modify the definition of franchise fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH (for herself, Mr. HAGEDORN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. OMAR, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 6220. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 3rd Avenue Northwest in Perham, Minnesota, as the ''Charles P. Nord Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH (for herself, Mr. HAGEDORN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. OMAR, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 6221. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 155 Main Avenue West in Winsted, Minnesota, as the ''James A. Rogers Jr. Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 6222. A bill to provide for punishments for immigration-related fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MAST, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H.R. 6223. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to require any officer or employee of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to receive a COVID-19 vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 6224. A bill to prohibit payment of administrative funding to States with a high backlog of unprocessed unemployment claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 6225. A bill to modernize the business of selling firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 6226. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for deductions for transfers from estates or gifts to certain cemeteries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 6227. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to allow direct certification of children in households of active duty members of the Armed Forces for certain Federal school meal programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MANNING (for herself, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. NEWMAN, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 6228. A bill to limit cost sharing for prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 6229. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make financial assistance to States under the Land and Water Conservation Fund available for water quality projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEUSER (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 6230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate lead oxide, antimony, and sulfuric acid as taxable chemicals under the Superfund excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 6231. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the feasibility and advisability of establishing a pilot program to support medical residency and fellowship programs that assist veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. CHENEY):

H.R. 6232. A bill to delay the implementation of a rule relating to the importation of sheep and goats and products derived from sheep and goats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 6233. A bill to extend the period for adjustment of status for certain Liberian nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself, Ms. BUSH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BASS, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. JONES, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 6234. A bill to improve the governmental process for recommending applications for clemency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DUNN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PALMER, Mr. LONG, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. BOST, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CLINE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 6235. A bill to provide for the development of a plan to increase oil and gas production under oil and gas leases of Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense in conjunction with a drawdown of petroleum reserves from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 6236. A bill to require the Administrator to provide certain notices to property owners when undertaking remapping in geographic areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. HERRELL, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 6237. A bill to prevent the admission of any member or leader of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STANSBURY (for herself, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COLE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 6238. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to increase Tribal access to water conservation and efficiency grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. KELLER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. HERRELL, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BABIN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. MANN, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. MACE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. KATKO, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 6239. A bill to require the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to investigate the vetting and processing of illegal aliens apprehended along the southwest border and to ensure that all laws are being upheld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 6240. A bill to release the reversionary interest of the United States in certain non-Federal land in Salt Lake City, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6241. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for rules for the use of retirement funds in connection with federally declared disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 6242. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that limitations on the scope of judicial review of certain removal proceedings apply only in the case of discretionary determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H.R. 6243. A bill to prohibit Federal public benefits for or naturalization of any alien who receives a payment pursuant to an agreement to settle certain civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 6244. A bill to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs located in metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia, as the ''Joseph Maxwell Cleland Atlanta Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. BOST,

Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CLINE, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. COLE, Mr. COMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ESTES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HERN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HILL, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LATURNER, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. MACE, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MEIJER, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BRADY, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Omnibus COVID-19 Health Care Staff Vaccination''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 6202.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BACON:
H.R. 6203.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

By Ms. OMAR:
H.R. 6204.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ADAMS:
H.R. 6205.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BANKS:
H.R. 6206.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BEYER:
H.R. 6207.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:
H.R. 6208.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.
Article I, section 8 of the United State Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:
H.R. 6209.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:
H.R. 6210.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:
H.R. 6211.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. CAMMACK:
H.R. 6212.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

By Mr. CICILLINE:
H.R. 6213.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:
H.R. 6214.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 6215.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:
H.R. 6216.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DONALDS:
H.R. 6217.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 T

By Mr. EMMER:
H.R. 6218.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I

By Ms. ESHOO:
H.R. 6219.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH:
H.R. 6220.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. FISCHBACH:
H.R. 6221.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. FOSTER:
H.R. 6222.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:
H.R. 6223.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HARDER of California:
H.R. 6224.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:
H.R. 6225.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. KIND:
H.R. 6226.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LEVIN of California:
H.R. 6227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MANNING:
H.R. 6228.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Action 1, Section 8, Clause 18
To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MAST:
H.R. 6229.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MEUSER:
H.R. 6230.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NEGUSE:
H.R. 6231.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PFLUGER:
H.R. 6232.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PHILLIPS:
H.R. 6233.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1. Section 8

By Ms. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 6234.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:
H.R. 6235.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 4 Section 3

By Mr. ROSENDALE:
H.R. 6236.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. SALAZAR:
H.R. 6237.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STANSBURY:
H.R. 6238.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 6239.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEWART:
H.R. 6240.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 6241.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I

By Ms. TLAIB:
H.R. 6242.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:
H.R. 6243.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:
H.R. 6244.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN:
H.J. Res. 67.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 203: Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 263: Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 310: Mr. BUDD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 399: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 465: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 475: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 481: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 515: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 544: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 748: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 851: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 914: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 971: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 1012: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 1145: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 1297: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 1361: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 1378: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1401: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1433: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1437: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1474: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 1516: Mrs. DEMINGS.
H.R. 1569: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 1661: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1729: Mrs. MCCLAIN and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 1785: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. BUSH.
H.R. 1861: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 1866: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 1884: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1919: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 1976: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1983: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 2021: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 2050: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2187: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 2230: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2234: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2249: Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2252: Mr. COSTA, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. COOPER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2255: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. TRONE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2256: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2269: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.
H.R. 2542: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2565: Mr. GIMENEZ and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2586: Ms. ROSS, Ms. CHU, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2588: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2589: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2590: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2674: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2689: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 2748: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2811: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2920: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2954: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 3075: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3089: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3108: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 3134: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3187: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 3203: Mr. ROSE and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3327: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 3335: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. CHU, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3342: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3402: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. FLETCHER, and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3405: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 3461: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 3488: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3509: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 3525: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 3541: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3548: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3554: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 3570: Ms. CHU and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 3577: Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. MACE, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3602: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
H.R. 3685: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 3808: Mr. RUSH and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 3824: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 3857: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 3933: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 3952: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3982: Mr. EMMER and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 4038: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4058: Ms. DEAN and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4099: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4129: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4137: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4151: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HUIZENGA, Ms. ROSS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4176: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 4186: Ms. PORTER and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4239: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 4268: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4287: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 4328: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4331: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 4387: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4390: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4429: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4436: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 4447: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4599: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4640: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VELA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4690: Ms. NORTON and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4701: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 4794: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 4811: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 4819: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 4872: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4878: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 5043: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 5137: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 5141: Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. PORTER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 5150: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 5332: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5335: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 5338: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5344: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5370: Mr. CARBAJAL and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5407: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5429: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 5430: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5435: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5441: Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 5468: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 5502: Mr. PANETTA and Mrs. STEEL.
H.R. 5533: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 5536: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 5543: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 5554: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 5581: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5590: Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. FALLON, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 5598: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5605: Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 5618: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5665: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 5710: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 5754: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 5769: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 5809: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 5819: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
H.R. 5826: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 5828: Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 5834: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 5854: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 5866: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5878: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5905: Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CARSON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. CASTEN, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LIEU, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 5908: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 5919: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CASE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 5938: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 5949: Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GARCIA of California, and Mr. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 5963: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5975: Mr. BACON, Mr. CROW, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 5981: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 5996: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5999: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CHU, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 6015: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BACON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. BERA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. PORTER, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MFUME, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 6016: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 6017: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 6020: Mr. DELGADO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HILL, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 6047: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 6048: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 6086: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 6089: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 6094: Ms. ROSS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6100: Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ROSS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 6118: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 6140: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 6153: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 6161: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 6184: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. ALLEN.
H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. FALLON, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. CAREY.
H. Con. Res. 42: Ms. MACE.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. WALBERG.
H. Res. 20: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 346: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H. Res. 558: Ms. STEVENS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. FOXX, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H. Res. 744: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and Mr. BALDERSON.
H. Res. 762: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Mr. VELA.
H. Res. 784: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 798: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H. Res. 833: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 845: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. LIEU.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2021 No. 213

Senate

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our hope for years to come we worship You. Your Name is great, and we offer You our adoration and praise.

Bless our Senators. Lord, open their eyes so they can discern Your involvement in human affairs. Prepare their hearts and minds for today's challenges, inspiring them to conduct themselves with civility and honor. Keep their motives pure, their words true, and their actions constructive.

Almighty God, we acknowledge that our lives are in Your hands, so please keep our feet from stumbling.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DR. LORNA BREEN HEALTH CARE PROVIDER PROTECTION ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 610, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 610, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

Pending:

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill.

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with Schumer amendment No. 4871 (to the House amendment), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 4872 (to amendment No. 4871), to modify the effective date.

Schumer motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Schumer amendment No. 4873, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 4874 (to the instructions (amendment No. 4873) of the motion to refer), to modify the effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 4875 (to amendment No. 4874), to modify the effective date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING ROBERT J. DOLE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, earlier this morning, it was my honor to join with President Biden, the Vice President, Leader MCCONNELL, the Speaker, and other congressional leaders in paying a final tribute to our former colleague, Senator Bob Dole of Kansas.

From defending our country in World War II, where he fought the Nazis on the hillsides of Italy, to dedicating his final years advocating with disabled Americans and veterans, Senator Dole redefined and elevated what it means to serve our country. By 21, he had given more of himself than most of us give in a lifetime, and then he kept going for 70 years after that.

Leader Dole, rest in peace. Thank you for all you did to make our country better. And I extend my condolences and prayers to his wife, Senator Elizabeth Dole, their family, and all who mourn the loss of the gentleman from Kansas.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, now on the debt ceiling.

Later today, the Senate is going to hold a crucial vote that will enable us to address the debt ceiling on a fast-track basis, avoiding the prospect of a catastrophic, calamitous default on our sovereign debt.

The proposal I worked on with Leader MCCONNELL will allow Democrats to do precisely what we have been seeking to do for months, what I have been coming down to the floor advocating since the fall: provide a simple majority vote to fix the debt ceiling without having to resort to a convoluted, lengthy, and ultimately risky process.

The Nation's debt has been incurred on a bipartisan basis, so I am pleased that this responsible action will be taken today to facilitate a process that avoids a default.

I want to thank Leader MCCONNELL for working with us on this agreement. Our multiple conversations were fruitful, candid, productive.

This is the responsible path forward: no brinksmanship, no default on the debt, no risk of another recession.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

We still have a few more steps to take before we completely resolve this matter, but I am optimistic that after today's vote we will be on a glide path to avoid a catastrophic default.

BUILD BACK BETTER ACT

Mr. President, now on Build Back Better. In the first 9 days of December, Democrats have made very good progress on some of our largest priorities for the month. We successfully avoided a needless government shutdown. We cleared the path to address the debt ceiling and avoid a default. And now we are close to passing an annual Defense bill on a bipartisan basis, as we have done for decades.

Last night, I filed cloture on NDAA and, for the information of my colleagues, we will vote early next week to move forward on this bill.

Soon we will be able to turn to another crucial item on our December to-do list: passing Build Back Better in time for Christmas. We remain on schedule to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate before December 25. Yesterday, four Senate committees released their titles of the Build Back Better Act, and the Congressional Budget Office released scores for those titles. More titles and scores are scheduled to be released this week.

For the knowledge of all Senators, the text and scores can be found online at the Senate Democrats' and CBO websites. So it is available to everybody.

Senate Democrats have also wrapped up all of our final meetings with the Parliamentarian's office. Those are the meetings where just Democrats talked to the Parliamentarian. Republicans also get their chance alone. And now we anticipate that the bipartisan Byrd bath—where both sides are together to make their case to the Parliamentarian and argue back and forth—we expect those to start next week.

I want to thank the Parliamentarian's office and all of our committee's staff for working so hard this week to bring us to this point.

For all the reasons we should pass Build Back Better, I want to talk about one in some detail this morning: extending the child tax credit.

During the holiday season, American families are looking for every option to lower costs, make ends meet. So the best thing we can do is pass Build Back Better before some critical tax breaks from the American Rescue Plan—above all, the child tax credit checks—come to a premature end. That is one thing no American should want.

COVID isn't over, and so these checks shouldn't lapse either. On the contrary, they should keep going. Roughly 35 million families will get their next $300-per-child check in the mail on December 15, and we need to assure that they will get their checks in January, too, without any glitch. As a number of outlets have reported, families are at risk of seeing these checks end after December, if we don't take action.

So let's get this done. Let's pass and enact Build Back Better into law before Christmas so families won't see their checks come to a halt in the coming months, and families, as they are doing their Christmas shopping, can be assured that new checks will be coming over the next year.

For the tens of millions of families that have taken it on the chin during COVID, an extra $300 per month, per child could be what helps the parents stand on their own two feet. That is extra money for groceries, fill up the tank at the gas station, pay for diapers.

These are not luxuries. These are not handouts. They are daily essentials that nobody should have to worry about in today's day and age. In an affluent society, no one should have to worry about these things, and that is what these checks do: they bring a little more fairness into our economy.

They say to poorer people: You can have a chance and, more importantly, your children can have a chance. That is part of the American dream.

Of course, Build Back Better will do more than that. It will, for example, provide the largest investments to date to fight climate change.

I have been working with my colleagues for months to make sure our climate investments will be robust, effective, and will lay a foundation for us to keep taking action to fight the climate crisis here in Congress in the future.

Climate change costs our country tens of billions of dollars every time that storms we used to label ''once in a century'' slam us. Build Back Better will help us address the climate crisis by lowering emissions, making our communities more resistant to disasters, and protect our planet for the next generation.

Our work on Build Back Better will keep going until we get the job done.

STUDENT LOANS

Finally, on student loans, Mr. President, as the year comes to an end, tens of millions—tens of millions—of Americans face another looming deadline they cannot afford. Soon, the Federal Government's moratorium on student loan payments will expire, and payments are set to resume in February of next year.

Yesterday, I joined with my colleagues Senator WARREN and Representative PRESSLEY to call on the Biden administration to extend the pause on student loan payments. The pause expires in January, and it has been paused because of COVID. It ought to be extended. COVID is not over, and students still have these huge burdens. They are just readjusting to life, where they may have missed school or missed jobs or not gotten fully paid. So we need to certainly pause these payments. But we also urge the administration to take the next important step in granting borrowers relief by canceling student loan debt.

As we keep recovering from COVID, as Americans are looking to cut costs and make ends meet, now is precisely the wrong time for us to allow this commonsense moratorium to end. According to one study, it could strip away more than $85 billion—$85 billion—from American families over the coming year. At a time like this, that just makes no sense. We should give student loan payers a break and keep the moratorium going.

Should the moratorium be allowed to expire, the burden will fall the heaviest on those who are least prepared to shoulder it—on low-income borrowers and borrowers of color, who typically take out more loans than White Americans and end up paying them back over a much longer time horizon.

On the flip side, the President's decision to extend the moratorium over the course of the year was precisely—precisely—the right thing to do. It has allowed borrowers to focus on saving up for these hard times, to save up for emergencies, and to pay down other forms of debt. We should keep it going.

This is about taking one commonsense, easy step to save people costs. It is about racial equality. It is about giving people more opportunities to build wealth and achieve the American dream. The administration can do it on its own. They don't need any kind of congressional approval. We know how arduous those things are around here.

Should the moratorium be extended, the administration should take further action to cancel up to $50,000 in student loan debt per borrower. Imagine the economic activity we can see if tens of millions of Americans are suddenly freed from crushing student loan debt. They can buy homes, start a business, buy a car, or help send their own kids to college. What a boom that would be for our country, especially at a time now when it is needed.

For decades, higher education was considered a ladder up for tens of millions of people—for immigrants, people of color, and working-class families—but, today, it is an anchor weighing too many down. These Americans deserve relief. They deserve help. They deserve to have the moratorium extended and their student debt canceled.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING ROBERT J. DOLE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today, the Capitol is once again hosting a hallowed tradition. The U.S. Congress just solemnly welcomed our

late friend and colleague, Leader Robert J. Dole, one final time. This most distinguished soldier-statesman now lies in state at the epicenter of our democracy. Our Nation has bestowed this honor only 33 times in its history—to Presidents, to Senators and Representatives, to heroes of war.

With today's ceremony, Bob's path aligned one last time with his Army hospital buddy's, turned longtime fellow Senator, Danny Inouye. It was amazing enough that Bob's and Danny's paths converged all the way from bedside bridge games in the 1940s to votes on this floor into the 1990s, but now they have both rested on the exact same catafalque that has held up our great statesmen, dating back to President Lincoln.

Bob Dole earned these honors many, many times over—through a heroic fight that began on Hill 913 and left lifelong scars, through accomplished service at both ends of this building, and in a bid for even higher office, conducted with integrity and grace.

Bob Dole left this Chamber a quarter of a century ago, but service to his beloved Kansas and his fellow Americans remained the focus of his life until the moment he was called home on Sunday.

The sting of losing our friend is still fresh, but we are proud to celebrate this extraordinary American—now draped in the colors to which his entire life was dedicated and already at home in eternal rest.

BUILD BACK BETTER ACT

Now, Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, on Tuesday, I shined a spotlight on Washington Democrats' proposed toddler takeover. They want to spend hundreds of billions of dollars in order to upend families' arrangements, create massive inflation in daycare costs, and attack faith-based providers.

Now, Democrats say their plan would not hurt faith-based providers because it wouldn't explicitly block them up front. Ah, but that is only a small part of the story. The reckless taxing-and-spending spree might not ban faith-based providers on day 1, but their scheme of mandates and subsidies would slowly and quietly push them out.

The Democrats' bill would deny religious providers an extra funding stream for upgrading their facilities, which their secular competitors would actually get, and their proposal would let woke bureaucrats persecute faith-based groups unless they leave their values at the door. If a Jewish daycare wants to prioritize Jewish families, they could get thrown out of the Democrats' scheme for engaging in discrimination. A Catholic facility could be kicked out if families who are registered parishioners get first dibs. If a faith-based provider decides not to hire somebody who fundamentally rejects their teachings, leftwing bureaucrats and lawyers would come after them as well. The woke mob that stalks cake bakers and florists is now coming for church daycare.

Twenty-one organizations, representing hundreds of thousands of faith-based daycares and preschools, signed an open letter to the Senate. Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and Muslims all wrote to Chairwoman MURRAY and Senator BURR.

Here is what they said:

> The Build Back Better Act will suppress, if not exclude, the participation of many faith-based providers. . . . [P]rovisions in the bill text make it virtually impossible for many religious providers to participate.

Let me say that again:

> [P]rovisions in the bill text make it virtually impossible for many religious providers to participate.

Now, the far left says that if you don't support the toddler takeover, you are somehow out of touch, but they are projecting, as it is their Big Government scheme that is out of touch with the diverse aspirations of different families.

Last year, a nonpartisan survey asked families what childcare arrangements they would ideally like. Apart from the pandemic, if finances were no obstacle, what would American parents want? The share who said ''center-based childcare'' was 27 percent. This is the only route that Democrats want to subsidize—center-based childcare. Just 27 percent of parents say that is their ideal world, and of that 27 percent, a majority prefer the faith-based options that Democrats would push out.

Now, a larger group, nearly 40 percent, said their ideal arrangement would involve full-time parenting in some form, either one parent stays home or the two trade off. Another 9 percent said they would ideally like an extended relative like a grandparent to be the caregiver. Other families would ideally want a nanny share or a neighborhood co-op.

The Democrats' daycare scheme would give all these people nothing—nothing. A family that has sacrificed so much so that a mom or dad can stay home will not get one penny for books or supplies or make up for lost wages. A grandparent who leaves a part-time job to spend weekdays with their grandkids will not get a dime under the Democrats' plan. A neighborhood nanny share gets zero help.

Forget about diversity. Forget about choice and fairness. Families would either enroll in a specific pathway that Big Labor and Big Government like best or they get nothing. Meanwhile, even in the centers that Democrats do want to subsidize, parents would get a very mixed bag.

Analysts agree the new regulations would send costs skyrocketing. The District of Columbia's local government estimates that these sorts of policies would increase the cost of daycare by roughly $12,000 per child per year. Their plan would supposedly use government subsidies to make up this new inflation, but that assistance would be confusing and uneven.

So this bill manages to be wildly inflationary and wildly unfair at the same time. That is pretty hard to pull off—wildly unfair and wildly inflationary at the same time. It insults the diversity of American families and their aspirations. It simply hands money and power to the same woke bureaucrats who are letting far-left propaganda into K–12 schools and then sending the Department of Justice after parents who speak up.

This bill would give HHS Secretary Becerra, a hard-core culture warrior, a giant slush fund to start shaping the care of babies and toddlers. And facilities and families who make different choices would be left facing a massively inflated market with zero help.

This would be an awful—awful—proposal for American families, even if it were free. But, of course, it isn't.

Washington Democrats don't just have to explain to parents why they want to make childcare more expensive, more inflexible, and more unfair; they also get to explain why they want to print and borrow hundreds of billions of dollars to do it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

GREEN RIBBON CAMPAIGN

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I am glad to be on the floor today, joined by my colleague Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM.

We all saw and remember the horrific images from this past summer when Afghanistan fell into the hands of a brutal Taliban regime. It was a difficult time for many of us, especially our veterans, our Gold Star families, and the families of the 13 servicemembers we lost during that disastrous exit, including the family of Marine Cpl Daegan William-Tyeler Page of Red Oak, IA, my hometown.

These heroes must never be forgotten. While the tragic exit from Afghanistan may have moved off of the front pages, and while it may not be top of mind for many Americans here at home, the devastating situation in Afghanistan is all too real for the hundreds of American citizens and allies who were left behind.

The reality is, right now, U.S. citizens, green card holders, and SIV-eligible Afghans are still stranded behind enemy lines in Afghanistan.

I am furious over the mishandling of this administration's exit from Afghanistan. It was a disaster from start to finish. Now, America has a duty and an obligation to get these people home or brought to safety, plain and simple.

To those who are stranded in Afghanistan today, my message to you is clear: I have not forgotten you. America has not forgotten you.

As my colleagues pointed out already, we are trying to find ways to remind Congress, the administration, and the public of those Americans who are still stranded in the country and the importance of taking action to get them home.

As a way to remind those around that our fellow Americans are still stranded and that we need to get them home, I am encouraging Iowans and all Americans to join me, to join Senators Graham and Blumenthal in wearing a green ribbon this holiday season.

We must ensure that America does not forget those who this administration has left behind.

I am proud to join my colleagues today, Democrats and Republicans, to ensure we keep the pressure on and to get these people, including our fellow Americans, home at last. We cannot and we will not let them be forgotten.

I yield the floor to Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored today to join Senator ERNST and Senator GRAHAM in this call on America to honor our commitment.

This effort is completely bipartisan, and it is about values and ideals that we share and that we should reemphasize at this time of year, at this moment in our history, at this challenging moment in world history.

We are here to support a grassroots initiative called Honor Our Commitment. Our goal is very simply to keep this cause present and real for Americans, even as we complete the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, so that we keep faith with the Afghan allies and their families to bring them to safety, to evacuate them, to enable them to escape the danger, death, and torture that threatens them now.

For 20 years, these men and women helped to protect our troops and our diplomats. They are the translators, civil servants, humanitarian workers, members of the judiciary, and others who supported the U.S. mission in Afghanistan. They were at our side, at significant risk to them, sometimes in combat. I know because one of my sons was a Marine Corps infantry officer in Helmand Province, and he felt so deeply that he had an obligation to bring to safety his translator, which he was able to do after years of effort. There are many other translators like him still in danger there who went into combat with our troops and helped to protect them. My other son is a Navy SEAL—was. He is out now. But he knows as well the importance of these people on the ground to protect them.

I fear for other parents in the future who will know their sons and daughters are in harms' way and who need those folks on the ground, the people who speak the language, who know the culture, who have friends in the community. How can we ask them to serve us when we are engaged in the same kind of conflict, if we fail to honor our promises to these men and women in Afghanistan who now have targets on their backs only because they helped us in moments of danger and crisis?

Most of my colleagues, I think, share these feelings of apprehension and anxiety on behalf of those men and women who now are in hiding, many of them with their families, trying to get out.

I strongly believe that honoring our past commitments, keeping our promises, as every great nation does, means establishing a clear, consistent, compassionate strategy for the evacuation and settlement of all of these individuals and their families. That is why I have called repeatedly for an evacuation czar, with clear Presidential direction and authority to implement such a strategy and coordinate all of the numerous Federal Agencies, with all of their individual responsibilities and authority, to evacuate and resettle our at-risk Afghan allies and their families.

Our at-risk Afghan allies deserve no less. That is what I have said to the President of the United States in a letter that I have written to him personally. That is the reason that I offered an amendment with Senator GRAHAM and Senator ERNST, which, unfortunately, was not included in the final version of the National Defense Authorization Act. And that is why I enlisted colleagues to support it. And, indeed, it has broad bipartisan, broad bicameral support to establish a strategy—very simply a strategy—to support the mission of evacuating those at-risk Afghan allies.

I am saddened that the Congress has failed to require this basic plan and fulfill our moral obligation. That legislation directed the administration to develop a plan that would provide for an initial, expedited security screening and vetting, conducted remotely, if necessary, to get our allies out of Afghanistan as quickly as possible.

We need to encourage rapid departure by air charter and land passage because the United States has no presence diplomatically or militarily. Those charter flights, the on-land passage, are the only means of escape right now, and the situation of these at-risk Afghan allies and their families is increasingly dire and dangerous.

There are numerous humanitarian flights, independently organized and funded by nonprofit organizations, to expedite the evacuation process in parallel to U.S. Government efforts. We ought to encourage that assistance, not create bureaucratic hurdles to hobble these efforts.

We need a strategy to have our government engaged with relevant countries to facilitate transport to third countries—or lily pads, as they are called—where more rigorous and thorough security screening and vetting can be completed before onward movement to the United States or other locations for resettlement.

So I am disappointed—in fact, I am angry—that this amendment was not included in the National Defense Authorization Act, but I am committed that we will honor this commitment to these at-risk Afghan allies and families, and I am heartened by this green ribbon initiative.

And that is why I am wearing a green ribbon today and why my colleagues, I hope, will do so as well and why I thank my friend Sid Goodfriend of Greenwich, CT, for initiating this effort—and all of his support network.

I want to close by thanking our veterans. I have been inspired over these last weeks and months by their determination to enable those Afghan allies who served them to escape the danger in Afghanistan. Their steadfast commitment is a part of the reason why I feel we need to honor our commitment.

Those veterans and NGOs, the network of people, the coalition of groups that has worked so hard to evacuate allies against all the odds—and my office has been proud to work with them—have inspired me.

I call on my colleagues in both parties and in both Chambers of Congress and the executive branch to continue this work until we enable every at-risk Afghan ally to leave Afghanistan. To do any less is an immense tragedy, and it will forever stain the honor of this country if we fail to complete this mission.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to—before Senator BLUMENTHAL departs—thank him so much for bringing this to my attention. And it came from his constituent—the idea—Sid Goodfriend, who has truly been a good friend to this cause.

And Senator BLUMENTHAL I find to be always willing to work with you where he can. And the fact that he has a son who served as a Marine infantry officer and a son who is a Navy SEAL speaks volumes to his family. And to those two young men, who served at the highest level in the military, thank you very much.

Mr. Goodfriend came to us with the idea of what can we do to not let America forget. Afghanistan is hell on Earth right now. Twenty-three million people are virtually starving to death. ISIS is at war with the Taliban. Al-Qaida is growing in influence. And people inside of Afghanistan are living a miserable life. Those who helped us are being hunted down. Special operations commandos are now having to choose between joining ISIS or dying.

And the point here is not to focus on how we got here. I have got my views; Senator BLUMENTHAL has his. We have agreed, when it comes to going forward, we have to be together. And there is plenty of blame to go around, so we don't need to beat on one group versus the other right now. What we need to focus on is what is next.

And Senator BLUMENTHAL's legislation that I joined with to create a plan, an evacuation czar, is the bare minimum we need to be doing. Out of

sight, out of mind does not work in this environment.

''Honor our commitment'' is a phrase we use to describe what we are trying to achieve. You can't fight these wars by yourself. If America has to go it alone in the war on terror, it is going to be a very dark period for the United States.

The goal is to get people in the faith, in the region, to fight back against the radical Islamic movement that would take the whole world into darkness. And the good news is, for 20-something years, people fought. The Afghans died in large numbers in the last 5 years. I don't think we lost a soldier in 18 months. God bless the fallen and God bless the injured, but to say that the Afghans weren't fighting is just a dishonor to those who fell.

And now we are out, and we have left behind people who had a choice between standing up to the Taliban and ISIS and al-Qaida and siding with us. They chose us, and now we are gone. We cannot forget them.

I promise you, how we handle the next year or two in Afghanistan will determine what kind of a national security future America has. People are testing us all over the world right now.

I would like to work with Senator BLUMENTHAL and others when it comes to Ukraine. I want to introduce sanctions with a national security waiver that would allow President Biden to sanction the hell out of Russia based on the military buildup that threatens Ukraine, not the actual invasion; to give him tools where he can go to Putin and say: This is what Congress, in a bipartisan fashion, thinks about what you are doing. You go forward at your own peril.

I would like to create legislation that would make sure this administration and other administrations have the direction and the tools they need to end this Afghan engagement with a sense of honor.

Honorourcommitment.org—you can go to that site and get information about the status of people in Afghanistan. We have gotten some out, but we have got a lot left behind. And this green ribbon is an effort to remind ourselves and the Nation writ large what is at stake if we abandon those who fought along our side.

I did my Reserve duty in Afghanistan on several occasions. My commitment was small in comparison to most, but I got to know the translators. I got to know the people who worked with the judges and the law enforcement officials to bring a rule of law to being in Afghanistan.

I am sure all those who served relied upon their translators for their very life—not only ''What did the guy say?'' but ''Are we safe?'' And the bravery of Afghans to side with us should be respected and honored.

And I am going to join with Senator BLUMENTHAL and ERNST and others to introduce freestanding legislation. We will try to do it before the holidays.

And the one thing I like about Senator BLUMENTHAL: He is the most tenacious guy I have ever met without being mean about it. He has a determination for his causes that is unparalleled.

I can understand why your sons went in the Marine Corps and the Navy. I think they probably get those qualities from you and your wife.

So we are going to take that quiet determination. We are not going to let this go. We are going to insist that this body vote to create a system to make sure that those who were with us get treated fairly.

To the American people: You abandon those who helped us in Afghanistan at our own peril.

This is a time of reckoning for the American people. It is a time of choosing. And I choose honor over abandonment. I choose to be a good ally, someone you can count on when the going gets tough. And I think that spirit really does describe our country.

So the green ribbon campaign—I would like more of our colleagues to wear the ribbon during the holiday season to get people who are looking to America for hope see a demonstration of our will.

If you travel abroad, you are shocked at how people view our country. We sort of fight with each other all the time that sometimes we lose sight of how important we are. When you travel throughout the world—I know the Presiding Officer does this—the people care what we think, and they watch what we do.

We still, in spite of all our differences, represent the best hope of mankind. I really believe that. I think our military represents the best spirit of mankind.

I think the men and women who fought on our behalf in Afghanistan wearing the American flag feel a sense of obligation to those who stood by them. That is why we wear the green ribbon.

Go to honorourcommitment.org.

To Mr. Goodfriend, thank you. The private sector is going to get involved. We are going to get major corporations advancing this cause.

And what can we do beyond wear the ribbon and say a prayer?

We can pass legislation that will make honoring our commitment real, not just a talking point.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 610, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Martin Heinrich, Elizabeth Warren, Patty Murray, Tammy Duckworth, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jacky Rosen, Chris Van Hollen, Jeanne Shaheen, Christopher Murphy, Ron Wyden.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 610, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 490 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Barrasso	Heinrich	Romney
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Blunt	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Burr	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cantwell	Leahy	Smith
Capito	Luján	Stabenow
Cardin	Manchin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Thune
Casey	McConnell	Tillis
Collins	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cornyn	Murkowski	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Ossoff	Wicker
Ernst	Padilla	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	
Gillibrand	Portman	

NAYS—36

Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Risch
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Sasse
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Sullivan
Fischer	Lummis	Toomey
Graham	Marshall	Tuberville
Grassley	Moran	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 36.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer and the amendment pending thereto fall.

The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2846

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Pfizer released a study this week showing how antibodies from its vaccines respond to the Omicron variant in a lab.

The company claims that three doses should provide some protection against the variant. It also showed that those who had previously had COVID and recovered demonstrated stronger immunity to the Omicron variant.

While natural immunity comes at a cost, studies have shown throughout the pandemic that it works. Those who have recovered from COVID have significant protection from both catching the virus again and from the most severe symptomatic infections. While this is not always the case, and vaccination may improve immunity further, natural immunity is real. There are data to prove that.

A study conducted in Italy showed that natural immunity is more effective than vaccines at reducing risk of future infection. Another study of half a million people in Denmark showed that natural immunity provides significant, lasting protection against infection.

Finally, a study from three separate hospitals in Israel found that natural immunity from a previous COVID infection was ''twenty-seven times more effective than vaccinated immunity in preventing symptomatic infections.''

This, of course, is good news, especially considering that natural immunity is combining with vaccinated immunity in the general population. Recent data from the Nationwide Blood Donor Seroprevalence Survey shows that almost 92 percent of Americans over the age of 16 have COVID antibodies from vaccination or infection. The vast majority of Americans have at least some protection against COVID–19—92 percent.

I believe the vaccines are generally safe and effective. I have been vaccinated, as has my family. I see these vaccines as a miracle, one that is helping protect many millions of Americans from the dangers associated with COVID–19.

But I also recognize that millions of Americans are separately protected, separate and apart from anything else that might be there, as a result of immunity built up through their natural defenses because they have previously contracted and then recovered from COVID.

Now, the science shows that this immunity is strong, that it is effective, and that it is really widespread in America. Astoundingly, that information is not frequently shared in the media and never mentioned by the Biden administration. In fact, the administration makes no effort to recognize natural immunity in its mandates or in its formal guidelines.

I have asked the Biden administration to provide clarity on its research on natural immunity as well as meaningfully address the research being conducted by other countries that show natural immunity is strong and effective and valid. However, the Biden administration has yet to respond to my inquiries, inquiries that I asked, reasonably, to be answered no later than the beginning of this week.

Tragically, tens of millions of Americans have superior protection against the virus, even from new variants, and yet this administration would still fire them if they don't comply with the administration's mandates regarding vaccination. It is as irrational as it is cruel.

I have heard from hundreds of Utahns who are worried about losing their jobs due to the mandate. They are just a few of the half a million workers who are at risk of losing their jobs in my State. There are 45 million Americans altogether who could lose their jobs due to this unconstitutional, illegal, and immoral overstep.

The Senate, thankfully, recognized that these jobs were worth saving last night. Fifty-two Senators, including Democrats and Republicans, stood with American workers. Now, that resolution could, of course, fail in the House, but it could, of course, be vetoed by the President. Nevertheless, regardless of that outcome, the Senate's statement last night rings loud and clear.

Moreover, I hold out hope that the American people are being heard—they are being heard in the Senate, as evidenced by last night's vote; they are being heard in the House of Representatives, which will take up this measure in the coming days.

I hold out hope that the House, too, will pass this measure, and I implore the President to consider allowing it to become law.

But regardless of what else happens, these workers need immediate, real, lasting protection from the threat of the mandates. One way to have a significant portion of these jobs protected is to recognize the benefits of natural immunity.

So today I am offering a bill that would require that Federal Agencies recognize, accept, truthfully present, and include natural immunity in any regulation. This bill does not say that vaccines are bad or unhelpful; it merely asks the Federal Government to respect widely available science.

I am glad to be joined in this effort by Senators BRAUN, TUBERVILLE, and SULLIVAN, who are with me as cosponsors.

This bill would keep Americans employed and help us beat the pandemic in a smart way. I urge my colleagues to support it.

To that end, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 2846 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. 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 Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, unfortunately, even though the Senate has had multiple exposures to nonsense ideas like this bill, they keep coming back.

Agencies like the CDC and NIH are already looking closely at the data on COVID–19 infection and natural immunity; they have been since the earliest days of this pandemic.

In an August ''Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report,'' CDC actually assessed data from Kentucky and found that out of a group of people who had been infected with COVID before, those who were unvaccinated were twice as likely to get COVID again than people who were vaccinated.

And a CDC report from October looked at multiple studies and concluded that vaccinating people who were previously infected significantly strengthened their immune response and reduced their risk from COVID.

In other words, being unvaccinated puts you at higher risk of being reinfected, period. Getting vaccinated is a necessary step to protect you and to protect those around you.

And now our Agencies are focused on a new variant, as we know, that appears to be spreading quickly throughout the world—Omicron.

We are in the middle of the deadliest pandemic in American history. It has killed 785,000 people and counting. If we are going to end this, if we are going to reopen our economy, if we are going to save lives, we need to get everyone vaccinated when they are eligible.

We certainly don't need politicians suggesting they know more than the experts and ignoring the data. We don't need bills meant to weaken one of our strongest tools to get this thing behind us, like the one that the Republicans have repeatedly been pressing for.

Workplace safety standards are nothing new in this country. Immunization requirements are nothing new in this country.

And let's be clear. The emergency temporary standard OSHA has put forward specifically provides employers the flexibility to offer testing as an alternative to vaccination.

People are dying every day. Families are scared and they are tired and they are angry that, even as they try so hard to do the right thing so we can end this crisis, even after all the progress we have made to rebuild our economy and get students safely back in our classes, get people safely back to work, and get unemployment back to the lowest level since before this pandemic started—all that progress, all of our hard work is at risk of being undermined by bills like this.

Can Republicans please stop wasting our time trying to take us backward and pretending they know more than the experts about this disease? Is that too much to ask? I think not.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is important to remember that the fact that someone holds a government post and is an expert in a field does not make that person capable of making laws.

Yes, there are lots of experts in our government; some of them hold high bureaucratic or other executive posts. It doesn't mean that they may make laws.

By operation of the Constitution, we are the experts for purposes relevant to making law. We are the only organ of the Federal Government that may make law.

And so anytime someone starts to say they are the experts, therefore, they get to make the law, that is a problem.

To call this a ''nonsense idea,'' to refer to this as an idea that wastes the time of the American people, ignores the plight of almost 45 million Americans whose jobs are being threatened right now.

My friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington, has made an argument against this that doesn't match her conclusion. What she is stating is not that natural immunity makes no difference—although her conclusion would seem to suggest that—what she is saying instead is that someone who has had COVID and recovered and therefore developed natural immunity could develop additional resistance to future infections by also being vaccinated.

I understand this argument. In fact, it is an argument that I myself have used. I had COVID, I recovered from COVID, and I have been fully vaccinated. But the question is not whether you can gain additional protection from that; it is whether or not you can look at an original COVID infection from which someone has recovered and accept the fact that it offers at least a comparable degree of protection as one can obtain from a vaccine.

So let's be honest about what we are and are not talking about here. We are talking about 45 million Americans whose jobs are being threatened as they head into the holidays at a time when economic conditions make that unusually intolerable—intolerable as a result of many conditions that the Federal Government itself put in place.

In all events, this is really a bare minimum of what we can do for the American people. The burden should not be on them to prove why they should not be fired—fired by a company being threatened by the President of the United States with crippling fines. This is cruel. It is barbaric. It is not authorized by statute or the Constitution. And in this circumstance, they are ignoring science.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to request unanimous consent to move qualified, uncontroversial nominees from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 300, 348, 349, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 484, 485, 569, 570, 571, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594; that the nominations be confirmed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am sorry that we had an objection because right now, the HELP Committee has more than 30 nominees who are waiting on us to confirm them. These are qualified nominees, and they should be on the job and working, overseeing critical parts of the Department of Labor and the Department of Education, leading independent Agencies, and serving in very important roles. We need to confirm them so they can get to work on behalf of the American people, especially as we continue our economic recovery. If we are going to rebuild from this pandemic, we need all hands on deck.

Many of the nominees whom I just tried to move by unanimous consent were voted out of the HELP Committee unanimously, and they have bipartisan support. But now my Republican colleagues are holding up all these nominations for manufactured reasons and in some cases, for absolutely no reason at all.

That was, by the way, not our practice during President Trump's administration or any other administration, and it should not be the practice now.

Obstructionism is not helping anyone. All this does is make it harder for Departments and Agencies to do their work and harder for our families and our communities to get the help they need.

It should not be this difficult for the Senate to perform its constitutional duty and confirm nominees who are qualified and supported by both Democrats and Republicans. Republicans are blocking or have delayed nominees who received support from every Republican on the HELP Committee, nominees who received support from bipartisan groups and who will serve in nonpartisan roles, and privileged nominees who are supposed to be fast-tracked through the Senate as part of a longstanding bipartisan practice, and that, by the way, includes a former colleague of ours, Dennis DeConcini. Every one of these nominees has gone through the full process and cleared the HELP Committee.

I am extremely frustrated that Republicans have blocked nominations despite their clear qualifications, the history of fast-tracking nominations like this in a bipartisan way, and most importantly, the critical challenge we are facing and the work that families are counting on all of us to get done. They have been blocking several other critical, noncontroversial nominees my colleagues have been pushing to confirm as well.

We have heard plenty of excuses from across the aisle, but all we know is that there is no good reason for this. We know these are qualified nominees. We know the work they are being blocked from doing is important if we are going to rebuild our Nation stronger and better. I want my colleagues across the aisle to know that we are not going to give up on this side. We are going to keep pushing to get these nominees confirmed so they can do their jobs and get to work for the people and the communities of this Nation.

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. CARDIN. Mr. 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 REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly, I am going to be making a unanimous consent request in regard to the confirmations of several nominations that are currently pending before the U.S. Senate.

My colleagues have been pointing out that these are unprecedented times with the number of Presidential nominations that have cleared our committee and cleared committees with overwhelming votes—in some cases, near unanimous votes—of people who are well qualified for the positions to which they have been nominated, but they cannot take their responsibilities, their oaths, until after we have confirmed them before the U.S. Senate.

So, for reasons unrelated to their qualifications or the need to have confirmed nominees in positions, we have seen individual objections to allowing these nominations to go forward—objections from Republican Members of the U.S. Senate. I say that because these are unprecedented. We have never seen mass numbers like we have seen in this Congress.

We have a responsibility. We have a responsibility to confirm Presidential nominations so that they can carry out the missions that we want them to carry out and the responsibilities that go with the reasons why we think it is important enough for the Senate to confirm those nominations. We then have a responsibility to take these nominations up in a timely way and act on them.

