United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2022 No. 8

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 12, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DARREN SOTO 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:

Eternal God, throughout human history You have acted on our behalf, defended us against our enemies, saved us from our own sinfulness. And like those who have gone before us, we have failed to appreciate the mercy You have afforded us from the beginning of time.

Show us the writing on the wall. Our days are numbered. It doesn't matter whether we are counting the days of our life, or the time in our current vocations, You have determined the days we are given to serve You.

May we not be found wanting, having fallen short of the part we play in Your gracious design.

May we instead look to all that You have done for us, all that You have promised, and remember how blessed we are.

May we respond with full hearts and willing spirits, in our attitudes and actions, living lives worthy of Your mercy.

May we speak Your truth in our every word with our colleagues and constituents, as to the stranger and to the estranged.

And may we reflect to the world Your steadfast love to those around us, the poor and needy, the offensive and the irascible, friend and foe.

Holy God, make our lives count in the economy of Your grace. 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 gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT CHISOLM

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Robert Chisolm, an American hero who passed away peacefully on January 4, 2022, after a lifetime of service to our country and to El Paso.

Lieutenant Colonel Chisolm served in the Army in World War II, the Korean war, and the Vietnam war. He was a paratrooper in the 82nd Airborne Division when he parachuted into combat in Normandy, France, on D-day, a day that liberated Western Europe from Nazi rule.

He was also recognized in 2012 by the French Government and awarded the French Legion of Honor medal.

After 29 years of faithful service, he retired from the military and settled in El Paso, Texas, with his wife, Margaret. Lieutenant Colonel Chisolm helped create a community for local veterans as a founding member of the Benavidez-Patterson All Airborne Chapter of the 82nd Airborne Division Association, which awards scholarships to the children and grandchildren of paratroopers.

May Lieutenant Colonel Robert Chisolm's legacy of devotion to our country, his fellow veterans, and his unwavering commitment to service continue to inspire us all.

HONORING THE CAREER OF COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR JOHN F. SAMPA

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

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished and exceptional career of my friend, Command Sergeant Major John F. Sampa, the retiring Command Sergeant Major of the Army National Guard.

It is one of my greatest honors and privilege to have served with then-Sergeant John Sampa when I was a lieutenant with Bravo Company 4th Battalion 112th Armor, in Rosenberg, Texas. He mentored and advised countless soldiers and airmen throughout his career.

His rise to the highest enlisted rank in the National Guard was not by chance. Command Sergeant Major

Printed on recycled paper.

Sampa is an extremely talented and competent noncommissioned officer who led by example, outworked his peers, and always took care of his troops.

Along with the citizens from the great State of Texas, and the Army National Guard soldiers throughout the country, I wish Command Sergeant Major John Sampa a well-deserved retirement. He has served his neighbors, State, and country well.

I wish John, his wife Carlette; son, John; and daughter, Julia, all the best in their future endeavors.

COMMEMORATING KOREAN-AMERICAN DAY

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

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Korean-American Day. I am proud to represent the largest Korean-American population of any congressional district in the country.

Tomorrow we recognize the 119th anniversary of the arrival of the first Korean immigrants to the United States, and the recognition that they have contributed to the life and well-being of the people of the United States for so many years.

One person that is an example of that is Erin Pak, who leads the Kheir Center, a community health center in Los Angeles. During the pandemic, they kept their doors open, taking care of anybody who needed help; everything from testing, to vaccine boosters, to people who are Korean, Latino, it didn't matter their background. But their doors were open during the toughest times.

It is with that kind of commitment that Korean Americans have really made not only L.A. a better place to live, but the United States a better place to live.

So I urge my colleagues to support my resolution to recognize the ideals of Korean-American Day and the essential contributions of Korean Americans to American life.

OPPOSITION TO PROXY VOTING

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, there is no substitute for conducting the business of the American people in person.

On Monday, 80 members of the majority voted ''present'' by proxy. This is one of the most asinine things that has become commonplace under one-party rule by the majority.

Have House Democrats become so averse to work that they now believe voting from their couches is a viable option?

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end proxy voting once and for all. It is one of the many blemishes that have been put on this great body under one-party rule.

If the current majority won't end proxy voting, Republicans will snuff it out entirely when we take back the House. It is past time to get back to work.