Secondly, when we have a confirmed person in position, we get greater accountability on the responsibilities of

that Agency. We have a person whom we can hold accountable because of the actions that we have taken in confirming that individual. Both are missing in regard to not having these confirmed positions.

I chair the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that deals with the management of the State Department, and I am going to be asking unanimous consent in regard to seven nominees who passed out of our committees a long time ago and have been pending in the Senate for months. There is no question as to the qualifications of the individuals, but they are not able to take on the responsibilities for why we decided it was important enough to have nominations with the confirmations of the Senate. That is just not right, and I think we need to point that out.

First, I want to just talk about the individuals, and then I will make my consent.

One is Adam Scheinman, as the Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador. The nomination has been pending before the full Senate since October 19—for over 50 days.

Adam Scheinman is the Special Representative of the President for the Nuclear Nonproliferation, a position that is essential to national security as a U.S. Special Representative on the nuclear nonproliferation treaties and the support of activities to strengthen global nuclear nonproliferation regimes. Can you think of a more important position?

Mr. Scheinman is eminently qualified for the position to which he has been nominated, and there is no stated reason not to confirm his nomination.

The second is Jack Markell, to be Representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador. Jack Markell is the nominee to be the Ambassador of the OECD, known as the heavy-weight multilateral organization in the area of anti-corruption and keeper of the OECD's anti-bribery convention, which is one of the most important international anti-corruption treaties. We all talk about our commitment to fight corruption, and yet we are holding back a confirmed ambassador to that position.

Jack Markell is a former Governor and is eminently qualified for the position to which he has been nominated. There is no reason why we should not confirm his nomination.

Marcela Escobari was appointed to be the Assistant Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID. The Assistant Administrator for Latin America and the Caribbean oversees all USAID activities in the region, including the 13 field offices for regional programs and 3 Washington, DC-based programs. Ms. Escobari served in the same position for which this nomination is being made under the Obama-Biden administration.

I must tell you, I was on a call with Senator BLUNT yesterday with regard to Colombia, the need to up our game in regard to USAID activities in that one country and so many more.

Ms. Escobari is eminently qualified for the position to which she has been nominated. Indeed, she served in this position under the Obama-Biden administration, and she should be confirmed today.

Atul Gawande has been nominated as the Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, another USAID appointment. He would lead the U.S. international health, development, and humanitarian efforts worldwide.

Now, more than ever, we know we need a confirmed person in the USAID to deal with the COVID–19 pandemic. Our leadership is desperately needed. We are asking lots of international questions today from the Biden administration. Wouldn't it be nice to have a confirmed ambassador who is responsible for this?

The nomination has been pending before the full Senate since September 29, for over 70 days.

Dr. Gawande is eminently qualified for the position to which he has been nominated. There is no good reason not to confirm him today.

Next will be Marcia Bernicat, as the Director General of the Foreign Service and Chair of the Board of the Foreign Service, Department of State.

The Director General of Foreign Service, who serves concurrently as the Director of Global Talent Management, is responsible for leading the GTM Bureau's mission of recruiting, retaining, and sustaining a diverse, talented, and inclusive Foreign Service and Civil Service workforce at the Department of State.

The position is critical in the modernization of the State Department and making sure the Department is attracting and training the necessary talent needed to tackle the challenges of the 21st century.

This nomination has been pending before the full Senate since September 13, over 86 days.

I recently held a hearing in the subcommittee on the retention and training of our State Department personnel. We had lots of questions, lots of good things we need to do. We need a confirmed administrator in order to have a person responsible to carry out the changes that we need in regard to the personnel at the State Department. There is no reason why she should not be confirmed without any further delay.

My next unanimous consent will be in regard to Julieta Valls Noyes to be Assistant Secretary of State for Population, Refugees, and Migration.

Now, more than ever, with the administration dealing with a backlog that has been heightened by COVID and with the withdrawal from Afghanistan, the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration needs to have a Senate-confirmed representative in place.

This nomination has been pending for over 50 days.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle are questioning the State Department and asking what they are doing to get people out of Afghanistan. We are asking valid questions. There is no reason to hold up this nomination from the point of view of her qualifications.

We need this position filled in order to carry out our responsibility to those Afghans who are at risk today and migrants who are at risk around the world.

Lastly, I will be asking consent with regard to Anne Witkowsky, the nominee for Assistant Secretary for Conflict and Stabilization Operations and Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization.

The Conflict and Stabilization Operation Bureau is responsible to anticipate, prevent, and respond to conflicts that undermine U.S. national interests. We are putting our national security at risk without leadership in the Conflict and Stabilization Bureau to assess how the United States will engage in emerging conflicts.

We were trying to stop conflicts from happening. We all recognize that. The risk factors couldn't be greater around the world for conflict. We need to have a confirmed Assistant Secretary responsible for this portfolio in place immediately.

This nomination was reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 4. Her nomination has been awaiting confirmation for 126 days.

Dr. Witkowsky is fully qualified and should be confirmed without further delay.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 323, 327, 328, 461, 462, and 528; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions; and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, approximately 24 hours after the attack at Abbey Gate in Kabul, I had the privilege to speak with the father of one of the marines who lost his life there, a young marine from the State of Missouri, St. Charles County, named Jared Schmitz.

His father, whose name is Mark, told me of the devastation of losing his son. He later spoke in public about his son in this way. He said:

I am very honored—

This is Mark talking about his boy Jared.

I'm very honored that I could call him my son. His life meant so much more. I'm so incredibly devastated that I won't be able to see the man that he was very quickly growing into becoming.

Thirteen servicemembers lost their lives on that day and hundreds of civilians. As a result of the botched evacuation operation, hundreds, if not thousands, of American civilians were left behind to the enemy, where hundreds still remain.

Now, I am not going to reveal the contents of my conversation with Mr. Schmitz, except to say something that he asked me, something that he told me. He told me, ''Go fight like hell,'' and that is exactly what I am going to do until there is accountability for the worst foreign policy crisis this country has suffered since the Vietnam war.

We hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle that our insistence that we actually vote on nominees is unprecedented. I would humbly suggest that the crisis into which this President has led this country is unprecedented. In my lifetime, it is unprecedented.

It is unprecedented for an American President to watch 13 servicemembers lose their lives in an evacuation for which he is responsible and then to celebrate that operation as ''an unqualified success,'' ''an extraordinary success,'' I believe were President Biden's words.

Really, an extraordinary success? Thirteen servicemembers dead, hundreds of civilians dead, hundreds of Americans left behind to the enemy—that is success? No, that is a failure. That is unacceptable.

And who has been held accountable for this disaster? No one. Who has the President fired? Who has offered their resignation? Which of the planners at the Department of State or the Department of Defense or the National Security Council has been relieved of duty? No one.

We have seen this movie before. Back to Vietnam. In Vietnam, we watched as the experts in Washington sent thousands and thousands of Americans to die, concealing the true state of the war, lying to the American people.

And what happened to the people who planned that disastrous war over all those years? Nothing. They went on to their board seats. They went on to collect their fat pension checks. They went on to be celebrated. And who was left to pick up the pieces? It was the families of the fallen. It was those who lost their lives.

Well, I, for one, am not willing to stand by and participate in that kind of theater again. I am not going to go back to the families of the fallen in my State and say that I didn't do anything while people in this body looked the other way. It is time that there was accountability.

So is this a protest that I am launching by asking the Senate to actually vote on these nominees? You bet it is. You bet it is because we don't need more leadership of the same kind in the State Department. We don't need more leadership of the same kind in the Department of Defense. We need a different kind of leadership. We need a different direction for this country.

Until there is accountability, I am going to ask that the Senate do the simple task of its job, which is to actually vote on these nominees. The least we could do is observe regular order and vote on these leadership positions at the Department of State and at the Department of Defense.

My colleague from Maryland says—and I think he is right—that we have got to put national security first. I agree with him about that. That begins at the top, with the President of the United States and the leadership of the Department of Defense and the Department of State. But I, for one, am not going to stand by and look the other way while this administration systematically endangers our national security, imperils the American people, and watches the sacrifice of our soldiers go by without any accountability, without any change in direction.

I am not willing to look the other way and just pretend it didn't happen, which seems to be the posture that many in this body have adopted. I am not willing to do that. Frankly, I can't do that because I promised the parents of the fallen that I wouldn't do that.

So I am going to discharge my responsibility. And as long as it takes, I will continue to draw attention to what happened at Abbey Gate and to demand accountability for it.

If I am still here on the floor doing this in 2023, so be it; 2024, so be it, until somebody is held accountable. I don't care who the President is. I don't care what administration it is. I want to see accountability for what has happened in Afghanistan, what happened to those servicemembers, and what happened to those hundreds of civilians who are even now left behind enemy lines to the enemy.

I would just note one other thing about the situation we are in, vis-a-vis these nominees. While I can ask that there be a vote on the floor of the Senate, I certainly can't prevent that vote. So you might ask yourself: Why in the world, if these nominations are so important—and, by the way, I agree that these are leadership positions. That is, in fact, why I am asking for a vote. These are leadership positions to the Department of State, in this case, the Department of Defense in other cases. But why in the world we haven't voted? I can't prevent a vote. None of my colleagues can prevent a vote.

The answer is, ask Senator SCHUMER. My friends control the floor. Senator SCHUMER is the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, and what has he had the Senate doing? Well, not much.

Last week, over a 3-day period—3 days—how many votes did the U.S. Senate take? One. For 2 full days, we were in session. How many votes did the U.S. Senate take on any subject? Zero. If these were such pressing priorities, why isn't the Senate majority leader putting them on the floor for a vote? I have no earthly idea other than, apparently, he just can't get his act together to do it.

Here we are. It is 2:15 in the afternoon on a Thursday.

Are we voting?

No.

How many votes have we taken today?

One.

Will we be voting tomorrow?

I doubt it.

Will we be voting next week?

Who knows. Apparently it is not that much of a priority.

So Senator SCHUMER has a lot to answer for in many regards, not the least of which is his defense of the indefensible Afghanistan debacle and the loss of life there. But he also should take a look in the mirror. And I humbly suggest that my colleagues across the aisle might want to question him as to why these nominations that they insist are so important aren't being put on the floor to be voted on.

I would be happy to vote on them anytime, but I am not going to consent to waving them through and waiving regular order until there is some accountability for the disaster that this administration has pushed upon this country and upon the people of my State.

Now, I have one other—before I object—and I am going to object, Mr. President. Before I do, I want to pick up one piece of bookkeeping item, bookkeeping issue with my colleague, the Senator from Maryland. Let me just say this while I am on that subject. The Senator from Maryland is across the aisle. I want to be clear about this with my colleague, the Senator from Maryland, whom I have worked with many times before.

I don't doubt for a moment his sincerity or his earnestness on this issue. And I know that he thinks that these nominations are pressing and that they are important, and I agree with him. And I am sure that he is frustrated by the fact that we disagree on the right way to get accountability in Afghanistan. I acknowledge that. It is an honest disagreement.

So I don't want my remarks in any way to suggest in any fashion that I question the integrity or the uprightness or the sincerity of my colleague from Maryland, and I just wanted to say to him that two of the nominations that he read out I don't have any objection to: Adam Scheinman and Jack Markell. So if the Senator were willing to reoffer those separately, I think he certainly would encounter no objection from me.

But with all of that, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would be willing to modify to get those two nominations approved. I want to be clear. I have been told that there may be other objections on the other side of the aisle. I would like to get them done right now, if possible. I would modify my request to get these two nominations done.

I have been told that there is a Republican objection to the other two nominations.

Let me just conclude this part of the discussion by saying I understand that you have a right to demand a vote, but you are requiring us to file cloture, which means basically it is a filibuster. And under the Senate rules, that requires an intervening day; it requires a vote and debate on the cloture motion; then debate time. And there are only a certain number you can get done within a period of time while other ones are pending.

So the fact that we are not able to have a process to conclude these nominations is not the majority leader's fault. It is the fault of the massive objections that are being made en bloc to qualified individuals in regards to these appointments.

And I understand the gentleman's concerns, but the American people have a right to demand that there is an accountable person to deal with nonproliferation, that there is a confirmed nominee to deal with the remaining individuals that are in Afghanistan that we are trying to get out of Afghanistan. And by denying the confirmations of these appointments, we are denying the rights of Americans to have accountable people confirmed by the Senate in regards to all of these important subjects.

So, for all those reasons, I am disappointed. I will take back to my colleagues the offer in regards to the two individuals that the gentleman mentioned. And if we can clear those two, we will try to bring them back to the floor and get them cleared. So I appreciate that offer, and we will see what we can do about getting those two confirmed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 426

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, after Watergate, Congress passed the Inspector General Act, creating independent watchdogs who would ensure integrity, transparency, and accountability for executive branch Agencies and officials.

Since then, inspectors general have played a vital role in exposing misconduct by administrations of both political parties. Over the years, IGs have proven indispensable—so much so that Congress has repeatedly expanded their ranks—originally 12 after the 1978 Inspector General Act, to now 74 separate, independent inspectors general in the Federal Government.

In 1988, Congress created several new inspectors general, including an inspector general for the Department of Justice. The IG oversees Justice Department components ranging from the FBI to the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Drug Enforcement Administration.

But there is a problem. There is a loophole. There is one clear omission when it comes to the authority of the inspector general. Listen. The Justice Department inspector general cannot investigate professional misconduct by Justice Department lawyers. Let me repeat that. The Justice Department inspector general cannot investigate misconduct by Justice Department lawyers.

This means the Department's independent inspector general cannot investigate allegations of misconduct by lawyers in the Department's National Security Division, Criminal Division, 93 offices of U.S. attorneys, or even the Attorney General himself.

Well, what does this result in?

All too often, Justice Department officials from the administrations of both political parties have escaped independent scrutiny by the inspector general.

The IG was unable to investigate, for example, discovery violations during the prosecution of our former colleague Ted Stevens. The inspector general was unable to investigate the unethical non-prosecution agreement with sex offender Jeffrey Epstein. And absent approval by the Attorney General or his deputy, the inspector general cannot investigate professional misconduct by high-ranking Department of Justice political appointees.

This lawyer loophole, of all places, is unique to the Justice Department. The Department of Justice—I want this clear for the record—is the only, only, Agency in the Federal Government whose inspector general cannot investigate professional misconduct by Agency lawyers. I hope that is clear.

Inspectors general investigate the activity and conduct of lawyers in every other Federal Agency other than the Department of Justice. Instead, DOJ lawyers get special treatment. They aren't subject to the inspector general like every other Federal agency. Instead, they are under the supervision of the Department's Office of Professional Responsibility, known as OPR.

Now, I don't dispute the skill or dedication of OPR. The problem is not their qualifications; it is their independence.

Listen to this. Unlike the inspector general, OPR reports to the Attorney General, who can control and even terminate investigations. This doesn't happen in any other Federal Agency. This creates an unfair double standard where every other DOJ employee is subject to inspector general scrutiny.

So if you are an FBI agent, the inspector general is going to be watching your conduct to make sure it is proper. Drug enforcement agents in the Department of Justice, subject to the inspector general; U.S. marshals, subject to the inspector general; Federal prison guards, inspector general. They can all be investigated by the independent inspector general, except for the lawyers. And it enables the appearance, if not the reality, of politicization in cases where the alleged misconduct involves high-ranking Department attorneys.

For years, literally decades across administrations, other Senators before us and Senator LEE and myself now have worked to close the lawyer loophole with our Inspector General Access Act. He advocated for this bill when Bill Barr was the Attorney General of President Trump. I am advocating for this bill when Merrick Garland is the Attorney General of President Biden.

You would be hard pressed to find a bill with broader-based bipartisan support. Our original cosponsors include—and he is here today on the floor—my colleague Senator GRASSLEY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee; Senators LEAHY, FEINSTEIN, RUBIO, KLOBUCHAR, CRUZ, COONS, BLACKBURN, BLUMENTHAL, and HIRONO, to name a few.

Last year, we considered this bill in the Judiciary Committee and we reported it out of the committee after a debate, and the vote was 21 to 1 to bring this bill to the floor. Unfortunately, it didn't pass last year. It passed the House. It passed again this year in the House.

This broad support reflects a basic principle: No Attorney General from either political party should be insulated from independent scrutiny by the inspector general; and no Attorney General should have veto power over the inspector general's authority to investigate Department of Justice attorneys, whether that Attorney General is a Democrat or a Republican.

Mr. President, I would like at this point to yield to my colleague Senator LEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is important to remember every Agency within the Federal Government has an inspector general. Inspectors general play an important role in every Agency, and they are there for the purpose of independently reviewing the actions of those who operate that Agency.

Everywhere you look, these inspectors general serve with independence, and what we see from them is work product that is publicly released and can be digested by the public. It is a helpful resource not only for the American people but also to us personally as Members of the U.S. Senate, who, in our capacity as Senators, have the ability and, in fact, the duty of exercising oversight over Federal Agencies.

With respect to the U.S. Department of Justice, a body that really is all about law and has a lot of lawyers, to put it very mildly, you end up with a dichotomy—a dichotomy that can't be found anywhere else.

In every other Federal Agency, the inspector general is able to do his or

her job, to conduct research, to do evaluations, issue public reports. And those reports allow us to exercise our oversight responsibilities. They also allow the American people to know what is going on in the Agency in question.

We have got a difference within the Department of Justice. If you are a lawyer within the Department of Justice, you are covered by the Office of Professional Responsibility.

Now, I want to point out a couple of differences within the Office of Professional Responsibility—between OPR, as it is called, and the Office of Inspector General. These don't reflect any idea that one is bad and the other one isn't. They are just different.

The Office of Professional Responsibility does operate on a confidential basis. It operates in secret. And I don't use that term denigratingly. It is there to perform a specific, highly specialized role.

See, lawyers have a separate set of ethical rules and standards they are expected to abide by. The Department of Justice, employing a lot of lawyers, wants to make sure that there is some degree of consistency and discipline within the practice of law. They want to make sure that the relative interests, the privacy, and the professionalism of the attorney can be balanced with their other investigative demands.

But the inspector general has a different function. The inspector general isn't there to evaluate whether or to what extent and in what way any of the highly specialized, sometimes complex, nuanced rules of professional responsibility affecting lawyers in the practice of law are concerned. No. The inspector general has a much different role.

So that is one difference, is that one has a public-facing role; the other one has a private-facing role affecting the individual attorney or attorneys under investigation.

Secondly—and this one is perhaps even more significant in its impact—the inspector general operates independently of the Attorney General. The head of the Office of Professional Responsibility, by contrast, reports directly to the Attorney General of the United States and can be fired by the Attorney General of the United States.

This is a big difference, and it is a difference we don't see replicated in any other Federal Agency—not with lawyers, not with any other regulated professional class that I am aware of—nor should we, because, if we were to do that, we would end up creating problems.

So this is not about a perceived inadequacy or a perceived culture of corruption within the Department of Justice created by the Office of Professional Responsibility.

That is not at all what I am saying. In fact, I believe the people who operate the Department of Justice, the lawyers of the Department of Justice, including those who operate the Office of Professional Responsibility, by and large do their job and do their job well and faithfully. But insofar as we allow them to do their job in such a way that it precludes any ability by the inspector general of the Department of Justice to penetrate section 8E of the Inspector General Act insofar as it insulates the operations of the U.S. Department of Justice from investigation of the sort that we have come to expect and rely on from the Office of Inspector General, it is going to be a problem.

Within the Department of Justice in particular, it is a big problem. I think it would be unwise in any Federal Agency for us to say: OK, the IG can do anything that the IG needs to do unless there is a lawyer involved. I think that would be dangerous anywhere because you do have lawyers involved, but it is especially dangerous at the Department of Justice because so much of what they do is law, is necessarily performed by people who are lawyers.

What happens is that we see countless dead ends where, because the Office of Professional Responsibility has jurisdiction, the inspector general may not tread. They hit dead end after dead end. In the absence of evidence of actual criminal misconduct, they can't proceed, and nobody else can penetrate it. It ought not take evidence of criminal accountability—of criminal liability to enable the inspector general to do his or her job.

There are myriad circumstances where someone might engage in unseemly, unethical, unwise behavior within the Department. Whether they are lawyers or whether they are not and separate and apart from whether those deviate from the professional standards imposed by the State bar of any State, by the rules of any court, or the professional standards for lawyers operating within the U.S. Department of Justice, there is an adequate, independent, freestanding interest that the American people have in being able to gain access to that information. But, alas, since 1988, section 8E of the Inspector General Act has precluded his visibility. This needs to stop.

As my friend and colleague the Senator from Illinois stated so well moments ago, this bill is not either Republican or Democratic; it is not liberal or conservative. I have been a proud supporter of this bill and sponsored this bill during a Republican administration because I believe that regardless of who is in power, we need visibility into the Department of Justice—visibility that we have in every other Federal Agency, every one. We lack it here. We lack it here with respect to a whole lot of what the Department of Justice does because of this loophole in section 8E. What benefit does this bring to the American people? To the extent there are benefits there, I respectfully submit, they don't even come close to offsetting what we lose in terms of visibility.

We need this. We need it now as much as ever. I implore my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Utah for his cosponsorship of this bipartisan measure.

I want to yield at this point to the ranking Republican member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I can't think of a single Member on either side of the aisle who has been as outspoken as Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa on the role and the importance of inspectors general.

I yield the floor to Senator GRASSLEY.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Senator DURBIN, and thank you, Senators DURBIN and LEE, for bringing some common sense to the principles of checks and balances of government.

In this particular case, it is not checks and balances between the legislative branch and the executive branch so much as it is injecting another level of checks on abusive authority within the executive branch.

So I strongly support this act and the bipartisan work of you two Senators to bring greater accountability to the attorneys at the Department of Justice.

Congress created the inspectors general to be independent. They don't just investigate whatever their Agency or Congress might want them to; the law says that inspectors general shine a light on waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal Agencies. Sometimes transparency is very uncomfortable, but it is extremely necessary.

You are not going to get real accountability if you have an Agency's employees policing themselves. Right now, the only folks who can investigate the Justice Department attorneys are other Justice Department attorneys. This system erodes public trust and creates clear conflict of interest.

For example, the Justice Department attorneys reviewed the plea agreement given to serial child sex offender Jeffrey Epstein. I note that many of my colleagues here found that internal review ''substantively inadequate.'' Those are words from my colleagues. Had the inspector general conducted the review, he might have gotten somewhere with it, just like he did with the behavior of FBI agents in the Larry Nassar case. What if we had left that investigation to the FBI to police itself?

This is why the Justice Department inspector general has identified as the Agency's No. 1 top management challenge ''strengthening public trust'' in the Justice Department. One way to fix that is to make sure the independent inspector general has the same authority over all Department employees. Why do FBI analysts and DEA agents require more independent scrutiny than Department attorneys? This is so simple that even a lawyer could get this.

I heard rumors that my friend Senator COTTON may be objecting to this—a person I agree with 90 percent of the time. It seems to be very uncharacteristic. He and I believe alike that there are two ways of doing business in the United States: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness or let the bureaucrats run everything. And I know Senator COTTON is a person who doesn't think bureaucrats should run everything. In this case, nothing is reviewable by people who make a decision not to produce this. That is the height of irresponsibility.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his spirited support of this effort. I am glad he used that classic example. Of all the hearings—and we have had many good ones and many important ones—in the Senate Judiciary Committee this year. The one we all remember is when the gymnasts came, the Olympic gymnasts came. These wonderful, young women came before us and summoned the courage to tell us about the abuse that took place by a man who purported to be a doctor, Larry Nassar.

Sitting next to them during the entire presentation was the head of the FBI, taking the medicine he should have taken, because the inspector general gave us a graphic report of how the agents at the Federal Bureau of Investigation let those young women down. When they summoned the courage to come forward and tell the world what had happened to them, it was virtually ignored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Thank goodness the inspector general was there to be critical, to produce the evidence, and to make it clear to the American people that this conduct was disgusting and deplorable and unacceptable.

The inspector general was critical for the administration of justice. Why is it any different if, instead of an attorney who works for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, we are talking about an attorney who works in a U.S. Attorney's Office somewhere in the United States or in the Department of Justice itself? It shouldn't make a difference.

As Senator GRASSLEY and Senator LEE have made clear, all we are asking for is the same level of accountability for attorneys in the Department of Justice that applies to every other Federal Agency. Why are we treating these attorneys any differently?

Senator GRASSLEY makes the point—we are succumbing to bureaucratic deference at a time when we ought to have our eyes wide open, and wide open, we would see that this bill, which was extensively debated and discussed last year and reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of Senator GRAHAM by a vote of 21 to 1, wasn't called on the calendar. We are bringing it back this year in the same manner. The bill has not changed. We are bringing it back this year, and I believe now is the time for us to do what is right for the cause of justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 426 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I oppose passage of the Inspector General Act. This bill or similar versions of it have been around for at least a decade now. To my knowledge, the Judiciary Committee hasn't had a hearing on this specific issue—certainly hasn't had one this year.

As my colleagues have said, this bill has bipartisan support, and they have a principled position on the bill. The Senator from Illinois pointed out that he supports the bill now that Merrick Garland is the Attorney General, just like the Senator from Utah supported it when Bill Barr was the Attorney General, just like the Senator from Iowa supported it when Bill Barr was the Attorney General. So it is true it has bipartisan support. Bipartisanship can cut another way as well.

To my knowledge, every Attorney General, both Democratic and Republican, has opposed this bill since the very beginning of the inspector general for the Department of Justice.

Both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Utah used the word ''loophole''—a loophole that an inspector general can't investigate attorneys in the Department of Justice. That implies it was an unintended consequence. That simply is not the case.

In 1988, when Congress created the inspector general for the Department of Justice, Congress had detailed negotiations with the Department of Justice under the leadership of Attorney General Thornburgh, and they reached a compromise to keep investigations of allegations of attorney professional misconduct within the responsibility of the Office of Professional Responsibility.

In 2007, Eric Holder—not someone whom I usually cite as an authority—after he had been the Deputy Attorney General, called an earlier version of this bill ''deleterious and unnecessary,'' and he said he ''believe[s] strongly'' that it ''would create additional opportunities for improper political concerns to influence law enforcement decisions.'' In other words, Eric Holder thought the bill would compound the problem it purported to address.

In 2017, the Department of Justice once again articulated similar concerns with the bill.

Just yesterday, I can relay, the esteemed Judge Michael Mukasey—also a former Attorney General—said that he opposed the expansion of inspector general authority into allegations of attorney professional misconduct, which has always been handled competently by the Office of Professional Responsibility. Judge Mukasey also relayed that he would be happy to testify at a hearing at a later date on such legislation.

I share some of those same concerns raised about this bill, and I think at the very least we should have a hearing on what would be a significant change in the way the Department polices allegations of attorney misconduct to study its relevance and its impact.

I want to note that the Office of Professional Responsibility historically has conducted its investigations with integrity and competence. I did not hear any allegations to the contrary today either. That is in part because it is composed of attorneys—both former prosecutors and former defense attorneys—who have decades—decades—of experience and a special expertise in legal ethics rules and the many complicated decisions any Department attorney makes in the process of charging grand jury proceedings or jury trials. The inspector general and his investigators simply do not have that expertise. The inspector general is charged with investigating waste, fraud, and abuse.

We also heard some today about independence and alleged conflicts of interest. I have to say I am also concerned that this bill would create a serious conflict of interest itself if the inspector general is given broad authority to investigate allegations of attorney professional misconduct.

The inspector general can and does refer criminal matters to Department prosecutors. Let's say a prosecutor declines to prosecute one of these referrals. An inspector general could then come up with any reason to investigate that prosecutor.

I think we all agree that the determination of who will be prosecuted or not be prosecuted lies with and must constitutionally lie with the Attorney General and that the inspector general should not be able to influence who is prosecuted or not prosecuted with the looming threat of potential investigation.

I, of course, as the Senator from Iowa said, do not want to see a government of the bureaucrats. But I would point out that the inspector general is a bureaucrat. The Attorney General is a politically accountable officer of the United States.

I also have concerns that this bill could empower criminals.

Criminals can additionally use the inspector general to try to harass Federal prosecutors by making unfounded targets of Federal investigations. With the wrong inspector general and with the wrong political climate, a career prosecutor could be under pressure by leftwing jailbreak advocates into dropping cases against violent criminals,

pursuing cases against police officers who have broken our laws. It is not surprising that this bill is supported by leftwing groups such as the ACLU, Demand Progress, and the Brennan Center.

The inspector general could easily weaponize professional misconduct investigations also to defeat anti-crime policies the executive branch chooses to pursue. Imagine, for instance, an inspector general who refused to dismiss allegations of racism when the U.S. Attorneys' Office simply chooses to prioritize gun prosecutions in high-crime areas. Such investigations have a chilling factor, of course, on other offices for prioritizing similar prosecutions.

We also heard some about transparency. But I would note this bill does not necessarily provide more transparency, because, just like the Office of Professional Responsibility, the inspector general is governed by the Privacy Act, rules pertaining to grand jury materials and court orders sealing documents. This bill would not change that.

If it is punishment and sanctions that the bill is concerned about, I would also note that the Office of Professional Responsibility is not responsible for the legal level of discipline imposed. That falls, instead, to the Professional Misconduct Review Unit, the unit created by then-Attorney General Eric Holder in 2014. Expansion of inspector general jurisdiction would not change where that responsibility falls.

I, of course, share concerns with my colleagues about politically motivated prosecutions or prosecutions pursued by so-called glory seekers. But I do not want to proceed down a path where we unintentionally exacerbate the very problem we are trying to solve. Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I am disappointed by the objection by the Senator from Arkansas.

This has overwhelmingly bipartisan support in the House and in the Senate, and we had an opportunity to make history today and we missed that opportunity for the moment.

The suggestion that inspectors general are not up to the job of inspecting attorneys, I am afraid if you look at the fact that every other Federal Agency's lawyers are subject to review and scrutiny by the inspector general of their departments, it certainly says that particular observation is not accurate.

The argument that the Attorney General, because he is approved by the President directly and by Congress, should be the person to make this decision overlooks the obvious. Each inspector general goes through the approval process, the nomination process, and advise and consent of the Senate. So they are subject to the same level of scrutiny.

I might also add that what we are suggesting has been an evolution that I think really calls for this change that we have asked for in this measure. In the course of that evolution, in the year 2002, the inspector general's responsibilities were extended within the Department of Justice to apply to both the FBI and DEA agents who are involved, obviously, in significant law enforcement operations within the Department. The inspector general has handled that responsibility without jeopardizing any prosecutions. So I think that argument is certainly a weak argument when you look at the facts since 2002.

We will return with this. I am glad to have bipartisan support of Senators LEE and GRASSLEY, who will have more to say on the subject.

I believe if we are going to apply this standard of IG responsibility for lawyers' activity across Federal Government, there is no reason to make an exception for the Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I agree with and echo the observations made by my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois. I would like to add a couple of things in response to the observations and remarks presented by the Senator from Arkansas.

One of the points that he made that I feel compelled to respond to is he expressed concern about what he describes as potential weaponization of—I feel compelled to respond, in particular, to his argument that the Inspector General Access Act could result in the weaponization of allegations of attorney misconduct within the Department of Justice and that this could be used in circumstances to intimidate, threaten, and harass Department of Justice attorneys, including prosecutors, for either taking or not taking actions in retaliation to the same.

This is always a concern. It is a concern that follows government, generally. It is, in particular, a concern that follows Federal prosecutors. It is also not a concern that is unique to the Inspector General Access Act.

With or without passage of this, there is always a risk of that happening. Nothing about that risk that we immunize ourselves from by leaving intact the loophole—and it is a loophole. It is a deliberate carve-out in Section 8E of the Inspector General Act. It is a loophole. And my friend from Arkansas is right, it is not unintended. It is intentionally created. It was there for a reason. I don't mean to suggest any nefarious motive on the part of those who created it, but it might have been a shortsighted move at the time. It has, at least, in time, exposed a vulnerability in Democratic and Republican administrations alike.

If the risk is weaponizing allegations of professional misconduct against Department of Justice lawyers, that is not something that we are immune from today. It is something that I am certain the Office of Professional Responsibility deals with all the time. It doesn't mean we make ourselves more vulnerable to it. It is simply by allowing the inspector general of the Department of Justice to do his or her job without regard to who is a lawyer and who is not, and without regard to this special carve-out for this one Federal Agency that makes it different from every other Federal Agency, including what makes Department of Justice lawyers different from attorneys in every Federal Agency.

If the risk is that you might have people who, for bad reasons, might make up allegations of misconduct, there is no more risk of that with an inspector general than there is with the Office of Professional Responsibility.

Here, again, they perform different functions. One of them is there specifically to deal with the rules of professional responsibility within the practice of law by Department of Justice lawyers. That is their focus. Their focus is not a broad one. Their focus does not include or extend to issuing a public report to inform the public about abuses of power.

My friend from Arkansas is right. They can go in—if there are allegations of criminal misconduct and if they have evidence of the same that they have to pursue—yes, they can do that. That doesn't mean we don't need an inspector general capable of doing the job of the inspector general.

He also made the argument that there is no expertise among and between inspectors general with regard to handling allegations of attorney misconduct. If that is true, the same can be said of all other attorneys and all other departments.

My friend from Arkansas does correctly point out that attorneys within the Department of Justice—at least some of them do—perform different functions than what we see from attorneys in other Federal Agencies. That part is true. But that doesn't mean inspectors general assigned to the Department of Justice don't have the expertise necessary to investigate the types of allegations that they typically investigate.

My friend from Arkansas also points out inspectors general tend to focus on allegations of waste, fraud, and abuse. Yes, this is absolutely true, and this is absolutely why we should not limit the access that inspectors general in the Department of Justice have to attorneys. Remember, this is a department that is all about law. It is focused on law. It is, therefore, not surprising that they have an unusual abundance of lawyers.

You know what the Office of Professional Responsibility is not focused on—is not really their role; they are not involved in; they are not trained in—their focus is not on issuing public reports and informing the American

people of allegations of things like waste, fraud, and abuse, generally. They have a much narrower function and perform that function especially well. They perform it laudably, and they do a great job of doing it.

It is not the same thing as an IG. We need IGs with access to visibility into the Department of Justice. We don't have it now. We haven't since 1988. Thirty-three years is long enough. Let's close the 8E loophole and give the Department of Justice inspector general the access needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, do you hear what I hear?

Before the prancing and pawing of each little hoof of Santa's eight tiny reindeer will be heard on the roof, there is a joyful sound that denotes the coming of the yuletide season in just a few instantly recognizable notes.

Of course, I am talking about Mariah Carey's ''All I Want for Christmas Is You.'' While it has become a holiday classic, the song is taking on a whole new meaning this season.

If, like Mariah, you don't want a lot for Christmas and don't care about the presents underneath the Christmas tree, this may be your year. That is because Bidenomics is causing everything to be back-ordered, delayed, unavailable, or just plain unaffordable. Even Christmas trees are in short supply. So don't be surprised if your only option to deck the halls this year looks like Charlie Brown's sad little twig of a fir tree branch.

Whether shopping at a store or online, we are all experiencing it. With the cost of gifts up 20 percent and consumer prices surging to the highest level in over 30 years, you are paying a ho ho whole lot more for a ho ho whole lot less; that is if you can even find what you are looking for.

Perhaps the most telling sign of the times, the Dollar Tree—which had to discontinue selling some of its popular products due to cost constraints—is raising prices to $1.25.

President Biden's contribution to this year's season of giving could best be summed up by an elf on an empty shelf. After all, the Biden administration has ignored, dismissed, and even contributed to the conditions causing these economic hardships.

Speaking at the White House just last week, the President actually claimed his efforts have resulted in ''shelves across the country being well-stocked.'' That may be true at his White House gift shop, but not in the stores in Iowa and across the country. The supply chain problem is such a mess, not even Rudolph with his nose so bright can guide all of the barges stuck at sea into port by Christmas night.

The Democrats' out-of-control spending spree and misguided economic policies, like paying people not to work for most of the year, have decreased both the availability of goods, as well as the value of the money in your wallet.

For folks in Iowa and the rest of the Nation who are working longer hours due to labor shortages or just to keep up with the skyrocketing prices, this has created a real-life ''Nightmare Before Christmas.''

As a result, a record number of Americans say they won't be buying gifts this year. But rather than addressing these concerns, ''Bare Shelves Biden'' is pushing his so-called Build Back Better Act, which itself is a Christmas tree bill adorned with something for every leftwing special interest group and topped off with a massive $300 billion tax break for coastal elites.

For those millionaires on their wish list who literally have everything, DC Democrats are wrapping up a generous tax cut worth nearly $17,000. To no one's surprise, those benefitting the most from this tax giveaway live in or around the San Francisco Congressional District represented by Speaker NANCY PELOSI; and the State of New York, home of the Senate majority leader. It is a lot like a plot twist to Charles Dickens' classic, ''A Christmas Carol.''

But instead of learning to embrace the giving spirit of Christmas, Scrooge receives a tax handout paid for out of the pockets of essential workers struggling to provide for their own families. What a bunch of humbug.

Santa Claus, I don't know if you are listening, but if you are, when you're making your list and checking it twice, remember that President Biden promised taxpayers that his Build Back Better plan costs zero dollars, doesn't waste any money on tax breaks for the wealthy, and adds—you guessed it—zero dollars to the national debt.

To no one's surprise, that promise ended up being a fa-la-la-la-lot of malarkey. The truth is the Biden bill costs $1.7 trillion, adds $376 billion to our debt and gives a huge tax cut to millionaires.

While the President certainly deserves a stocking full of coal for breaking his promises to taxpayers, even coal is in short supply at the moment, and the price has soared to the highest level in more than 12 years.

Other energy prices, whether to warm your home or fill up the gas tank of your car, are also up sharply. The President has done his part to limit fuel supplies by signing Executive orders to further restrict access to oil and gas.

After enduring nearly 2 years of making sacrifices, folks should not have to now choose between heating their house, buying food for their families, or putting gifts under the tree.

So rather than passing another one of President Biden's budget busting bills, the best gift that Washington can give taxpayers is to keep this from being a blue Christmas and simply stop making matters worse.

Folks who have worked hard all year desperately deserve a break from the economic pressures being caused by Bidenomics so they can enjoy some time with their families. And unlike last Christmas, we can once again rediscover the true meaning of this holiday season by spending time with those we love the most, just like Mariah sings about, ''Make my wish come true, all I want for Christmas is you.''

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Well, following on the Christmas season message that we just heard, this season is around the corner, and Democrats are scrambling very, very hard to deliver on their liberal wish list before the end of the year. And that's not a Christmas list that people—or an agenda that people are going to accept very well, from what I've heard about the opposition to the trillions of dollars that they are trying to spend.

This grab bag of long-sought, new government programs is a top priority for Washington Democrats. Meanwhile, the bigger concern that I hear around Iowa is rising prices on everything from gas, to food, to home goods.

Americans doing their holiday shopping this year are finding items out of stock and, when in stock, paying far more for less. Even the Christmas tree is no exception. Christmas tree prices are up 30 percent.

Overall, consumer prices were up 6.2 percent on an annual basis in the month of October—a 31-year high. Economists polled by the Wall Street Journal expect November inflation to shoot up to 6.7 percent. Even some analysts are saying that it could be closer to 7 percent.

Americans are experiencing the highest inflation in a generation. The last thing they need for Christmas is another Democrat spending boondoggle further fanning the flames of inflation.

They ought to listen to their own Democrat economists. Larry Summers, former Secretary of Treasury in the Clinton administration, Council of Economic Advisers in the Obama administration, warning us in January, again in April, again in August, again in October, I saw on television. They're pouring fires on the—gasoline on the fires of inflation.

Unfortunately, unless our voices of reason within the Democratic Party prevail, that's exactly what they are going to get, more inflation. Democrats say there is nothing to worry about because—to quote Treasury Secretary Yellen—their bill is, ''fully paid for.''

We know that's not true. But even the Washington Post isn't buying Yellen's statement, and they said that by awarding the Secretary two Pinocchios for her comment. The reality is Democrats pull every budget trick in the book in an attempt to cloak the reckless tax-and-spending spree with the illusion of fiscal responsibility.

However, even their budget sleight of hands fail to mask the upfront inflationary pressures embedded in that

very bill. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office—CBO, as we call it around here—their bill contains hundreds of billions of dollars in deficit spending in each of the first 5 years.

That means that, regardless of what Democrats say, their bill will add to inflation pressures now when it matters most. Under honest assumptions, the deficit spending never stops.

According to the Penn Wharton Budget Model, their analysis, if their spending proposals are permanent, as they intend, their plan would increase debt and deficits by more than $2 trillion over 10 years. As a result, by 2050, government debt would be 24 percent higher, economic growth will be 3 percent higher, and wages of the middle class would be 1.7 percent less than they would otherwise be.

Now, they go by the bill, building back better. Sounds to me like all of this is building back worse. So I urge my Democratic colleagues to pursue and rethink the approach. Securing a near-term ideological win is not worth the risk of spurring unchecked inflation, sapping the value of America's hard-earned dollars.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, one thing you can say for the Democrats so-called Build Back Better plan is that it provides a never-ending supply of bad proposals to talk about. And the bad Build Back Better measure I want to discuss today is Democrats' plan to double the size of the IRS—yes, double the size of the IRS.

The IRS is not exactly the most popular government Agency, and with good reason. The Agency has gained for itself a reputation for poor taxpayer service and, most seriously, for mishandling the confidential information—taxpayer information it has access to.

In fact, the IRS was subject to a massive leak or hack of private taxpayer information mere months ago—information that somehow ended up in the hands of advocates at ProPublica. And neither Treasury nor the IRS has provided meaningful followup about the data breach, much less any accountability.

For months, Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee have pressed the administration for details about the breach of private taxpayer information. I would have hoped by now that my friends on the other side of the aisle would have shown similar concern for the privacy of the American taxpayer.

And who could forget the IRS scandal during the Obama administration, when the IRS targeted a number of organizations based on their political beliefs?

Those are two notorious examples of IRS misconduct, but there are plenty of others.

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration has repeatedly found instances of IRS agents violating taxpayer rights. And then there is the Agency's record of irresponsibility or incompetence, or both—losing track of laptops that may have contained sensitive taxpayer information, rehiring employees who'd been fired for bad behavior, work delays due to a lack of simple printer maintenance, hanging up on taxpayers who call the IRS for information.

Customer service departments, in general, can be frustrating, but at least at many companies you can reach an actual person in a fairly reasonable amount of time. If you call the IRS, you have a 1-in-50 chance of reaching a human being—1 in 50.

I could go on, but suffice it to say that there are good reasons why Americans tend not to be big fans of the IRS and why they think this Agency already has too much power.

But Democrats would like to double the size of the Agency. The Democrats' bill would add 87,000 new IRS employees—87,000. That's enough employees to fill an entire football stadium with some left over; 87,000 is more than the population of Rapid City, SD, the second largest city in my home State.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that increasing the size of the Agency in this way would result in significantly higher audit rates of American taxpayers. Many of those audits would hit middle-income taxpayers and small businesses; in other words, individuals without easy access to an army of accountants to help them navigate the process and ensure that their rights are protected.

Democrats' primary reason for the IRS expansion is to raise revenue, to help pay for their partisan tax-and-spending spree. They claim that hiring all these new IRS agents and employees will allow them to close or reduce the tax gap—the difference between taxes owed and taxes paid.

But there are a couple of problems with that. In the first place, it is extremely doubtful that they will be able to raise the money they claim they will be able to raise. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office doesn't even score hoped-for revenue from enforcement since it considers the acquisition of that revenue to be so uncertain.

And even if Democrats are able to raise a meaningful sum from increased enforcement, what exactly is it going to cost Americans for Democrats to recapture this money?

Increased scrutiny and costly audits of law-abiding taxpayers. IRS intimidation and harassment.

And just in case anyone thinks I am exaggerating about that intimidation, I would note that a provision in the House version of the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending spree would repeal a measure requiring written approval of a supervisor before an IRS agent can access—or I should say, can assess any penalties.

The provision was intended to prevent overreaching IRS agents from threatening Americans with unjustified penalties. And it is hard to imagine why Democrats are trying to repeal this measure if they are not trying to pave the way for much more aggressive IRS pressure and enforcement.

And I haven't even mentioned the provision that was in Democrats' proposal for a long time and which some Democrats, including the President's Treasury Secretary and other administration officials, would still—still—like to see included, and that's a provision that would empower the IRS to snoop on the details of Americans' bank accounts.

Under one version of this provision, the IRS would be able to sift through the bank records of any American with just $600 in annual transactions. In other words, the IRS would be able to look through the bank records of just about every American and find out just how much you spent on Starbucks or your last doctor's bill or that new winter coat.

It is staggering that the Democrats could even contemplate giving that much power to an Agency that has a track record of mishandling sensitive taxpayer information. But that is the kind of power the President's Treasury Secretary, for one, would like this Agency to have.

With their so-called Build Back Better plan, Democrats are proposing a massive expansion of government, and we are apparently just supposed to take it on faith that the government will be able to handle all these new responsibilities.

Well, I have to say, I—and I would say many other Americans—have my doubts. And the IRS provides a perfect example of why.

The IRS can't even properly handle the staff and responsibilities it already has, and yet Democrats think it is a good idea to double the size of this Agency and give it new enforcement powers and, if some have their way, expanded access to Americans' personal information.

Doubling the size of the IRS is a terrible idea, and it is one more reason why Build Back Better is a bad deal for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, when the Grinch stole Christmas, it was a relatively simple operation, one that required a relatively simple solution.

Unfortunately, cold, unfeeling regulations and entrenched bureaucracies do not have undersized hearts; hearts that can somehow grow three sizes.

Protectionist laws and labor support shortages do not warm to holiday cheer.

The COVID–19 pandemic has caused our already deeply troubled economy problems, and it has caused our already deeply troubled supply chain to become mired with challenges of all sorts, including truckdriver shortages, outdated port technology, lack of container storage capacity, port labor difficulties, and scarce freight equipment.

In fact, as situations become more dire with the supply chain crisis, with inflation, and with shortages all over the country, our own regulations do a whole lot to delay and disrupt solutions that we need the most at the time we most need them.

Americans are feeling the pain of skyrocketing prices, of shipping delays, and empty shelves as our laws and bureaucracies fail to respond to shipping backlogs and labor shortages. The system just is not working. And President Biden's press release policies have not fixed it. In fact, they have made it much, much worse.

Like so many problems during his Presidency, President Biden is not touching them with a 39½-foot pole.

As the holidays are here, we see the problems continuing to mount. And these problems needed solutions many, many months ago, but there is still hope. My STOP the GRINCH Act can help us fix the supply chain crisis and save Christmas.

This is a bill that focuses on the problems that are actually slowing down our supply chain, and it is a bill that, if enacted, would get products off of ships, onto trucks, and into stores so that people in Utah and across the Nation could get the things they need for everyday life and especially for Christmas.

By suspending a number of Federal restrictions on ports, on ships, and on trucks, we can help clear the backlog at our ports, get products onto shelves, and get the presents under the trees.

The bill will help solve our truck-driver shortage by temporarily lowering the commercial driver license age to 18 for interstate travel, and it would waive for 1 year the hours-of-service requirements, specifically, for those involved in transporting containers into and out of ports.

The bill would allow for more ships to move more freely and to move cargo between American ports by waiving the Jones Act, and it would also allow for Federal land that has been designated as appropriate for multiple use to be used to temporarily store cargo containers. That would do a lot in and of itself to help us break our port logjams. A combination of these things would do so masterfully.

And, finally, my bill would help ease the lack of freight equipment by allowing excess Department of Defense equipment to be used to help move cargo. A lot of our problems can be traced to a lack of available truck chassis, and if we open up those that are deemed excess, we can do a lot to move freight.

While this bill doesn't address every challenge with our supply chain, it does provide tangible solutions that, if enacted into law, would solve real problems right now.

Look, we can end this nightmare before Christmas. We can stop the Grinch, save our holidays, and secure our economy.

My STOP the GRINCH Act is the start to a merry Christmas and a happy new year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, we are less than 3 weeks away from Christmas, and Joe Biden has run this country into the ground.

I know President Biden thinks that Santa can solve his problems, but our supply chain is such a mess not even Santa Claus, with all of his Christmas magic, can fix it.

There are nearly 100 ships waiting to dock in California ports. About 40 of them are a few miles off the coast, but more than 50 are holding back farther in the Pacific. It looks to me like the Biden administration didn't like the visual.

I recently received a letter from a grandmother in New Smyrna Beach, FL. She is retired now but was a small business owner who has spent her life working hard to support her kids and grandkids.

I have the letter with me. In her letter she writes:

> I am worried about inflation. I see prices of fuel, groceries, and staples going through the roof. I see the American standard of life declining. It is getting harder and harder for families to make ends meet, buy a home, afford medical care and higher education for their children.

She also tells me that Joe Biden's unconstitutional vaccine mandate is putting her husband at risk of losing his job, despite the fact that he worked throughout the pandemic as an essential worker.

She is not alone. She shares the exact same concerns as millions of Americans and businesses right now that are reeling from the impacts of Biden's socialism.

The Pantry of Broward County, FL, usually supplies meals to 500 families each month, but they weren't able to donate as many Thanksgiving turkeys this year because of skyrocketing prices.

And there are other terrible stories in the news across my State every day.

I heard about a single father of three in Clearwater, FL, who lost his job due to COVID, and at his new job he is having to stretch each dollar as far as it can possibly go as prices for meat, food, rent, everything goes up and up and up.

I heard about a woman who delivers groceries in South Miami. She is seeing prices going up and having to send pictures of empty shelves to her online customers to show grocery stores are out of so many products. She can hardly ever find any juice boxes for her own children.

These are the stories of real Floridians, and I could keep going because Florida families and families all across our great country are struggling as Biden's inflation and supply chain crisis rages on.

Now, most people, when they are in charge, they want to do something positive when a problem arises. When the families are struggling, leaders should want to solve a problem.

What is shocking is that even as ships wait in docks, in ports—wait to dock in ports and families are forced to count their pennies and sometimes even go without certain products, the Biden administration is doing absolutely nothing.

Secretary Raimondo and Secretary Buttigieg would rather play TV commentator than actually travel to California and solve some of these problems facing our distributors. Instead of coming to the Senate Commerce Committee to testify about what actions they are actually taking, they would rather stay silent. If they don't want to show up and do the job they signed up for, I have heard there is an opening at CNN.

Energy prices are up, and families who are simply trying to stay warm during the winter season are going to face higher bills, just as gas prices and food prices continue to climb.

The American people are fed up with President Biden's utter lack of leadership. Time and time again, I have come to the floor to try to get some information about this crisis, but Senate Democrats have stood in the way.

When I came down to demand notes from internal meetings the Biden administration held about the signs of inflation they were seeing, Democrats blocked—blocked—it. When I walked down here to request a report about the factors causing the energy prices to rise, Senate Democrats blocked it. When I came down here to pass bicameral, commonsense legislation that would alleviate the supply chain crisis facing our ports, Senate Democrats blocked it.

This isn't how Washington should be working. I came here to make Washington work for Florida families, but Democrats in this body are joining hands with the White House to institute policies that make life more difficult and more expensive.

This isn't government for the people; this is Big Government that hurts the people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, in case anyone was wondering, there are 16 days left before Christmas—16 shopping days.

Now, I know I still have some shopping to do, and I look forward to that, but it seems as though some of my colleagues have a jump on me. Seems as though President Biden has a jump on me, and that is good thinking because this year you can't start too early, with the supply chain as bad as it is and the price of presents rising.

So why don't we gather around the Christmas tree to see what gifts national Democrats are prepared to pass out on Christmas morning, thanks to their reckless tax-and-spending spree.

To the leftwing labor unions, what do they offer? Democrats are gifting billions of dollars in handouts to strengthen this core constituency of

theirs. While they are letting charitable deductions expire in Build Back Better, they have gift wrapped an above-the-line tax deduction for union dues.

Let's see what we have here.

Well, that is a car. That is a car. And this is the labor union present. Hmm. As a special Christmas surprise, it seems that the Democrats have put under the tree a shiny new tax credit for electric vehicles but only if those vehicles are made in a union shop—only a union shop.

You see, if you are naughty, and you buy an electric vehicle from a non-union shop, like those that are made in my State of Indiana, you will miss out on the Democrats' $4,500 holiday giveaway in this bill. Apparently, during the Christmas season, the impact of electric vehicles on climate change only matters if the workers' contracts are collectively bargained.

Which brings us to another gift we have, and that is China. China has a gift under the tree. Why don't we just open this China gift. Well, that is a lot of money. The tax hikes on businesses large and small in this bill will give China an unfair competitive advantage. Increasing taxes on American employers by more than $800 billion, when they are already struggling with supply chain issues and worker shortages—this is going to do very little to bring jobs back home, jobs of the future here in the United States of America, which is exactly why the Chinese Communist Party and all of its leaders will love this very expensive gift.

And the largest gift under the Washington Democrats' tree goes to—is that—could that be? It says ''the rich.''

I am going to see what is in there.

Well, this must mean—it says SALT. By dramatically increasing the cap on the State and local tax deduction, or what is known around here as SALT for short, the once-proud party of the working class is giving a tax cut to two-thirds of people earning more than $1 million a year. Now, the average size of that tax cut is almost $17,000 a year for millionaires. This is the new Democratic Party.

Merry Christmas. This is the single most expensive tax expenditure in the Build Back Better Act, and it is the second biggest component of the entire bill.

So, evidently, the national Democrats believe it is better to give than to receive from millionaires so they proposed a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans from the wealthiest cities in the wealthiest States, gift wrapped from the Democratic Party.

So after the handouts and giveaways and entitlements and earmarks, what is left for regular, middle-class working stiffs?

Well, we know that really big gifts come in smaller packages. So I see this stocking here that says ''taxpayers'' on it. Let me see what is in here.

Oh, my word. That looks like coal—a lump of coal. That lump of coal must represent the massive $367 billion that will be added to the debt by the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending bill, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, not to mention the 10 years of tax increases included in the bill to pay for only a few years of policy changes.

Of course, we all know that figure is going to be much higher in reality. If all the temporary provisions in this bill are made permanent, it will increase our budget deficit by nearly $3 trillion in this decade. It seems the Democrats want our children and grandchildren to pay for this bundle of goodies through the layaway plan.

GDP is expected to fall because of Build Back Better. The cost of living is expected to rise even more because of Build Back Better. And despite the promises of President Biden and my Senate Democratic colleagues, despite their votes right here on this floor, if Build Back Better were to become law, taxes would be raised on lower and middle-class Americans who are just trying to get by this Christmas season.

Ho, Ho, Ho. Ladies and gentlemen, boys and girls, this Christmas season Democrats are not offering holiday jobs or good cheer. Instead, this feels more like the nightmare before Christmas.

Colleagues, the best present that all of us can give the American people is to do whatever is in our power to stop the Build Back Better Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Indiana. What he didn't have under that Christmas tree or in the stocking was a lump of coal because I guess a lump of coal is not something we would find in Build Back Better. Even though there is a lot of stuff in there that is really bad for our economy right now, bad for our families, bad for our workers. And when you think about it, right now, we are in a time of high inflation, supply chain difficulties, record levels of debt and deficit, and an uncertain economy due largely to the uncertainty regarding COVID and particularly this variant, the Omicron.

So this is not a time for us to be putting forward a massive new spending bill and a massive new tax increase on the American economy. In fact, it is the time for us to retrench a little bit and try to help to get back to where we were before COVID–19.

Remember, that was the time when after the 2017 tax reforms, we had a great economy, by any measure. And it was an opportunity time. It was the lowest poverty rate in the history of our country since we started keeping track in the 1950s.

As of February, just before going into the COVID–19 period, February 2020, we had 19 straight months of wage gain of over 3 percent. By the way, that was over inflation because inflation was so low. So people were feeling it. They were actually getting a wage increase. In my State of Ohio, that was the first time in probably a decade and a half.

Now, it is just the opposite. Wages are actually down when you take inflation into account. And inflation is high, as everyone feared because we have dumped so much on the demand side of the economy, and the supply side is restricted, in part, because of what has happened with COVID, and it creates this inflation. This was warned by not just Republicans like myself, but back in March, when President Biden and the Democrats put $1.9 trillion into this economy—the most ever, the biggest bill ever—it was Larry Summers, former Secretary of the Treasury under President Clinton, and NEC, National Economic Council, Chair under President Obama, who said: You know, this is going to stoke inflation. It is going to overheat the economy.

And that is exactly what it did.

So we have this high inflation. We have these record levels of debt and deficit. We are talking about extending the debt limit right now, and people think the number is going to be—just to extend it for about a year—over $2 trillion; meaning that we are spending so much more than we are taking in. And yet there is this discussion that somehow before Christmas we are going to put forward this Build Back Better legislation that we just talked about.

It is not building back America better. Unfortunately, it is building us worse off than we were and adding to inflation, adding to the supply chain difficulties, adding to the debt and deficits at record levels, and certainly doing nothing with regard to COVID–19.

So why would we do this? And certainly why would we do this now? It makes no sense. Well, because I guess there was a promise made that we are going to have this massive new spending and these massive new tax increases.

What is in there? Well, on the spending side, when you look at it, it is the largest spending bill ever put forward by the U.S. Congress, unless you believe that it is really only $1.7 trillion instead of two or three times that. In that case, it is the second biggest ever. But the analyses I have seen from the Penn Wharton study, from the Committee for a Responsible Budget, and from others said: You know, there are a lot of sunsets in there.

As an example, the child tax credit lasts for 1 year. Does anybody believe it only lasts for 1 year? That wouldn't be the history of this place. So it will continue.

So these sunsets are not going to be effective so the spending will continue to increase. The tax increases don't cover them so there will be a big gap accrued to the deficit, and the projections are it is more like $4½ trillion in spending. So it is the largest increase in the history of our country by far.

We are talking about doing this, again, at a time when already we have record levels of debt and deficit and high inflation and driven by COVID, a lot of uncertainty in our economy.

On the tax side, I could argue it is even worse because the tax increases are going to be hard on workers because they are taxes on businesses. What the Joint Committee on Taxation says—which is the nonpartisan group here in Congress that advises us—what CBO says, the Congressional Budget Office says, what other outside groups say is the same thing, which is when you tax these businesses, who gets taxed? Well, it is workers—lower wages, lower benefits.

Seventy percent of the benefit of our tax cuts in 2017 went to workers, and 70 percent of this increase in taxes will be coming out of workers' pockets. So it is a bad idea. But let's look a little deeper at what these taxes actually are. There is a 15-percent minimum tax—a new alternative minimum tax, which is always complicated for everybody to figure out what that is. But in this case, it is called the book tax.

Now, I don't know if this was on purpose or not. I assume it wasn't. But the book tax, as you apply it to our economy, will result in real damage to things that most people think are important like defined benefit plans, pension plans. Democrats and Republicans alike have supported defined benefit plans. I support them. Unfortunately, there aren't as many as there used to be. But there will be even fewer if this passes. Why? Because when you calculate your taxes under the book tax, you now have to take into account whatever your asset increase is in your pension. And if you are one of these companies caught up in this, you could well find yourself in a situation where, for the first time ever, you get no deduction for your contribution to your pension. Why would we do that? And then you are taxed on the asset increase, which may be caused by higher interest rates, may be caused by the market going up, but you get no benefit in your company, and your profits in your company may not be enough to pay those taxes.

Here is an example of this. There are some companies that have figured out this problem. By the way, there are some unions figuring it out, too, because a lot of union workers are caught up in this as well because they have defined benefit plans, typically. The company is saying: OK. If I make $100 million in profit and if I have a $2 billion or $1 billion increase in my pension assets and you apply a 15-percent tax to that, I am not going to have enough money to pay my taxes.

So what are they going to do? Well, they could declare bankruptcy. They could get a loan, which again hurts workers. So that, I hope, is an inadvertent part of this, but that is in this legislation.

Why do we want to hurt defined benefit plans?

I think it was an effort to say: OK. We are going to raise taxes, but we are going to do it in a sort of convoluted way so that it doesn't look like we are really raising taxes. But it is real taxes, and it is going to hurt, again, workers in America.

Another thing it would disqualify companies from doing is taking what is called bonus depreciation. All of us, I thought, were kind of supportive of that.

In 2017, that tax bill, this put in place where you can immediately write off expansion of plant equipment. Retailers love it, restaurants love it, and so do manufacturers. And they use it a lot. And those manufacturers are telling me: OK. Now, under the book tax, you have to go back to the regular depreciation so you are not writing things off that first year as you can now under bonus depreciation. Why would you want to do that right now, again, with all the economic uncertainty out there, with COVID, with inflation fears? We want to encourage people to expand plant equipment, and there are a lot of people hesitating. That is in this legislation.

Now let's talk quickly about the SALT provisions. We already know what that is because it has gotten a lot of play. But the State and local tax deduction means that in States like mine, Ohio, we are subsidizing high-tax States. So if you are from Missouri—Senator BLUNT is here on the floor—or if you are from Ohio, by having a deduction for your State and local taxes at the Federal level, you are not only encouraging those States to continue to have high taxes and even have further taxes if you are being subsidized by Federal taxpayers, but it is unfair to those States that have done the responsible thing to try to keep taxes under control.

But in this legislation, Democrats say: No, we are going to increase this cap from 10,000 to 80,000 bucks a year; in other words, provide more help to the SALT beneficiaries. Guess what. There is an analysis out this week that says almost none of that benefit goes to Americans who are not in the top 10 percent of wage earners. Almost none of that benefit that is in this bill goes to people not in the top 10 percent. There is $285 billion devoted to this—$100 billion more than is devoted to the cornerstone social safety net program, the childcare credit in this bill. Over $100 billion more for this.

So how does this all shake out in terms of whom it is helping and whom it is hurting?

Well, here are what the numbers are. This is, again, the Joint Tax Committee, folks who are nonpartisan, looking at this. Almost 70 percent—almost 70 percent—of people who make $1 million or more a year are going to get a significant tax cut because of this legislation.

Think about that. It is about 68 percent-plus are going to get a significant tax cut if you make a million bucks a year. If you are a millionaire, you are going to do very well.

If you make between $500,000 and a million bucks a year, 90 percent will get a tax cut under this legislation.

But if you make $30,000 a year—only 30,000—only 30 percent of people who make $30,000 a year are going to get tax relief under this legislation, and that is just in the first year.

In the second year, it goes down below 30 percent to 12 percent; in the third year, 10 percent; and then it goes down to single digits. So the benefit is heavily skewed toward higher income Americans. Why would we do that? It just makes no sense. Are we worried about millionaires? But that is in this legislation.

So, again, I would say, Build Back Better? I don't think so. We were building pretty well when we had the lowest poverty rate in the history of our country, when we had the lowest unemployment rate ever for Blacks, Hispanics, the disabled, when we had 50-year lows in unemployment overall in our economy, when we had a situation where wages were going up—again, 19 straight months of 3 percent or more wage gains. It was real wage gains above inflation.

Let's get back to that. That is how you grow the opportunity economy. That is how you give people a chance. That is how you help everybody.

But let's not do this massive new spending bill that will cause more inflation, massive tax increases that are going to hurt the economy and hurt workers, especially coming into the holiday season. Let's instead do something that gives the American people the gifts they deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BLUNT. I think we are a little beyond our time on this side, but I am grateful for my friend from Rhode Island who is willing to let me have a chance to make the points I wanted to make. And I think, as is often the case here, many of them have already been made and were just made pretty well by Senator PORTMAN, certainly, in the spending bill he was talking about and the tax bill that he was talking about.

We keep hearing that a majority of all Americans like these programs; that if they could just know what was in the bill, they would like the bill. We are going to have some time now over the next few weeks, I am confident, to talk about what is in the bill. These are programs that are supposed to make life better for everyday Americans. Things like paid family leave, I am sure would be helpful in many, many cases.

But what the Senator from Ohio was just talking about, you know, four times what this bill would spend on paid family leave it pays on tax cuts for the wealthiest families.

When people begin to look at that, they are going to have to wonder, how is that priority established to where

the second biggest spending item in the entire bill would be tax cuts for the wealthiest families in America—$230 billion of that $1.7 trillion is tax cuts for those families. The deductibility of State and local taxes goes from $10,000 as a cap to $80,000 as a cap.

Let me just repeat what I think I just heard, which was that 70 percent of this tax break—70 percent of that entire $230 billion—goes to the top 5 percent of all taxpayers; 94 percent goes to the top 20 percent; and 85 percent goes to the top 10 percent.

Those are pretty big numbers in a bill that is supposed to make life easier for everyday American challenges.

Now, I am sure the top 5 percent of all taxpayers have their own challenges. I am also sure they are different than my challenges, but they are not the challenges that everyday Americans face. It is pretty amazing, I think, in all the discussion of what this bill is designed to do, that that is what would happen.

VACCINE MANDATE

Madam President, let me talk about one other topic as I make way here for the Senator from Rhode Island. I want to talk a little bit about the vaccine mandate and what I am hearing about that.

Yesterday, in a vote in the Senate on the Congressional Review Act, which is when we have an opportunity to look at regulations proposed by the administration, 52 Senators from both parties—Senators from both parties made up that 52—voted not to go forward with this mandate.

It is very possible to be pro-vaccine and not pro-mandate. I am pro-vaccine. Over and over again, I have recommended to my friends and my family that you get the first shot and, now, if you are available for the booster shot after you have had either one or two of the other shots, to get that one too. The vaccines have made a big difference. Frankly, my advice would be, unless your doctor tells you you shouldn't do this, I think you ought to do it.

The mandate just appears not to be working. I am not even going to assume it was designed in a way that the administration thought it would have the impact it appears to be having, but it is clear and it is out there. You know it, and I know it.

I have visited with Missouri hospital administrators, and they may have been at a place where, just a few days ago, if that mandate had gone into effect, you couldn't have gotten Medicare or Medicaid patients paid for at your hospital if you weren't 100-percent vaccinated.

Now, fortunately, a Federal court said: No, we are not sure the President has the authority to do that, so we are going to postpone that.

But as we approached that deadline, I kept hearing more and more hospital administrators say: We think we can get almost all of our professional staff vaccinated, but we are not even sure about that. We are absolutely sure we can't get 100 percent of the people—those who work in the cafeteria, who mop the floors, and who provide security for the building—vaccinated. So we wouldn't be able to participate in those programs, and that would create a serious problem, particularly in small, rural hospitals.

There is the next mandate, the one for every group that has more than 100 employees in it. All kinds of police officers, for whatever reason, either don't want to get vaccinated or don't want to be told they have to be vaccinated. You know, we have enough problems right now in finding police officers and firemen and first responders that, if you delete those forces, our current problems will be even bigger. That is what will happen.

If you have got that 100-person force but you still want to be a police officer, in all likelihood, within driving distance, there is a 20-person police force or a 5-person police force. It may be a little easier, safer job anyway, and you will not have to be told by the government what you have to do.

I am hearing that from schools. We have schools where the National Guard is driving school buses. By the way, a lot of the people in the National Guard are thinking about leaving the National Guard if they have to do something like this.

You know, what people really, I think, resent is when government tells them: You have to do this, and you have to do it for your own good.

If it is for your own good, that is probably a decision that you should be allowed to make.

Whether you are allowed to make it or not, this is the response to all of these mandates, whether it is the Health and Human Services mandate on hospitals; the mandate on Federal contractors—and, by the way, we need those Federal contractors or we wouldn't have contracted with them—or the mandate on policemen and firemen and grocery store workers.

I saw a number the other day of 50-some percent—I think it was 56 percent—of the people who work in a grocery store would rather work somewhere else after what they have gone through in the last year: shorthanded; more people getting food at the grocery store than ever before. They are looking for a reason to say: OK. I am done with this.

We need our grocery store workers. We need our healthcare providers. We need our policemen. We need our firemen. We need our school bus drivers. We need our schoolteachers.

This is not working. Fortunately, up to now, Federal judge after Federal judge has said: We don't think you have the authority to do this, and we are going to suspend the implementation of these mandates.

I think this gives the Biden administration a chance to look at this again and realize that the unintended consequences of what they were trying to do might be more significant than the consequences of what would happen if you forced compliance.

I thank my friend for giving us a few extra minutes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, it is a pleasure, and I appreciate my friend, Senator BLUNT.

I am here today to rise for the 10th time to talk about the rightwing scheme to capture our Supreme Court.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I have delivered a lot of speeches on the Senate floor, and a majority of them—279 of them, to be precise—addressed climate change. These were my ''Time to Wake Up'' speeches, many of which focused on the network of phony front groups and trade associations used by the fossil fuel industry to block any meaningful climate legislation.

That vast web of climate denial and climate obstruction is one of the main reasons that we are in the climate crisis we face today. I am here today to report that there is common technique behind that smelly climate denial operation and the rightwing donor operation to capture the Court.

They both rely on massive amounts of dark money. They both rely on a small number of ultrawealthy donors who supply that dark money. And they both rely on an armada of front groups and phony corporate entities, funded by those big donors, to hide their hands. At this point, it is, actually, depressingly, familiar.

But it is worse than just common technique. It is the same entities: the Koch operation, Americans for Prosperity, DonorsTrust, the Bradley Foundation, the Scaife Foundation, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The list goes on and on and on. These are the exact same players on both sides of the operation—on the climate-denying web and on the Court-capturing scheme.

My colleagues and I showed in a number of Web of Denial climate speeches how a few ultrawealthy, rightwing foundations, corporate trade groups, and so-called donor-advised funds supply the bulk of the dark money for modern-day climate denial.

Big oil companies used to do that directly, but they got burned and learned that it is bad for their public image, and I suspect they are hiding now behind those anonymizing entities and trade groups.

The big funding guns included the Koch network; the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation; the Searle Freedom Trust; the Sarah Scaife Foundation; Donors Capital; and DonorsTrust, which has been called the rightwing's ''dark money ATM.''

This is the Web of Denial graphic that we used in many of those Web of Denial speeches, and you will see these groups turning up over and over again. They are central in the web of climate denial.

Now, if you look at the big funders behind the scheme to capture the Court, you will see this—in my last scheme speech, I talked about the flotillas of amici curiae—or ''friends of the court''—who come in and orchestrate phalanxes to file briefs for the rightwing in cases of significance to the scheme's big donors. Well, it turns out that those funders also inhabit the web of denial.

This is an appendix that I filed in the case of Seila Law v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—a case that was the rightwing's shot at weakening a consumer watchdog agency they hate. This appendix—a first of its kind in the Supreme Court, which was attached to my amicus brief—looked at some of the other amici who had filed briefs and cross-referenced where their funding had come from.

My point then was that the Court was not told that there was this huge overlap of funding. Each brief came in as if it were independent rather than part of an orchestrated cascade. So nearly every one of these groups is part of the web of denial: DonorsTrust, Donors Capital, the Charles Koch Foundation, the Sarah Scaife Foundation, the Bradley Foundation, the Searle Foundation.

But the overlay isn't just with the phony amicus flotillas that are orchestrated up at the Supreme Court; it is right in the cases themselves. Take the notorious anti-labor cases of Friedrichs and Janus. According to a trove of documents uncovered in 2016, legal groups funded by the Bradley Foundation brought those cases. They weren't just amici filing briefs; they were the litigating law group in those cases. The law group went out and found the plaintiffs—plaintiffs of convenience, and they paid the plaintiffs' legal expenses. Those same donors, Bradley has shown in this, funded that whole boatload of amici who came in to support their also-funded group that was bringing the case on behalf of a nominal plaintiff. By the way, they funded a flotilla of amici in Janus. Seventeen Supreme Court amicus briefs came from groups funded by DonorsTrust, Donors Capital, and Bradley.

The front groups in those labor cases actually played a little bit of switcheroo amongst themselves. Think of the pea-and-shell game. The group that brought the case in Friedrichs became an amicus supporting the plaintiff in Janus. The group that brought the case in Janus had been an amicus supporting the plaintiff in Friedrichs. All of those groups—the ones that brought the two cases and the groups that chimed in as amici—were funded by the same organizations. It is a little bit like that pea-and-shell game except, if you know the parties, it is being played with transparent shells; but for some reason, the Court is incapable of noticing this scheme that is being pulled in plain view, in their presence.

Now, some front groups are invented shells—purpose built—just to hide whoever is behind them. Others are preexisting, captured, and co-opted. The key common characteristic, whether invented or captured and co-opted, is that they got to hide the donors. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is the easy example of a captured and co-opted group.

According to the watchdog group InfluenceMap, the Chamber is one of the biggest climate obstructors in Washington.

Why?

The Chamber has lots of members who don't support climate obstruction, but someone—someone—gave the Chamber enough money to become a worst climate obstructor. And guess what. The Chamber is also a major player in the scheme. It is the biggest filer of scheme amicus briefs; it campaigned hard for all three of Trump's dark money-chosen Supreme Court Justices; and way back, it commissioned the Lewis Powell memo that launched the entire scheme.

Other major front groups serving both the web and the scheme include the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, and the Competitive Enterprise.

Again, the common thread?

They all hide the donors so they can provide that vital screening, anonymizing function, which is key to the donors because they have to hide their identities and their motives in order to do their dark work.

On the scheme side, each one of these groups gets gobs of scheme dark money, helps hatch hot-house legal theories to present to scheme Justices, helps locate plaintiffs of convenience to bring cases for and/or joins the orchestrated flotillas of scheme amicus briefs. You see the same players over and over and over again, and how the Court manages not to notice or be curious is a mystery.

On the web side, each is also a central node in the web of denial. Here, for instance, is the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation. Here is the Donors Trust, Donors Capital. Here is Koch-affiliated foundations. Here is Searle Freedom Trust. Here is the Americans for Prosperity Foundation. These groups pretty notoriously represent the interests of Big Business and rightwing donors, so you at least know that much, if not the specific identity of who is funding the brief. But some of the web-scheme overlay gets a little bit harder to unravel, so let's drill into one: the Independent Women's Forum.

This group was founded by rightwing donors in the very early days of the scheme to prop up the troubled nomination of Justice Thomas. It has accepted millions of dollars from a who's who of scheme and web-of-denial donors—Bradley, Scaife, Koch, Donors Trust. Its stated mission is to ''improve the lives of Americans by increasing the number of women who value free markets and personal liberty,'' but its real mission is to pop up anytime its dark money donors want to trot out a front group purporting to represent women. In practice, that means they pop up everywhere. They popped up in a pending Second Amendment case before the Court. They popped up in the Americans for Prosperity Foundation case that granted a constitutional right to dark money, signed off on by the dark money Justices. They popped up in the Little Sisters of the Poor contraception case. They popped up in a challenge to the EPA's authority to regulate greenhouse gases.

The Independent Women's Forum's work in that EPA case brings the overlay between the web and the scheme into focus.

In 2016, the forum joined the dark money amicus flotilla asking the Supreme Court to strike down the EPA's Clean Power Plan, along with other web-scheme front groups like the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Texas Public Policy Institute, and other groups opposing the EPA. These parties asked the Robert Court to stop the Clean Power Plan before it went into effect. Just days before Antonin Scalia died and their 5-to-4 majority evaporated, the Republican Justices obliged.

This was ''shadow docket'' work, for those of you following the Texas abortion case ''shadow docket'' fiasco.

In the EPA case, for the first time, the Court stepped in to stay a regulation before it went into effect and before the lower court had a chance to weigh in.

By the way, it was a purely partisan decision, with all the Republicans behind it and none of the other Justices.

Fast-forward to today. The Trump administration replaced the Clean Power Plan in 2018 with a Trump donothing, polluter-friendly rule. When the Biden administration came in, it completely abandoned the Trump donothing, polluter-friendly rule, so right now, there is actually no regulation to challenge. But the scheme has replenished its dark money Court and supercharged it with a sixth Justice.

They are out to disable what they call the administrative state for the sake of their big donors, so they sued again, backed by familiar organizations—the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Texas Public Policy Institute, and other web-scheme groups—to ask, as they put it in their brief, that the Court ''finish what it started when it stayed the [Clean Power Plan].''

There is no regulation to challenge. Yet the Republicans on the Court took the case—so much for the ''case or controversy'' principle of the Constitution. Now the Court, I guess, is going to make decisions based on what might happen. Where I come from, that is called an advisory opinion, which our Court is not supposed to do under the separation of powers. But the Federalist Society six on the Court are out for big game. The prize is to bring down the ''regulatory state'' altogether, and where better than where it most helps the fossil fuel industry—the

industry lurking behind this web of denial and likely also working behind the dark money that put the last Justices on the Court and likely also lurking behind the dark money millions that fund the Republican election groups.

This Clean Power Plan challenge opens an avenue for scheme-appointed Justices to delight the donors behind both the scheme and the web. In the short term, it would hobble the EPA's ability to combat climate change—something very much sought by vested interests in the fossil fuel industry. Over the long term, it would accomplish rightwing donors' goal of kneecapping Federal Agency power across the board.

For Donors Trust, the Chamber of Commerce, the Independent Women's Forum, and dozens of other groups that link the web and the scheme, winning cases like this one means big wins for their big secret donors.

To go back to my early speeches about the scheme, they are following Lewis Powell's advice years ago to seize what he called the ''most important instrument for social, economic, and political change''—the Federal judiciary—and to control it with what he called ''an activist-minded Supreme Court.'' The scheme has captured the Court. The scheme's captured Court will deliver for the web. It is the same donors and organizations behind both, and it has got to be cleaned up because this is not how courts are supposed to work.

To be continued.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. 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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to support a number of our nominees for Ambassadors and positions within the State Department.

As the chair of the European Affairs Subcommittee, I am particularly concerned about the number of openings we have in Europe for Ambassadors.

I want to support today Mark Gitenstein, again, to be U.S. Ambassador to the European Union; Kent Logsdon to be U.S. Ambassador to Moldova; Michael Murphy to be U.S. Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina; Clair Cronin to be U.S. Ambassador to Ireland; Denise Bauer to be U.S. Ambassador to France and Monaco; and Julissa Reynoso Pantaleon to be Ambassador to Spain and Andorra.

Those are the Ambassadors in Europe whom I wanted to raise this afternoon, but I also want to raise concern about Rufus Gifford, who has been nominated to be Chief of Protocol for the Department of State.

As I said, I am chair of the European Subcommittee, so I have had the opportunity to attend the hearings for these nominees and to see just how qualified they are and how important to American foreign policy they are.

Earlier this week, Victoria Nuland, who is an Under Secretary at the Department of State, testified in front of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the U.S. foreign diplomacy is operating at quarter-power as a consequence of the numerous holds that have been placed on ambassadorial appointments by just a few of our Republican colleagues.

I have some maps here that I think really very vividly demonstrate the consequences of this inaction in the Senate.

The first map shows where we have U.S. Ambassadors to Europe. You can see that anything blue is where we have Ambassadors. On this map, everything from Spain to Ukraine, the United Kingdom, Iceland, Ireland—we have no U.S. Ambassadors approved in those countries.

Compare that to what Russia and China have in terms of their diplomatic ability in Europe. The gold color is Russian Ambassadors, countries where Russia has their Ambassadors—virtually every country in Europe. Red is where China has its Ambassadors—virtually every country in Europe. Again, the United States, our Ambassadors in Europe—it is basically empty. Finland, Sweden, Norway, Spain, France, Germany, Poland, Ireland, the EU—we are desperately in need of Ambassadors because right now, we have very little presence in Europe.

This is happening at a time when we know there are significant challenges taking place in Europe, particularly in Ukraine, where Russia is threatening to invade Ukraine, its sovereign territory, again, and where we need—if we are going to be successful in responding to Russia—where we need to take a unified approach among our allies. We need to be working with the EU, with NATO, with all of our European allies.

Yet, in most of the countries where we need to be working, we don't have Ambassadors, and we don't have Ambassadors because of opposition from just a few of our Republican colleagues.

I see Senator CRUZ on the floor, so I know that he is going to be here to object to my effort to move these. But this is the impact of what is happening as a result of the holds of Senator CRUZ. We can't put our national security in the hands of those people who don't have the status of Ambassadors. We know that our Embassies are doing a great job in all of those countries. They are working hard. But it makes a difference to have someone who has been approved by the Senate, who has been nominated by the President, who has the rank of Ambassador.

As I think about the challenges that are facing this country, I can't think of anything that is more harmful to our foreign policy than deliberately hampering this country's ability to advance American interests on the international stage.

I want to say a few words about each of these nominees before I move for unanimous consent. Again, I would like to begin with Mark Gitenstein, who has already served our Nation before. He was the U.S. Ambassador to Romania. He has spent over 25 years working on energy issues. And as we think about the negotiations that are happening around energy and Nord Stream 2 in particular, which I know is a concern for Senator CRUZ because it is a concern that I have, we don't have an ambassador to the EU at the table for those discussions. Mr. Gitenstein's nomination is critically important in responding to Russia's weaponization of gas flows to Europe and strengthening the transatlantic alliance as we face escalating aggression from Russia.

Similarly, Kent Logsdon's nomination as Ambassador to Moldova couldn't come at a more critical moment where Russia is, again, using energy there as a weapon.

Maia Sandu—the newly elected, pro-EU, pro-reform President there—has every intention of steering Moldova, the poorest country in Europe, toward a better path, and she is looking west to do that. But, of course, she has already faced pressure from Putin and his cronies, who have threatened to weaponize gas flows into Moldova.

We can't allow Moldova to become the next Ukraine or the next Georgia, and we can only prevent that by conveying strong U.S. leadership to support its pro-European aspirations.

I also want to say a few words on Michael Murphy's nomination as Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina. America played a critical role in bringing peace to Bosnia through the Dayton Accords, but we are seeing now that peace and stability in Bosnia and unity in Bosnia are under increasing attack.

Earlier today, I had a chance to meet with the Bosnian Foreign Minister, and I am seriously concerned by the deteriorating political situation there. It requires an expert career diplomat like Michael Murphy to provide the commanding leadership to help Bosnia through this moment.

The same is true in Ireland. Claire Cronin's nomination as Ambassador to Ireland is not just a symbolic gesture to a longstanding ally of the United States. Peace in Northern Ireland is hanging by a thread as the UK, Ireland, and the EU handle the fallout from Brexit.

I was concerned by the release of a report on Tuesday which indicated that the paramilitary gangs embedded in Northern Ireland's divided communities pose a ''clear and present danger'' of violence fueled by post-Brexit tensions. By stalling our confirmation of Ms. Cronin, we risk tarnishing our legacy in fostering peace in Northern Ireland through the Good Friday Agreement.

Of course, Denise Bauer's nomination to France is necessary as the country prepares for national elections next year. These elections have significant implications for our bilateral relationship, in addition to the role France will play in the EU and NATO.

Similarly, Julissa Reynoso's nomination to Spain requires swift confirmation. Spain will host the Madrid Summit next year, where NATO will elect the next Secretary General and finalize the strategic concept. What happens in NATO is critical to America's national security, and we want to have an ambassador on the ground there who can monitor what is going on with those talks, in addition to the other officials we need to send.

Finally, Ambassador Rufus Gifford has been nominated to be the Chief of Protocol for the Department of State. He previously served as our Ambassador to Denmark, where the Queen there acknowledged him for his meritorious service to the Kingdom of Denmark. His background and service will make him an excellent Chief of Protocol, and we urgently need him in place to assist Secretary Blinken.

Combined, these nominations are all critical to immediate challenges facing our national security interests.

With that in mind, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 320, 440, 447, 448, 450, 454, and 519; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, you know, in Washington, there is always political rhetoric that goes around. The Senator from New Hampshire just moments ago described the Embassies in Europe that are missing Ambassadors. She said they are missing Ambassadors because of Republican objections, and she highlighted in particular Ukraine.

I would like to point out there is some irony in her doing so because actually the reason there is no Ambassador in Ukraine is because of one thing and one thing only: President Biden has not nominated anybody to serve as Ambassador to Ukraine. We are in December of the first year of his Presidency, and Biden has yet to name an ambassador. So there are no Republican holds, there are no Republican objections to an ambassador that Biden has not even named.

In addition, there were multiple Ambassadors who have been named whom the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has yet to hold a hearing on. For every one of those nominees on whom there hasn't been a hearing, again, there are no Republican objections; it is simply that the Senate Democrats have failed to move forward with hearings.

But there are a number of nominees who have been nominated and who have had hearings on whom I have holds. And we are here today once again because the Democrats in this Chamber have been unwilling to do the one thing that would stop Vladimir Putin from potentially invading Ukraine, which is sanctioning the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline and making sure that it never becomes fully operational.

Now, Senator SHAHEEN, along with every other Senator in this Chamber, knows exactly why I have holds on these nominees. Right now, as we speak, over 100,000 Russian troops are massed on the border of Ukraine, waiting to invade. And it is Joe Biden's fault because it is a direct consequence of President Biden's surrender to Vladimir Putin on Nord Stream 2.

For those watching at home asking ''What is Nord Stream 2?'' it is a pipeline being constructed from Russia to Germany to carry natural gas. Putin is building Nord Stream 2 to go around Ukraine because right now, Russian gas gets to Europe through Ukraine.