CONGRATULATIONS TO STARBUCKS WORKERS UNITED

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, from the steel mills to the auto plants, Buffalo and Western New York are communities that respect hard work and have a long and strong record of leading and supporting the labor movement.

That tradition continues with local Starbucks workers. Despite pressure tactics and roadblocks, they were successful in their bid to organize unions at Starbucks locations in Buffalo and Cheektowaga, New York.

This weekend, I was proud to stand with the Starbucks Elmwood employees who were fighting for better working conditions.

Today, I recognize the efforts of all workers who show courage and solidarity in their fight for fair wages and working conditions.

Every social movement in America started from the ground up, from people with passion and vision to demand better for their workplace, for their community, and for our collective future.

Congratulations to Starbucks Workers United. Your organizing achievement is a victory for many and an inspiration to all.

ANOTHER YEAR OF DISRUPTED LEARNING

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, more than one million students started 2022 with closed schools: another year of disrupted learning.

In Chicago, more than 300,000 kids spent 4 days locked out of their classrooms. This is the same Chicago that received nearly $2 billion from the Democrats' so-called COVID relief bill to keep schools open.

We have an education and a mental health crisis on our hands. Every student who is trapped behind a screen knows it. Every mom and dad who is anxious about another year of last-minute closures know it. Even Democrat mayors and voters know it.

And yet, President Biden said yesterday, America is on the ''right track'' with regard to the pandemic.

Mr. President, in what world is this considered the right track?

Disrupted learning means we are leaving behind a generation of struggling students. It might be the single most destructive policy imposed on our children this century. The negative consequences can last a lifetime.

The only question we have now is, how do we save our kids from more disruption to their education in the days and weeks to come?

The President of the United States could have gone to Chicago or any of the 5,400 schools that started off this year closed to send a clear signal that kids belong in the classroom.

Instead, he was in Atlanta yesterday delivering a speech that was so self-serving and out-of-touch that even Stacey Abrams kept her distance.

But I have a simple principle that every parent knows well: Our kids' education is not dispensable. Their futures are not dispensable. I believe that as a parent, as a lawmaker, and as an American citizen, and I know every House Republican believes it, too.

We must be a society that pushes to do the best we can for the next generation, a society that finally achieves the goal of allowing every kid in every neighborhood to go to the school that their parents believe is best for them.

House Republicans will work to make sure our children are the national priority they should be, even if this administration and House Democrats won't.

RECOGNIZING SOUTH METRO FIRE RESCUE

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the members of South Metro Fire Rescue for their bravery and professionalism in combating the devastating Marshall fire that swept across Boulder County.

As we prepared to ring in the new year, Colorado experienced the most destructive wildfire in its history. Faced with hurricane-level winds that fueled rapid spread, our very own South Metro firefighters jumped into action. They sacrificed time with family during the holidays and put their lives on the line to protect thousands of homes, save countless lives, and make our community proud.

Rising temperatures and prolonged drought have made wildfires a part of everyday life in Colorado. As Coloradans inevitably face similar challenges in the coming years, I am grateful to have the heroes at South Metro representing and protecting our community.

I am honored to recognize the members of South Metro Fire Rescue for their service to our community and thank them for inspiring a hope in our future, a hope that together we can face the challenges of this new future head-on.

COVID–19 TESTING SHORTAGE

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, President Biden promised to ''shut down the COVID–19 virus, not the country.'' He also promised ''access to regular, reliable, and free COVID–19 testing.''

But as we near a year into his Presidency, he has failed to deliver on these basic promises. In the Trump administration we got Operation Warp Speed. However, for the Biden administration we seem to be getting operation no rush.

President Biden alone is to blame for the current testing shortage that the American people are facing. Just look at the facts.

In the spring of 2021, when a group of health agency officials approached the White House on a proposal to purchase millions of rapid tests, the White House officials never followed up.

In October 2021, White House officials rejected a proposal for free rapid tests for the holiday season.

In December 2021, President Biden announced that 500 million tests would be sent out in January 2022, however, the contract for these tests has yet to be signed.

The bottom line is that President Biden failed to meet his promises, and the American people are paying the price.

□ 1215

A RISE IN GUN SALES AND THE MURDER RATE

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, the past year has seen an explosion in gun sales and, with it, a 30 percent rise in the murder rate.