Putin didn't just wake up one day and decide to invade Ukraine; he has wanted to invade Ukraine for years. He did it in 2014, but he stopped short of a full invasion because he needed to use Ukrainian energy infrastructure to transport Russian gas to the European market. Ukraine's energy infrastructure is their insurance policy against a Russian invasion.

Nord Stream 2 is all about Putin building an alternative avenue to get Russian gas to Europe. So if Nord Stream 2 comes online, it leaves Ukraine exposed to Russian aggression.

Just 2 years ago, we had a bipartisan consensus in the Senate that we needed to stop Nord Stream 2. Now, Senator SHAHEEN knows that well because she and I authored the legislation together. She and I worked together to get the support of Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and the support of Democrats and Republicans in the House. The Cruz-Shaheen legislation sanctioning Nord Stream 2 passed both Houses of Congress overwhelmingly and was signed into law. The Cruz-Shaheen legislation worked marvelously well, so well that Putin stopped construction of Nord Stream 2 the day that President Trump signed our legislation into law—not even a week later, not a month later, but the very day that our sanctions were signed into law.

It was an incredible, bipartisan national security victory that we won together, and that victory continued for over a year. For over a year, Nord Stream 2 lay dormant on the bottom of the ocean, dead, until, unfortunately, Joe Biden became President.

Almost from the moment of election day, Biden and the incoming administration began projecting weakness to Russia and Putin, and to understand just how much that message was received: Joe Biden was sworn in as President on January 20, 2021. Putin began building the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline again on January 24, 2021, 4 days after Biden was sworn in.

In the Senate, I introduced legislation again in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that passed in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—in this Senate—with overwhelming bipartisan support to sanction Nord Stream 2 yet again. But this summer, the Biden White House made a political decision to surrender completely to Putin on Nord Stream 2, and President Biden waived the sanctions on Nord Stream 2. He did so overruling the recommendations of his own State Department that argued that this protects U.S. national security interests, this stands up to Russia, and this protects Ukraine. The Biden White House didn't care about any of that—overruled it all.

Then, unfortunately, Senate Democrats lost their willingness to hold Biden to account. This is an issue on which Democrats and Republicans are agreed on the substance. But it can be difficult to stand up to a President of your own party, and on Nord Stream 2, Senate Democrats have not been willing to do so. They were eager to do so when Donald Trump was in the White House, but when a Democrat was in the White House, suddenly their willingness to stand up to the President evaporated.

So the holds that I have placed are directly in order to try to force Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS to follow the law and stand up to Russia and stand up to Putin.

So I will offer my colleague Senator SHAHEEN a deal that I have offered many times to the White House, to the State Department, to the Department of the Treasury, and to Senate Democrats—a deal that if we, as the Senate, will impose sanctions on Nord Stream 2, CAATSA sanctions—yet another Russia sanctions bill that both Senator SHAHEEN and I voted for, that we both advocated and supported, and that the Biden administration is refusing to apply—if the Senate will impose those sanctions, I will happily, enthusiastically lift my holds on these nominees, and Senator SHAHEEN can take her map of Europe and color in all of those countries. We can do that right now by doing the right thing substantively.

By the way, this is the one step which has a real possibility of stopping a Russian invasion of Ukraine.

This past weekend, the Biden administration declassified their own internal projections that an invasion is imminent; it could happen as soon as January or February. And if we see Russian tanks in the streets of Kiev, it will

be because Joe Biden surrendered to Putin and Senate Democrats weren't willing to hold him to account.

I hope that is not the case. We can act right now to sanction Nord Stream 2 to stop the pipeline from being operational, to stop Putin and the soldiers at the border to prevent the invasion, and to clear these ambassadorial nominees that my Democratic colleagues want.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3322 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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 an objection?

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

My colleague and I agree on our opposition to Nord Stream 2, but I am not looking at it, despite your accusations, through the same partisan lens that you are, Senator CRUZ.

And I would go back—I think you threw out a lot of red herrings in your initial objection there, one of which was to suggest that I said that you had a hold on our Ambassador to Ukraine, and I actually agree with you. I think this administration needed to appoint that Ambassador to Ukraine 8 months ago.

And if you agree with me right now, then will you agree that you will not put a hold on the Ukraine nomination, once we get it—if we get it within the next couple of weeks, before the end of this year?

I will ask you to think about that for a minute because I do think we need to have an Ambassador there. And that is certainly on my list of places in Europe where we need Ambassadors.

But I think the bigger question now, you suggest that the mere action of sanctioning Nord Stream 2 would be enough to deter Putin and his ambitions in Ukraine. Sadly, I think that is a simplistic analysis of the situation that we are in because the biggest deterrent we can provide right now to what Putin is thinking about is to let him know that we are united with our allies in Europe on our opposition to any action he might take in Ukraine, that we are united with our NATO allies, that we are united with our European allies. And, unfortunately, one of those major allies is Germany.

And I don't think it would be good for the unity message that we need to give to Putin to, at this point, sanction Nord Stream 2 because I think the Germans are going to come to that conclusion on their own. They have a new administration. They have a new administration that has issued some contracts—what they call contracts in developing their coalition government—that have a very different tone with respect to how they are talking about Russia and China, for that matter, and so I think it is more prudent.

I also have real concerns about the current legislation on Nord Stream 2. But I think it is more prudent for us to continue to work with our allies to make clear to Putin what is at stake. And Nord Stream 2 is at stake if he goes into Ukraine. There is no about that. And right now, as we know, the certification of the pipeline has been delayed, and it has been delayed until well after the first of the year. We are not sure what the timetable is, but it is going to be sometime after the spring.

So I just came to a different conclusion than you did, Senator CRUZ, about the best way to deter Putin at this point. I think it is to work together. It is not to poke a finger at our most prominent ally on this issue and suggest that we create those divisions, which is what you would like to do.

And I think, furthermore, that the efforts to undermine our appointment of Ambassadors and our ability for the State Department to conduct foreign policy further weakens our ability to negotiate with Putin. And it sends a message about divisions within Congress that is really not helpful. It is not helpful as Putin is watching us; it is not helpful as China is watching us.

So you and I just have fundamentally different views of how best to address this issue and how we can achieve the goal that we both want, which is to end Nord Stream 2 and reduce Europe's dependence on Russia and to prevent Putin from invading Ukraine.

So, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. You know, I would note that Senator SHAHEEN said it was simplistic to say that sanctioning Nord Stream 2 would stop a Russian invasion of Ukraine. And in that, Senator SHAHEEN may well be right.

I cannot guarantee that Nord Stream 2 sanctions would prevent an invasion of Ukraine. What we do know is, it has in the past—what we do know is that in 2014, when Putin invaded Ukraine in the Crimea, that he stopped short of a full invasion because he needed the Ukrainian energy infrastructure.

And we also know that, during the more than a year in which the Cruz-Shaheen sanctions were in effect and Nord Stream 2 was dead, that Putin didn't amass troops in preparation for an invasion. So we know that it has been effective.

And we also know, although I cannot promise that sanctioning Nord Stream 2 would prevent an invasion—we know the obverse is true, which is that allowing Nord Stream 2 to go online and become operational would invite an invasion.

Senator SHAHEEN noted that the certification process is expected to be concluded in January or February of next year.

I would note that according to the Biden administration's own documents, the Russian invasion is expected, potentially, in January or February of next year. I do not believe it is coincidental that the instant Putin can turn on the switch of Nord Stream 2 is when the tanks are preparing to invade.

If the Senate Democrats continue their partisan blockade of sanctions, they are inviting a Russian invasion.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Will my colleague let me ask a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I would happily consent to a colloquy.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I just want to correct what I said because I think the Senator mischaracterized it.

What I said was, we know that the certification has been delayed until after the first of the year, and it is not likely to happen until after the spring, which is well later than January, February, So I just want to correct for the record that. And I think if you look at what is being proposed, you will find that it is even later than that.

Mr. CRUZ. Well, I will accept that correction. I don't believe the Senator said the spring. I think the Senator said after the first of the year, but—

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Then I went on to say, after the spring, as well. I just want the Senator to listen to what I said.

Mr. CRUZ. I do not think it is coincidental that the timing of Nord Stream 2 and the timing of an invasion are intertwined.

Now, Senator SHAHEEN also suggested the way to prevent an invasion is to be united with our allies. I actually agree with that.

I would point out that this summer, when President Biden waived the sanctions on Nord Stream 2, do you know what our allies said? Ukraine and Poland put out a joint statement. I would encourage you to read the joint statement from the Foreign Ministers of Ukraine and Poland because they denounced the Biden administration for waiving sanctions on Nord Stream 2.

And do you know what Ukraine told us? That waiving those sanctions makes a military attack on Ukraine much more likely. That is what Poland told us.

Senator SHAHEEN knows that. She has spoken with the governments of both countries, I am sure. I have spoken with the governments of both countries. And they adamantly believe that waiving those sanctions is a major force increasing the likelihood of a Russian invasion.

You know, one of the things that is striking in the debates we have had in Nord Stream 2, throughout the course of all of this, we have yet to see a single Democrat stand up and defend the Biden administration's waiver of sanctions on Nord Stream 2 on the merits. They all know it is wrong.

The only arguable benefit that the Biden White House claims is they

earned some good will with Angela Merkel. Angela Merkel had been the leader of Germany. But, as Senator SHAHEEN noted, she is no longer the leader of Germany. The German people voted her party out of office. And the new administration is expected to oppose Nord Stream 2.

So we literally have a situation in which the Biden White House surrendered to Russia, gave a multibillion-dollar pipeline to finance the Russian military, abandon our Ukrainian allies, and did it all in search of good will from a leader who is no longer in office.

Do you want us to be united? The European Parliament voted to condemn Nord Stream 2. The last vote was roughly 500 to 50 to condemn Nord Stream 2. Do you want to be united? How about if we stand with the 500 and not the 50?

If Senate Democrats would not object to my motion, we would be standing with the whole of Europe, and we would be united.

And a final observation, Senator SHAHEEN decried the holds as an effort to undermine Ambassadors. I would note that I have offered here, as I have offered many, many times—as I have offered in writing as far back as August of this year—to lift the holds if we adopt policy that actually stands up to Russia.

Senator SHAHEEN says her changed position is not partisan. I understand why one would want to say that. But her substantive argument is, now, she doesn't want us to disagree with Germany.

Well, when Senator SHAHEEN and I authored Cruz-Shaheen in 2019, when we authored the second Cruz-Shaheen in 2020, when we passed both of them, we were disagreeing with Germany. The German Government was very unhappy with it. But it was the right thing for American national security. Nothing has changed.

And by the way, when there was a Republican President in the White House, I repeatedly took on the Trump administration and pressed them on this issue. The only thing that has changed—one thing has changed: the letter behind the name of the person in the White House. Now, it is a ''D'' and not an ''R.'' And all the Democrats who gave speeches on Nord Stream 2, suddenly, we hear crickets. That needs to change.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I just want to clarify a couple of things that Senator CRUZ said. One is that the Nord Stream 2 pipeline was completed, despite those sanctions, because what Russia did was to employ their own ships with Gazprom and complete the Nord Stream 2 pipeline despite the sanctions that we had threatened. And it was, in fact, not until right before he left office that President Trump actually invoked some of those sanctions.

So, again, I think the response has been somewhat simplistic in terms of what we really need to do now to address what is happening with Russia and Ukraine. And I certainly applaud our allies: Poland and Ukraine. But I think we need to stand united with many more of our allies in Europe in order to deter Putin that the United States, Poland, and Ukraine probably are not going to do it on our own, and we need all of us to act together.

Also, you know, maybe if we had our Ambassador to the EU, he could have reported to the Senate what the vote was in the EU about Nord Stream 2, but because he is still on hold, we haven't had a chance to hear from him.

I would also point out that at this time in the first year of the Trump administration, 44 of his Ambassadors had been confirmed, compared to 13 for the Biden administration. And, you know, it seems like there ought to be a number of things we can agree on. And by the way, there was going to be a vote on Nord Stream 3 before some of your colleagues objected to the process under the Defense bill. If that hadn't happened, we would have actually had a vote on Nord Stream 2 and we could see what the view of this body is. But, unfortunately, it was because of those objections that we didn't get that vote.

I think, again, if you look at our ability to conduct our foreign policy and to be effective against Vladimir Putin, one of the most important things we can do is to put in place our diplomats so that they can help advance American foreign policy.

What is happening right now, in addition to those people you have on hold, we have over 50 State Department nominees on hold because of your objections and the objections of some of your other colleagues. Again, I don't think that is where most of the Members of your caucus are. I think most of them, while they may not agree with all these Ambassadors, they would agree that we should go forward and allow our foreign policy to move forward with diplomats.

I understand your objection to Nord Stream 2. As I said, I have objected to Nord Stream 2. But I think at this point what we need to do is look at how we can conduct our foreign policy in a way that best puts pressure on Vladimir Putin, and I just disagree with you that that is going to do it right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, a brief moment of clarification. Several of the facts that I said in my remarks are undisputed because they are undisputable.

No. 1, it is a fact that Putin stopped construction of Nord Stream 2 the day—the exact day—that President Trump signed the Cruz-Shaheen sanctions into law—that day—and the pipeline was dormant for over a year.

Now, Senator SHAHEEN said Putin ultimately went back to building the pipeline even with the sanctions on the books. That is true—after Joe Biden was sworn into office. Putin began building the pipeline on January 24, 2021, 4 days after Biden was sworn in. Not a foot of the pipeline was built between December of 2019, when the sanctions were signed into law, and January 24. Putin began building the pipeline because Biden telegraphed his surrender.

Secondly, Senator SHAHEEN suggested that if only we had an ambassador, we might know what the European Parliament did. Thankfully, we have these magic little devices that let us cross the Atlantic in the twinkle of an eye, so we actually know that the European Parliament voted roughly 500 to 50 to condemn Nord Stream 2. So if we want to stand united with Europe—not just Ukraine and Poland; Europe—we want to stand up to Nord Stream 2.

A final point I will say to Senator SHAHEEN perhaps is a word of encouragement, which is that I have right now pending an offer with the Democratic leadership to lift a number of these holds—a significant number of these holds—if the Democratic leadership will agree to a vote on Nord Stream 2 sanctions. We are engaged in productive negotiations on that issue. If the Democrats cease obstruction, we can have that vote, and a number of these holds can be lifted. But that ultimately is going to be a decision for Senate Democrats.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HONORING BRIAN BOURGEOIS

Mr. CASSIDY. Pretty handsome guy, huh? Real handsome guy in his dress blues. Today, the citizens of Lake Charles in the State of Louisiana and our country mourn the loss of this U.S. Navy SEAL and commander of SEAL Team 8. Commander Bourgeois, Brian Bourgeois, died from injuries suffered during a training accident Saturday. We lost a SEAL, a dedicated patriot, a son, husband, father, and hero.

Commander Bourgeois was born 43 years ago in Lake Charles, LA. He dedicated his adult life to family and to service to our country. He began by enrolling in the U.S. Naval Academy, from which he graduated in May 2001. During his two-decade-long career, Commander Bourgeois served honorably, led his men bravely, and made our country proud.

The long list of honors and medals Commander Bourgeois earned for his service to our country includes a Bronze Star marked with a ''V,'' denoting heroic acts performed during combat; two Defense Meritorious Service Medals; a Joint Service Commendation Medal; two Marine Corps Commendation Medals; two Marine Corps Achievement Medals; a Combat Action Ribbon; a National Defense Service Medal; an Iraq Campaign Medal; and a Global War on Terrorism Service Medal. He was as decorated as he was loved.

At the annual Army-Navy game scheduled for this weekend, to honor

Commander Bourgeois—a brother and former member of the Midshipmen football team—the Navy team will run out onto the field with a flag of SEAL Team 8. That banner, representing his spirit, will fly alongside the American flag, the Navy flag, and the Marine Corps flag.

The Navy Football Brotherhood, a nonprofit organization aimed at supporting the families of their fallen teammates, is leading fundraising efforts to help support the Bourgeois family.

Our country has and always will depend on our most noble answering the call to serve. To his wife Megan and five children, your father represents the best of our Nation. He is a hero who dedicated his life to defending our country and protecting the lives of every American. For that, we will be forever grateful and shall never forget his service and sacrifice.

Please join me in taking this moment in silent prayer for Commander Bourgeois, his family, and all who loved and knew him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CHINA

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the threat that is posed by communist China.

China's economy has grown sevenfold in just the last two decades. China already has a million members in terms of active-duty soldiers. China also has the largest navy in the world. That is right—it is now larger than ours, and the Chinese military is not stopping. China plans to build more than 100 new ships in the next 8 years, and in those same 8 years, China is also building about 300 missile silos and plans to have 1,000 nuclear missiles. Several times this year, China has tested hypersonic weapons capable of use around the world. At the same time, the world has witnessed increasing Chinese aggression. China's goal is unmistakable: It truly wants to become the world's one dominant power.

Since day 1, the Biden administration has been caught flatfooted as President Joe Biden has been soft on China. This is no surprise given the fact that Joe Biden has been soft on China for 50 years. When he was Vice President, he said:

> A rising China is a positive . . . development, not only for China but for America and the world writ large.

During his run for President, Candidate Joe Biden said China was not a threat to the United States. During his announcement speech when he was announcing he was going to be a candidate for President, he said:

> They're not bad folks. They're not competition for us.

Joe Biden should tell that to the working families in factory towns who have been put out of business by communist China. He should tell that to the families who lost loved ones to fentanyl and other opioids made in China. He should tell that to the Uighurs and ethnic minorities persecuted and used as slave labor by the Communist Party.

I have to tell you, leaders on both sides of the aisle here have been shocked by those comments by then-candidate for President Joe Biden. Many Democrats recognize the danger posed by communist China. Regrettably, our President, Joe Biden, is not one of them.

On issue after issue, the Biden administration's policies are only making China stronger, and at the same time, that makes America weaker. I want to just mention a few.

President Biden's first budget proposed to basically supersize the Government of the United States—huge budget increases in every government Agency you can think of except for two. The two were Defense and Homeland Security.

His political appointees at the Pentagon seem more focused on climate change and ''dissident ideologies'' and vaccine mandates than on security threats to our Nation.

While China's military is growing, ours is going broke and ours is going woke. That is the difference fundamentally today.

Joe Biden has stopped America's policy of helping developing countries use fossil fuels to eliminate poverty and grow their economies. Who are these other countries turning to for help now? Well, they are turning to communist China.

Joe Biden seems to be doing everything he can to shut down coal production here in America. Wyoming is proud to be America's leading coal producer, and we have been for 35 years straight. Coal is the most affordable and reliable energy source known to man. Yet Joe Biden is determined to drive down coal production and drive energy jobs overseas.

China is not making this same mistake. China is acting in its own self-interest. China is producing and using more coal than ever before. China is also funding the construction of coal-fired powerplants as part of their Belt and Road Initiative.

The Biden administration and the Democrats have also put a big Christmas present to China in their reckless tax-and-spending spree because the bill includes trillions of dollars in new taxes on American businesses. As a result, some of our tax rates are going to be higher than those in China. It is going to make it cheaper to do business overseas, and that is exactly what many companies will do.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, the taxes in this bill that the Senate is trying to push on the Democrats' side of the aisle and Republicans are trying to stop—the taxes in the bill will eliminate 125,000 American jobs.

Democratic giveaways for electric vehicles will also send additional money directly to China. Electric vehicles use lithium batteries. A critical mineral necessary for those batteries relies on child labor in cobalt mines in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and slave labor in China. At the same time, Democrats' spending bill would virtually end mining on Federal lands here at home. Instead of getting the minerals we need at home in Wyoming, we are going to get them from China.

More than a million Muslims in the western part of China have been put into slave labor camps. In many cases, those people are forced to make solar panels.

Last week, Senator RUBIO offered an amendment to the Defense bill to ban imports from Chinese companies using slave labor. This is the same legislation that this Senate passed unanimously in July.

Yet now Democrats are kowtowing to an administration weak on China, and are blocking Senator RUBIO's proposal.

Why have the House Democrats failed to move forward on this critical issue?

According to the Washington Post, it is because the Biden administration asked them to.

The Washington Post reports: ''While the administration supports the legislation in public, they are asking Democrats to essentially water it down in private''—that from the Washington Post.

On issue after issue, Democrat policies are only making America weaker and making China stronger. It is no wonder only a quarter of Americans approve of how President Biden is handling China.

On Monday, the President announced the United States will boycott next year's Olympics in Beijing. This is a good first step, but it is not enough. Symbolism is not enough. It is time for Democrats to wake up from this threat from communist China before it is way too late.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

INSTAGRAM

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, at 3 in the morning, the people at Instagram published a blog post describing another laundry list of product updates they claim will make their platform less toxic for children and teens.

And I am sure they thought that the dead of night was the right time to make this announcement, and I don't blame them. If I wanted to pass off something and just give a little lip service and a little deflection and make it look like some type of meaningful reform, I might try a 3 a.m. news dump also.

Because what they did was to put up changes on how to handle things on their site with drug use and self-harm and violence and eating disorders and low self-esteem and human trafficking and bullying.

What they told us is they know there is violence and adverse content on

their site. And, yesterday, at the hearing at our Consumer Protection Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, Senator BLUMENTHAL and I made it fairly clear to our friends from the Silicon Valley that they cannot escape accountability for what is happening on their site—not from Congress and not from the American people. I am talking about the moms, the dads, the teachers, the pediatricians, who approach me every single day that I am in Tennessee.

They are worried about their kids, and the concern is not the product of generational differences. When they were growing up, drugs and eating disorders and bullying were problems, but—you know what, Mr. President—they weren't inescapable.

Now these horrible things follow our children every minute of every day, all courtesy of Big Tech. So, yes, when a company like Instagram claims that they are going to do more to support parents and to keep kids safe, Tennesseans listen, but they don't take their word for it. They test it out. They look for evidence of accountability.

And with all of these updates that they posted, they didn't give us transparency. They didn't give a timeline for when they are going to be implemented. Basically, they said: We know this is a problem, and we will get around to fixing it at some point in the future.

They are still not making changes.

I do want to thank Chairman BLUMENTHAL and other members of the subcommittee for staying focused on this issue. This time around, we had Instagram CEO Adam Mosseri on the witness stand, and it really was perfect timing.

You know, yesterday's hearing was the fifth time this year that the subcommittee has met to discuss what Congress and Big Tech should do to protect our precious children online. It was the fourth time I have personally spoken to someone from Meta, as they now call themselves, which is Instagram's parent. And by this point, I felt like maybe they would come forward with something concrete for us: This is how we are going to get things done.

But, no, nothing changes.

This week, my staff put themselves through yet another deep dive into the dark corners of Instagram and confirmed that there has been no crackdown on dangerous content, as Instagram has previously claimed.

We searched for posts that glorified eating disorders and drug use, and it took them about 30 seconds to find those posts glorifying drug use and eating disorders. And they are not nearly as good at this as the 14- and 15-year-olds who are on this platform are at finding this content.

If they can find this content given half a minute and a decent internet connection, then why can't Instagram find this? Why do they continue to deny that it is there?

One of the things that shocked me the most with Mr. Mosseri's testimony was his refusal to admit that this content is still pervasive. He was absolutely sure that we were hitting him with anecdotal evidence, and he said as much.

But it wasn't just me finding this terrible content on the platform; it was everyone on our committee, Democrat and Republican. There was agreement. We all came to the table with evidence of what we had found online.

I will still stipulate that we all share the same goal of protecting our children and teens online, but nothing has made me question that more than watching executive after executive from platform after platform deny the existence of these problems.

The time for talking through these problems is over. The people who work for Big Tech at Instagram, Facebook, Snapchat, TikTok, Google are all aware of this problem. They don't need congressional hearings to tell them that there are platforms—their platforms—that are hotbeds for trafficking, drug use, bullying, and the glorification of eating disorders.

They don't need me to come to the dais with evidence that their current protections don't work and that more of the same won't magically turn the tide. They know it, and we know that they know it. And their knowledge, it hasn't changed a single thing about their business model.

Fortunately, we have bipartisan momentum to put some guardrails back on these companies. We are working on children's privacy, data security, and Section 230 reforms. We are also working on a national consumer privacy bill and kids' specific policies to keep minors safe online. No more half measures; no more empty promises.

I have been working in tech policy for quite a while now, and I watched companies like Instagram grow from these tiny, great ideas and startups into multibillion-dollar corporations, the largest in our country. Their platforms are integrated into our lives, our culture, our politics. They are upstream from everything.

Unfortunately, they are also places where teens can go to buy drugs, bully their classmates, find human traffickers, sex traffickers, and where girls waste away. If anyone deserves an explanation from Big Tech, it is the children and teens and their parents who are suffering because of these companies.

I invite my colleagues to join me in holding these companies accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHATZ. I ask unanimous consent that, at 6:15 p.m., all postcloture time on the House message to accompany S. 610 be expired; that the motion to concur with amendment be withdrawn; that if cloture is invoked on the Koh nomination, the Senate vote immediately—vote immediately—on the motion to invoke cloture on the Sung nomination; further, that if cloture is invoked on either nomination, all postcloture time be expired and the confirmation vote on the Koh nomination occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 13, and the confirmation vote on the Sung nomination occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader; further, that the cloture motions on the Elliott nomination and on the House message to accompany S. 1605 ripen on Tuesday, December 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. For the information of Senators, there will be three rollcall votes beginning at 6:15.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I want to rise today to support the nominations of Victoria Wassmer to be Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Transportation, and Mohsin Syed to be the Department's Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.

Right now, we are facing supply chain issues. The reason for this includes unprecedented demand for goods, market disruptions caused by the pandemic, and greater demand.

But the biggest issue is the lack of investment in our Nation's infrastructure over the past half century. Simply put, we need better infrastructure to move things in, out, and across the country. And that is why it is so important that we pass the bipartisan infrastructure bill.

The bill provides a historic $567 billion to the Department of Transportation, including $37 billion for freight investments. It creates new programs to reduce bottlenecks and ease supply chain congestion.

The $1.5 billion for my home State of Hawaii will give a massive boost to our local economy. But DOT needs staff to make this investment work.

Ms. Wassmer is well qualified to serve as CFO, with private- and public-sector experience, including as CFO of the FAA.

The same goes for Mr. Syed as Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs. He spent 6 years on Capitol Hill, including in my office, and worked in the DOT general counsel's office. That is why he passed out of the Commerce Committee with overwhelming bipartisan support, and that is why it is so maddening that Republicans are now refusing to move these nominations forward.

These are not controversial individuals. This is basically a blanket hold to stop the government from functioning, to stop the infrastructure bill from being implemented. And nobody wins here. We don't win passing a huge bill and then kneecapping it. And the American people who sent us here to serve certainly don't win.

So let us do our job and move these nominees forward. And so, therefore, I

ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive calendar Nos. 468 and 469; that the nominations be confirmed; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the Record; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I am sure my colleague is aware that, last month, I sent a letter to the Commerce Committee—a committee on which we both serve—informing the chair that I would be holding all Department of Transportation and Department of Commerce nominees until the Senate-confirmed leadership from these Agencies testify about the supply chain crisis.

Right now, there are nearly 100 ships waiting to dock in California ports to unload their goods, but they are unable to do so because of President Biden's supply chain crisis. Christmas is just a couple weeks away, and families and businesses are facing empty shelves, shortages on goods, and higher prices. And, so far, Secretary Raimondo and Secretary Buttigieg have been too busy playing TV commentator to actually go to California and solve the problem.

It is long past time for the Biden administration to tell us what they are actually doing to solve this crisis and help American families.

I appreciate my colleague's partnership with me on the issues under the purview of the Commerce Committee. In fact, I am looking forward to next week, when the bill we are putting together will be considered during a Commerce markup hearing.

Given that we will be in session next week, I would urge my colleagues to join me in urging leadership from the Commerce and Transportation Departments that come before the committee and testify on what those Agencies are doing to combat and mitigate the supply chain crisis that is hurting so many families and businesses in Florida and across the country.

This isn't an unreasonable request. The Senate has oversight authority, and we can't allow Agency leadership to just ignore their responsibility to report to us on these issues impacting our constituents.

But if that is too much to ask, I am inviting Secretary Raimondo and Secretary Buttigieg to even just have an open, public meeting with me and my colleagues. But until we hear from Senate-confirmed officials responsible for this crisis in the Commerce committee, I will be objecting to all Commerce and Transportation nominees going through an expedited process here in the Senate.

This isn't personal. It is about accountability for Florida families. Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE PATRICK CARROLL

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise—I want to thank Senator SCHATZ for making that motion and his fight for these nominees to get the government running, when the chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee and others continue to block one nominee after another nominee after another nominee.

I rise to honor an Ohio public servant who is retiring this month after 32 years of service on the bench in Northeast Ohio.

Judge Patrick Carroll, whom I knew 30 years ago before he was on the bench, as a—just a good citizen of Cuyahoga County, has dedicated his life to serving Ohioans, including serving as Lakewood Municipal Court Judge for some three decades.

He grew up in Northeast Ohio. Judge Carroll spent his life in the community, from Cleveland State to the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, to the county prosecutor's office, to the local bench.

He not only served the public in the courtroom, he has been a lifelong teacher—by many different definitions—mentoring young attorneys and judges at his law school and then on the faculty of the Ohio Judicial College.

Twice in the last 3 years, Judge Carroll received the President's Award for Judicial Excellence from the Association of Municipal and County Court Judges of Ohio.

I had the privilege of joining him earlier this fall, along with Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice Maureen O'Connor, for a bipartisan event of highlighting the innovative work that they were both doing.

Judge Carroll—the innovative work that they have done preventing evictions during the pandemic helped get the word out to more Ohio judges about what they can do to connect Ohio with the emergency rental assistance that we provided back months ago from the Congress.

In the American Rescue Plan, we provided grants to State and local governments for emergency rental and utility assistance to families across the country. The last thing we wanted was a wave of evictions during the health crisis. We know people move in with family members, the COVID spreads even faster. We know that happened too often.

This eviction prevention effort was a lifeline for so many families that that might have happened to.

We know what it does to families even during normal times. Think about the upheaval that that causes, especially for children. Their health suffers. They may get pulled out of their school to go to a different school. They may have to give up their pet because the pet costs too much money. You can't bring them to a new apartment. They don't feel stable. It is much harder for their parents to get back to work using public transportation, if they are even served, and to earn a living.

As all of us know, when people are evicted, they end up in crowded shelters or moving in with family. It makes them more vulnerable to coronavirus. It makes it more likely to spread, especially among people who are not vaccinated.

We know that 90 percent of the hospitalizations—whether it is Columbus, GA, or Columbus, OH—90 percent of patients in hospitals with COVID are unvaccinated.

Finding another place to rent after an eviction is much, much harder.

After we passed the American Rescue Plan, not enough people knew help was available to them. That is where Judge Carroll came in. That is where Chief Justice O'Connor came in. The work they have done to divert eviction proceedings and connect people with help is literally lifesaving for many.

He taught courses to the State judiciary on eviction law. He worked with tenants and landlords to divert eviction proceedings. Judges can work to connect both renters and landlords with the help available to them.

Ohio leads the way because of Judge Carroll and because of Chief Justice O'Connor in preventing evictions and connecting people with their potential emergency rental assistance. These actions by the judges encourage them to—tenants to explore all rental assistance options before the judge proceeds with an eviction case.

Since the start of the pandemic, more than 1,000 households in Lakewood, OH, a suburb west of Cleveland, have been connected with some form of rental help—more than 1,000 households. That is because of the work that Judge Carroll did and the work that Justice O'Connor has done around the State. It is the kind of success we want to see replicated in Ohio and across the country.

In September, Judge Carroll told us that judges need to ''recognize eviction cases are more than civil cases for disposition. An eviction order impacts a person's life, home and property, and in many cases, the lives of children who are uprooted from school when forced to move.''

He is a judge that—as President Lincoln used to tell his staff, I have got to leave the White House and go out and get my public opinion bath. That is what Judge Carroll as a judge does. It is not necessarily something most judges do, but when he does that, he finds out what he can do as a judge to prevent families from being evicted.

We need more judges in Ohio and around the country to follow his lead in a final push to get rental assistance to Americans in need.

The Biden administration has worked throughout the year with us on eviction—on help for evictions, on emergency rental assistance, cutting red-tape, encouraging State and local governments to move faster to get this help to families and landlords. That work has delivered impressive results. More than 520,000 renters received emergency rental assistance in October alone.

It means those families were able to keep their homes, keep their lights on in October, work to get back on their feet, and recover from the pandemic.

In total, more than 2½ million payments have gone out to tenants and landlords. Now, with the end of the year approaching, we need that final push to get funding to the renters and the landlords who need it.

As Judge Carroll prepares for a well-earned retirement, it is my hope that this will be an important part of his legacy—of the work Chief Justice O'Connor does and the work that they do in Ohio and we can do around the country—as an example to public servants in Ohio and all over the United States, showing how we can keep a roof over families' heads, allow landlords to pay their bills, and emerge stronger from this pandemic.

I urge my colleagues—ask them to join me in honoring Judge Patrick Carroll and a lifetime of service to the people of my great State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER SUNG

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on President Biden's nomination of my neighbor and fellow Oregonian, Jennifer Sung, to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

I guess I ought to save everybody some suspense. I am proud to support her nomination, and I just want to take a few minutes to talk about why she deserves the support of all Senators.

First, with respect to her qualifications, Ms. Sung is a graduate of Oberlin College and Yale Law School. As a student, she volunteered to represent low-income patients at a local hospital. As a legal fellow at the Brennan Center for Justice, she fought on behalf of workers who toiled in poor conditions for little pay. In private practice, she defended the rights of all people in our country to work in safe and fair conditions, to get the healthcare they need, and to freely exercise their constitutional rights.

Currently, Ms. Sung serves as a member of Oregon's Employment Relations Board. That is the board that adjudicates disputes over labor practices and employment law. She has decided more than 200 cases in that role. She has proven her impartiality, which I think we all understand is fundamental to what we need in a justice. And she has certainly shown her diligence and her commitment to justice. Her qualifications, in my view, simply cannot be questioned.

Second, I have had the chance to get to know Ms. Sung personally since her nomination, and what struck me is we both have a family story that is only possible here in our great country. Members of her family fled political persecution and violence in China in the 1940s—the Wydens fled the terror or Nazis just a few years earlier—and they barely spoke any English when they arrived here in their new home.

Our country provided safety and opportunity for my family and for Ms. Sung's family. And I have always found that so many who have that family story take a special interest in protecting the rights and the freedoms Americans enjoy. That has been a hallmark of Ms. Sung's legal career, and it is something, in my view, that all Senators ought to support.

So I am proud to describe my Southeast Portland neighbor, Jennifer Sung, as a talented, committed individual who will be a great asset on the bench. She is going to be a superb judge.

I urge all my colleagues to support Jennifer Sung when we vote soon on President Biden's nomination, Oregonian Jennifer Sung, to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

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

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

The Senator from Utah.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Senate, today, will pass a bill that, quite literally, gives a blank check to President Biden and the Democrats. They will use it to pass the ''destroy America bill,'' which they call Build Back Better.

There is literally a blank check in the bill. It is literally a blank check. The Senators who gave that blank check don't want you to know that they did it. They used procedural jiujitsu to hide their votes. Republicans are hiding behind Democrats, and Democrats are hiding behind Republicans, but the American people see through it.

They closed the doors, held their noses, and created a new way to pass bad bills and claimed that it was just this one time.

Mark my words: This bill will be one more tool repeatedly used to abuse the American people.

This debt ceiling increase is a blank check for the Democrats' reckless tax-and-spending bill. It should have never happened.

NOMINATION OF LUCY H. KOH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Lucy H. Koh to serve as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Judge Koh is a highly respected member of the Federal judiciary and has served California well throughout her career. She would be a welcome addition to the Ninth Circuit bench.

I have long supported Judge Koh and am pleased that the Senate will soon be considering her nomination. I recommended Judge Koh for a seat on the Ninth Circuit back in 2016 and was pleased that President Obama nominated her at that time. And I was disappointed that she did not receive a vote on the Senate floor, even though she received strong bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee, which favorably reported her nomination.

I am pleased that Judge Koh was among the first circuit court nominees announced by President Biden earlier this year. Her credentials are undeniably impressive. She received her undergraduate degree from Harvard College in 1990, and her law degree from Harvard Law School in 1993.

Judge Koh spent several years early in her career in public service, first as a legal fellow on the Senate Judiciary Committee's Immigration Subcommittee and then with the Department of Justice. Among her achievements while at the Justice Department, Judge Koh received an award from the FBI for ''Demonstrated Excellence in Prosecuting a Major Fraud Case.''

She then brought her skills to the private sector, spending nearly a decade in private practice in Palo Alto, CA, where she became a distinguished intellectual property lawyer working on patent, trade secret, and commercial civil litigation. In 2008, she was appointed by California's then-Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, a Republican, to serve as a judge on the California Superior Court for Santa Clara County.

In 2010, President Obama nominated her to serve as a Federal district judge on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. The Senate voted unanimously, 90 to 0, to confirm her to that position. She has served with distinction as a Federal district judge for more than a decade.

Judge Koh has excelled throughout her career as a Federal prosecutor, in private practice, and as both a state and Federal judge. I have no doubt that she will continue to excel if she is confirmed to the Ninth Circuit.

Judge Koh has received bipartisan support each time her nomination has come before the Senate, including a bipartisan vote earlier this year in the Judiciary Committee. I urge all of my colleagues to support her nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. RISCH. 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.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The motion to concur with amendment No. 4871 is withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 491 Leg.]

YEAS—59

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

NAYS—35

Blackburn	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hagerty	Paul
Braun	Hawley	Risch
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Johnson	Shelby
Cruz	Kennedy	Sullivan
Daines	Lankford	Tuberville
Ernst	Lee	Wicker
Fischer	Lummis	Young
Graham	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—6

Burr	King	Sasse
Cornyn	Rounds	Toomey

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 486, Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Debbie Stabenow, Chris Van Hollen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Luján, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Cory A. Booker, Brian Schatz.

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 Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. R. SCOTT), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 492 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—38

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

NOT VOTING—11

Burr	King	Scott (FL)
Capito	Risch	Sinema
Cassidy	Rounds	Toomey
Cornyn	Sasse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will proceed to executive session.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 533, Jennifer Sung, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Debbie Stabenow, Chris Van Hollen, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Luján, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Cory A. Booker, Brian Schatz.

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 Jennifer Sung, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 493 Ex.]

YEAS—48

Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Bennet	Brown	Carper
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Casey

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

NAYS—39

Barrasso	Grassley	Moran
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blunt	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Portman
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cotton	Inhofe	Rubio
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Kennedy	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Sullivan
Daines	Lee	Thune
Ernst	Lummis	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	Wicker
Graham	McConnell	Young

NOT VOTING—13

Braun	King	Sinema
Burr	Risch	Tillis
Capito	Rounds	Toomey
Cassidy	Sasse	
Cornyn	Scott (FL)	

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer Sung, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I just would like to speak about the vote we had—the first vote.

I am really pleased that this Chamber just passed legislation setting up a fast-track process with debt ceiling legislation—no brinksmanship, no default on the debt, no risk of another recession. Responsible governing won the day. This is now headed to the President's desk.

I want to be clear. This is about paying debt accumulated by both parties. So I am pleased we were able to facilitate a process with the support of Members from both parties that avoids a needless and catastrophic default and cuts to Medicare.

This was a bipartisan process, and I hope there can be more. And I want to thank Leader MCCONNELL for working with us in good faith to get to this point.

We started this month with a daunting to-do list, but we have made significant progress and are on track to get the work done. To repeat, we did this with no brinksmanship, no default on debt, no risk of another recession. It was responsible governing that won the day, and now the bill is headed to the President's desk.