Yet, at a time when the data becomes increasingly clear that more guns in the hands of those who should not have them results in more deaths of those who should still be alive and with us today, Republican officials across the country are trying to make it easier for anyone to wield guns around our children and our families.

Back in my home State of Georgia, our Governor is trying to implement permitless carry, irresponsible legislation that is dangerous for our law enforcement, dangerous for our families, and dangerous for the people that we love and cherish.

We cannot allow these destructive efforts to continue, and we must reaffirm our dedication to passing meaningful legislation that truly saves American lives.

THE CRISIS AT THE BORDER CONTINUES

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, a week after my visit to the border to meet with agents on the ground and survey the situation with my own eyes, I am here to report some unsurprising news. There is still a growing crisis at our Nation's southern border.

I saw firsthand how President Biden has ceded—not in farming, but given up—ceded control of the southern border to the cartels.

Thankfully, Texas Governor Abbott has stepped up to enforce the law, but Federal border agents continue to lack critical federally provided resources.

From halting construction of the wall and resisting the remain in Mexico policy, to releasing illegals into our interior and pursuing mass amnesty, this President and Democrats in Congress have incentivized a long-term border surge that will forever change our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to reverse these America-last policies, secure the border, and uphold law and order in the face of this current administration's refusal to do so.

NEW WAVE OF VOTER SUPPRESSION EFFORTS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a wave of voter suppression efforts show their ugly heads across this country, a crisis of unprecedented proportion that is cracking at the very foundation of our democratic process.

Republicans have continued to push lies and conspiracy theories to depress voter turnout and sow mistrust in our elections at the highest levels.

It is time that we choose: the filibuster or our democracy. We cannot allow arcane Senate rules to stand in the way of this Congress upholding its most basic constitutional responsibilities, at one of the most critical junctures in our history.

It is incumbent on us to restore the voting rights protections that our Nation's civil rights leaders bled to secure.

This Congress can and will fight against these draconian measures, to restore and expand the sacred right to vote.

History will remember anyone who stands in our way.

JOBS DESTROYED UNDER PRESIDENT BIDEN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the December jobs report came in at less than half of what was projected. People continue to suffer at the hands of the Biden and Democrat policies. Jobs are being destroyed.

A recent national poll found that 68 percent of respondents said the economy was a top concern.

Inflation is a tax on all Americans, and it has gone up every month since the Biden Presidency. Gasoline is up 58 percent; propane, kerosene, and firewood are up 34 percent; bacon is up 21 percent; and hamburger is up 20 percent.

Real wages have decreased under Biden in 8 of his 10 full months in office, with a loss of $5,000 per family.

The Democrat elite think they are smarter than everyone, and Democrat voters and Democrat media are ignorant to believe that trillions of dollars cost zero dollars.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America. Sadly, we are in day 151 of Americans left behind, as cited by Sean Hannity.

REPUBLICANS CONTINUE TO FLIP-FLOP

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, MITCH MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans have repeatedly taken a stand against the truth and common sense by devoting themselves to the big lie, flip-flopping from previous positions with the aim of satisfying a virulent base to obtain power, defending the January 6 insurrection, and protecting violate radical extremists, passing dozens of anti-voting laws across the country, taking up dangerous and destructive efforts to take over and sabotage future elections, all with the aim of staying in power at the expense of democracy and what our Founders held dear.

The flip-flop continues with the filibuster. Let's be clear. MITCH MCCONNELL has a long record of changing the rules whenever it suits him, and he continues to mislead about the filibuster. There have been more than 161 changes made to the filibuster in the last five decades, with the filibuster altered to pass trade deals, tax cuts, and Supreme Court justices.

The filibuster is not in the Constitution, and the Founders only mentioned supermajority for impeachment.

They must do better on the other side of the aisle and the other side of this Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities towards Members of the Senate.

HONORING BOB WOOLEY

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

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, today, it is my great honor to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, Bob Wooley.

Bob Wooley and I served together in the New Mexico House of Representatives, and he has a passion for the people. He served as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He also

served in the Army during the Vietnam war. His passion for helping our veterans stems way beyond his service in the State; it stems throughout the Nation.