I expect—after this legislation is signed, I expect new legislation will be introduced to increase the debt limit, and we intend to pass it by December 15. The American people can breathe easy and rest assured there will not be a default.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 359 and 361; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislation session.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Stephen A. Owens, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years; and Sylvia E. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 160, S. Res. 380.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 380) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic, and with an amendment to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

[$6,000,000,000 in emergency humanitarian assistance since the start of the civil war in December 2013;

[Whereas, on July 9, 2021, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan marked 10 years in existence at a total cost of more than $10,300,000,000, and total United States contributions are estimated to exceed $3,300,000,000 through 2021;

[Whereas the leaders of South Sudan have consistently failed to uphold their responsibilities to create the conditions for peace and prosperity, have prioritized self-preservation and corruption over the needs of the people they represent, have acted in bad faith in the implementation of cease-fire and peace agreements, and have betrayed the cause of freedom, resulting in the loss of millions of innocent lives;

[Whereas South Sudan has not held an election since its independence and the current leaders of South Sudan were appointed or installed through transitional arrangements based on peace agreements;

[Whereas South Sudan merits consistent high-level attention given the central role the United States played in diplomatic efforts leading to the independence of South Sudan and the enormous investments in humanitarian and other assistance the United States has provided to South Sudan; and

[Whereas, on July 9, 2021, South Sudan celebrated the 10th anniversary of its independence: Now, therefore, be it]

Whereas the Republic of South Sudan became the newest country in the world on July 9, 2011, following the Referendum on the Self-Determination of Southern Sudan, in which 99 percent of Southern Sudanese voters voted in favor of secession from Sudan;

Whereas the 21-year civil war in Sudan, the longest-running conflict in Africa, caused approximately 2,000,000 deaths and mass population displacement of approximately 550,000 refugees and 4,000,000 internally displaced persons;

Whereas the United States played a significant role in supporting the resolution of Sudan's civil war, facilitating peace negotiations, serving as a guarantor to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Sudan People's Liberation Army signed in January 2005, and providing substantial resources for the implementation of that agreement alongside other international partners;

Whereas, on December 15, 2013, just 28 months following independence, the political power struggle between President Salva Kiir and Vice President Riek Machar, both of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), erupted into open conflict between ethnically allied Dinka and Nuer factions of the security services and quickly escalated into civil war;

Whereas, on August 17, 2015, after months of mediation by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan was signed by President Kiir, Riek Machar for SPLM-In Opposition (SPLM-IO), and Pagan Amum for SPLM-Former Detainees;

Whereas the parties to the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan demonstrated a lack of political will for sustainable peace, delaying implementation of the agreement, and in July 2016, new clashes in Juba quickly spread, returning the country to civil war;

Whereas the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan, signed on September 12, 2018, reasserted the Parties' commitment to a permanent ceasefire, humanitarian access, and respect for human rights, and called for the establishment of a Revitalized Transitional Government of National Unity to lead South Sudan to democratic elections after 44 months;

Whereas Kiir's presidential term has been extended 3 times since South Sudan's independence, twice through amendments to the Transitional Constitution of South Sudan and most recently through an extension of the Transitional Period under the Revitalized Agreement on the

Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan to 2023;

Whereas, despite years of fighting, the widespread suffering of South Sudanese civilians, punitive actions by the international community, and 2 peace agreements, the leaders of South Sudan have failed to build sustainable peace, and critical provisions of the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan remain unimplemented;

Whereas the conflict in South Sudan resulted in the deaths of at least 383,000 people from December 2013 to April 2018, according to a report by the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, and caused one of the worst displacement crises in the world with 1,600,000 internally displaced persons and 2,200,000 refugees and asylum seekers in the region as of May 2021, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

Whereas South Sudan ranks 185th of 189 countries in the 2020 Human Development Index, performed the worst of 180 countries on the 2020 Corruption Perceptions Index, is perennially one of the most dangerous countries in which aid workers operate, received the lowest ranking in the Department of State's Trafficking in Persons Report every year from 2015 to 2021, and has been on the Child Soldiers Prevention Act list for 10 years in a row;

Whereas the United Nations declared a ''manmade'' famine in parts of South Sudan in February 2017, and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs stated in March 2021 that ''South Sudan is facing its highest levels of food insecurity and malnutrition since independence ten years ago'';

Whereas the African Union and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights found that parties to the conflict had committed acts that constituted war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other violations of international humanitarian law;

Whereas, in February 2021, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan ''found that ten years after independence, staggering levels of violence continue and threaten to spiral out of control across several regions in the country'';

Whereas, in September 2021, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Chairperson of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan both reported that there were significant levels of localized violence and a marked deterioration of human rights conditions in South Sudan;

Whereas the situation in South Sudan persists while its neighbors face increasingly urgent domestic and regional issues, including a fragile political transition in Sudan, conflict in Ethiopia, and deeply flawed electoral processes and political unrest in Uganda and Somalia;

Whereas the United States has been the largest donor to South Sudan, providing more than $1,800,000,000 in development assistance since independence and more than $6,000,000,000 in emergency humanitarian assistance since the start of the civil war in December 2013;

Whereas, on July 9, 2021, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan marked 10 years in existence at a total cost of more than $10,300,000,000, and total United States contributions are estimated to exceed $3,300,000,000 through 2021;

Whereas the leaders of South Sudan have consistently failed to uphold their responsibilities to create the conditions for peace and prosperity, have prioritized self-preservation and corruption over the needs of the people they represent, have acted in bad faith in the implementation of cease-fire and peace agreements, and have betrayed the cause of freedom, resulting in the loss of millions of innocent lives;

Whereas South Sudan has not held an election since its independence and the current leaders of South Sudan were appointed or installed through transitional arrangements based on peace agreements;

Whereas South Sudan merits consistent high-level attention given the central role the United States played in diplomatic efforts leading to the independence of South Sudan and the enormous investments in humanitarian and other assistance the United States has provided to South Sudan; and

Whereas, on July 9, 2021, South Sudan celebrated the 10th anniversary of its independence: Now, therefore, be it

[*Resolved,* That the Senate—

[(1) reiterates the commitment of the United States to helping the people of South Sudan realize their aspirations of an independent, stable, democratic, and prosperous South Sudan;

[(2) calls on the Secretary of State to lead a comprehensive interagency process to develop a revitalized United States policy toward South Sudan that—

[(A) identifies a broader range of South Sudanese political and civilian stakeholders, beyond President Kiir and First Vice President Machar, with whom the United States may work for the promotion of peace, democracy, development, accountability, transparency, and anti-corruption efforts;

[(B) restores United States diplomatic leadership with regard to South Sudan alongside European and African partners;

[(C) reflects the realities of the conflict and the political context in South Sudan; and

[(D) increases diplomatic efforts to urge regional actors, particularly in Kenya and Uganda, to investigate assets of corrupt South Sudanese elites and ensure Kenya and Uganda are no longer havens for conflict- and corruption-related proceeds;

[(3) calls on the United States Mission to the United Nations—

[(A) to demonstrate renewed United States leadership with regard to the United Nations Mission in South Sudan to orient the peacekeeping mission toward increased effectiveness, clarity of purpose, and eventual drawdown; and

[(B) to call upon regional and international actors to cooperate in enforcing the United Nations arms embargo in South Sudan and take action against those violating the embargo;

[(4) calls on the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Secretary of State—

[(A) to ensure that United States assistance adheres to the principle of ''Do No Harm'' by pausing any funding, including humanitarian aid, that is manipulated to legitimize or enrich any party to the ongoing conflict;

[(B) to review United States diplomatic engagement and assistance to South Sudan, which currently amounts to more than $1,000,000,000 in aid each year, with the goal of matching the level of United States diplomatic engagement with United States assistance; and

[(C) to ensure that the comprehensive review of United States assistance programs to South Sudan, started in 2018 to ''ensure our assistance does not contribute to or prolong the conflict, or facilitate predatory or corrupt behavior'', is completed and its findings publicized; and

[(5) urges the Secretary of the Treasury—

[(A) to prioritize investigative actions into illicit financial flows fueling violence in South Sudan;

[(B) to work with the Secretary of State to add to the list of individuals and entities designated under the South Sudan sanctions program, including individuals at the highest levels of leadership in South Sudan and from within the National Security Service; and

[(C) to coordinate, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, with the United Kingdom and the European Union on South Sudan-related sanctions designations and enforcement.]

That the Senate—

(1) reiterates the commitment of the United States to helping the people of South Sudan realize their aspirations of an independent, stable, democratic, and prosperous South Sudan;

(2) calls on the Secretary of State to lead a comprehensive interagency process to develop a revitalized United States policy toward South Sudan that—

(A) restores United States diplomatic leadership with regard to South Sudan alongside European and African partners;

(B) advances United States policy goals for South Sudan and the Horn of Africa and establishes a plan to support a peaceful, prosperous South Sudan;

(C) identifies South Sudanese political and civilian stakeholders, beyond President Kiir and First Vice President Machar, with whom the United States may work for the promotion of peace, democracy, development, accountability, transparency, and anti-corruption efforts;

(D) increases diplomatic efforts to urge regional actors, particularly in Kenya and Uganda, to investigate assets of corrupt South Sudanese elites and ensure Kenya and Uganda are no longer havens for conflict- and corruption-related proceeds; and

(E) ensures that United States diplomatic engagement is commensurate with the level of assistance the United States provides to South Sudan, which currently amounts to more than $1,000,000,000 in aid each year;

(3) calls on the United States Mission to the United Nations—

(A) to take steps to ensure increased effectiveness of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan; and

(B) to call upon regional and international actors to cooperate in enforcing the United Nations arms embargo in South Sudan and take action against those violating the embargo;

(4) calls on the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Secretary of State—

(A) to ensure that United States assistance adheres to the principle of ''Do No Harm'' by pausing any funding, including humanitarian aid, that is found to enrich any party to the ongoing conflict; and

(B) to ensure that the comprehensive review of United States assistance programs to South Sudan, started in 2018 to ''ensure our assistance does not contribute to or prolong the conflict, or facilitate predatory or corrupt behavior'', is completed and its findings publicized; and

(5) urges the Secretary of the Treasury—

(A) to prioritize investigations into illicit financial flows fueling violence in South Sudan;

(B) to work with the Secretary of State to update, on a regular basis, the list of individuals and entities designated under the South Sudan sanctions program, including individuals at the highest levels of leadership in South Sudan and from within the National Security Service; and

(C) to coordinate, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, with the United Kingdom and the European Union on South Sudan-related sanctions designations and enforcement.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 380), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that 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 committee-reported amendment to the preamble, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 380), as amended, and the preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 380

Whereas the Republic of South Sudan became the newest country in the world on July 9, 2011, following the Referendum on the Self-Determination of Southern Sudan, in which 99 percent of Southern Sudanese voters voted in favor of secession from Sudan;

Whereas the 21-year civil war in Sudan, the longest-running conflict in Africa, caused approximately 2,000,000 deaths and mass population displacement of approximately 550,000 refugees and 4,000,000 internally displaced persons;

Whereas the United States played a significant role in supporting the resolution of Sudan's civil war, facilitating peace negotiations, serving as a guarantor to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Sudan People's Liberation Army signed in January 2005, and providing substantial resources for the implementation of that agreement alongside other international partners;

Whereas, on December 15, 2013, just 28 months following independence, the political power struggle between President Salva Kiir and Vice President Riek Machar, both of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), erupted into open conflict between ethnically allied Dinka and Nuer factions of the security services and quickly escalated into civil war;

Whereas, on August 17, 2015, after months of mediation by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development, the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan was signed by President Kiir, Riek Machar for SPLM-In Opposition (SPLM-IO), and Pagan Amum for SPLM-Former Detainees;

Whereas the parties to the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan demonstrated a lack of political will for sustainable peace, delaying implementation of the agreement, and in July 2016, new clashes in Juba quickly spread, returning the country to civil war;

Whereas the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan, signed on September 12, 2018, reasserted the Parties' commitment to a permanent ceasefire, humanitarian access, and respect for human rights, and called for the establishment of a Revitalized Transitional Government of National Unity to lead South Sudan to democratic elections after 44 months;

Whereas Kiir's presidential term has been extended 3 times since South Sudan's independence, twice through amendments to the Transitional Constitution of South Sudan and most recently through an extension of the Transitional Period under the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan to 2023;

Whereas, despite years of fighting, the widespread suffering of South Sudanese civilians, punitive actions by the international community, and 2 peace agreements, the leaders of South Sudan have failed to build sustainable peace, and critical provisions of the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan remain unimplemented;

Whereas the conflict in South Sudan resulted in the deaths of at least 383,000 people from December 2013 to April 2018, according to a report by the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, and caused one of the worst displacement crises in the world with 1,600,000 internally displaced persons and 2,200,000 refugees and asylum seekers in the region as of May 2021, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

Whereas South Sudan ranks 185th of 189 countries in the 2020 Human Development Index, performed the worst of 180 countries on the 2020 Corruption Perceptions Index, is perennially one of the most dangerous countries in which aid workers operate, received the lowest ranking in the Department of State's Trafficking in Persons Report every year from 2015 to 2021, and has been on the Child Soldiers Prevention Act list for 10 years in a row;

Whereas the United Nations declared a ''man-made'' famine in parts of South Sudan in February 2017, and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs stated in March 2021 that ''South Sudan is facing its highest levels of food insecurity and malnutrition since independence ten years ago'';

Whereas the African Union and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights found that parties to the conflict had committed acts that constituted war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other violations of international humanitarian law;

Whereas, in February 2021, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan ''found that ten years after independence, staggering levels of violence continue and threaten to spiral out of control across several regions in the country'';

Whereas, in September 2021, the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Chairperson of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in South Sudan both reported that there were significant levels of localized violence and a marked deterioration of human rights conditions in South Sudan;

Whereas the situation in South Sudan persists while its neighbors face increasingly urgent domestic and regional issues, including a fragile political transition in Sudan, conflict in Ethiopia, and deeply flawed electoral processes and political unrest in Uganda and Somalia;

Whereas the United States has been the largest donor to South Sudan, providing more than $1,800,000,000 in development assistance since independence and more than $6,000,000,000 in emergency humanitarian assistance since the start of the civil war in December 2013;

Whereas, on July 9, 2021, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan marked 10 years in existence at a total cost of more than $10,300,000,000, and total United States contributions are estimated to exceed $3,300,000,000 through 2021;

Whereas the leaders of South Sudan have consistently failed to uphold their responsibilities to create the conditions for peace and prosperity, have prioritized self-preservation and corruption over the needs of the people they represent, have acted in bad faith in the implementation of cease-fire and peace agreements, and have betrayed the cause of freedom, resulting in the loss of millions of innocent lives;

Whereas South Sudan has not held an election since its independence and the current leaders of South Sudan were appointed or installed through transitional arrangements based on peace agreements;

Whereas South Sudan merits consistent high-level attention given the central role the United States played in diplomatic efforts leading to the independence of South Sudan and the enormous investments in humanitarian and other assistance the United States has provided to South Sudan; and

Whereas, on July 9, 2021, South Sudan celebrated the 10th anniversary of its independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reiterates the commitment of the United States to helping the people of South Sudan realize their aspirations of an independent, stable, democratic, and prosperous South Sudan;

(2) calls on the Secretary of State to lead a comprehensive interagency process to develop a revitalized United States policy toward South Sudan that—

(A) restores United States diplomatic leadership with regard to South Sudan alongside European and African partners;

(B) advances United States policy goals for South Sudan and the Horn of Africa and establishes a plan to support a peaceful, prosperous South Sudan;

(C) identifies South Sudanese political and civilian stakeholders, beyond President Kiir and First Vice President Machar, with whom the United States may work for the promotion of peace, democracy, development, accountability, transparency, and anti-corruption efforts;

(D) increases diplomatic efforts to urge regional actors, particularly in Kenya and Uganda, to investigate assets of corrupt South Sudanese elites and ensure Kenya and Uganda are no longer havens for conflict- and corruption-related proceeds; and

(E) ensures that United States diplomatic engagement is commensurate with the level of assistance the United States provides to South Sudan, which currently amounts to more than $1,000,000,000 in aid each year;

(3) calls on the United States Mission to the United Nations—

(A) to take steps to ensure increased effectiveness of the United Nations Mission in South Sudan; and

(B) to call upon regional and international actors to cooperate in enforcing the United Nations arms embargo in South Sudan and take action against those violating the embargo;

(4) calls on the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, in coordination with the Secretary of State—

(A) to ensure that United States assistance adheres to the principle of ''Do No Harm'' by pausing any funding, including humanitarian aid, that is found to enrich any party to the ongoing conflict; and

(B) to ensure that the comprehensive review of United States assistance programs to South Sudan, started in 2018 to ''ensure our assistance does not contribute to or prolong the conflict, or facilitate predatory or corrupt behavior'', is completed and its findings publicized; and

(5) urges the Secretary of the Treasury—

(A) to prioritize investigations into illicit financial flows fueling violence in South Sudan;

(B) to work with the Secretary of State to update, on a regular basis, the list of individuals and entities designated under the South Sudan sanctions program, including individuals at the highest levels of leadership in South Sudan and from within the National Security Service; and

(C) to coordinate, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, with the United Kingdom and the European Union on South Sudan-related sanctions designations and enforcement.

JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 170, S. 2938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the ''Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building'', and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 2938) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2938

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

SECTION 1. JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, shall be known and designated as the ''Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Courthouse and Federal Building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building''.

ODELL HORTON FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 171, H.R. 390.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 390) to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee as the ''Odell Horton Federal Building''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 390) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FREDERICK P. STAMP, JR. FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 172, H.R. 4660.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4660) to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 1125 Chapline Street in Wheeling, West Virginia, as the ''Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 4660) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TO OBTAIN AND DIRECT THE PLACEMENT IN THE CAPITOL OR ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS OF A STATUE TO HONOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR AND A STATUE TO HONOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of S. 3294 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3294) to obtain and direct the placement in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds of a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Sandra Day O'Connor and a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 3294) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3294

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

(a) SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Sandra Day O'Connor was born in 1930 in El Paso, Texas, and spent her childhood on her family's isolated Arizona cattle ranch. She lived with her grandmother in El Paso during the school year, away from her home and parents.

(2) O'Connor matriculated to Stanford University at the age of 16, and combined her undergraduate and law school curricula, graduating with a bachelor's degree in economics and a law degree in just 6 years. She was third in her law school class, behind William Rehnquist, her future colleague on the Supreme Court of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Supreme Court'').

(3) Despite her qualifications, O'Connor could not find work as an attorney because of bias against women in the law. She ended up negotiating for an unpaid position in the San Mateo County District Attorney's office at a shared desk, while her husband, John, finished at Stanford Law School 1 year later.

(4) O'Connor traveled to Frankfurt, Germany, in 1954 with her husband John, who had joined the United States Army Judge Advocate General's Corps, where she was able to find work as a civilian attorney with the United States Army Quartermaster Corps. In 1957, O'Connor returned to Arizona and still could not find work with a traditional law firm due to her gender, so she ''hung out a shingle'' as a sole practitioner.

(5) In 1965, O'Connor was hired as an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Arizona.

(6) Active in Republican Party politics and well-received for her work at the Arizona State Capitol, O'Connor was appointed to an Arizona State Senate seat in 1969 when the incumbent, also a woman, was appointed to a Federal position and vacated the office.

(7) In 1970, O'Connor was elected to the Arizona State Senate and served 2 consecutive terms. In 1972, she was selected as Majority Leader of the Arizona State Senate, the first time a woman held such a position in any State.

(8) In 1974, O'Connor ran for office as a trial court judge. She won and was later appointed to the Arizona Court of Appeals in 1979.

(9) On August 19, 1981, President Ronald Reagan nominated O'Connor to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, to fill the seat vacated by Associate Justice Potter Stewart. On September 21, 1981, the Senate confirmed O'Connor's nomination by a unanimous vote, making her the first woman to serve on the Supreme Court.

(10) O'Connor established herself as a pragmatic, independent voice on the Supreme Court, casting decisive votes during a time when the Court was being asked to resolve politically charged issues.

(11) In the 1982 case of Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan, O'Connor wrote the majority opinion holding that the State could not prevent men from enrolling in an all-women's nursing school, writing that laws discriminating on the basis of sex would be allowed only if there was an ''exceedingly persuasive justification'' for them.

(12) O'Connor sought, when possible, to find the middle ground between her often-divided colleagues, frequently joining the majority decision but presenting her views in concurring opinions that eschewed broad

constitutional doctrine in favor of resolving the cases before the Court.

(13) O'Connor put a very public face on the role of the Supreme Court, domestically and around the world. She became the Court's most prolific public speaker, traveling to all 50 States and to countless law schools, libraries, and public events to describe how the Court works and its role in our constitutional form of government. She traveled worldwide as an ambassador for the Rule of Law and the independence of judiciaries everywhere.

(14) After 24 years on the Supreme Court, O'Connor announced her retirement to care for her ailing husband, who had Alzheimer's disease. President George W. Bush nominated John Roberts, Jr., for the vacancy, but before Roberts was confirmed, Chief Justice Rehnquist passed away, creating a second vacancy. President Bush personally appealed to O'Connor to remain on the Court so he could nominate Roberts for the Chief Justice vacancy and have more time to make a second nomination to the Court. In yet another act of public service, O'Connor agreed to serve until Samuel Alito was confirmed to fill her seat on January 31, 2006.

(15) O'Connor began her retirement with 2 goals. One was to convince more States to adopt merit selection of judges for filling vacancies in State courts. The second was to educate the public on the importance of an independent judiciary. Her judicial independence work led to her awareness of a national civics education deficit.

(16) In 2009, O'Connor created iCivics.org to educate young Americans about civics and what it means to be a citizen. That endeavor grew to become the largest civics education platform in the country, with over 7,000,000 students annually enrolling in the programs. Its popularity was due to a captivating online, interactive gaming approach. The program was free to all and had no advertising. iCivics played a crucial role in Educating for American Democracy, a federally funded initiative to improve civics and history education, which released its reports in March 2021.

(b) RUTH BADER GINSBURG.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Ruth Bader Ginsburg was born in 1933 in Brooklyn, New York, and grew up in a low-income, working-class neighborhood.

(2) Ginsburg graduated from Cornell University in 1954, finishing first in her class. Following her graduation, Ginsburg enrolled at Harvard Law School in 1956, entering into a class of 552 men and only 8 other women.

(3) As a law student, Ginsburg became the first female member of the Harvard Law Review, a prestigious legal journal. She also cared for her husband, Martin Ginsburg, who had been diagnosed with cancer, and their young daughter. Ginsburg finished her legal education at Columbia Law School, where she graduated first in her class in 1959.

(4) Ginsburg taught at Rutgers University Law School from 1963 to 1972 and at Columbia Law School from 1972 to 1980, where she became the school's first female tenured professor.

(5) During the 1970s, Ginsburg served as the director of the Women's Rights Project of the American Civil Liberties Union. In this position, she led the fight against gender discrimination and successfully argued 6 landmark cases before the Supreme Court.

(6) Ginsburg won 5 cases on gender discrimination before the Supreme Court, including the case Weinberger v. Wiesenfeld, which involved a portion of the Social Security Act that favored women over men, because the Act granted certain benefits to widows, but not widowers.

(7) In 1980, President Jimmy Carter nominated Ginsburg to a seat on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(8) On June 22, 1993, President Bill Clinton nominated Ginsburg to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, to fill the seat vacated by Associate Justice Byron White. On August 3, 1993, the Senate confirmed Ginsburg's nomination to the Supreme Court by a 96 to 3 vote.

(9) Ginsburg became the second female justice to serve on the Supreme Court, as well as the first Jewish female justice to serve on the Supreme Court.

(10) As a justice, Ginsburg presented a strong voice in favor of gender equality, voting rights, the rights of workers, and the separation of church and state.

(11) In 1996, Ginsburg wrote the Supreme Court's landmark decision in United States v. Virginia, which held that the State-supported Virginia Military Institute could not refuse to admit women.

(12) Ginsburg famously dissented in Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., where the plaintiff, a female worker being paid significantly less than males with her same qualifications, sued under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), but was denied relief under a statute of limitation issue. Ginsburg broke with tradition and wrote a high colloquial version of her dissent to read from the bench. In her dissent, she also called for Congress to undo this interpretation of the law.

(13) Ginsburg's impactful dissent in Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. led to the successful passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–2; 123 Stat. 5), which was the first piece of legislation signed by President Barack Obama.

(14) Until the 2018 term, Ginsburg had not missed a day of oral arguments, not even when she was undergoing chemotherapy for pancreatic cancer, after surgery for colon cancer, or the day after her husband passed away in 2010.

(15) Ginsburg passed away on September 18, 2020.

SEC. 2. STATUES HONORING JUSTICE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR AND JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG.

(a) OBTAINING OF STATUES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, in consultation with the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library considers appropriate, consistent with applicable law, the Joint Committee shall—

(A) enter into an agreement to obtain a statue honoring Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Sandra Day O'Connor; and

(B) enter into an agreement to obtain a statue honoring Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

(2) CONSIDERATION.—In selecting one or more artists to make the statues obtained under paragraph (1), the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library shall make the announcement available to, and consider, artists from a variety of backgrounds, including artists from underrepresented demographic groups.

(b) INSTALLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, shall permanently install each statue obtained under subsection (a) in a prominent location in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds, as described in section 5102 of title 40, United States Code.

(2) PRIORITY FOR LOCATION.—In determining the location for the permanent installation of each statue obtained under subsection (a), the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library shall give priority to identifying an appropriate location near the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol.

(c) FUNDING.—Amounts available in the Capitol Preservation Fund established under section 803 of the Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act of 1988 (2 U.S.C. 2083) may be used by the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library for payments for the costs of creating and installing the statues obtained under subsection (a), without regard to subsections (b) and (d) of such section, provided that not more than $500,000 of such amounts may be used for each statue obtained under subsection (a).

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 20–0I. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 16–58 of November 17, 2016.

Sincerely,

JEDIDIAH P. ROYAL,
Acting Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 20–01

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(B)(5)(C). AECA)

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Qatar.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1). AECA Transmittal No.: 16–58.

Date: November 17, 2016.

Military Department: Air Force.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On November 17, 2016, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 16–58 of the possible sale under Section 36(b)(1) of the

Arms Export Control Act of weapons, equipment, and support for: seventy-two (72) F–15QA aircraft, one hundred forty-four (144) F–110–GE–129 aircraft engines, eighty (80) Advanced Display Core Processor II (ADCP II), eighty (80) Digital Electronic Warfare Suites (DEWS), eighty (80) M61A ''Vulcan'' gun systems, eighty (80) Link–16 systems, one hundred sixty (160) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS), three hundred twelve (312) LAU–128 missile launchers, eighty (80) AN/APG–82(V)l Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radars, one hundred sixty (160) Embedded OPS/Inertial Navigation Systems (INS) (EGI), eighty (80) AN/AAQ–13 LANTIRN navigation pods w/containers, eighty (80) AN/AAQ–33 SNIPER Advanced Targeting Pods w/containers, eighty (80) AN/AAS–42 Infrared Search and Track Systems (IRST), two hundred (200) AIM–9X Sidewinder missiles, seventy (70) AIM–9X Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM), eight (8) AIM–9X special training missiles, twenty (20) CATM AIM–9X missile guidance units, twenty (20) AIM–9X tactical guidance kits, two hundred fifty (250) AIM–120C7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM), five (5) AIM–120C7 spare guidance kits, one hundred (100) AGM–88 High Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARM), forty (40) AGM–88 HARM CATMs, two hundred (200) AGM–154 Joint Standoff Weapons (JSOW), eighty (80) AGM–84L–1 Standoff Strike anti-ship missiles (Harpoon), ten (10) Harpoon exercise missiles, two hundred (200) AGM–65O2 (Maverick) missiles, five hundred (500) GBU–38 Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAM) guidance kits, five hundred (500) GBU–3l (Vl) JDAM guidance kits, two hundred fifty (250) GBU–54 Laser JDAM guidance kits, two hundred fifty (250) GBU–56 Laser JDAM guidance kits, five hundred (500) BLU–117B bombs, five hundred (500) BLU–117B bombs, six (6) MK–82 Inert bombs, and one thousand (1,000) FMU–152 Joint programmable fuzes. Also included were ACMI (P5) Training Pods, Reece Pods (DB–110), Conformal Fuel Tanks (CFTs), Identification Friend/Foe (IFF) system, AN/AVS–9 Night Vision Goggles (NVG), ARC–210 UHF/UVF radios, LAU–118(v)l/A, LAU–117–AV2A, associated ground support, training materials, mission critical resources and maintenance support equipment, the procurement for various weapon support and test equipment spares, technical publications, personnel training, simulators, and other training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total cost was $21.1 billion. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted $11.5 billion of this total.

On January 5, 2018, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 0C–17 for the replacement of the previously notified two hundred (200) AGM–65H/K (Maverick) missiles (MDE), with two hundred (200) AGM–65G (Maverick) missiles (MDE); the inclusion of eighty (80) AAR–57A Common Missile Warning Systems (MDE), which were included in the total value of the DEWS systems previously notified, but not enumerated as MDE in the original notification; the replacement of five hundred (500) BLU–111B bombs, five hundred (500) BLU–117B bombs, and six (6) MK–82 Inert bombs (all MDE), with five hundred (500) BLU–111B or MK–82 (500lbs) bombs, five hundred (500) BLU–117B or MK–84 (2,000 lbs) bombs, and six (6) MK–82 Inert bombs (all MDE); and the inclusion of the following sub-components of JDAM and Laser JDAM guidance kits. The MDE sub-components were included in the total value previously notified, but not enumerated in the original notification:

a. Two hundred fifty (250) GBU–38 JDAMs with KMU–572 Air Foil Groups (AFG) (MDE);

b. Two hundred fifty (250) GBU–31 JDAMs with KMU–557 AFG (MDE);

c. Two hundred fifty (250) GBU–54 Laser JDAMs with KMU–572 AFG (MDE) and DSU–38 Laser Seeker; and

d. Two hundred fifty (250) GBU–56 Laser JDAMs with KMU–557 AFG (MDE) and DSU–40 Laser Seeker.

The replacement or upgrading of the equipment to MDE did not result in a change to the estimated cost of MDE of $11.5 billion. The total estimated case value remained $21.1 billion.

On November 28, 2018, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 0L–18 reported the inclusion of additional training assets as MDE to support the previously notified AGM–65 (Maverick) missiles: five (5) TGM–65 Maverick-Missile Aircrew Trainer; one (1) TGM–65 Maverick-Missile Load Trainer; and one (1) TGM–65 Maverick-Missile Maintenance Trainer. The estimated value of the additional MDE items was $3.5 million but its addition did not result in a net increase in the MDE value notified. The total estimated case value remained $21.1 billion.

This transmittal reports the inclusion of up to Five Hundred (500) GBU–39/B Small Diameter Bombs Increment I (SDB I) (MDE); One (1) GBU–39 A/B Focused Lethality Munition (FLM) Practice Bomb (MDE); One (1) GBU–39 B/B Laser SDB Practice Bomb (MDE); Four (4) MS–110 Reconnaissance Pod Retrofit Kits (non-MDE); Two (2) Transportable Ground Station Upgrades (non-MDE); One (1) Fixed Ground Station Upgrade (non-MDE); and associated spares; systems/materiel; support; and services. These additional MDE and non-MDE items are valued at $35 million in MDE and $220 million in non-MDE. However, the total estimated case value will remain $21.1 billion.

(iv) Significance: This notification is being provided to report the inclusion of MDE that were not enumerated at the time ofthe original notification. Inclusion of these items of MDE/non-MDE results in an increase in capability over what was originally notified. This equipment will support the requested weapon system, support the capabilities of Qatar's F–15QA fleet, and contribute to interoperability with the United States.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States. Qatar is an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Arabian Gulf region. The procurement of SDBs, MS–110 Retrofit Kits, and associated materiel/services will significantly improve Qatar's defense capabilities to meet current and future threats and deter regional aggression.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The GBU–39/B Small Diameter Bomb Increment I (SDB I) is a 250-pound weapon designed as a small, all weather, autonomous, conventional, air-to-ground, precision glide weapon able to strike fixed and stationary re-locatable targets from standoff range. The SDB I weapon system consists of the weapons, the BRU–61/A (4-place pneumatic carriage system), shipping and handling containers for a single weapon and the BRU–61/A either empty or loaded, and a weapon planning module. It has integrated diamond-back type wings that deploy after release, which increase the glide time and therefore maximum range. The SDB I Anti-Jam Global Positioning System aided Inertial Navigation System (AJGPS/INS) provides guidance to the coordinates of a stationary target. The payload/warhead is a very effective multipurpose penetrating and blast fragmentation warhead couples with a cockpit selectable electronic fuze. Its size and accuracy allow for an effective munition with less collateral damage. A proximity sensor provides height of burst capability.

2. An MS–110 Retrofit kit converts a DB–110 into an MS–110. The MS–110 is a NonProgram of Record tactical reconnaissance pod with long range, day/night, multispectral sensor technology. The multi-spectral sensor lets. the end user see color and better distinguish subtle features that a DB–1 l0's dual band imagery cannot. The pod can transmit imagery via a datalink to ground-stations for near-real time analysis and exploitation. The pod is designed for carriage on fighter jets. There are no advanced technologies in the system, subsystems, equipment or technical manuals that could be exploited by a technologically-advanced adversary.

The highest level of classification ofdefense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: December 8, 2021.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, S. Con. Res. 14, the fiscal year 2022 congressional budget resolution, included a reserve fund in section 3003 to allow the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget to revise budget aggregates, committee allocations, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger for legislation that would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2022 to 2031.

The Senate will soon consider S. 610, the Protecting Medicare and American Farmers from Sequester Cuts Act, as amended by the House, which meets the condition of being paid for and not increasing the deficit over the 10-year period. As such, I am filing a revision to the aggregates and committee allocations under the budget resolution, which were filed on September 23. Specifically, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that S. 610 will increase budget authority in 2022 by $7.65 billion and outlays by $7.144 billion. Over 5 years, budget authority and outlays will increase by $7.079 billion, while there is no net increase to outlays over the 10-year period. I am increasing the aggregate amount of budget authority and outlays for 2022, as well as the allocation to the Committee on Finance and the Senate pay-as-you-go ledger, by those amounts.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISIONS TO BUDGET AGGREGATES—BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

(Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)

($ in billions)

	2022
Current Spending Aggregates:.	
Budget Authority	4,137.815
Outlays	4,497.102
Adjustment:	
Budget Authority	7.650
Outlays	7.144
Revised Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	4,145.465
Outlays	4,504.246

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION TO SENATE COMMITIEES

(Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)

($ in billions)

	2022	2022–2026	2022–2031
Finance:			
Budget Authority	2,929.972	15,675.717	37,803.344
Outlays	3,025.410	15,761.012	37,875.037
Adjustments:			
Budget Authority	7.650	7.079	−2.380
Outlays	7.144	7.079	0.000
Revised Allocation:			
Budget Authority	2,937.622	15,682.796	37,800.964
Outlays	3,032.554	15,768.091	37,875.037

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE SENATE

(Revisions Pursuant to Section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022)

($ in billions)

	Balances
Current Balances:	
Fiscal Year 2022	0
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	0
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	0
Revisions:	
Fiscal Year 2022	7.144
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	7.079
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	0
Revised Balances:	
Fiscal Year 2022	7.144
Fiscal Years 2022–2026	7.079
Fiscal Years 2022–2031	0

CONFIRMATION OF C.B. SULLENBERGER III

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, On December 2, 2021, the Senate confirmed C.B. Sullenberger III to be Representative of the United States to the International Civil Aviation Union—ICAO—with the rank of Ambassador. After receiving responses to a series of written questions to the nominee, I remain concerned about this nominee's approach to the Ambassador position.

In response to questions on balancing regulation with the need for an open environment for innovation, Mr. Sullenberger emphasized a position that favored more regulation at the expense of innovation, as well as deference to standards established internationally rather than those generated in the U.S. I do not disagree with the need for essential safety standards to protect the flying public; however, I believe Mr. Sullenberger's views cross a threshold in which the automatic preference for government regulation, particularly international government regulation, risks stunting the growth of aviation startups in emerging technology, entrench the largest players, and result in the exclusion of State and local jurisdictions from conversations in emerging areas of unmanned flight below the airspace of manned aviation.

Finally, based on Mr. Sullenberger's responses, I am not convinced that he would properly advocate that the United States lead at ICAO in setting standards that would swiftly bring civil supersonic air travel to fruition. For these reasons, I did not offer my consent to confirm Mr. Sullenberger unanimously and instead requested a voice vote.

DEMOCRACY SUMMIT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today—on International Anti-Corruption Day, as declared by the United Nations—to speak about the Democracy Summit that President Biden is convening today and tomorrow, to which government leaders from 110 countries have been invited. It will also include a range of leading civil society actors, business and labor leaders, civic educators and investigative journalists, philanthropists, and nonprofit leaders as speakers and participants.

Undeterred by the Coronavirus pandemic, the Biden administration has organized a global virtual gathering with participants tuning in from six continents. It is an ambitious, even audacious, undertaking.

And it comes at a critical time, as the world is now 15 years into a global democratic recession, according to the well-respected watchdog organization Freedom House. In its widely cited annual survey of freedom, it has reported that, in each of the past 15 years, more countries have seen their democracy scores decline than the number of countries whose scores have improved. And last year, during the height of the global pandemic, nearly 75 percent of the world's population lived in a country that saw its democracy score deteriorate last year.

For a President who has pledged to put democratic values at the heart of American foreign policy, it is fitting and proper that he should convene the democratic leaders of the world and other relevant parties to plan the revitalization of global democracy.

Of course, readers of the annual Freedom House assessment will know that there are not 110 well-functioning, effective democracies in the world and that way too many poorly performing nominal democracies have been invited to this gathering, thus diluting its character.

While some conspicuously back-sliding countries, like Hungary and Turkey, have not been invited, there are numerous back-sliding pseudo-democracies, including the current governments of the Philippines and Pakistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Zambia, Bolsinaro's Brazil among others, that unfortunately have been included.

Then there is India, which dropped from Free to Partly Free status in Freedom in the World 2021, which contributes significantly to the fact that 75 percent of the world's people last year resided in countries moving away from democracy. Yet the government of Prime Minister Narendra Modi, after its sustained crack down on critics during the past 2 years and the atrocious scapegoating of Muslims, who were disproportionately blamed for the spread of the virus and faced attacks by vigilante mobs, has been invited to the Democracy Summit.

Members of the Senate will also know that there has been precious little information sharing with this body about the contours of the summit. There has been no discussion with us about the invitation list or the way forward from this week's summit, which I see as a missed opportunity for the Biden administration.

On the other hand, I was proud to be able to participate in a side event convened last Friday morning by the House Democracy Partnership for a discussion with legislators from other countries about the important role that parliaments can and do play in leading their governments to address the enduring and universal problem of corruption. I want to congratulate Representative DAVID PRICE of North Carolina for his leadership of that important initiative and for convening a productive international exchange of views last week in the run up to the President's gathering. One of the main take-aways from that webinar was that it is always incumbent on the legislatures of the world to press forward with laws that instruct and enable executive branch officials to elevate their work to combat corruption.

This is the main topic of my intervention today, to discuss one of the hopeful aspects of the President's Democracy Summit, which is the central role that the battle against corruption is playing in the proceedings and to underscore the leading role that we in the Congress must take to compel further action from our colleagues in the executive branch.

History tells us that they will likely not do so on their own. In fact, the history of anti-corruption laws in the United States is replete with fervent opposition from the executive branch, whether during Democratic administrations or Republican, to virtually every measure proposed in the Congress. This was true of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, which barred U.S. companies and their officials from paying bribes in foreign countries. The executive and the business community declared that this would end the ability of American corporations to do business around the world, which turned out not to be true, of course.

Indeed, it became in due course a foundational element in the United Nations Convention Against Corruption—UNCAC—and other elements of the international architecture of the battle against corruption.

Yet the executive has continued to oppose every measure introduced in Congress to address kleptocrats and human rights abusers, including the original Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 and its successor, the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act of 2016.

This is especially ironic because, since the enactment of the 2016 law, both Republican and Democratic administrations have been utilizing the law frequently and to good effect. Indeed, today, Secretary of State Tony Blinken announced that—on the occasion of International anti-Corruption

Day—the Department of State has designated 12 individuals from 7 countries for significant corruption and also named another 18 family members. In five of the designations, the Treasury Department has invoked Global Magnitsky sanctions for their roles in corruption.

The Democracy Summit is being built around three principal themes: defending against authoritarianism, promoting respect for human rights, and fighting corruption. Corruption is the means and the method for kleptocratic rulers around the world to steal from their own people and to stash their wealth in safe havens, most often in the democratic Western world. This is directly and intimately connected to the undermining of the rule of law and the repression of human rights in these same countries—which is why I was so pleased to see that, on June 3 of this year, President Biden declared the fight against corruption to be ''a core national security interest.'' And he directed his National Security Advisor to develop a comprehensive strategy to address the problem.

Accordingly, earlier this week, in the run-up to the Democracy Summit, the White House published the first ''United States Strategy on Countering Corruption.''

The strategy is a 38-page document that describes several major lines of effort in the new strategy. Among the document's commitments are pledges to crack down on dirty money in U.S. real estate, to require certain gatekeepers to the U.S. financial system such as attorneys, accountants, and investment advisers to perform greater due diligence on their prospective clients, and to make it a crime for foreign officials to solicit or accept bribes from U.S. companies.

If this strategy is matched with appropriate resources, it has the power to fundamentally change the calculus for kleptocrats and redirect stolen funds back to the original problems they were meant to fund such as fighting the pandemic, countering the effects of climate change, funding economic development and opportunity.

We in the Congress can do our part by passing pending legislation that would further strengthen the hand of the U.S. Government in this effort. While there are a number of valuable proposals pending, there are two that I suggest would be the most impactful and necessary.

The first is the Combating Global Corruption Act, S. 14, which I introduced and was cosponsored by my Republican friend from Indiana, Mr. YOUNG, which would create an annual global report, modeled in some ways on the Trafficking-in-Persons report, in which the State Department would assess how earnestly and effectively the governments of the world are living up to the commitments they have made in international treaties and covenants. The report would also place the countries of the world in 3 tiers, according to how well they are doing. And for those in the lowest performing tier, likely the governments that are actually kleptocracies, the bill asks that the executive branch assess government officials in those places for possible designation for Global Magnitsky sanctions.

The second is the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, S. 93, which I introduced and was cosponsored by my Republican friend from Mississippi, Mr. WICKER, which would permanently reauthorize the existing Global Magnitsky framework and to widen the aperture of the law to encompass more bad actors and actions.

Both these measures have been reported favorably and unanimously by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and both are ready for final action by the Senate. As President Biden convenes the Democracy Summit today, with its major focus on the battle against corruption, it would be timely for the Senate to demonstrate our resolve as well.

So I hope that my colleagues here in the Senate will agree in the coming days to adopt these two bills, so that we may take them to the House of Representatives, where they also enjoy bipartisan support, and get them onto the desk of President Biden during the coming year. Participating governments in the Democracy Summit, including the United States, are making commitments to strengthen their own democracies in the next 12 months, in advance of a second summit that is envisioned for next December.

The American position will be enhanced if we have enacted these laws before then.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts of the ''United States Strategy on Countering Corruption'' be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES STRATEGY ON COUNTERING CORRUPTION

PURSUANT TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY STUDY MEMORANDUM ON ESTABLISHING THE FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION AS A CORE UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY INTEREST—DECEMBER 2021

Introduction

When government officials abuse public power for private gain, they do more than simply appropriate illicit wealth. Corruption robs citizens of equal access to vital services, denying the right to quality healthcare, public safety, and education. It degrades the business environment, subverts economic opportunity, and exacerbates inequality. It often contributes to human rights violations and abuses, and can drive migration. As a fundamental threat to the rule of law, corruption hollows out institutions, corrodes public trust, and fuels popular cynicism toward effective, accountable governance.

Moreover, the impacts of corruption frequently reverberate far beyond the immediate environment in which the acts take place. In today's globalized world, corrupt actors bribe across borders, harness the international financial system to stash illicit wealth abroad, and abuse democratic institutions to advance anti-democratic aims. Emerging research and major journalistic exposes have documented the extent to which legal and regulatory deficiencies in the developed world offer corrupt actors the means to offshore and launder illicit wealth. This dynamic in turn strengthens the hand of those autocratic leaders whose rule is predicated on the ability to co-opt and reward elites.

On June 3, 2021, President Biden established the fight against corruption as a core national security interest of the United States. As he wrote in National Security Study Memorandum-I (NSSM–1), ''corruption threatens United States national security, economic equity, global antipoverty and development efforts, and democracy itself. . . . [B]y effectively preventing and countering corruption and demonstrating the advantages of transparent and accountable governance, we can secure a critical advantage for the United States and other democracies.''

Pursuant to NSSM–1, Federal departments and agencies have conducted an interagency review to take stock of existing U.S. Government anti-corruption efforts and to identify and seek to rectify persistent gaps in the fight against corruption. In parallel with this review, departments and agencies have begun to accelerate and amplify their efforts to prevent and combat corruption at home and abroad; bring transparency to the United States' and international financial systems; and make it increasingly difficult for corrupt actors to shield their activities.

This first United States Strategy on Countering Corruption builds on the findings of the review and lays out a comprehensive approach for how the United States will work domestically and internationally, with governmental and non-governmental partners, to prevent, limit, and respond to corruption and related crimes. The Strategy places special emphasis on the transnational dimensions of the challenges posed by corruption, including by recognizing the ways in which corrupt actors have used the U.S. financial system and other rule-of-law based systems to launder their ill-gotten gains.

To curb corruption and its deleterious effects, the U.S. Government will organize its efforts around five mutually reinforcing pillars of work:

Modernizing, coordinating, and resourcing U.S. Government efforts to fight corruption;

Curbing illicit finance;

Holding corrupt actors accountable;

Preserving and strengthening the multilateral anti-corruption architecture; and,

Improving diplomatic engagement and leveraging foreign assistance resources to advance policy goals.

By pursuing concrete lines of effort that advance strategic objectives under each of these pillars, and integrating anti-corruption efforts into relevant policy-making processes, the United States intends to lead in promoting prosperity and security for the American people and people around the world.

The Impacts of Corruption

From the small-town hospital administrator who demands bribes in exchange for life-saving services, to the globe-trotting kleptocrat who offshores an embezzled fortune, corruption harms both individuals and societies. The effects of corrupt acts are frequently both direct and indirect. When government officials steal from public coffers or fix a contract to reward a political crony, these actors directly transfer funding from essential services to private interests. Corruption also indirectly contributes to reduced public trust in state institutions, which in turn can add to the appeal of

illiberal actors who exploit popular grievances for political advantage.

Whether grand corruption perpetrated by powerful elites, or administrative corruption carried out by lower-level officials interacting directly with the public, corrupt acts harm the public interest, hamper countries' development, and diminish state capacity. Corruption has been shown to significantly curtail the ability of states to respond effectively to public health crises and to address climate change, migration, and inequities of all forms, while contributing to state fragility. Countries with high levels of corruption are more likely to have populations that suffer from human rights abuses, and are less likely to address those abuses. And states with endemic corruption are more vulnerable to terrorist networks, transnational organized and gang-related criminals, and human traffickers.

Corruption's increasingly globalized nature—fueled in part by transnational illicit finance and criminal networks, as well as exploitation of the licit financial system—imposes steep costs on ordinary citizens and good governance alike. In particular, transnational corruption driven by political and economic elites with the aid of complicit financial and legal service providers undermines lower income countries' ability to advance the welfare of their citizens and perpetuates aid dependency. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development's Economic Development in Africa Report 2020, for example, every year an estimated $88.6 billion—equivalent to 3.7 percent of Africa's GDP—leaves the continent in the form of illicit capital flight.

Corrupt actors exploit deficiencies in anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) systems and processes—as well as in other critical transparency, reporting, business, real estate, and tax regimes—to use public contracting, concessions, and procurement processes for personal enrichment. Corrupt elites and non-state armed groups enrich themselves through illicit proceeds and trade of high-value commodities, including gold, wildlife, timber, petroleum, and other natural resources. Across an ever-more connected and digital world, corrupt actors exploit oversight and regulatory weaknesses in jurisdictions around the world to divert and hide the proceeds of their acts. And by leaving their financial systems vulnerable to illicit assets—through anonymous shell companies, opaque transactions, and under-regulated professional service providers—rule-of-law-based societies continue to provide entry points for corrupt actors to launder their funds and their reputations. Such activity negatively impacts average citizens in the United States, tilting the economic playing field against working Americans, enabling criminals to flourish and foreign adversaries to subversively peddle their influence, perpetuating growth-dampening inequality, and contributing to pricing out families from home ownership through real estate purchases.

In parallel, authoritarian regimes and their proxies have been shown to engage in bribery and other corrupt acts as a means to advance their strategic goals, while exploiting the international financial system to offshore illicit gains, and influence elections and policies in democratic states. Corruption in the form of state-directed cross-border investments from authoritarian states, for example, has had a corrosive effect on institutions in developing countries. Such practices harm the competitive landscape of financial markets, and often have long-term corrosive impacts on governance and human rights standards. The U.S. Government will continue to study the weaponization of corruption to understand its use and impacts on the United States, other democracies, and countries around the world, as well as how to thwart and build resilience against this evolving threat.

While the U.S. Government has long recognized countering corruption as an important foreign policy goal, a growing understanding of corruption's strategic impact and the increasing interconnectedness of the global economy underscores the need for a new approach. For the U.S. Government to effectively counter contemporary corruption, we must recognize the transnational dimensions of the challenge, and respond in a manner that is both systemic and tailored to local conditions. Doing so will require addressing vulnerabilities in the U.S. and international financial systems; bolstering international best practices, regulations, and enforcement efforts; supporting the role of non-governmental actors; building political will and recognizing when it is absent; and consistently pursuing accountability through a combination of diplomatic engagement, foreign assistance, and enforcement actions.

The United States will continue to evaluate and implement measures as needed to further safeguard our financial system, and will work with like-minded partners and relevant multilateral institutions to do the same. We will make it harder to hide the proceeds of ill-gotten wealth in opaque corporate structures, reduce the ability of individuals involved in corrupt acts to launder funds through anonymous purchases of U.S. real estate, and bolster asset recovery and seizure activities. We will innovate, adapt, partner, and learn, so as to maximize the potential for diplomatic tools, including foreign assistance and targeted sanctions, to stem corruption and to hold corrupt actors accountable, while expanding efforts to ensure that foreign assistance and engagement do not inadvertently contribute to corrupt practices. And we will continue to vigorously enforce the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) and other statutory and regulatory regimes via criminal and civil enforcement actions.

Countering corruption is not a simple task. Changing embedded cultures of corruption requires significant political will, and achieving sustained progress can take decades. Positive change requires consistent leadership, public accountability, an empowered and impartial judiciary, and a diverse and independent media. Mindful of these realities, the United States will increase support to state and non-state partners committed to reform, boost the capacity of other governments to tackle corruption, and empower those, including activists, investigative journalists, and law enforcement on the front lines of exposing corrupt acts. We will bolster and promote public-private partnerships to more consistently bring in the private sector as critical actors in the fight against corruption, help level the playing field and improve the international business climate, and lead in international fora as we work to curb the ability of actors to hide ill-gotten wealth behind anonymity. Our closest engagement will be with our most committed allies and partners, including with respect to the influence of strategic corruption deliberately employed by authoritarian governments.

Illustrative Types of Corruption

Corruption takes on many forms and is used to further various illicit behaviors. Illustrative types of corruption include, but are not limited to:

Grand corruption: when political elites steal large sums of public funds or otherwise abuse power for personal or political advantage.

Administrative corruption: the abuse of entrusted power for private gain—usually by low to mid-level government officials—in interactions with citizens and the private sector, including to skirt official regulations and extort citizens in exchange for their basic services.

Kleptocracy: a government controlled by officials who use political power to appropriate the wealth of their nation. Can include state capture.

State capture: when private entities improperly and corruptly influence a country's decision-making process for their own benefit.

Strategic corruption: when a government weaponizes corrupt practices as a tenet of its foreign policy.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND CUBA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an NJ.com article by Roland Armando Alum, titled ''Opinion: Six Decades After Dictator's Assassination, Dominican Republic Flourishes While Cuba Is Miserable'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX DECADES AFTER DICTATOR'S ASSASSINATION, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC FLOURISHES WHILE CUBA IS MISERABLE

(By Roland Armando Alum)

As we commemorate Memorial Day this weekend in the U.S., the Dominican Republic's people mark 60 years since the fall of Rafael Trujillo's dictatorship on May 30, 1961. Considered Latin-America's bloodiest dictator, Trujillo beleaguered Dominicans for 31 years, until a patriots' cabal executed him with the secret assistance of U.S. officials.

Up to the 1959 rise of the Fidel & Raúl Castro brothers in Cuba, Trujillo was unmatched as the despotic model in the Americas, as historian Lauren Derby noted in ''The Dictator's Seduction'' (2009). It behooves us to draw some chronological contrasts from both countries in the last six decades, developments that—incidentally—have affected our own local demographics.

Indeed, northern New Jersey is home to sizable and dynamic Hispanic communities of Cubans and Dominicans; some of them have attained prominent positions in every walk of life (admittedly, sometimes to the chagrin of self-appointed ''guardians-of-the-gate'').

Ironically, the geneses of the Dominican and Cuban emigration are opposite. Dominicans began to emigrate en masse after 1961, when freedom of movement became guaranteed; while Cubans fled in disapproval of the Castros' converting the previous Pearl of the Antilles into a bankrupt vassal state of the now defunct Soviet empire. In summer–1980 alone, about 1.5 percent of Cuba's population ''voted with their feet'' via the unprecedented Mariel Freedom Flotilla, many of whose refugees and their descendants flourished in this great Garden State of ours.

Both countries emerged from traditional militaristic dictatorships around the same time, 1961 for the D.R., and 1959 for Cuba, after Afro-Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista fled the island-nation. Cuba's undeniably remarkable economic prosperity was accomplished despite Batista's relatively brief authoritarianism (1952–58) and the pitfalls of the preceding 1902–1952 republican epoch.

Conversely, conditions were wretched in the D.R. while Trujillo was ruling the country as a private fiefdom. The instability that

followed ended with the U.S. military intervention that eventually fostered a classic tripartite constitutional government, with multiple competing political parties alternating in power. Moreover, the jobs-creating business sector and the labor movement thrive. A year ago, Dominicans elected their eighth post-Trujillo president: successful businessman Luis Abinader (born in 1967), D.R.'s first chief executive born after Trujillo's downfall.

All this sharply contrasts with socialist Cuba, a stagnant, closed society controlled by the Castro family and its hand-picked, mostly military, non-elected cronies still chanting discredited Marxist slogans. True, the Castros counted on initial popular support, but it soon vanished as they hijacked the liberal-inspired anti-Batista political rebellion and turned Cuba into a nightmarish dystopia. While the D.R. steered toward the Open Society ideal, Cuba rushed in the opposite direction with the Castros' tropical version of the failed Soviet-Russian mold.

Dictatorships of all genres customarily attract foreign apologists who, comfortably from abroad, extol alleged relative achievements. Trujillo, who even received an honorary doctorate from a U.S. university, was praised by the same New York Times that characteristically propagates ridiculous excuses for Cuba's oppressors. Likewise, the academic world brims with fake-news reports intent on laundering the Castros' fiascos, while also defaming Cuban-Americans.

As we salute Dominicans upon their celebrating six decades free of despotism, one should commiserate with the Cuban people, still suffering three generations of anachronic totalitarianism; in fact, so far over twice as long as Trujillo's dictatorship lasted.

TRIBUTE TO DR. FRANCIS COLLINS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to ask the Senate to join me in recognizing the incredible career of Dr. Francis Collins, Director of the National Institutes of Health, as he prepares to step down as Director and return to his research laboratory at the National Human Genome Research Institute, NHGRI.

NIH is the crown jewel of our Nation's and the world's biomedical infrastructure. The Institute touches all of our lives through its research, which deepens our understanding of the natural world and produces groundbreaking medicines and lifesaving treatments for diseases. Like all Marylanders, I am proud that NIH is headquartered in Bethesda and has several satellite campuses throughout the State.

Dr. Collins' career with NIH has spanned more than three decades. A physician-geneticist, Dr. Collins served as the director of the National Human Genome Research Institute from 1993 to 2008. In this work, he led the Human Genome Project, which in April 2003 completed sequencing the human DNA instruction book. The sequencing of the 3 billion DNA letters that make up the human genetic ''instruction book'' has been instrumental in uncovering the role that the genome plays in human health and disease and marshalling in a new era of medicine. For this work, Dr. Collins deservedly received the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2007.

Dr. Collins is the longest serving, Presidentially appointed NIH Director, having served as the 16th Director of NIH under three U.S. Presidents over more than 12 years. Building on his groundbreaking research in genetics, Dr. Collins has led the Institutes in the effort to develop a greater understanding of medicine and pursue innovations in diagnoses and treatments.

This includes the ''All of Us'' program, which is a precision medicine initiative that in 2018 began gathering the health data of 1 million participants to develop individualized healthcare that enables us to better treat and prevent disease. Dr. Collins' leadership has similarly led to incredible advancements in understanding neurological conditions. The Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies—BRAIN—Initiative aims to develop revolutionary pictures of the brain to enable researchers to find new ways to treat, cure, and even prevent neurological disorders that affect millions of Americans.

Dr. Collins' tenure has included leading the fight to eradicate cancer under the Cancer Moonshot Initiative. This generational effort aims to improve our ability to prevent cancer or detect it at an earlier stage and develop more effective therapies to treat it. To date, over $1 billion in Moonshot funding has made incredible progress through support of over 240 research projects across more than 70 cancer initiatives.

Last but certainly not least, Dr. Collins' leadership as NIH Director has witnessed one of the toughest and most challenging tests for the Institutes: the COVID–19 pandemic. Through Dr. Collins' commitment to adhering to the science and steadfast leadership, the NIH has played an historic role in shepherding the development of vaccines, therapeutics, diagnostics, and all manner of medical resources toward COVID–19 response efforts. Though the Omicron variant is troubling and the pandemic rages in many parts of the world, we are better prepared to respond and persevere against the COVID–19 pandemic because Dr. Collins played a principal role in leading our national biomedical response efforts.

Dr. Collins is not just a scientist. He is also an avid guitarist and motorcyclist. And his book, ''The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief'', is one of the most intellectually rigorous and compelling efforts to reconcile the worlds of science and faith.

I ask the Senate, my fellow Marylanders, and a grateful Nation to join me in recognizing the career of an extraordinary physician-geneticist, Dr. Francis Collins. We are incredibly grateful for his leadership and stewardship of NIH and wish him a happy and well-deserved return to his research laboratory.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LOUIS UCCELLINI

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and honor the upcoming retirement on January 1, 2022, of a true public servant and leader, Dr. Louis Uccellini, Director of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Weather Service.

Louis is the epitome of a dedicated civil servant, having spent the past 43 years of his career at both NOAA and NASA contributing to and leading the maturation and advancement of our Nation's weather prediction capabilities. Put simply, there is no aspect of today's weather forecast that Dr. Uccellini hasn't advanced during his storied career.

But Louis' contributions span far beyond science. Perhaps most notably, and certainly most visible to the public, are the organizational changes Louis has made to National Weather Service since becoming Director in 2013. The establishment and development of the Weather-Ready Nation program, a paradigm shift that refocused the entire NWS staff and mission, now enables forecasters to use weather information to deliver Impact-based Decision Support Services to emergency managers, which is empowering local officials to help citizens be ready, responsive and resilient to weather events. This is the real purpose of the weather forecast and is allowing the National Weather Service to better perform its mission of saving lives and protecting property.

Louis' mark on the National Weather Service will undoubtedly be felt for many years to come. On behalf of my constituents in Kansas and a grateful nation, I personally thank Dr. Louis Uccellini for his service to our Nation; wish him and his wife, Susan, well in retirement; and as Louis would say, ''I'll leave it at that.''

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LEVILLE STEPHENS

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of World War II veteran Leville Stephens.

I am proud to celebrate this milestone and honor his service and sacrifice in our Nation's uniform.

Mr. Stephens answered the call to serve. He trained at Fort Huachuca in Arizona, one of 30,0000 African-American soldiers who prepared for battle at this location before deploying overseas. He was assigned to the 93rd Infantry Division and shipped to the Pacific theater.

As a private first class, Mr. Stephens served in a number of dangerous locations during the war, including the Philippines, New Guinea, and the Solomon Islands. He was on his way to Japan when the United States dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, bringing about the Japanese surrender.

Mr. Stephens described his mindset while in uniform as simply ''doing his

duty as a soldier.'' He believed his job was to follow his orders and do what needed to be done. That attitude, shared by so many of his fellow soldiers among the Greatest Generation, helped the United States achieve victory and secure a desperately needed peace.

He is rightfully proud of his service, alongside his family and friends among whom he also inspires admiration and gratitude by being a devoted husband to his wife Hattie and a dutiful father and grandfather.

Mr. Stephens is a true American hero whose determination and dedication helped change the course of history. He answered his country's call to arms with courage, bravery, and honor. Our Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for his efforts to defend the freedoms we hold dear and defeat tyranny around the globe.

I am honored to recognize his serve and sacrifice, and wish him a very special and wonderful 100th birthday.●

RECOGNIZING THE PANCAKE PANTRY

● Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 60th anniversary and the opening of a new location of the legendary Pancake Pantry in Nashville.

On December 13, the Pancake Pantry, a Nashville staple and landmark restaurant, will open a second location to offer its famous varieties of pancakes as well as begin a partnership with the Nashville Predators Foundation to support local communities.

Since 1961, this iconic restaurant has brightened the mornings of both tourists and residents of the Music City and will now partner with the Nashville Predators Foundation to give back to the community.

Through grants and partnerships directed towards the educational, health, and social needs of Middle Tennesseans, the Pancake Pantry is committed to supporting the local community.

To show their support, special ''Nashville Predator'' pancakes will be available between January 1 and February 28, 2022, and for each order sold, the Pancake Pantry will make a monetary donation to the Nashville Predators Foundation.

Established on August 18, 2009, the Nashville Predators Foundation strives to meet the needs of the local community by offering resources and financial support to youth-oriented organizations, awarding nearly $7.0 million to the greater Nashville community. Let us celebrate this announcement and commitment to helping those in need.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHEAL MAHONEY

● Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and recognize Micheal Mahoney of Kansas City. Micheal has been a reporter in the KC area for over 40 years, starting with breaking news, then making a career into politics with a fair, but always tough sensibility.

I have known Mike for a few years now since coming to Congress, and to me, he has one of the best reputations among reporters in the region. The press and Congress are often thought of as adversaries, with journalists always trying to dig into Members to get the best scoop or ''gotcha'' moment, while Members are having to watch their backs. With Mike, that has never been the case. Sure, he would always try to dig, but that was simply to get the best possible info for Kansans, not just to put someone on the spot. Any time I had an interview with Mike, he truly was looking for the heart of a story, with no cheap tricks. He gave everyone involved a fair shot to tell their side and laid everything out crystal clear for viewers to see when the story came on. It is easy to see in each story what was really going on thanks to Mike's integrity in interviews, and talent for storytelling.

As he finishes out his time with KMBC, I hope he is able to reflect on the wonderful career he has had. He has been there to provide outstanding coverage of every political event in Kansas for all to see and even has an Emmy to his name for covering the 1993 flooding along the Missouri River, along with a Mall Dodson National Headliners Award in 1981 for his coverage of the Hyatt Regency Skywalk falling in KC. Furthermore, Mike has been on the board of the Kansas City St. Patrick's Day Committee and has even been the grand marshal for the St. Patrick's Day parade. Through it all, he has been one of KC's finest. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the wonderful career of Mr. Micheal Mahoney and wish him nothing but joy and happiness in his next chapter of life.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 897. An act to take certain lands in California into trust for the benefit of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1193. An act to amend title IV of the Public Health Service Act to direct the Director of the National Institutes of Health, in consultation with the Director of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, to establish a program under which the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall support or conduct research on valvular heart disease, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1667. An act to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

H.R. 2074. An act to assist Tribal governments in the management of buffalo and buffalo habitat and the reestablishment of buffalo on Indian land.

H.R. 2355. An act to facilitate responsible, informed dispensing of controlled substances and other prescribed medications, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2364. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to provide for a public education campaign to raise public awareness of synthetic opioids.

H.R. 3531. An act to authorize the Women Who Worked on the Home Front Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3537. An act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to support research on, and expanded access to, investigational drugs for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3743. An act to increase funding for the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration and for the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health.

H.R. 3894. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue and disseminate guidance to States to clarify strategies to address social determinants of health under the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4489. An act to amend the Act of June 20, 1958, to require that certain amounts collected by the United States with respect to lands under the administration of the Forest Service be invested into interest bearing obligations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4555. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a public education campaign across all relevant programs of the Health Resources and Services Administration to increase oral health literacy and awareness.

H.R. 4616. An act to deem certain references to LIBOR as referring to a replacement benchmark rate upon the occurrence of certain events affecting LIBOR, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4706. An act to establish the Blackwell School National Historic Site in Marfa, Texas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4996. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5119. An act to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of Coronavirus Relief Fund payments to Tribal Governments.

H.R. 5290. An act to extend authorization for livestock mandatory reporting.

H.R. 5487. An act to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5545. An act to extend certain expiring provisions of law relating to benefits provided under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs during COVID–19 pandemic, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5551. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5561. An act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5608. An act to support research and state management efforts on chronic wasting disease.

H.R. 5609. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, to establish a cattle contract library, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5677. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code, title 50, United States Code, and title 52, United States Code.

H.R. 5679. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 7, title 20, and title 43, United States Code.

H.R. 5695. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions which were formerly classified to chapters 14 and 19 of title 25, United States Code.

H.R. 5705. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions reclassified to title 34, United States Code.

H.R. 5746. An act to amend title 51, United States Code, to extend the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into leases of non-excess property of the Administration.

H.R. 5961. An act to make revisions in title 5, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current, and to make technical amendments to improve the United States Code.

H.R. 5982. An act to make revisions in title 51, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current, and to make technical amendments to improve the United States Code.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution providing for the use of the catafalque situated in the Exhibition Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the rotunda of the Capitol for the Honorable Robert Joseph Dole, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the lying in state of the remains of the Honorable Robert Joseph Dole, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 897. An act to take certain lands in California into trust for the benefit of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 1667. An act to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2074. An act to assist Tribal governments in the management of buffalo and buffalo habitat and for the reestablishment of buffalo on Indian land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 2355. An act to facilitate responsible, informed dispensing of controlled substances and other prescribed medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2364. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to provide for a public education campaign to raise public awareness of synthetic opioids; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 3531. An act to authorize the Women Who Worked on the Home Front Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3894. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue and disseminate guidance to States to clarify strategies to address social determinants of health under the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4489. An act to amend the Act of June 20, 1958, to require that certain amounts collected by the United States with respect to lands under the administration of the Forest Service be invested into interest bearing obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 4555. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a public education campaign across all relevant programs of the Health Resources and Services Administration to increase oral health literacy and awareness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 4616. An act to deem certain references to LIBOR as referring to a replacement benchmark rate upon the occurrence of certain events affecting LIBOR, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4706. An act to establish the Blackwell School National Historic Site in Marfa, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4996. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5290. An act to extend authorization for livestock mandatory reporting; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 5487. An act to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5551. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5561. An act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5608. An act to support research and state management efforts on chronic wasting disease; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 5609. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, to establish a cattle contract library, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 5677. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 2, United States Code, title 50, United States Code, and title 52, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5679. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 7, title 20, and title 43, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5695. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions which were formerly classified to chapters 14 and 19 of title 25, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5705. An act to make technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions reclassified to title 34, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5961. An act to make revisions in title 5, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current, and to make technical amendments to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5982. An act to make revisions in title 51, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current, and to make technical amendments to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3743. An act to increase funding for the Reagan-Udall Foundation for the Food and Drug Administration and for the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1428. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Dawn N. Ison, of Michigan, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3349. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to provide applicants for certain loans and grants with updates with respect to those applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3350. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to condition an institution of higher education's receipt of Federal assistance on waiving the application for enrollment fee for homeless children and youths and students who were in foster care at any time when the students were 13 years of age or older; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3351. A bill to establish the Coastal Management Fellowship and the Digital Coast Fellowship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3352. A bill to prohibit air carriers from imposing fees that are not reasonable and proportional to the costs incurred by the air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH:

S. 3353. A bill to provide solutions to the United States energy crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. DAINES, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 3354. A bill to delay the implementation of a rule relating to the importation of sheep and goats and products derived from sheep and goats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3355. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to propose a new nationwide permit under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for dredging projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3356. A bill to effectively staff the high-need public elementary schools and secondary schools of the United States with school-based mental health services providers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3357. A bill to substantially restrict the use of animal testing for cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3358. A bill to authorize the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the lying in state of the remains of the last Medal of Honor recipient of World War II, in order to honor the Greatest Generation and the more than 16,000,000 men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States from 1941 to 1945; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3359. A bill to award grants to States to support efforts at institutions of higher education to increase degree attainment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 3360. A bill to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3361. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to modify the definition of franchise fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3362. A bill to require the Healthy People Maternal, Infant, and Child Health Workgroup and the Maternal Health Working Group to establish a formal coordinated approach for monitoring maternal health efforts across the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 3363. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 135 West Wisconsin Street in Russell, Kansas, as the ''Robert J. Dole Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3364. A bill to provide for a study on the transmission of respiratory syncytial virus transmission in schools and daycare facilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3365. A bill to eliminate certain requirements with respect to dredging and dredged material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3366. A bill to permit the use of NATO and major non-NATO ally dredge ships in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3367. A bill to repeal the requirements of the Foreign Dredge Act of 1906 with respect to dredging and dredged material; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 3368. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3369. A bill to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia, as the ''Joseph Maxwell Cleland Atlanta Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 3370. A bill to release the reversionary interest of the United States in certain non-Federal land in Salt Lake City, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 3371. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make financial assistance to States under the Land and Water Conservation Fund available for water quality projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3372. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to strengthen benefits for children of Vietnam veterans born with spina bifida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3373. A bill to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3374. A bill to reauthorize the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3375. A bill to promote travel and tourism in the United States, to improve the health safety and security of international flights entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BURR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. DAINES, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Omnibus COVID–19 Health Care Staff Vaccination''; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 344

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retirement pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 535

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) 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. 1106

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1106, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1133, a bill to direct the Director of the National Institutes of Health, in consultation with the Director of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, to establish a program to support or conduct research on valvular heart disease, and for other purposes.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1385, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to establish additional requirements for dealers, and for other purposes.

S. 1404

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1404, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a ''Ghost Army'' that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1813

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1813, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to support research on, and expanded access to, investigational drugs for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and for other purposes.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and stability of the transportation security workforce by applying the personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2155

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2155, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to provide increased protections for election workers and voters in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 2276

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2276, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 2376

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2376, a bill to ensure the parental guardianship rights of cadets and midshipmen consistent with individual and academic responsibilities, and for other purposes.

S. 2497

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2497, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to prohibit nonconsensual release of a nondebtor entity's liability to an entity other than the debtor, and for other purposes.

S. 2614

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) were added as cosponsors of S. 2614, a bill to provide for the modernization of electronic case management systems, and for other purposes.

S. 2627

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2627, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve assistance for veterans with travel necessary for counseling, mental health services, health care, and others services furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2716

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2716, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to establish country of origin labeling requirements for beef, and for other purposes.

S. 2747

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2747, a bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box and reduce the influence of big money in politics, and for other purposes.

S. 2760

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2760, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 2872

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2872, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the adjusted gross income limitation for above-the-line deduction of expenses of performing artist employees, and for other purposes.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 3037

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3037, a bill to require elementary schools and secondary schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before facilitating a child's gender transition in any form, and for other purposes.

S. 3080

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3080, a bill to amend the

Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan (or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan) to provide for cost-sharing for oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the cost-sharing provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider.

S. 3094

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve homeless veterans reintegration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3169

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3169, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of food packaging containing intentionally added PFAS, and for other purposes.

S. 3276

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3276, a bill to prohibit the circumvention of control measures used by Internet retailers to ensure equitable consumer access to products, and for other purposes.

S. 3283

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3283, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to fully protect the safety of children and the environment, to remove dangerous pesticides from use, and for other purposes.

S. 3309

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3309, a bill to require SelectUSA to coordinate with State-level economic development organizations to increase foreign direct investment in semiconductor-related manufacturing and production.

S. 3332

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3332, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to allow States to promote Medicaid objectives through work or community engagement requirements.

S. 3344

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3344, a bill to protect the American Taxpayer and Medicare.

S. RES. 183

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 183, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 467

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 467, a resolution recognizing the contributions made by the 305-meter radio telescope at the Arecibo Observatory.

AMENDMENT NO. 4877

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4877 intended to be proposed to S. 610, a bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 3360. A bill to reauthorize title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is time for a national investment in building a strong and resilient educator pipeline to ensure that all schools have the diverse, profession-ready teachers, principals, librarians, counselors, and other specialized instructional support personnel they need to support student development and academic achievement. Today, along with Senator Bob Casey and Representative Alma Adams, I am introducing the Educators for America Act to provide the blueprint for building this pipeline.

For years, we have seen declines in enrollment in educator preparation programs. Now in the wake of the pandemic, schools are facing pervasive staffing shortages. An Education Week survey found 40 percent of district leaders and principals describe the shortages as ''severe'' or ''very severe.'' The National Association of Secondary School Principals reported that nearly 4 out of 10 principals are expecting to leave the profession in the next 3 years.

Moreover, the gap between the demographic makeup of the student body and the education profession is widening. Even though over 50 percent of students are people of color and that multiple studies have shown that racial diversity can provide significant benefits to students, a 2016 Department of Education report showed that 82 percent of public school teachers identified as White, a figure that had barely changed since 2000.

Simply put, we can no longer afford to neglect the educator pipeline.

The Educators for America Act calls for a $1 billion annual investment in the educator pipeline, divided evenly between State capacity building and direct support for educator preparation programs and partnerships with high need school districts. It addresses the full pipeline from early outreach and career exploration to financial assistance and wraparound supports for those pursuing education careers to clinical preparation for teachers, principals, and other educators to faculty development, all with a focus on ensuring equity and diversity.

Just as importantly, the Educators for America Act will reduce financial barriers to pursuing careers in education. The legislation will double the value of the TEACH grant to $8,000 per year and provide greater flexibility for meeting the service requirements. It establishes a new monthly credit for teachers, principals, and other educators towards repayment on their student loans so they earn loan forgiveness as they serve rather than watching their loan balances stagnate or grow for 5 to 10 years before receiving any benefit.

The Educators for America Act reflects the input from stakeholders across the education field about what is needed to recruit, prepare, and support educators. To date, 45 organizations have endorsed it.

The Nation's outlook for the future is tied to the strength of the education profession. Our economic prosperity, the health of our democracy and civic society, and our ability to meet the challenges of climate change and the information age depend on our students having access to well-prepared and supported educators who reflect the diversity of the students they serve.

Today, the profession is in crisis. It is time to act. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Educators for America Act and work with me to get it passed into law.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 3368. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The bill requires the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3368

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 ''VITAL Assessment Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. VETERANS INTEGRATION TO ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The number of medical centers of the Department, institutions of higher learning, noncollege degree programs, and student veterans supported by the program, and relevant trends since the program began.

(B) The staff and resources allocated to the program, and relevant trends since the program began.

(C) An assessment of the outcomes and effectiveness of the program in—

(i) supporting student veterans;

(ii) connecting student veterans to needed services of the Department or services provided by non-Department entities;

(iii) addressing the mental health needs of student veterans;

(iv) lowering the suicide risk of student veterans; and

(v) helping student veterans achieve educational goals.

(D) An assessment of barriers to expanding the program and how the Secretary intends to address such barriers.

(E) An assessment of whether the program should be expanded outside of the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention to support students veterans with needs unrelated to mental health or suicide.

(b) UNIFORM BEST PRACTICES, GOALS, AND MEASURES.—The Secretary shall establish best practices, goals, and measures for the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department that are uniform among the medical centers of the Department.

(c) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall conduct outreach among the Armed Forces, veterans service organizations, institutions of higher learning, and non-college degree programs with respect to the Veterans Integration to Academic Leadership program of the Department.

(d) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall assess the feasibility and advisability of including the suicide rate for student veterans in the National Veteran Suicide Prevention Annual Report of the Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention of the Department.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING.—The term ''institution of higher learning'' has the meaning given that term in section 3452 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) STUDENT VETERAN.—The term ''student veteran'' means the following:

(A) A veteran or member of the Armed Forces using educational assistance under any of the following provisions of law:

(i) Chapter 30, 31, 32, or 33 of title 38, United States Code, or chapter 1606 or 1607 of title 10, United States Code.

(ii) Section 116 of the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–48; 38 U.S.C. 3001 note).

(iii) Section 8006 of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117–2; 38 U.S.C. 3001 note prec.).

(B) A veteran who is enrolled in an institution of higher learning or other training program, without regard to whether the veteran is using educational assistance specified in subparagraph (A).

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4885. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 610, to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4886. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4887. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4888. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4889. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4890. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4891. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4892. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1605, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4885. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 610, to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PRESERVATION OF THE RIGHTS OF SENATORS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Senate is the world's greatest deliberative body because of its protection of the right of its Members to engage in full, robust, and extended debate with respect to legislation.

(2) The Senate plays a unique role in the American legislative process.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Senators strongly oppose any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Members to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as legislation is considered before the Senate in the future;

(2) Senators support efforts to preserve existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the Senate;

(3) while a variety of opinions exist among Senators regarding the appropriateness of limiting debate when the Senate is considering judicial and executive branch nominees, Senators are determined to preserve the ability of Members to engage in extended debate when bills are being considered on the Senate floor; and

(4) Senators are steadfastly committed to ensuring this great American institution continues to serve as the world's greatest deliberative body.

SA 4886. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. ____. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 6 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4887. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''6 days'' and insert ''5 days''.

SA 4888. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. ____. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 7 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4889. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 3, strike ''7'' and insert ''6''.

SA 4890. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike ''6'' and insert ''8''.

SA 4891. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1054. HONORING HERSHEL WOODROW "WOODY" WILLIAMS AS THE LAST SURVIVING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT OF WORLD WAR II.

(a) USE OF ROTUNDA.—Upon his death, Hershel Woodrow ''Woody'' Williams, who is

the last surviving recipient of the Medal of Honor for acts performed during World War II, shall be permitted to lie in state in the rotunda of the United States Capitol if he or his next of kin so elects.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall take the necessary steps to implement subsection (a).

SA 4892. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title V, add the following:

PART 4—MILITARY JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT AND INCREASING PREVENTION

SEC. 539I. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the ''Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act of 2021''.

SEC. 539J. IMPROVEMENT OF DETERMINATIONS ON DISPOSITION OF CHARGES FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES UNDER UCMJ WITH AUTHORIZED MAXIMUM SENTENCE OF CONFINEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE YEAR.

(a) IMPROVEMENT OF DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in subsection (b) and not excluded under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretaries of the military departments to provide as described in subsection (d) for the determinations as follows:

(A) Determinations under section 830 of such chapter (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on the preferral of charges.

(B) Determinations under section 830 of such chapter (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on the disposition of charges.

(C) Determinations under section 834 of such chapter (article 34 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on the referral of charges.

(2) HOMELAND SECURITY.—With respect to charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense specified in subsection (b) and not excluded under subsection (c) against a member of the Coast Guard (when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide as described in subsection (d) for the determinations as follows:

(A) Determinations under section 830 of such chapter (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on the preferral of charges.

(B) Determinations under section 830 of such chapter (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on the disposition of charges.

(C) Determinations under section 834 of such chapter (article 34 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) on the referral of charges.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to terminate or otherwise alter the authorities enumerated in any articles of the Uniform Code of Military Justice other than articles 30 and 34 (10 U.S.C. 830, 834).

(b) COVERED OFFENSES.—An offense specified in this subsection is an offense as follows:

(1)(A) Offenses under the following sections of chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for more than one year: sections 893a, 917a, 918, 919, 919a, 919b, 920, 920a, 920b, 920c, 921, 921a, 921b, 922, 924, 924a, 924b, 925, 926, 927, 928(b) and (c), 928a, 928b, 930, 931, 931a, 931b, 931c, 931d, 931e, 931f, 931g, and 932 (articles 93a, 117a, 118, 119, 119a, 119b, 120, 120a, 120b, 120c, 121, 121a, 121b, 122, 124, 124a, 124b, 125, 126, 127, 128(b) and (c), 128a, 128b, 130, 131, 131a, 131b, 131c, 131d, 131e, 131f, 131g, and 132, respectively, of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(B) The offenses of child pornography, negligent homicide, indecent conduct, indecent language communicated to any child under the age of 16 years, and pandering and prostitution, as punishable under the general punitive article in 934 of such title (article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(2) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in paragraph (1) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in paragraph (1) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(4) An attempt to commit an offense specified in paragraph (1) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(c) EXCLUDED OFFENSES.—Subsection (a) does not apply to an offense as follows:

(1) An offense under sections 883 through 917 of title 10, United States Code (articles 83 through 117 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), but not an offense under section 893a of such title (article 93a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(2) An offense under section 922a, 923, 923a, or 928(a) of title 10, United States Code (articles 122a, 123, 123a, and 128(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) An offense under section 933 or 934 of title 10, United States Code (articles 133 and 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), but not the offense of child pornography, negligent homicide, indecent conduct, indecent language communicated to any child under the age of 16 years, or pandering and prostitution as punishable under the general punitive article in section 934 of such title (article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(4) A conspiracy to commit an offense specified in paragraphs (1) through (3) as punishable under section 881 of title 10, United States Code (article 81 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(5) A solicitation to commit an offense specified in paragraphs (1) through (3) as punishable under section 882 of title 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(6) An attempt to commit an offense specified in paragraphs (1) through (3) as punishable under section 880 of title 10, United States Code (article 80 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(d) REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS.—The disposition of charges covered by subsection (a) shall be subject to the following:

(1) The determination whether to cause charges to be preferred or refer such charges to a court-martial for trial, as applicable, shall be made by a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces designated as a court-martial convening authority in accordance with regulations prescribed for purposes of this subsection from among commissioned officers of the Armed Forces in grade O–6 or higher who—

(A) are available for detail as trial counsel under section 827 of title 10, United States Code (article 27 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

(B) have significant experience in trials by general or special court-martial; and

(C) are outside the chain of command of the member subject to such charges.

(2) Upon a determination under paragraph (1) to refer charges to a court-martial for trial, the officer making that determination shall determine whether to refer such charges for trial by a general court-martial convened under section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or a special court-martial convened under section 823 of title 10, United States Code (article 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(3) A determination under paragraph (1) to cause charges to be preferred or refer charges to a court-martial for trial, as applicable, shall cover all known offenses, including lesser included offenses.

(4) The determination to cause charges to be preferred or refer charges to a court-martial for trial, as applicable, under paragraph (1), and the type of court-martial to which to refer under paragraph (2), shall be binding on any applicable convening authority for the referral of such charges.

(5) The actions of an officer described in paragraph (1) in determining under that paragraph whether or not to cause charges to be preferred or refer charges to a court-martial for trial, as applicable, shall be free of unlawful or unauthorized influence or coercion.

(6) The determination under paragraph (1) not to refer charges to a general or special court-martial for trial shall not operate to terminate or otherwise alter the authority of commanding officers to refer charges for trial by special court-martial under section 823 of title 10, United States Code (article 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) or summary court-martial convened under section 824 of title 10, United States Code (article 24 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), or to impose non-judicial punishment in connection with the conduct covered by such charges as authorized by section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(7) The determination under paragraph (1) to refer charges to a general or special court-martial shall not be subject to section 834 of title 10, United States Code (article 34 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), provided that the officer making the determination determines that—

(A) the specification alleges an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

(B) there is probable cause to believe that the accused committed the offense charged; and

(C) a court-martial would have jurisdiction over the accused and the offense.

(8) The convening authority shall not concurrently or subsequently serve as counsel or supervisory counsel in the same case in the case in which he or she served as the convening authority.

(e) CONSTRUCTION WITH CHARGES ON OTHER OFFENSES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or affect the preferral, disposition, or referral authority of charges under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that allege an offense for which the maximum punishment authorized under that chapter includes confinement for one year or less, except for the offenses of child pornography, negligent homicide, indecent conduct, indecent language communicated to any

child under the age of 16 years, and pandering and prostitution as punishable under the general punitive article in section 934 of such title (article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

(f) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall revise policies and procedures as necessary to comply with this section.

(2) UNIFORMITY.—The General Counsel of the Department of Defense and the General Counsel of the Department of Homeland Security shall jointly review the policies and procedures revised under this subsection in order to ensure that any lack of uniformity in policies and procedures, as so revised, among the military departments and the Department of Homeland Security does not render unconstitutional any policy or procedure, as so revised.

(g) MANUAL FOR COURTS-MARTIAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall recommend such changes to the Manual for Courts-Martial as are necessary to ensure compliance with this section.

(h) IMPROVED SPECIALIZATION OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS.—The Secretary of Defense shall revise policies and procedures as necessary to improve specialization of criminal investigators to help increase the efficiency and effectiveness of sexual assault and domestic violence investigations.

SEC. 539K. MODIFICATION OF OFFICERS AUTHORIZED TO CONVENE GENERAL AND SPECIAL COURTS-MARTIAL FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES UNDER UCMJ WITH AUTHORIZED MAXIMUM SENTENCE OF CONFINEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE YEAR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph (8):

''(8) with respect to offenses to which section 539J(a) of the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act of 2021 applies, the officers in the offices established pursuant to section 539K(c) of that Act or officers in the grade of O–6 or higher who are assigned such responsibility by the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.''.

(b) NO EXERCISE BY OFFICERS IN CHAIN OF COMMAND OF ACCUSED OR VICTIM.—Such section (article) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) An officer specified in subsection (a)(8) may not convene a court-martial under this section if the officer is in the chain of command of the accused or the victim.''.

(c) OFFICES OF CHIEFS OF STAFF ON COURTS-MARTIAL.—

(1) OFFICES REQUIRED.—Each Secretary of a military department and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) specified in paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by subsection (a), shall establish an office to do the following:

(A) To convene general and special courts-martial under sections 822 and 823 of title 10, United States Code (articles 22 and 23 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), pursuant to paragraph (8) of section 822(a) of title 10, United States Code (article 22(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as so amended, with respect to offenses to which section 539J(a) applies.

(B) To detail under section 825 of title 10, United States Code (article 25 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), members of courts-martial convened as described in subparagraph (A).

(2) PERSONNEL.—The personnel of each office established under paragraph (1) shall consist of such members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, or such members of the Coast Guard or civilian personnel of the Department of Homeland Security, as may be detailed or assigned to the office by the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy). The members and personnel so detailed or assigned, as the case may be, shall be detailed or assigned from personnel billets in existence as of the effective date for this Apart specified in section 539R.

SEC. 539L. DISCHARGE USING OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Homeland Security (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) shall carry out sections 539J and 539K using personnel, funds, and resources otherwise authorized by law.

(b) NO AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL OR RESOURCES.—Sections 539J and 539K shall not be construed as authorizations for personnel, personnel billets, or funds for the discharge of the requirements in such sections.