Bob is a no-nonsense cowboy. He has got a zest for life and a zest for serving God. He also has a zest for telling the truth, even if you didn't want to hear it.

I am honored today to recognize Bob and his beautiful wife of 48 years, Janna. They have two children and five grandchildren.

Today, in New Mexico, we are celebrating Bob Wooley's 75th birthday. On behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives, I wish Bob Wooley a happy 75th birthday.

RECOGNIZING LAKEWOOD POLICE AGENT ASHLEY FERRIS

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Agent Ashley Ferris of the Lakewood Police Department for her heroic actions which undoubtedly saved lives and protected our community from further violence.

On December 27, 2021, the Denver and Lakewood, Colorado, communities experienced a terrible tragedy. A gunman opened fire at multiple locations in Denver before traveling to Lakewood where he continued the shooting spree.

As a result of this gun violence, five lives were taken and two others were injured. My condolences go to the friends and family of the five victims of these murders: Alicia Cardenas, Danny Scofield, Sarah Steck, Alyssa Gunn-Maldonado, and Michael Swinyard. Jimmy Maldonado was injured as well as Agent Ferris, who bravely confronted and killed the gunman even after being shot in the abdomen, undoubtedly preventing additional loss of life.

The Lakewood Police Department said it best: ''If not for the heroic efforts of Agent Ferris and other law enforcement, this incredibly violent tragedy could have been even worse.''

Agent Ferris was previously recognized for her actions on the job in 2020 when she, along with two fellow Lakewood Police Officers, performed lifesaving measures on a woman suffering medical distress. For her actions, she was presented with the department's Lifesaving Award.

I am thankful Agent Ashley Ferris was recently released from the hospital. I wish her a full and speedy recovery, and I extend my deepest appreciation for her bravery, sacrifice, and service to our community.

CALIFORNIA'S STATEWIDE DROUGHT EMERGENCY

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

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a statewide drought emergency, California has experienced much-needed rain and snowfall during these winter months.

While communities across my district are especially grateful for the rainfall we have encountered, I remain concerned that the State of California has already announced a zero percent allocation for water deliveries for this year.

I also remain concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation could possibly announce a similar water allocation for 2022 within the next month.

This is unacceptable.

We must work together to figure out a way to fully utilize the water we have access to in a way that benefits our communities and agriculture production. Farmers are desperate for water to grow their crops. Rural towns continue to face water shortages.

We need this rain, but we also need to do a better job of managing our resources. We have opportunities to move our water responsibly when the snowpack melts.

As you can see here, more than 5 million acre-feet of water was sent out to the ocean over this past year. This water could have gone a long way for our communities and for farmers in the Central Valley.

I have asked time and time again for support from the House majority to address this issue. The families of the Central Valley cannot continue to wait. I ask my colleagues yet again to join my efforts to improve water management in California.

BENEFITS OF THE BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE LAW

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

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share how the recent enactment of the bipartisan infrastructure law is already delivering for organized labor and businesses in the First District of Indiana.

My district is home to three airports that are drivers of our economy. They are essential to moving goods and people throughout the region and Nation and create good-paying jobs and increased economic opportunities.

According to the Federal Aviation Administration, three regional airports are expected to receive funds under the bipartisan infrastructure law, including over $150,000 to the Michigan City Municipal Airport, almost $300,000 to the Porter County Regional Airport, and over $750,000 to the Gary/Chicago International Airport.

I look forward to continuing the work in a spirit of cooperation with local and State officials to harness the impact of the bipartisan infrastructure law.

HONORING MATT PEDIGO

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Matt Pedigo of Allen County, Kentucky, who recently retired as general manager of the Citizen-Times newspaper in Scottsville.

After 22 years of reporting on the community he loves, Matt decided to put down his pen and pursue other ventures. At a time when many people are distrustful of the agenda of the media, Matt has been a shining star over the years, accurately reporting on current events and happenings in Allen County.

Through numerous interviews and conversations with Matt during my years in public service, I grew to appreciate his work ethic, knowledge of the issues, and passion for sharing the news with his community.

While he may be retiring, I know from my interactions with Matt that he is not finished making positive contributions to the community of Allen County and south-central Kentucky. I wish him nothing but the best in a well-earned retirement from journalism.