SEC. 539M. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES BY DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION, PROSECUTION, AND DEFENSE OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 546(c) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (10 U.S.C. 1561 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''on the investigation'' and inserting ''on the following:

''(A) The investigation''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) The implementation and efficacy of sections 539J through 539L of the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act of 2021 and the amendments made by such sections.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)''.

SEC. 539N. LIMITATION ON MODIFICATIONS TO SEXUAL ASSAULT REPORTING PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may not amend section 4 of enclosure 4 of Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 6495.02, relating to Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures, or otherwise prescribe any regulations or guidance relating to the treatment and handling of unrestricted and restricted reports of sexual assault, until 30 days after notifying the congressional defense committees of the proposed amendment or modification.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''congressional defense committees'' has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 539O. PROFESSIONALIZATION OF MILITARY PROSECUTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall increase enhanced and specialized training to certain prosecutors on the proper conduct, presentation, and handling of sexual assault and domestic violence cases.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the program implemented under subsection (a).

SEC. 539P. INCREASED TRAINING AND EDUCATION ON MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT.

(a) UNIFORMED OFFICERS AND SENIOR ENLISTED LEADERS.—

(1) UNIFORMED OFFICERS.—All uniformed officers of the military services shall be required within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this Act to complete training on military sexual assault prevention equivalent to that provided to Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Victim Advocates before those officers may be considered for promotion to a grade at or above O–5. A portion of this training shall be in-person, facilitated training.

(2) ENLISTED LEADERS.—All senior enlisted leaders of the military services will be required within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this Act to complete a training on military sexual assault prevention equivalent to that provided to the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Victim Advocates before enlisted service members may be considered for promotion to a grade at or above E–9. A portion of this training shall be in-person, facilitated training.

(b) OFFICER CANDIDATES AND ROTC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The United States Army Cadet Command, the Naval Education and Training Command, the Air Education and Training Command, and the Coast Guard Recruiting Command shall carry out a program for increasing training on the prevention of military sexual assault within cadet ranks. A portion of this training shall be in-person, facilitated training.

(2) REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Army Cadet Command, the Naval Education and Training Command, the Air Education and Training Command, and the Coast Guard Recruiting Command shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the development of the program required under paragraph (1) and a plan for execution.

(3) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Army Cadet Command, the Naval Education and Training Command, the Air Education and Training Command, and the Coast Guard Recruiting Command shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the program required under paragraph (1).

(c) MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Superintendents of the military service academies shall carry out additional military sexual assault prevent training and education at the academies. A portion of this training shall be in-person, facilitated training.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Superintendents of the military service academies, shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the additional training and education implemented pursuant to paragraph (1).

SEC. 539Q. INCREASING THE PHYSICAL SECURITY OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a survey of all lodging and living spaces on military installations to identify, replace, or repair locking mechanisms on points of entry, identify areas of installation of closed-circuit

television (CCTV) security cameras, and other passive security measures as necessary to increase the prevention of crimes, including sexual assault, on military installations.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the survey conducted under subsection (a).

(c) PROGRAM.—Based on the results of the survey conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall carry out a program for increasing the security of all lodging and living spaces on military installations, including replacing or repairing locking mechanisms on points of entry, installation of CCTV security cameras, and other passive security measures as necessary to increase the prevention of crimes, including sexual assault, on military installations.

SEC. 539R. EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—This part and the amendments made by this part shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to any allegation of charges of an offense specified in subsection (b) of section 539J, and not excluded under subsection (c) of section 539J, which offense occurs on or after such effective date.

(b) REVISIONS OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Any revision of policies and procedures required of the military departments or the Department of Homeland Security as a result of this part and the amendments made by this part shall be completed so as to come into effect together with the coming into effect of this part and the amendments made by this part in accordance with subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 9, 2021, at 11 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 9, 2021, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 9, 2021, at 9 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, MEDIA, AND BROADBAND

The Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 9, 2021, at 10:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, December 13; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Elliott nomination; further, that if any nominations are confirmed during Monday's session, the motions 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be a rollcall vote at 5:30 p.m. on the confirmation of the Koh nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2021, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:46 p.m., adjourned until Monday, December 13, 2021, at 3 p.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*CHRISTI A. GRIMM, OF COLORADO, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 9, 2021:

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

STEPHEN A. OWENS, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

SYLVIA E. JOHNSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GROUND-BASED AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

HON. SHARICE DAVIDS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to engage with my colleague, Representative RICK LARSEN, the Chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation.

I thank Representative LARSEN for his hard work to ensure that aviation priorities were included in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. I am concerned about the many ground-based air traffic management systems that are now operating well beyond their planned service life. This includes the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) network of more than 2,700 navigation and landing systems located at more than 1,500 sites in all 50 states. For the last 20 years, the FAA has been systematically dedicated to the implementation of NextGen to enable more efficient flight operations in the National Airspace System. During this period, investment has shifted away from legacy ground-based air traffic control infrastructure. It is important for us all to recognize that aging electronic systems cannot be sustained indefinitely. I am concerned that accelerating rates of component failures combined with parts obsolescence creates a risk of field failures that would threaten aviation safety and the flying public.

I am pleased that Division J, Title VIII of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act provides $5 billion over 5 years for the FAA's Facilities and Equipment account. Included in this amount is funding to address investment and modernization shortfalls in ground-based aviation infrastructure, including landing and navigational aids. These systems are critical to maintaining safety in the national airspace and providing operational resiliency.

Representative LARSEN, I am glad that the bill reflects our shared priorities of providing more funding to the FAA's Facilities and Equipment budget and I want to be certain that a proportionate amount is spent on modernization of crucial infrastructure, such as lighting and landing systems. Is it your understanding that this is consistent with the intent of the committee? Can we continue to work to ensure that the U.S. Department of Transportation's 2022 spend plan reflects these congressional priorities?

GROUND-BASED AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

HON. RICK LARSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I share the concerns of my friend from Kansas regarding the need to upgrade the Nation's ground-based aviation infrastructure in a much timelier fashion. Aviation is a part of the backbone of the U.S. economy and keeping all aspects of the system up to date is essential to continued growth and quality of life for all Americans. The backlog of ground-based navigation aids that are currently operating past their useful life is real. In fact, at the current slow pace of modernization, some of these systems will be more than 100 years old by the time they are replaced.

As Chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation, I am committed to addressing this issue before it becomes a crisis for the aviation system. The funding in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act will give the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) the tools it needs to make significant improvements in the safety and reliability of critical ground-based infrastructure by acquiring, installing, and commissioning new instrument landing systems; distance measuring equipment; tactical air navigation equipment; runway lighting systems; and very high frequency omni-range equipment. Further, this funding supports the FAA's administrative expenses, including salaries, giving the agency the flexibility to bolster its workforce and implement innovative solutions to accelerate the modernization of these systems.

Ensuring the safety and reliability of the Nation's ground-based aviation infrastructure is a priority of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and I am committed to working with Representative DAVIDS on this issue as we move forward, including oversight on the U.S. Department of Transportation spend plan.

HONORING ED AVERILL'S RETIREMENT

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Edward Averill on his upcoming retirement.

After forty-six years of service with the United States Army as both a soldier and as a civilian, Mr. Averill will retire after serving as the Deputy to the Commander for Letterkenny Munitions Center.

Originally from Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, Mr. Averill has served our Nation with honor and distinction. In 1979, after leaving active-duty status, he continued to serve our country and community by enlisting in the Pennsylvania National Guard.

Mr. Averill began his work at Letterkenny Army Depot in 1981 as a Munitions Destroyer, through his leadership and subject matter expertise he rose to the position of Deputy to the Commander in 2013.

Today, I am proud to recognize Mr. Averill for his continued service to our Nation and the people of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District.

I thank him, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE FOURTH WALL FILMS FOR RECEIVING A MID-AMERICA EMMY AWARD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fourth Wall Films for receiving a MidAmerica Emmy Award for their short documentary, "Over & Under: Wildlife crossings."

The Emmy awarded film aired earlier this year on WQPT PBS which allowed viewing for many Illinoisans from the northwestern region, serving the Quad Cities. The Fourth Wall Films is a film and video production company from Moline, Illinois. The Fourth Wall Films serves the Northwestern region of Illinois and specializes in Midwestern Historical documentaries for public television broadcast and other streaming services.

Other awards and accolades earned by Fourth Wall Films are eight mid-America Emmy nominations, video and television Telly Awards, film festival Best Documentary Awards, and abundant amounts of recognition for their excellence and outstanding skill in the film and television industry.

It is because of the wonderful talent of the Fourth Wall Films that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate the Fourth Wall Films for receiving a Mid-America Emmy Award for their short documentary, "Over & Under: Wildlife crossings."

HONORING SHASTA SHAFFER'S COMMITMENT AND SERVICE TO THE CONSTITUENTS OF FLORIDA'S 9TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, today, we honor Ms. Shasta Shaffer, the director of constituent services for Florida's 9th Congressional District. Throughout her years of public service, Shasta has gone above and beyond to help Central Floridians in need. As a paralegal for the law office of Darren M. Soto during his tenure in the Florida Legislature, she worked tirelessly to help clients navigate their legal matters. Once Congressman Soto was elected to the House of Representatives, Shasta embarked on the journey to Congress. It was quickly discovered that public service came naturally to Shasta, and she was promoted to lead the constituent services department during the 115th Congress.

After Hurricane Maria devastated the island of Puerto Rico, tens of thousands of families were forced to flee and sought refuge in Florida's 9th Congressional District. Without hesitation, Shasta worked with local stakeholders to provide shelter, food, and stability for those in need.

As the daughter of a Vietnam War veteran, Shasta worked especially hard to help veterans and young people applying to the five military academies. For five years, Shasta led the efforts for Florida's 9th Congressional District's Service Academy nominations and took great pride in selecting members for the military advisory board. Several students have been admitted under her tenure.

During the COVID–19 pandemic, she was instrumental in helping constituents, within and outside of the district, with unemployment and IRS issues. Because of her efforts, thousands of families received much-needed relief during a historically tumultuous time.

For this and more, we honor Ms. Shasta Shaffer.

FAREWELL TO MS. JODI B. MITCHELL

HON. ANTHONY G. BROWN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, today I honor a superb leader and Army liaison for her tireless commitment to the United States Army with over 14 years of service to the Nation serving in the Army Office of the Legislative Liaison, culminating as the Deputy Division Chief of the Army House Liaison Division. As Ms. Jodi Mitchell transitions to her next assignment as a Department of the Army Civilian, I believe it is fitting to recognize her dedication to fostering the relationship between the United States Army and this Chamber.

Ms. Mitchell's commitment to service and leader development enabled her to excel in numerous leadership positions throughout her time serving as a Department of the Army Civilian. Over the course of 14 years, while serving in many key legislative liaison assignments, she has continued the tradition of strengthening the relationships between Members of Congress and their staffs with the United States Army.

Ms. Mitchell's relentless commitment proved invaluable in providing support to the House of Representatives and our constituents. She has spent countless hours ensuring our Members were educated on Army combat systems, modernization programs and policy initiatives. She also managed and led multiple Congressional Delegations to various locations around the globe. Ms. Mitchell has become a trusted adviser and friend to many of us, distinguishing herself by continuously going above and beyond the call of duty to serve the needs of Congress.

This Chamber will feel Ms. Mitchell's absence. I join many past and present Members of Congress in my gratitude and appreciation to Ms. Mitchell for her outstanding leadership and unwavering support. This nation is grateful for her commitment and the personal sacrifices she has made during her time in the Army Legislative Liaison Office.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the United States of America, I commend Ms. Jodi Mitchell for her tireless dedication in support of our Army, our Soldiers and this Nation. I congratulate her on an extremely successful career, dedicated to service, and wish her the best in all her future endeavors.

HONORING THOSE WHO FOUGHT THE HONDA CANYON FIRE

HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I want to honor those who served diligently to combat the Honda Canyon Fire that occurred on Vandenberg Space Force Base, California on December 20, 1977 on its 44th Anniversary.

The Base, which at the time was known as Vandenberg Air Force Base, had strategic, scientific, and military significance to our military readiness and national security as the Western Space and Missile Center.

In persistently safeguarding the Base, four individuals lost their lives. These heroes include the Base Commander Col. Joseph G. Turner, the Base Fire Chief Billy J. Bell, the Base Assistant Fire Chief Eugene Cooper, and a heavy equipment operator, Clarence McCauley.

Furthermore, sixty-five active duty, government, civilian, and contract workers were injured when they were overrun by the Honda Canyon Fire.

Despite these losses, active duty, government, and contract workers—augmented with local civilian fire fighting forces—continued to battle the flames to prevent the loss of vital military equipment, launch facilities, communications sites, and satellite test facilities.

These personnel encountered an additional seven fire overruns of their personnel and equipment. They rescued injured and burned personnel, then regrouped to modify their tactics and strategies before heroically continuing to fight until the fire was subdued.

Following this tragic fire, military commanders assessed their losses and their response to the fire, prepared a comprehensive mishap report, convened a planning group, and prepared an Operation Plan to address the findings of the mishap report. They enhanced training, firefighting capabilities, and support roles for all base operations groups to help manage similar events in the future.

Unfortunately, the efforts of all those who fought the Honda Canyon Fire—whether active duty or civilian—have never been recognized.

I want to acknowledge the loyalty, integrity, and resourcefulness of the active duty, government civilian, and contract workers who assisted in fighting this fire. I ask all members of the House of Representatives to recognize them for service to their country and specifically for their efforts to quell the historic Honda Canyon Fire and protect critical infrastructure at the Base, which is located in the California's 24th Congressional District and is an asset to the community and integral to our national security.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHANIE N. MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on Roll Call Nos. 406 through 435 on December 8, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call Nos. 406 through 435.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, Unfortunately, I did not participate in the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 409, and YEA on Roll Call No. 417.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY RADIO

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate Howard University Radio (WHUR) on its 50th anniversary.

After the Washington Post donated WTOP to Howard University, the rebranded WHUR debuted on December 10, 1971, with the mission of "Delivering Excellence In Broadcasting and Community Service."

In January 2004, WHUR was the first radio station in the District of Columbia metropolitan area to convert to digital broadcasting. In September 2016, the station was named "Urban Station of the Year" by the National Association of Broadcasters.

Today, WHUR broadcasts to nearly half a million listeners across five states and the District and is one of the few commercial radio stations in the United States that is owned and operated by an institution of higher education.

I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing WHUR for 50 years of providing culturally enriching content to the District of Columbia and the surrounding communities. I wish WHUR many more years of success.

IN RECOGNITION OF STEPHANIE PORTA FOR HER CAREER AS A COMMUNITY ORGANIZER

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, as a community organizer, Stephanie Porta served Central Florida for the past 18 years working to support low-income communities in their fight for equity. Through various strategies including

community organizing, ballot initiatives, local and statewide legislative campaigns, and corporate campaigns, Stephanie has been committed to ensuring low-income communities have the power to decide their own destinies. Ms. Porta has worked on successful campaigns for candidates and issues-including environmental justice, community safety, community development, health care, public education and more.

Stephanie served as the Florida Director of ACORN where she organized communities across the State. She successfully led the effort to raise Florida's minimum wage, pass police accountability reforms, as well as advocate for foreclosure prevention programs and affordable utilities.

She later co-founded Organize Florida, a nonprofit member organization of low- to moderate-income people. She led efforts to expand Medicaid, pass paid sick days, gun control, and clean energy legislation. In 2016 and 2018, she supported outreach efforts to more than four million voters across Florida.

Stephanie has been recognized by the Orlando Sentinel, Orlando Weekly and Orlando Magazine for leadership on government transparency and issues facing the working poor.

HONORING LT. COL. ANTHONY WILLIAMS

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the exemplary service of Lieutenant Colonel Anthony William's as a Department of Defense legislative fellow. LTC Williams is transitioning from his current assignment in my office to serve as an Army Legislative Liaison for Intelligence in the Office of the Chief Legislative Liaison, Programs Division.

Born in Seoul, Republic of Korea, LTC Williams was commissioned as a Military Intelligence Officer from Louisiana State University in 2004. He earned his Bachelor of Science in Biological Engineering from Louisiana State University, his Master of Arts in Defense and Strategic Studies from the Naval War College in Rhode Island and is currently attaining his Master of Professional Studies in Legislative Affairs at George Washington University.

LTC Williams served in a broad range of assignments within the U.S. Army Special Operations Command, mostly with the 75th Ranger Regiment. He served seven total combat deployments in Iraq, Turkey-and Afghanistan. He most recently served as the Senior Intelligence Officer for the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force Syria in Turkey, assisting partnered forces and conducting counterterrorist missions.

While too numerous to mention in their entirety, LTC Williarnss military decorations include the Bronze Star Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Meritorious Service Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters and the Army Commendation Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters.

I have had the privilege of working directly with LTC Williams as a fellow in my Capitol Hill office over the last year, LTC Williams' professionalism, performance and commitment to his work in my office were in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and made a lasting impression on both myself and his Capitol Hill coworkers. We will all miss him tremendously.

I have also had the pleasure of meeting LTC Williamss family, who shares his selfless commitment to our country. I thank his wife, Tanya, as well as his two children, Liam and Leona, for their sacrifices made in supporting his service.

Madam Speaker, throughout his career, LTC Williams has positively impacted soidiers, peers and his superiors. He is a model Army Officer and our country has benefited from his extraordinary leadership and passion for our Armed Forces. It is with great appreciation that I recognize and commend LTC Williams for his commitment to our country and wish him all the best as he continues his Army service.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MAISHA FIELDS, JESSICA PRICE, ANDREA HERBERT, AND KELLY OSUNA

HON. JASON CROW

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a group of volunteers led by Maisha Fields, Jessica Price, Andrea Herbert, and Kelly Osuna for their work providing equitable access to the lifesaving COVID–19 vaccine.

The devastating effects of the COVID–19 pandemic have been felt in every corner of our community. Unfortunately, underserved communities have borne the brunt of the pandemic—with racial and ethnic minority groups contracting and dying from COVID–19 at a much higher rate due to discriminatory healthcare practices, lack of healthcare access, disproportionate representation in frontline occupations, and unfair and crowded housing conditions.

As the COVID–19 vaccine finally began its rollout, many breathed a sigh of relief as a return to normalcy seemed within view. However, community leaders like Maisha, Jessica, Andrea, and Kelly—who had seen first-hand the effects of inequity in our pandemic response—knew vaccine accessibility would not only face similar challenges reaching marginalized groups but would ultimately hamper our recovery and cost even more lives.

These four incredible women jumped into action and created a system of equitable vaccine clinics that operated throughout underserved communities in Arapahoe and Adams Counties. Their efforts included extensive collaboration with the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, finding and securing accessible venues, and recruiting volunteers to work at the clinics as translators, organizers, and vaccine administrators. Despite working full-time, this group of women went on to hold over 150 equity vaccine clinics throughout our community—culminating in more than 50,000 people receiving life-saving vaccines.

Time and time again, it is community leaders like Maisha, Jessica, Andrea, Kelly, and their devoted group of volunteers who give me hope we can overcome any challenges that are thrown our way. I am honored to recognize this group of volunteers led by these four women and I thank them for their work putting our community on a path towards a more equitable and safe place to call home.

HONORING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANCASTER PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. CHRIS JACOBS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Lancaster Public Library in the Town of Lancaster, New York on its bicentennial anniversary.

The Lancaster Public Library was founded in 1821 as the "Cayuga Creek Veterans' Library Society" in honor of the estimated forty veterans from the American Revolution and War of 1812 that founded the library. The library grew considerably over the years, moving from the Johnson School House to the Lancaster Presbyterian Church in 1832. It then moved to the Town Hall in 1896 and then to the Potter Estate in 1940 after the residence was donated by Mrs. Fanny Potter Eaton. In 1947, the growing Village of Depew located within the Town of Lancaster opened its own branch library, enabling even more Western New Yorkers to read and learn. By 1964, the Depew branch had opened its own exclusive facility until the Lancaster and Depew libraries merged in 2005.

Today, the Lancaster Public Library is one of the most vibrant and community-oriented libraries in the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library System. The library hosts various programs for all community members to enjoy. In recent years, the library has organized institutional staples for children such as story hours, crafting, and science activities. For adults the library hosts lectures series from local leaders on business, STEM topics, government affairs, and the arts. Even during the COVID–19 pandemic, the Lancaster Public Library worked to provide extensive virtual programming for the residents of Lancaster. Additionally, raffles, giveaways, and chicken barbeque fundraisers also help to promote the Lancaster Public Library's close-knit relationship with our community.

The Lancaster Public Library also partners with other local organizations and agencies to enhance their patrons' library experiences. Through the Lancaster Historical Society, the library has been able to compile photography displays of Lancaster from its humble beginnings to the bustling town that it is today. With Frosty's Ice Cream, a Lancaster favorite, the library has organized scavenger hunts for children with Frosty's coupons as prizes. Finally, the Lancaster Public Library has worked closely with the Erie County Department of Health to keep community members knowledgeable about COVID–19 and vaccinations. The library has forwarded public health directives and created public forums for citizens to speak directly with county health officials.

I thank the Lancaster Public Library for its tireless efforts serving the community since its founding and I again congratulate the library on its bicentennial anniversary.

COMMEMORATING THE NAIC'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate and commend the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) on the celebration of its 150th Anniversary and for the many years of advocacy and responsible stewardship of the insurance industry. Since its founding in 1871, NAIC has worked to diligently regulate the national insurance industry and market and protect hundreds of millions of American consumers.

As the first elected State Insurance Commissioner of California and former member of the NAIC. I know how invaluable state regulators' frontline role can be in holding insurance companies accountable. I am proud to continue to work closely with the NAIC here in Congress. including through the introduction of my bill the Primary Regulators of Insurance Vote Act. This important piece of legislation would support the work of the NAIC by ensuring that the expertise of our nation's primary insurance regulators, state commissioners, has equal weight in the monitoring of our financial stability at the national level.

Were it not for the work of the NAIC and its members. Americans would all too often be left unprotected from predatory practices of insurance companies. On behalf of the people of California's 3rd Congressional District. please accept my sincere congratulations and gratitude for the work you have done and continue to do and my best wishes for the years ahead.

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. KATHERINE BURCH

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today with great pleasure to extend my best wishes and congratulations to my constituent, Ms. Katherine Burch, on her 100th birthday.

Ms. Burch was born on November 28, 1921 in Baltimore, Maryland, where she lived until her marriage to John Thomas Burch when the couple moved to Virginia. John and Katherine Burch were married for 60 years and have two sons, Thomas and William. Ms. Burch currently resides in Morningside House of Leesburg.

Ms. Burch has lived through remarkable times in our country, progress and change unimaginable at the time of her birth. Our community is blessed by her experience, accomplishments, and the family she has built.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the grace and wisdom that comes with such longevity and wish Ms. Burch many more happy years of celebration.

CELEBRATING 30 YEARS OF KAZAKHSTAN'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the U.S.-Kazakhstan Congressional Caucus, I rise today to celebrate 30 years of Kazakhstan's independence and three decades of the U.S.-Kazakhstan bilateral relationship. In 1991, the United States was the first country to recognize Kazakhstan's independence, and the relationship remains as important today as it was 30 years ago.

In 2010, the United States and Kazakhstan entered into a Strategic Partnership and launched the Annual Bilateral Consultations on a variety of issues including but not limited to regional cooperation and security, rule of law and economic development, and human rights and civil society. In 2018, the two countries elevated their cooperation to establish an Enhanced Strategic Partnership for the 21st Century, and agreed to heightened cooperation on a multitude of policy issues.

One of the strongest areas of cooperation between the United States and Kazakhstan has been in the economic arena. Since independence, U.S. companies have been a significant source of foreign direct investment for Kazakhstan, and over the past 30 years, U.S. investment in Kazakhstan has totaled an estimated $370 billion. Kazakhstan has worked hard to create a strong market economy, and the country has focused significant resources on rule of law issues to create a welcoming environment for all foreign investment.

Kazakhstan became a member of the World Bank's International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes (''ICSID'') in 1992, a member of the World Trade Association (WTO) in 2015, and in 2017, Kazakhstan became a member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). In 2018, the government officially launched the Astana International Finance Center (AIFC), which among other things, provides foreign investors with the opportunity to seek out an alternative jurisdiction for dispute resolution. Such investments in the rule of law in Kazakhstan have been an important step to grow Kazakhstan's market economy and continue to attract investment from the United States.

As we continue to grow our strong economic ties, I urge Congress to establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations for Kazakhstan as soon as possible. I was honored to recently join in the bipartisan effort to introduce H.R. 5544, which lifts Kazakhstan from the existing constraints of the outdated Jackson-Yanik Amendment. This graduation for Kazakhstan is long overdue. As Ranking Member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee which has jurisdiction over U.S. foreign policy issues affecting Central Asia, I understand what an important regional partner Kazakhstan has been to the United States during the past 30 years. But I also understand what an important role Kazakhstan will continue to play in the region moving forward, and any efforts to strengthen our economic ties will strengthen the bilateral relationship across the board.

So I would like to congratulate all the people of Kazakhstan as well as Kazakh-Americans taking part in the 30th anniversary celebrations this month.

HONORING RANDOLPH BRINKLEY

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I offer these remarks on behalf of Congressman Ben Cline and myself in honor of Randolph ''Randy'' W. Brinkley of Daleville, Virginia, who passed away on November 13, 2021, at the age of 51. Mr. Brinkley served the community as a long-time educator and scoutmaster.

Mr. Brinkley was born on January 12, 1970 in Covington, Virginia, to Robert Franklin Brinkley and Glenda Scott Brinkley. Following his graduation from Alleghany High School in 1988, he joined and served in the U.S. Army National Guard for the next eight years.

He received degrees from numerous universities including a Masters of Arts in Teaching from Mary Baldwin and a Post-Masters degree as an Education Specialist from the University of Virginia. He began his teaching career in Roanoke city. Over the years he taught at several schools throughout the state and helped them establish programs to foster STEM education for their students. For the last five years, Mr. Brinkley has been serving as the STEM instructor for Salem High School.

Outside of the classroom, Mr. Brinkley spent much of his time serving as a scoutmaster with the Boy Scouts of America. He was an Assistant Scout Master and High Adventure Coordinator for Troop 211, which met at St. Mark's United Methodist Church. He was also a Mason at a local lodge and a Shriner who advocated for the Shriner's Hospital for Children. He spent his life teaching and investing in the lives of youth in the community. His distinguished service and kindness will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

Mr. Brinkley's survivors include his wife of twenty-five years, Donna Lynn Brinkley; his son, Nathaniel Scott Brinkley; and many other beloved family and friends. We offer them my condolences on the loss of this great man and educator.

SEA ISLE CITY BEACH PATROL

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, in October, I had the opportunity to attend the Sea Isle City Beach Patrol Annual Hall of Fame Induction. The Sea Isle Beach Patrol was officially formed in 1919 to protect the beachgoers who vacationed in the popular resort town. It started as just two lifeguards and three volunteers and has now grown into a large group. At the induction I attended, Robert Herzog, Bill Feaster, Jr., Jim Guntle, Jordy Troyan, Danny Rodgers, and Pat Scannapieco were inducted into the Beach Patrol Hall of Fame. Robert has been a part of Sea Isle Beach Patrol for 8 years and was also the mascot for multiple Sea Isle City Beach Patrol

surf bash competitors. Bill has been a part of Sea Isle Beach Patrol since 1980 and was a top 3 finisher multiple years in Sea Isle City Beach Patrol singles. Jim won the Avalon Beach 6-mile run and was also voted by beach patrol members to be the first President of the Sea Isle Beach Patrol lifeguards. Jordy was a full-time lifeguard from 2003 to 2010 and represented Sea Isle Beach Patrol on the Surf Dash Team, Swim Events, and Paddle board events. Danny won the singles row for the Sea Isle Beach Patrol for the first time in its history. Lastly, Pat has been a rowing legend on the Sea Isle City Beach Patrol for many years and has won the title of ''the most winningest doubles oarsman'' in the history of the Sea Isle Beach Patrol. These individuals should all be proud of their accomplishments and service to South Jersey, and it was my honor to watch them be inducted into the Hall of Fame. God Bless the Sea Isle Beach Patrol, and God Bless America.

CONGRATULATING GARY COHEN ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate Gary Cohen of Oakland, California, on occasion of his retirement from Blue Shield of California following a distinguished career as an attorney, public servant, advocate, mentor and leader committed to improving the health and well-being of millions of Americans.

Gary served the House honorably as my Chief of Staff in 2010 before helping lead the Obama Administration's implementation of the Affordable Care Act as the Director of the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight (CCIIO) where he oversaw implementation of regulations that established critical consumer protections that directly impacted the lives of millions of Americans.

As General Counsel to Covered California, California's health benefit marketplace—and Deputy Commissioner General Counsel during my tenure as California's Insurance Commissioner—Gary served as a passionate voice for consumers and worked tirelessly to improve Californians' access to affordable and comprehensive insurance coverage. As General Counsel for California's Public Utilities Commission, Gary developed a legal strategy that put consumers first amidst the state's unprecedented energy crisis.

In private practice, and following his government service, Gary pushed major California companies, including Blue Shield, to act instead of stand on the sidelines on making health coverage more affordable for members, empowering patients with better access to health data, and addressing the Bay Area's homelessness crisis.

Gary's experiences as a patient led him to push for a delivery system that is simplified, affordable and more patient friendly. He served as a trusted, experienced advisor to the California delegation on health care issues, and I have no doubt he will continue to do so following his retirement on the issues that matter.

In government and the private sector, Gary led with compassion and empathy. Gary inspired his staff to be passionate, fearless and to act consistent with their values in standing for what is right, no matter how challenging the politics or environment.

Gary is also a loving husband to his lifetime love Liz, and an attentive father and grandfather. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our appreciation and best wishes to Gary and his family following an outstanding and meaningful career.

HONORING YOLETTE BONNET

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Yolette Bonnet, a fierce advocate for health care in Florida's 21st Congressional District who recently announced her retirement. For 20 years, Yolette has been committed to improving access to quality health care for individuals and families across South Florida. She has gone above and beyond to meet their health care and social service needs, regardless of their ability to pay.

Under Yolette's leadership, what began as a small social service organization in 1985—then known as The Comprehensive AIDS Program—has since been transformed into a community health center that provides comprehensive and culturally competent care to all people. Known today as FoundCare, this organization plays a vital role in the Palm Beach County community.

Yolette has worked to garner millions of dollars in grants and donations for FoundCare, helping the organization to expand to a total of seven locations across the county. Yolette was instrumental in helping designate FoundCare as Florida's first Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC), which receives federal funding to serve low-income members of our community. Today, FoundCare is the largest non-governmental FQHC in Palm Beach County. Yolette has also supported our community throughout the COVID–19 public health crisis, initiating Florida's first COVID–19 community testing site at FoundCare.

Yolette's dedication and service to the people of South Florida is truly inspiring. Her outstanding work has touched countless lives, and I am so thankful for her efforts to improve health equity within our community. I wish her well on her retirement and I am proud to honor her today.

HONORING THE CAREER OF MR. CAMERON COLLIER

HON. JIM BANKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Cameron Collier of Decatur, Indiana for his dedicated service to our Nation as an officer in the United States Navy. Cameron has just retired from the Navy, and I wish to reflect the gratitude I, and all northeast Indiana, have for him.

Having graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 2001, Cameron reported to Naval Air Station Oceana in Virginia Beach, Virginia, in 2003, where he underwent training in preparation for deployment in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. During Iraqi Freedom, Cameron served as a Radar Intercept Officer aboard the aircraft carrier USS *Harry Truman*.

In 2006, Cameron moved to Annapolis, Maryland with his family, where he served as the Training Officer on staff at the Naval Academy. He left active-duty service in 2010 to pursue a career in financial planning, yet remained an officer in the Naval Reserve, attaining the rank of Commander in 2016. In this capacity, he also served as Chairman of my Service Academy Board, responsible for interviewing and evaluating high school students in Indiana's Third District seeking a nomination to U.S. service academies.

I hope Cameron's heart is filled with joy knowing he has played an essential part in securing our country's greatest blessings. As he retires from the Navy and prepares to move on to the next chapter of his life, understand that his record of service will stand as a shining example to generations of Hoosiers contemplating serving our country for years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JIM LEYSER

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my good friend, veteran, Jim Leyser, who passed away on November 17, 2021. Jim was well known in the Central Valley and was actively involved in the community, volunteering his time for many causes. Jim was a father, husband, loyal friend, and veteran.

Jim was born August 8, 1946 and was adopted in Hawaii to Maurice and Myrtle Leyser. Maurice, was a career navy submariner and was stationed on the submarine base of Pearl Harbor in Hawaii. As Jim got older, Jim felt the need to join the United States Marine Corps. In 1968, he enlisted and got out in 1976. During that time, Jim was part of the Crash Fire and Rescue in the Philippines and Japan. In 1976, Jim got out of the Marine Corps as a sergeant.

After serving in the Marine Corps, Jim met the love of his life, Mary. On April 24, 1981, they were married and started a family together. Jim worked at the Veteran Affairs Hospital in the specimen lab. He was part of the Marine Corps League as well as Commandant for Detachment-14 and was in the American Legion Charlie Waters Post 4, previously in Post 147. Jim participated on the K9 awards board committee and was State President for the American Legion for 2013–2014. He also assisted the commander of the district 14 on American Legion Posts meetings, and so much more.

Jim was often seen during Christmas volunteering for Toys-for-Tots; celebrating the Marine Corps Birthday at the ball every year and helping bartend for veteran events with the Marine Corps League. He made sure to be included in awareness events like the Suicide Awareness Ride, the annual Spaghetti Dinner

fundraisers, and being with his American Legion Riders Chapter 509. He volunteered his time handing out blankets to veterans during the holidays and participated in many funeral ceremonies in the Honor Guard, specifically during the pandemic. Mary was always by his side at the events, with a smile on her face and chatting with veterans and their families. They were both friendly and helpful to everyone and ready to assist when needed.

Jim is survived by his wife of 40 years, Mary; his son; daughter-in-law, his son-in-law, 12 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren. Jim's wonderful daughter, Vickie, passed away in 2020. He leaves behind many friends including his brothers and sisters of the Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the life of Jim Leyser. I join his family and friends in the veteran community in celebrating his life and continuous service to others.

MARIA PROCOPIO

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, recently, I had the pleasure of attending Maria Procopio's 100th birthday party. Maria has been a Vineland resident for 62 years. She was born in November of 1921 in the town of Montauro, Italy. In 1938, Maria married Giovanni Procopio and they immigrated to the United States in March of 1959. Maria and Giovanni have eight children, eleven grandchildren, and ten great grandchildren. On November 22, 2021, the Mayor of Vineland, Anthony Fanucci, recognized and celebrated the 100th birthday and longevity of Maria's life. I hope that Maria had a great birthday and it was an honor to be able to attend her birthday party. God Bless Maria, and God Bless our America.

RECOGNITION OF THE COTULLA-LA SALLE COUNTY AIRPORT'S NEW AIRPORT TERMINAL GRAND OPENING

HON. TONY GONZALES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the leadership and community of La Salle County and the city of Cotulla on the grand opening of the new airport terminal, which is happening today in my district. I especially want to recognize County Judge Joel Rodriguez Jr., Cotulla Mayor Jose Javier Garcia, Airport Manager E.T. Page, and members of the La Salle County Commissioners Court and Cotulla City Council for all the work that has gone into bringing today to fruition.

The Airport has a rich history since its beginning in 1947, when it was constructed to serve as an emergency airfield for military training aircraft in the area. The airport has truly become an area magnet for economic growth and in 2016, the Cotulla airport was even recognized as the TxDOT-Aviation Airport of the Year.

With today's ribbon cutting, Cotulla-La Salle County Airport (KCOT) has been set up for many years of success in the future. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the airport's success and thank them for all the work they do every day in south Texas.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF PAM MARPHIS

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Pam Marphis, a selfless public servant and one of the longest-serving staffers in my office.

Pam's 22 years working in Congress began with then-Representative David Vitter in 1999, then with Bobby Jindal, and then with my office when I won a special election in 2008.

Pam Marphis has helped thousands of constituents with their casework over the course of her career and she has been a rock star in so many ways.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Pam tirelessly helped Louisiana families navigate the FEMA bureaucracy so that they could get the help they needed to rebuild their homes and communities that were devastated.

When there was a child in Honduras needing heart surgery, Pam worked with the State Department to get that child to a hospital in Louisiana.

And as the world began to shut down in the beginning of this pandemic, Pam worked round-the-clock to get U.S. citizens back home.

I thank Pam, for her faithful service to our country. Her decades of experience will be sorely missed. Jennifer and I wish Pam and Gary the best in this next chapter of their lives.

HONORING HEARD, McELROY AND VESTAL'S 75 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. MIKE JOHNSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my good friends and community leaders who have been serving my hometown of Shreveport for a remarkable 75 years.

The CPA firm—Heard, McElroy and Vestal—has been an integral part of our community since 1946. In fact, founding partner Charles McElroy served as one of the first Chairman of the Louisiana Certified Public Accountants. From the very beginning, the firm has established itself as a "pillar of trust, integrity and competence." Their firm is now one of the largest public accounting firms in Northwest Louisiana.

This firm and its over 100 employees have worked faithfully for the people of Louisiana every day and have continued to be a cornerstone for our region. We are blessed to have their mission of accounting excellence and commitment to integrity as a part of our community.

I thank my friends for serving so well for all these years, and happy 75th anniversary.

HONORING GARY MANN ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding Hoosier, Gary Mann, as he celebrates his 80th birthday on December 13, 2021. Truly a giant in Elkhart, Indiana, Gary has demonstrated great leadership, excellence, and service throughout this life.

Gary, who graduated from Elkhart High School in the Class of 1959, was an exceptional student athlete. During his high school career, he earned two varsity letters each in football, baseball, and basketball. As a basketball player, Gary helped the Blazers reach the IHSAA state finals and, as a senior, was part of the Elkhart High School team that reached the sectional championship.

While he was a tremendous athlete across the board, Gary truly excelled on the football field. He rarely left the field during his football career, playing punter, tight end on offense, and safety on defense. Gary led the Blue Blazers in interceptions as a senior and was named MVP that year.

Following his storied high school sports career, Gary earned a full-ride scholarship to play football at Arizona State. Later, he earned a teaching degree from Ball State University and returned home to Elkhart County to teach and coach.

In the classroom, Gary taught generations of students as a history teacher at West Side Middle School. Additionally, he served as a longtime coach across the county. His tenures spanned ten years as Elkhart Memorial High School varsity football assistant, twelve years as Elkhart Central High School varsity football assistant, two years as Elkhart High School varsity wrestling assistant, nine years as West Side Middle School freshman football coach, and five years as the West Side Middle School seventh grade football, wrestling, and track coach.

For decades, Gary has been a respected mentor, coach, community leader, and role model to hundreds of young adults—both on and off the field. In recognition of his amazing legacy, Gary was inducted into the Elkhart County Sports Hall of Fame in 2012.

At home and across Elkhart County, he is well known for his support, guidance, encouragement, and work ethic that has motivated his family and so many other Hoosiers. Gary and his wife, Ann, were married in 1962 and have been blessed with two children, five grandchildren, and three great-granddaughters.

As Gary celebrates this incredible milestone, it is my privilege to honor him for his many accomplishments and—most importantly—his devoted service to the Hoosiers of Elkhart County. I wish Gary a happy birthday, and continued health and happiness in the years to come.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JEAN M. ROUSSEAU

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Jean M. Rousseau. Since 2015, Jean served as the County Administrative Office for the Fresno County Board of Supervisors.

Jean has been a citizen of the San Joaquin Valley his entire life. He has spent his marriage and his time raising his three children in the Central Valley. Jean attended California State University, Fresno where he received his bachelor's degree in Business Administration with an emphasis in accounting in 1986. Prior to attending college, he graduated from San Joaquin Memorial High School, my own alma mater. Jean has been with high school sweetheart, Andria for 38 years.

Before working for Fresno County, Jean was County Administrative Officer for Tulare County, and he held various other accounting-related positions throughout the Valley. His experience as a Certified Public Accountant has been an essential asset to the Central Valley for more than 30 years.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the career of Jean M. Rousseau. His service and contributions to the Central Valley will be missed. I join his family, friends, and the community in celebrating Jean's successful career and wish him the best of luck in retirement.

COMMEMORATING THE 250-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF ALAMANCE

HON. TED BUDD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, as we close out the calendar year, I rise today to commemorate the 250-year anniversary of the Battle of Alamance.

In 1771, a group of North Carolinians took a stand for their rights, raising their voices in opposition to the unjust overreach and abuses they were subjected to under the watch of royal governor William Tryon. These colonists branded themselves as the Regulators—seeking to protect individual liberties that had been encroached upon by a government more interested in serving itself than its people. Of primary concern to the Regulators were issues of unfair taxation, corruption, and illegally assessed fines, penalties, and fees.

Governor Tryon caught wind of the Regulators' revolt and moved swiftly to silence them. Assembling a militia at New Bern, Tryon and his forces headed west. The conflict reached its height when armed Regulators were met by the Governor's militiamen in modern-day Alamance County. Refusing to be subdued, the Regulators defied Tryon's call for their surrender and the Governor charged his militia to open fire. Many Regulators were killed, injured, or taken prisoner; but their cause was not forgotten and their bravery not wasted.

Preceding the onset of the Revolutionary War, the Regulator Movement gave public face to the frustrations of colonists who recognized they were toyed with like pawns at the hands of a power-hungry British Empire and its corrupt regime of abusive officials. Surely, it was the righteous anger, bold indignation, and strong resolve of these early North Carolinians that set flame to the hearts of their fellow American patriots who would declare their independence with resounding authority in 1776, affirming:

> . . . That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political Connection between them and the State of Great-Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved.''

Madam Speaker, as we reflect on the Regulators' courage, may we in this Congress vow to preserve the fundamental rights to life and liberty that undergird our American prosperity. Please join me in tribute to the spirit of the American Revolution as displayed in 1771 at the Battle of Alamance, in a county I have the high privilege of representing within North Carolina's 13th Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ITALY ALBERT ''I.A.'' GREENE

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an educator, a veteran, and a fellow South Carolina State University alumnus as he celebrates his 100th birthday. Dr. Italy Albert "I.A." Greene was born on the auspicious day of December 25, 1921 and has been blessed with longevity and a full life.

I.A. Greene was born in Williamsburg County, South Carolina and graduated from Wilson High School in Florence, South Carolina in 1941. After high school, he matriculated at South Carolina State College (now University), but World War II disrupted his plans. In 1942, he felt called to serve and enlisted in the U.S. Air Force. He received an honorable discharge in 1945 after three years of service.

After leaving the Air Force, Dr. Greene returned to South Carolina State and graduated in 1948 with a degree in agriculture. Upon graduation, he began teaching at Rosemary High School in Andrews, South Carolina, where he taught agriculture, biology, chemistry, and general science for five years.

In 1953, Dr. Greene was hired as the Vocational Agriculture Instructor at Mayo High School in Darlington, South Carolina, where he established the school's first Agriculture Department. While teaching in Darlington, he continued his higher education earning a master's degree in education in 1957 at South Carolina State and completing an additional 30 hours of post graduate work in Secondary Administrative Education.

During the 1968–1969 school year, Dr. Greene became Mayo High School's Assistant Principal. That year he oversaw the school's Accreditation Committee for the Southern Association of Secondary Schools. After just one year as Assistant Principal, Dr. Green was elevated to serve as Mayo High School's Principal.

His first year as Principal in 1969 through 1970 was historic. That was the year the courts ordered schools in Darlington County to integrate. Dr. Greene referred to his experience as "baptism by fire." He often recalls that no college classroom or textbook could prepare an educator to oversee such a significant change. Yet, Dr. Greene says, "it was the most dramatic and exciting period of my career."

Dr. Greene spent the rest of his career as Mayo High School's Principal and retired in 1983. In retirement, he has been active in the community; working with Habitat for Humanity, the Red Cross, United Way, the Community Action Agency, the Lord Cares Ministry, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, St. John's Heritage Foundation, and Billie Hardee Home for Boys.

His faith is the foundation of his life. He and his wife co-founded Comfort Ministries to offer Christian counseling and Bible study for the community. They also own two mobile home parks in Darlington County to support families in need of housing. St. James the Elder Theological Seminary of the Holy Catholic Church International awarded him an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree in 2012.

Dr. Greene is an active member of Bethel AME Church in Darlington, where he taught Bible study, Sunday school, and new member classes. He has also been a member of the Men's Choir and served as a class leader and as steward pro-tem. Dr. Greene is married to the former Effie Bacote of Darlington, and they are the parents of two children, grandparents of six, and great-grandparents of six.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in wishing centenarian I.A. Greene a heartfelt happy birthday. He has led a remarkable life and has had a tremendous impact on the lives of countless students and many others in his community. I offer sincere congratulations to Dr. Greene on reaching this significant milestone and extend best wishes for many more happy and healthy days.

IN RECOGNITION OF HOSSAM MAKSOUD, PHARMD

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Hossam Maksoud for his outstanding career and dedication to creating accessible health services. For over twenty-five years, Dr. Maksoud has been at the forefront of providing affordable medication and healthcare.

When Dr. Maksoud received his pharmaceutical degree in 1990 from St. John's University's School of Pharmacy, he already had an established family business and chain of pharmacies in Egypt. Dr. Maksoud used this entrepreneurial experience in the United States to establish Maksoud Pharm, Inc in 1993.

Maksoud Pharm grew into a chain of independent retail pharmacies in the New York tri-state area. With the revenues generated from Maksoud Pharm, Dr. Maksoud was able to launch his long-term care pharmacy company, Community Care Rx.

Dr. Maksoud currently serves as Chief Executive Officer of Community Care Rx. As a

long-term care pharmacy, the company serves Adult & Pediatric Residential Programs, Assisted Living Facilities, Hospital Discharge Programs, HIV Programs, Hospital and Nursing Home Discharges and Skilled Nursing Facilities. Community Care Rx has a specific focus on nonprofit organizations that serve individuals unable to care for themselves.

Dr. Maksoud's goal is to address pharmaceutical drug shortages, working with lists provided by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Over the years, Dr. Maksoud created additional healthcare companies to confront shortage concerns, such as Community Care Specialty Pharmacy, which is URAC and ACHC accredited, to address the difficulty in obtaining specialty disease state medications for patients. Dr. Maksoud also created Community Care Consulting, which reviews patients' medication charts in order to reduce patient and facility financial burdens.

In 2017, Dr. Maksoud once again launched an initiative to address the drug shortage problem. With four partners, he created Dawah Pharmaceuticals, Inc., a drug manufacturing company. Dawah Pharmaceuticals aims to provide affordable medication to the market by producing generic versions of otherwise widely inaccessible medication. One of these generics is currently under review by the FDA and has a projected release in the second quarter of 2022. In partnership with Oakrum Pharma, Dawah Pharmaceuticals will market the medication through wholesale distribution across the United States, to the benefit of institutions such as hospitals and clinics.

Dr. Maksoud is a board member of the Egyptian African Business Association (EABA) and is an active participant in many long-term care and nonprofit associations in the tristate area, such as IAC, ESAAL, NYAEMP, NYSACRA, HCANJ, and NJACP. Additionally, Dr. Maksoud, along with his family, established The Maksoud Foundation, which assists the elderly in obtaining medication they cannot afford.

As a dual citizen of Egypt and the United States with extensive experience living and working in multiple countries, Dr. Maksoud brings a unique perspective to his work. His global experience has demonstrated to him the importance and the value of diversity and community philanthropy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Hossam Maksoud for his community service, his generosity, and especially his commitment to providing affordable medication and increasing access to quality healthcare.

HONORING LLOYD PECK'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to wish United States Marine Corps Veteran and valuable member of our community, Mr. Lloyd B. Peck, a happy 90th birthday.

Mr. Peck served as an active-duty Marine from 1948 to 1959 on the front lines of the Korean war. When he returned home, he remained part of our military community, and dedicated himself to serving his fellow veterans.

In recent years, Mr. Peck has organized Veterans Day parades and has served as the Chief Parade Marshal in Altoona, Pennsylvania. Further, he heads the Blair County War Veterans Council, and has worked tirelessly to advocate for veterans' issues.

On behalf of the people of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I applaud Lloyd for his active efforts to better our community and his dedication to supporting America's veterans.

Let me be among the countless friends and family wishing him a happy 90th birthday.

ROBERT ''BOB'' BRIGGS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert ''Bob'' Briggs of Westminster, Colorado who passed away on December 2, 2021.

Bob was born December 24, 1937 in Greeley, Colo. as one of eight children and the oldest son. His family moved to Westminster, Colo. in 1943, where Briggs graduated from Westminster High School. He earned a bachelor's degree and a master's degree from Colorado State University, both in horticulture. According to a January 2020 profile in Orchard Living, ''he majored in horticulture because he did not want to wear a tie for a living.'' Bob married his wife Shirley on September 8, 1957.

Bob had a long career in local and state politics, serving as Adams County Commissioner for four years beginning in 1979, as the local Board Member for the Regional Transportation District for four years beginning in 1999, and a State Representative for District 29 from January 2003 to 2005. He served two terms on the Westminster City Council from 2007 to 2015, including a stint as the Mayor Pro Tem. He also served as charter President of the original Westminster Chamber of Commerce in 1967. That group merged with the Adams County Chamber in 1982 where he also served as a board member. In this free time, Bob spent his time serving the Colorado Greenhouse Grower's Association, the Westminster Open Space Board, the Westminster Rotary, the Jefferson County Historical Commission and was still serving as a member of the Board of Directors for the Butterfly Pavilion upon his passing. He was a longtime proponent of local rail and helped found the advocacy group, Rocky Mountain Rail.

Bob was a devoted husband and loving father and grandfather. Bob and Shirley raised two children and enjoyed spending time with their grandchildren. I am deeply grateful for his lifetime of service to our community.

CELEBRATING GREENVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLS 2021 HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE, MR. BILL EVANS

HON. JEFF DUNCAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Mr. Bill Evans in being named a Greenville County Schools 2021 Hall of Fame Inductee.

Born and raised in Washington, Georgia, Mr. Evans was inspired by his own high school teachers. He attended Berry College in Rome, Georgia, and graduated with a bachelor's degree in Physical Education and a minor in English. Upon graduation, Mr. Evans began his teaching career in 1989.

Evans taught English at Hillcrest High School in Greenville, South Carolina for 28 years. He is responsible for developing the school's Speech and Debate Program, which has won numerous tournaments and competitions. Altogether, his work in the education field promoted excellence for South Carolina students in the subjects of English, Speech, and Debate for nearly three decades.

During his career, Mr. Evans was twice named Teacher of the Year. In 2012, he earned the National Speech and Debate Teacher of the Year award and was inducted into the Mississippi Speech and Debate Hall of Fame. Additional accolades for Mr. Evans include the National Speech and Debate Four Diamond Coach Award and a two-time presidency of the South Carolina Speech Teachers Association.

In 2017, Mr. Evans retired from Hillcrest High School. That year's edition of the school yearbook was dedicated to him. The following year, the annual Hillcrest Speech and Debate Tournament was named in his honor.

Fellow teachers remember Mr. Evans as someone who takes new teachers under his wing and shows them how to make the classroom a positive and fun environment. They recall his love of Shakespeare and how his interactive lessons allowed students to engage and enjoy Shakespeare just as much. Mr. Evans describes himself as someone who was ''destined to be an educator.'' Among his many distinguished students are an award-winning poet, an award-winning screenplay writer, numerous state and national Speech and Debate champions, and several current and former members of my congressional staff.

In late November, at the Greenville Convention Center, Greenville County Schools honored Evans at its annual Hall of Fame ceremony. Today, Mr. Evans and his wife, Maria, reside in Simpsonville, SC. They have three children.

Reflecting on the accomplishments of Mr. Evans and his students, I am reminded of the impact Mr. Evans continues to make on young adults who completed their high school education at Hillcrest High School. His students, fellow teachers, and surrounding community members in the state of South Carolina are inspired by him. I am proud to represent and serve constituents as impactful as those like Mr. Evans.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to serve the Third District of South Carolina and to celebrate those who make a difference through education.

EDUCATORS FOR AMERICA ACT

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, today, I am proudly introducing the bicameral EDUCATORS for America Act, along with my colleagues, Representatives AXNE, HAYES, and GALLEGO, and my partners Senators REED and CASEY.

Education is perhaps the most precious gift we have, the sharing of information about our world as we currently understand it to the next generation. Being an outstanding educator requires a generosity of spirit, a will of steel, and a heart full of empathy.

I understand the value of education. As an educator for forty years, I had the opportunity to see bright young minds in my classrooms hard at work. I always hoped that some of these bright young minds would go on to become educators themselves.

Unfortunately, I saw that students aspiring to become educators were sometimes discouraged—by the student debt they would face, by the salaries they would earn, and by the lack of support they would confront.

Educators are struggling, particularly as we continue to grapple with the pandemic. We cannot afford to neglect the educator pipeline any longer. We simply cannot wait for the next generation of educators to appear. We must act intentionally to urgently recruit educators into the classroom, and more importantly, retain educators in the classroom. As such, educators should be given the opportunities and support they need. This bill does just that: it addresses educator preparation, support for educators, financial assistance, and mobilization of states and local communities in improving the educator pipeline.

I will close with this quotation from a titan in American history, W.E.B. Du Bois: ''Of all the Civil Rights for which the world has struggled, and fought for 5,000 years, the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental.''

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE, THE HONORABLE GEORGE S. CURRY

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service and leadership of Grant County Circuit Court Judge George S. Curry.

I first came to know Judge Curry when I had the honor of trying a case before him as a young special prosecutor. His skill as a judge to be fair, impartial and his knowledge of the rules of evidence made that trial much easier for a young victim of sexual assault, and for everyone in the courtroom.

George was a product of Southwest Wisconsin. He was raised there, went to school there and served most of public life there. He was born in Dodgeville, Wisconsin, and graduated from Darlington High School. He graduated from Luther College, Decorah, Iowa with a B.S. in Economics in 1969. He received his law degree from the University of Wisconsin Law School in 1972. While attending law school George also served in the United States Army Reserve and was honorably discharged in 1971.

George began his career as an attorney in private practice in 1972 and in 1990, Governor Tommy Thompson appointed him to the Grant County Circuit Court Judgeship. Judge Curry presided over the Grant County Circuit Court for 19 years until 2009. He was proud of developing and implementing the Grant County Fresh Start Program, a class that aimed to educate offenders and curb underage drinking. George was selected by Wisconsin Supreme Court Justice Shirley Abrahamson to chair the Judicial Conduct Advisory Committee for six years and, in 2018, was elected a Fellow of the Wisconsin Law Foundation for his distinguished and outstanding service as a Circuit Court Judge. Following his time as a Judge, George opened his own law practice, Curry Law & Mediation, focusing primarily on personal injury law. George was highly regarded for his ethics, integrity, and fair-mindedness during his distinguished legal career.

Judge Curry passed away on Saturday Dec. 4, 2021 surrounded by his wife Linda and their extended family, and I am honored to recognize the life and service of a man who served the citizens of Southwest Wisconsin with such dignity and integrity.

DAVID MOSER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize David Moser on his retirement from the United States Department of Labor Office of Workman's Compensation Programs' Division of Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation.

For nearly twenty years, David served across a variety of positions at the Department of Labor serving the American people. David started his public service as a member of the U.S. Navy from June 9, 1981 through February 1, 1994. He became a Hospital Corpsman after boot camp and corps school, during which time he was stationed at several Naval locations, including at the U.S. Naval Hospital in Portsmouth, Virginia from 1981 to 1982 followed by a 6-month deployment on the USS America to Europe. From 1984 to 1986, he went to the U.S. Marine Base Camp Butler in Okinawa, Japan with the 3rd Marine Corps Battalion as a Corpsman for an Artillery Unit followed by stints at the U.S. Naval Hospital at Subic Clinic in Subic Bay, Philippines and the U.S. Marine Corps Air Base in Yuma, AZ, as a corpsman for a Hawks Missile Unit from 1986 to 1990. He then moved to be a Medical Representative for the U.S. Marine Corps Office Selection Team in Denver, Colo. from 1990 to 1994.

After he left the U.S. Navy, David joined the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, working several different positions in the mail room, customer service and foreign medical program. David subsequently joined the U.S. DOL, Office of Worker's Compensation, Energy Employee's Occupational Illness Compensation Program (EEOICP) in the Denver District Office as a Claims Examiner, Senior Claims Examiner, and Medical Benefits Examiner from August 2005 to his retirement. His hard work and dedication to public service is tremendous.

I wish David all the best in retirement and send gratitude for his service to our community, the State of Colorado, and the United States of America.

CELEBRATING THE RETIREMENT OF CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT BRUCE A. FONG

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of Chief Master Sergeant Bruce A. Fong who will retire from the United States Air Force on December 18, 2021, after more than 31 years of military service.

Chief Fong is a native of Central New York and a graduate of Whitesboro Senior High School. He also holds a Bachelor of Science Degree in Computer Information Systems from Columbia College of Missouri, where he graduated Magna Cum Laude.

Chief Fong entered the active-duty Air Force under the delayed enlistment program in December 1979 and attended basic military training in July 1980 at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Following Basic Military Training, he went on to technical training at Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas to become an Air Cargo Specialist.

In September 1980 Chief Fong, then Airman Basic, was assigned to the 603rd Military Airlift Support Squadron, Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, Japan. He worked in the ramp services section where he was responsible for the on/off-loading of cargo on military and civilian aircraft such as the Boeing 747, the Lockheed Martin C–5 Galaxy, C–141A/B Starlifter, C–130 Hercules, the McDonnell Douglas C–9 Nightingale, and the KC–1O Extender. Chief Fong became phase two qualified on the C–130 and C–141, which provided the ability to service the aircraft without the supervision of a loadmaster. During his time at Kadena Air Base, Chief Fong was involved many times in an extraordinarily successful joint service deployment exercise ''Team Spirit'' supervising the loading operations of military aircraft, often working with untrained Air Force and Marine Corps load crews.

After two and a half years in Okinawa, Chief Fong had a permanent change of station to Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, where he was assigned to the 436th Aerial Port Squadron. He worked in the special handling section and was responsible for the timely and accurate inventory of critical cargo using the Aerial Port Documentation and Management System. Chief Fong also participated in the NATO exercise ''Bright Star,'' where he spent time in Cairo Egypt assisting the 436th Airlift Control Element in the on/off-loading of sixty aircraft and officially recognized for his effort by the Airlift Control Element commander.

After a 10-year break in service Chief Fong joined the I 74th Fighter Wing, New York Air National Guard in February 1996 as a Drill Status Guardsmen. He was assigned to the 174th Logistics Readiness Squadron as a Traffic Management Specialist.

In October 1998, Chief Fong was hired as a full-time military technician with the 174th Communications Flight. In his lengthy career within the organization, he held positions as a network administrator, network infrastructure technician, network control center supervisor, operations superintendent, and the finally as the Chief Enlisted Manager. As Chief Enlisted Manager, he was responsible for the training, readiness, and morale of all assigned enlisted personnel in support of combat and domestic operations. Chief Fong's other successful accomplishments include implementation of the following systems: Electronic Management Tracking System; Defense Biometric Identification System, and the Electronic Technical Order Distribution System, many of these accomplishments were firsts for the 174th Fighter Wing, the Air National Guard, and the United States Air Force. Chief Fong's other successes included installs and significant upgrades to the following base communications infrastructure and systems: Gigabit-Ethernet, Base Wireless Access, Base Area Network Modernization, NetApp Mass Storage, Network Control Center—Virtualization, Base Mass Notification System, and the Common Access Card, all told, totaling in the millions of dollars.

In March of 2000, Chief Fong deployed to Prince Sultan Air Base, Saudi Arabia in support of Operation SOUTHERN WATCH. Following the September 11, 2001 Terrorist Attacks on New York City, Chief Fong played an integral part providing back-end communications support during Operation NOBLE EAGLE, when the 174th Fighter Wing was tasked to fly Combat Air Patrol missions over New York City. In November of 2006, he deployed to Balad Air Base, Iraq in support of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM. At the height of the COVID pandemic, Chief Fong served as a Liaison Officer between the Air Force and Army for four and a half months. He provided logistical support to the New York State Military Joint Task Force, which was the command-and-control hub for all Central New York.

Throughout his career with the 174th Attack Wing, one of Chief Fong's crowning achievements and proudest moments has been serving as a Ceremonial Guardsmen with 174th Attack Wing's Base Honor Guard. During his time with the Base Honor Guard, he performed well over seven hundred active-duty, retiree, and veteran funerals, as well as participating in parades and other details supporting the base and community. This often involved working holidays, weekends, and traveling throughout 23 New York State counties, covering over 23,324 square miles.

For his 31 years of service Chief Fong has earned numerous decorations which include: the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters; the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters; the Air Force Achievement Medal with one oak leaf cluster; and the Air Force Good Conduct Medal. His military unit awards include: the Air Force Meritorious Unit Award with two oak leaf clusters, and the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with combat ''V'' device and five oak leaf clusters. His military campaign and service awards include: the National Defense Service Medal; the Air Reserve Forces Meritorious Service Medal with 7 oak leaf clusters; the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal; Iraq Campaign Medal with one bronze campaign star; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Armed Forces Service Medal; Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with gold border; the Air Force Longevity Service Award Ribbon with five oak leaf clusters; the Armed Forces Reserve Medal with silver hour glass and bronze mobilization ''M'' device; the Professional Military Education Ribbon with two oak leaf clusters; the Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon; and the Air Force Training Ribbon.

Chief Fong is married to Cynthia Kellar; has two children, Andrew and Jessica; and three grandchildren, Noah, Brooklynn, and Grayson. He is an avid photographer, trained in martial arts, and has flown solo in a Cessna 152, 182 and a Piper warrior in pursuit of a private pilot's license. Chief Fong is proud of his service to his country and looking forward to retirement and his next adventure.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing Chief Master Sergeant Bruce A. Fong for his three decades of honorable service. I wish Chief Fong the best in his retirement.

CHUCK GROSS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chuck Gross of the Adams County Education Consortium on his retirement.

For more than six years, Chuck has served the Adams County Education community in his role as Executive Director. Chuck has worked in many different roles with several organizations over the years. One of his earliest roles was as Sr. Vice President and General Manager of Kinzley-Hughes from 1988 to 1995. He then moved to Broadband and Associates from 1995 to 1996 and transitioned to the consulting world as a Principal at Worden Gross Consulting for eleven years where he provided public relations, community relations, marketing and communications to senior executives at some of America's most well-known brands, including the Ritz-Carlton and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Following Worden Gross, Chuck went to work for Sector Brands for seven years working as a senior branding and marketing communications consultant, working collaboratively with each client's executive leadership team to enhance its value and position the organization for leadership and growth.

His final role has been with the Adams County Education Consortium where he has been responsible for directing a county-wide partnership—including school districts, higher education institutions, local governments and businesses—that works to enhance academic skills development, career exploration, and relevant work-ready skills for all students in Adams County. My office has worked with Chuck on several different occasions over the years and I am inspired by his work ethic and contributions to Adams County Education community.

I wish Chuck all the best in retirement and send gratitude for his service to our community, the State of Colorado, and the United States of America.

HONORING CITY COUNCIL MEMBER ELLA MAE SMALL FOR A LIFETIME OF COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor City Council Member Ella Mae Small for a lifetime of service to her community and local government in Cabarrus County, North Carolina.

Upon graduation from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Councilwoman Small first worked as a schoolteacher in multiple districts throughout North Carolina and Georgia and served as a professor at North Carolina A&T University. After retiring from teaching, she assumed the high calling of public service when she completed her husband Allen Small's term on the Concord City Council after he passed while holding office. As the first African American female member of the Council, Councilwoman Small paved the way for greater diversity in local representation and provided astute and knowledgeable leadership on the Council for over 15 years.

Over the course of her career, Councilwoman Small has exhibited exceptional commitment and dedication to improving her community. As a schoolteacher, she served as one of the first kindergarten teachers in North Carolina. Her influence as a trailblazer helped cement this position as a permanent fixture of primary education. Praised highly by her peers, Councilwoman Small exerted similar influence on the Concord City Council to serve as a catalyst for positive change. For example, this past year she helped take charge of creating the Concord United Committee for the purpose of further addressing issues associated with race, equity, and diversity in the City. Her exemplary leadership provides a standard for all public servants. Although well-known for her role and initiatives as Councilwoman, she has also remained firmly committed to carrying out her responsibilities as a concerned citizen by holding many positions with national and local organizations such as the National Education Association and the Cabarrus Community Council among many others.

I would like to extend my most heartfelt appreciation to Councilwoman Small for her years of exemplary service as a teacher, community leader, and public servant. I speak for our entire community in wishing her and her family continued success and happiness as she moves into retirement.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in honoring Councilwoman Ella Mae Small for her extraordinary service.

CONGRATULATING JEFF ''THE IRONMAN'' DOWNER ON HIS RETIREMENT AS GROUNDSKEEPER AT PEKIN HIGH SCHOOL AFTER 36 YEARS

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jeff ''The Ironman'' Downer on

his retirement after 36 years as a Groundskeeper at Pekin Community High School.

Jeff started working at Pekin Community High School as a Groundskeeper in 1985 after graduating in 1977. His professionalism, attention to detail, and strong work ethic will make him difficult to replace. Jeff noticed when he first started work at the high school that the field was brown in the middle. It took two and a half years, but he was able to grow the field to be green and presentable for the students who use it. Jeff is respected because of his dedication to his profession and to the school, and is well-liked by everyone there. I commend Jeff for his hard work over the years to make Pekin Community High School a beautiful place where students are able to learn.

It is because of community leaders like Jeff Downer that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Jeff Downer on his retirement from Groundskeeping at Pekin Community High School.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LEE COOK

HON. TOM O'HALLERAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and the legacy of Lee Cook, who passed away recently at the age of 83.

After being drafted into the U.S. Army during the Korean War, Mr. Cook served our country with honor and distinction until he was honorably discharged.

Known for his sense of humor, humility, and devotion, Lee has left a lasting impact on his community.

He is survived by his wife of 65 years, eight children, twenty-two grandchildren, thirty-five great-grandchildren, and three great-great-great paternal grandchildren.

On behalf of my wife and myself, I want to commend Lee Cook's service to our nation, and offer sincere condolences to his wife, Ella R. Cook, and children, Alta James, Tommy Nodestine, Nancy Brown, Christine Cook, Sylvia Sloan, Sandy Cook, Martina Cook Johnson, and Frankie Cook.

My thoughts are with all who knew and loved Lee as they mourn his passing.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed a vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 430; YEA on Roll Call No. 431; YEA on Roll Call No. 432; YEA on Roll Call No. 433; YEA on Roll Call No. 434; and YEA on Roll Call No. 435.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARVIN SIMON

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to honor the life of Marvin Simon, a distinguished World War II veteran, fierce seniors' and veterans' advocate, and most importantly, my friend for nearly 15 years.

Marvin served in the U.S. Army Air Forces during the second World War. That service led to a lifetime of supporting the needs of our nation's veterans.

Marvin and his wife Pearl moved to Florida in 1985 and he became a strong advocate for Broward County's senior population. He was Vice Chair of the Area Agency on Aging's Advisory Council. As a member of the Pine Island Ridge Civic Association, Marvin was responsible for the county's emergency medical services having a base on the Pine Island Ridge condominium grounds.

Marvin was also a longtime member of the Broward County Veterans Coalition. He worked tirelessly to ensure the men and women who served our nation maintained their dignity and wellbeing.

Marvin served on my Academy Nominations Board from 2007 to 2014. In that role, he helped shape the future of the military by selecting students who will lead the armed forces in the years ahead.

Marvin and Pearl were married for 73 years before her death in 2020. They had two children, five grandchildren, and eight great grandchildren.

Although Marvin is no longer with us, his legacy lives on through the countless individuals whose lives he changed for the better.

Marvin Simon was one of a kind—a selfless, compassionate and a tireless advocate for others in Broward County. He was a patriot in the truest sense, will be profoundly missed but never forgotten.

CONGRATULATING DR. DUANE ESAREY ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 2021

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Duane Esarey, who is retiring from the Dickson Mounds Illinois State Museum in Lewistown after many years of tireless service.

Dr. Esarey has been committed to the disciplines of archaeology and anthropology throughout his life, especially in Central Illinois. He started his career in 1977, working in the field as an archaeologist in the Archaeological Research Labs at Western Illinois University. In 1982, Dr. Esarey earned a promotion to Director of the Archaeological Field School of the University. The following year, he relocated to Lewistown and accepted a position as Collections Manager for the Dickson Mounds Illinois State Museum. Dr. Esarey served as Collections Manager until 1994, when he became Assistant Curator of Anthropology for the Museum. He worked in this capacity until 2004 when he left to complete his Ph.D. at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and work as Assistant Director for the Illinois State Archaeological Survey in Champaign-Urbana. After 15 years, the Museum welcomed him back on March 10, 2019 as Director. Dr. Esarey's contributions have been significant and irreplaceable to the profile and growth of Dickson Mounds Illinois State Museum, and the fields of archaeology and anthropology in Central Illinois.

It is because of dedicated, innovative, and insightful leaders such as Dr. Esarey that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to, again, formally recognize Dr. Duane Esarey and thank him for his service to the collective Central Illinois community.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 610, Protecting Medicare and American Farmers from Sequester Cuts Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S9053–S9100

Measures Introduced: Twenty-seven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3349–3375, and S.J. Res. 32. **Pages S9093–94**

Measures Reported:

S. 1428, to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S9093**

Measures Passed:

Support for the People of the Republic of South Sudan: Senate agreed to S. Res. 380, 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, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and amendment to the preamble. **Pages S9082–85**

Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building: Senate passed S. 2938, to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building". **Page S9085**

Odell Horton Federal Building: Senate passed H.R. 390, to redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee as the "Odell Horton Federal Building". **Page S9085**

Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse: Senate passed H.R. 4660, to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 1125 Chapline Street in Wheeling, West Virginia, as the "Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse". **Page S9085**

Placement of a Statue: Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of S. 3294, to obtain and direct the placement in the Capitol or on the Capitol Grounds of a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Sandra Day O'Connor and a statue to honor Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S9085–86**

House Messages:

Protecting Medicare and American Farmers from Sequester Cuts Act: By 59 yeas to 35 nays (Vote No. 491), Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 610, to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals, after taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S9053–81**

Withdrawn:

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with Schumer Amendment No. 4871 (to the House amendment), to add an effective date. **Page S9081**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 64 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. 490), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill. **Page S9057**

Schumer motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Schumer Amendment No. 4873, to add an effective date, fell when cloture was invoked on Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill. **Page S9081**

Schumer Amendment No. 4874 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 4873) of the motion to refer), to modify the effective date, fell when Schumer motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Schumer Amendment No. 4873 (listed above) fell. **Page S9081**

Schumer Amendment No. 4875 (to Amendment No. 4874), to modify the effective date, fell when Schumer Amendment No. 4874 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 4873) of the motion to refer) (listed above) fell. **Page S9081**

Schumer Amendment No. 4872 (to Amendment No. 4871), to modify the effective date, fell when Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with Schumer Amendment No. 4871 (to the House amendment) (listed above) was withdrawn. **Page S9081**

Koh Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Page S9081**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 492), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S9081**

Sung Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Jennifer Sung, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Pages S9081–82**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 48 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. EX. 493), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S9081–82**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that all post-cloture time on the nominations of Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, and Jennifer Sung, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, be expired and the vote on confirmation of the nomination of Lucy Haeran Koh occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, December 13, 2021, and the vote on confirmation of the nomination of Jennifer Sung occur at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader; and that the motions to invoke cloture on the nomination of Samantha D. Elliott, of New Hampshire, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire, and on the House message to accompany S. 1605, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue in Orlando, Florida, ripen on Tuesday, December 14, 2021. **Page S9078**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, December 13, 2021, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Samantha D. Elliott, of New Hampshire, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire. **Page S9100**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Stephen A. Owens, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

Sylvia E. Johnson, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years. **Page S9082**

Messages from the House: **Pages S9092–93**

Measures Referred: **Page S9093**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S9093**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S9093**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S9094–96**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S9096–97**

Additional Statements: **Pages S9091–92**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S9097–S9100**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S9100**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—493) **Pages S9057, S9081–82**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:46 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, December 13, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S9100.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DISRUPTING DANGEROUS ALGORITHMS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband concluded a hearing to examine disrupting dangerous algorithms, focusing on addressing the harms of persuasive technology, after receiving testimony from Jessica J. Gonzalez, Free Press Action, and James Poulos, Claremont Institute, both of Los Angeles, California; Rose Jackson, Atlantic Council, San Francisco, California; and Dean Eckles,

MIT Sloan School of Management, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

PFAS CONTAMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal efforts to address PFAS contamination, after receiving testimony from Sean W. O'Donnell, Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency and Acting Inspector General, Michael J. Roark, Deputy Inspector General for Evaluations, Office of Inspector General, Richard Kidd, Deputy Assistant Secretary (Environment and Energy Resilience), and Laura A. Macaluso, Director, Force Safety and Occupational Health, Office of the Assistant Secretary (Readiness), all of the Department of Defense; Mark Johnson, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Columbus; Anthony M. Spaniola, Great Lakes PFAS Action Network, Troy, Michigan; and Andrea Amico, Testing for Pease, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2614, to provide for the modernization of electronic case management systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nomination of Dawn N. Ison, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 43 public bills, H.R. 6202–6244; and 1 resolution, H.J. Res. 67, were introduced. **Pages H7634–37**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H7638–39**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Brownley to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H7559**

Protecting Our Democracy Act: The House passed H.R. 5314, to protect our democracy by preventing abuses of presidential power, restoring checks and balances and accountability and transparency in government, and defending elections against foreign interference, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 440. **Pages H7562–H7617**

Rejected the Rodney Davis (IL) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 yeas to 217 nays, Roll No. 439. **Page H7616**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–20, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–205, shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H7563–82**

Agreed to:

Carolyn B. Maloney (NY) amendment en bloc No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–205: Adams (No. 1) that requires the FEC to make an income tax return public and post online within 48 hours of receiving a return, including redactions; Aguilar (No. 2) that requires that each state chief's election official creates a database of election officials who have received threats against them and need their personally identifiable information (PII) protected to ensure safe and fair elections; Cicilline (No. 4) that requires the White House to maintain a publicly accessible website that includes salary and financial disclosure information for White House employees; Clark (MA) (No. 5) that adds the President, Vice President, and any Cabinet member to the current statutory prohibition on members of Congress contracting with the federal government; Cohen (No. 6) that changes the definition of a "covered offense" to include pardons issued to any third degree relative of the President, any member or former member of the President's administration, any person who worked on the President's presidential campaign as a paid employee, or any person or entity when the offense at issue is motivated by a direct and significant personal or pecuniary interest of any of the described individuals; Connolly (No. 8) that protects merit system principles by limiting federal employee reclassifications to the five excepted service schedules in use prior to fiscal year 2021 (based on the bipartisan Preventing a Patronage System Act); Correa (No. 9) that closes the loophole that allows agencies to treat requests for information from members of Congress as FOIA requests by clarifying that the Freedom of Information Act prohibits executive branch agencies from responding to congressional requests for information with records that have been subject to FOIA

redactions; Correa (No. 10) that requires all Congressionally mandated reports from the executive branch to be transmitted to Congress in machine readable format; DelBene (No. 11) that directs the Federal Election Commission (FEC), in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), and other appropriate offices, to issue guidance for political committees and vendors on cybersecurity risks and best practices; Foxx (No. 12) that creates an Inspector General for the Office of Management and Budget to bring transparency and accountability to the agency; Foxx (No. 13) that creates parity in enforcement for Oversight and Reform Committee ''Rule of 7'' requests to protect minority party requests for information; Gallego (No. 14) that requires the President-elect to report to Congress on individuals in an incoming administration that are seeking a security clearance and the status of that clearance, including interim clearances; Golden (No. 15) that expands President and other covered officials' emolument disclosures to cover emoluments received or expected by spouses and dependent children, in line with other financial disclosures for spouses and dependent children in 5a USC 102(e); Issa (No. 16) that states that an incoming staffer in a Member office who already has a clearance shall not be counted against the two clearances per office that the current House rules allow; Kilmer (No. 17) that modernizes Federal Election Commission (FEC) disclosure requirements to ensure online political advertisements meet the same transparency and disclosure requirements that already apply to political ads sold on TV, radio, and satellite platforms; Lynch (No. 18) that prohibits the use of deepfakes within 60 days of a federal election and establishes corresponding criminal and civil penalties; Sean Maloney (NY) (No. 19) that clarifies language in the Former Presidents Act to state that impeachment and conviction, regardless of removal, makes a former president ineligible for benefits; McGovern (No. 20) that strengthens safeguards in the bill against presidential abuse of emergency powers by prohibiting their use for purposes other than emergencies; providing expedited procedures for joint resolutions to end emergency declarations; and ending ''permanent emergencies'' through a five-year limit; Ocasio-Cortez (No. 21) that expands coverage of section 3110 of title 5 of the U.S. Code to prohibit nepotistic appointments to the Executive Office of the President; Ocasio-Cortez (No. 22) that codifies President Biden's Executive Order on ethics commitments by executive branch personnel; Ocasio-Cortez (No. 23) that directs the Office of Government Ethics to promulgate regulations establishing ethics requirements for the establishment or operation of legal expense funds for the benefit of the President, Vice President, or any political appointee; Ocasio-Cortez (No. 24) that imposes disclosure requirements on inaugural committees, prohibits committees from taking money from foreign nationals; shadow entities; and corporations; and prohibits conversion of committee resources for personal use or for personal benefit; Omar (No. 26) that ensures agency interns are covered by whistle-blower provisions; Pascrell (No. 27) that amends Title X to clarify ability of federal officials to visit federal property prior to an election, requires disclosure of Hatch Act Investigations for certain employees, makes the Hatch Act applicable to the President and Vice President while conducting official duties on White House and White House grounds, strengthens Hatch Act violation penalties, grants the Office of Special Counsel rulemaking authority and ability to continue investigating certain employees, grants the Merit System Protection Board the ability to enforce subpoenas against certain employees, and conducts a GAO review of Hatch Act provisions; Phillips (No. 28) that explicitly prohibits conventions of national political parties for congressional, presidential, and vice-presidential candidates from being held on or in any federal property, including the White House and surrounding grounds; Phillips (No. 29) that directs the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to establish a program to support state and local governments in the transition to ranked choice voting (a system in which voters rank candidates in order of preference); Quigley (No. 30) that requires the President to establish and periodically update a public database of White House visitor records, including the names of visitors, with whom visitors met, and the purpose of the visit; Raskin (No. 31) that strengthens Title II of the Act to ensure that if a sitting President or Vice President is indicted while in office, a trial or other legal proceeding may only be delayed if it interferes with the defendant's official duties and ensures the burden to delay legal proceedings falls on the defendant; Ross (No. 32) that prohibits the President from requiring an officer or employee of the Executive Office of the President to enter into a nondisclosure agreement that is not related to the protection of classified or controlled unclassified information as a condition of employment or upon separation from the civil service; Ross (No. 33) that directs the Department of Justice (DOJ) to create an election threats task force to work with federal, state, and local partners to prioritize identifying, investigating, and prosecuting threats and acts of violence against election officials, workers, and their families; and Scanlon (No. 34) that changes the frequency

that the Inspector General of the Department of Justice must report to Congress improper communications between DOJ and the White House (by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 211 nays, Roll No. 436). **Pages H7594–H7608, H7613–14**

Rejected:

Carolyn B. Maloney (NY) amendment en bloc No. 2 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept 117–205: Burgess (No. 3) that sought to strike Title II; and Comer (No. 7) that sought to strike all sections of the bill and retitle as the "Inspector General Stability Act", but preserve a modified Title VII Subtitle A (Requiring Cause for Removal) which instead requires Congressional notification and a detailed rationale prior to an IG's removal, and also preserves Title VII Subtitle C (Congressional Notification) (by a yea-and-nay vote of 211 yeas to 218 nays, Roll No. 437); and **Pages H7608–11, H7614–15**

Ocasio-Cortez amendment (No. 25) printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–205 that sought to assert the Government Accountability Office's investigatory powers over the intelligence community (by a yea-and-nay vote of 196 yeas to 233 nays, Roll No. 438). **Pages H7611–13, H7615**

H. Res. 838, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5314), (S. 1605), and (S. 610) was agreed to Tuesday, December 7th. Agreed that in the engrossment of the bill, the clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House. **Page H7617**

Senate Referrals: S.J. Res. 29 was held at the desk. S. 2293 was held at the desk. S. 2796 was held at the desk. S. 693 was held at the desk. **Page H7617**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H7617.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7613–14, H7614–15, H7615, H7616, and H7616–17.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Committee Meetings

HOLDING BIG TECH ACCOUNTABLE: LEGISLATION TO BUILD A SAFER INTERNET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce held a hearing entitled "Holding Big Tech Accountable: Legislation to Build a Safer Internet". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

A REVIEW OF DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION PERFORMANCE IN AMERICA'S LARGE INVESTMENT FIRMS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion held a hearing entitled "A Review of Diversity and Inclusion Performance in America's Large Investment Firms". Testimony was heard from Michael Clements, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

WHAT'S NEXT FOR LIBYA? THE PATH TO PEACE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism held a hearing entitled "What's Next for Libya? The Path to Peace". Testimony was heard from Megan Doherty, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for the Middle East, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Karen Sasahara, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for North Africa, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee began a markup on H. Con. Res. 59, condemning the October 25, 2021, military coup in Sudan and standing with the people of Sudan; H.R. 6140, the "Sudan Democracy Act"; H.R. 5665, the "Combating International Islamophobia Act"; H.R. 6089, the "Stop Iranian Drones Act"; and H.R. 3988, the "Mental Health in International Development and Humanitarian Settings Act", H. Res. 376, condemning Turkey for its occupation of Cyprus and encouraging President Biden to make the resolution of the Cyprus problem a top foreign policy priority; and H. Res. 831, calling on the United States Government to uphold the founding democratic principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

LEVERAGING IIJA: PLANS FOR EXPANDING INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled "Leveraging IIJA: Plans for Expanding Intercity Passenger Rail". Testimony was heard from Julie White, Deputy Secretary for Multimodal Transportation, North Carolina Department of Transportation; David Kim, Secretary, California State Transportation Agency; and public witnesses.

CLEANER, CHEAPER ENERGY: CLIMATE INVESTMENTS TO HELP FAMILIES AND BUSINESSES

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Cleaner, Cheaper Energy: Climate Investments to Help Families and Businesses''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, continue markup on H. Con. Res. 59, condemning the October 25, 2021, military coup in Sudan and standing with the people of Sudan; H.R. 6140, the ''Sudan Democracy Act''; H.R. 5665, the ''Combating International Islamophobia Act''; H.R. 6089, the ''Stop Iranian Drones Act''; and H.R. 3988, the ''Mental Health in International Development and Humanitarian Settings Act'', H. Res. 376, condemning Turkey for its occupation of Cyprus and encouraging President Biden to make the resolution of the Cyprus problem a top foreign policy priority; and H. Res. 831, calling on the United States Government to uphold the founding democratic principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and establish a Center for Democratic Resilience within the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 9 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, December 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Samantha D. Elliott, of New Hampshire, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire.

At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, December 13

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12:30 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Alma S., N.C., E1353
Arrington, Jodey C., Tex., E1346
Banks, Jim, Ind., E1349
Brown, Anthony G., Md., E1346
Budd, Ted, N.C., E1351
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1345, E1354, E1355
Carbajal, Salud O., Calif., E1346
Chabot, Steve, Ohio, E1348
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1351
Costa, Jim, Calif., E1349, E1351
Crow, Jason, Col., E1347
Davids, Sharice, Kans., E1345
Duncan, Jeff, S.C., E1352
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E1349
Garamendi, John, Calif., E1348, E1349
Gonzales, Tony, Tex., E1350
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1348
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E1354, E1355
Jacobs, Chris, N.Y., E1347
Johnson, Mike, La., E1350
Joyce, John, Pa., E1345, E1352
Katko, John, N.Y., E1353
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1353
Larsen, Rick, Wash., E1345
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1351
Murphy, Stephanie N., Fla., E1346
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1346
O'Halleran, Tom, Ariz., E1355
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E1352, E1353, E1354
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E1347
Scalise, Steve, La., E1350
Soto, Darren, Fla., E1345, E1346
Van Drew, Jefferson, N.J., E1348, E1350
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1350
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E1355
Wexton, Jennifer, Va., E1348

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.