□ 1230

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDNA BROWN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to distinguished Ohio Senator Edna Brown, a trailblazer who recently passed away.

Edna Brown was a remarkable public servant from Toledo, Ohio, who dedicated her life and her three decades of service to improving the well-being and future of our community.

As the first and only African American to represent Lucas County in the Ohio Senate, she blazed a trail for many to follow at the highest level of elected office in Ohio.

She was a warm, inviting, and immensely kind person whose focus was always on public service and bettering the lives of the people she served, the people she truly loved.

Northwest Ohio lost a great champion. Her family lost a great mother and grandmother. America needs more people like Edna Brown in public service.

Her memory will live with us, and I know her legacy will inspire the next generation of Ohio's leaders, including women leaders.

I will include her life story and her obituary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a tribute to her persevering accomplishments for our Nation's betterment.

Godspeed, Edna Brown. May the angels carry you very high, and may you rest in peace.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF HENRY AND ARLENE LANGREHR

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an incredible veteran from my district for his service to our country and eastern Iowa.

Henry Langrehr of Clinton served in Europe during World War II with the 82nd Airborne Division. Because of his heroic and brave actions in France, he received two Bronze Stars, two Purple Hearts, and the French Legion of Honor.

Henry was a paratrooper who flew on a C–47 transport plane across the English Channel before being dropped into Normandy on D-day during the Allied invasion.

During the campaign, Henry was injured by shrapnel and taken as a German prisoner of war. He successfully escaped a Nazi work camp and made his way back to his countrymen.

Henry always makes sure to praise Arlene, his wife of nearly 80 years. While Henry was in Europe, Arlene worked 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, making machine gun stands needed for the war effort, a real-life Rosie the Riveter.

I am incredibly grateful to have amazing Americans like Henry and Arlene living in my district.

Thank you for your incredible service to and love for the United States, Iowa, and Clinton.

CONGRATULATING THE GEORGIA BULLDOGS

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate this year's college football national championship team, the Georgia Bulldogs.

For the first time since 1980, the Bulldogs are bringing the college football national championship trophy back to Athens, Georgia, after beating the Alabama Crimson Tide by a score of 33–18 this past Monday.

I could not be more proud of the Dawgs for showing all of us the true definition of heart, of character, and of dedication.

After losing to the Crimson Tide in the SEC championship game a few weeks back, the Bulldogs worked, they prepared, they practiced with intense focus in order to come back and win the national championship.

This team really gave us everything they had. They put it all on the field, and I am humbled to represent the University of Georgia and the 10th Congressional District of Georgia.

The Dawg spirit never ceases to amaze me. I want to extend sincere congratulations to the entire team, to Coach Kirby Smart and his coaching staff, and to the entire Dawg Nation.

Go Dawgs. Congratulations. It has been a great season.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF DR. ANTHONY ORTEGON

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

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of Dr. Anthony Ortegon of Pueblo, Colorado.

Dr. Ortegon and his amazing, strong, powerful wife, Vera, realized their American Dream early on. He will be remembered by those he loved as a God-fearing, country-loving, family man who was defined by his strong work ethic and love for helping others.

Dr. Ortegon was born in Bogota, Colombia, and made a courageous move to America, determined to create a better life for himself and his family. He finished college in 2½ years and attended the University of Miami's medical school to begin his passion for medicine and his patients, whom he loved. His work ethic was guided by his faith in God, and he trusted that he could build a life for himself in America.

He served the community of Pueblo for over 40 years, providing care to thousands of southern Coloradans through his medical practice, and he owned several small businesses. His spirit will live on through his strong wife, Vera; his sons, Anthony and Arthur; his four grandchildren; and through his impact on the community as a constant reminder of the potential of the American Dream.

DONALD HUISENGA RECEIVES HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA AT AGE 98

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

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with an incredible and inspirational story to congratulate San Angelo's Donald Huisenga on receiving his high school diploma after nearly 80 years of waiting.

Although originally in the class of 1943, he was drafted into World War II just 3 months before graduation was scheduled.

His service with the U.S. Army Special Forces took Mr. Huisenga behind enemy lines and to the front of the D-day charge.

Recently, after Ms. Tess Gooding of San Angelo's VA clinic met with Mr. Huisenga and heard him mention always wanting to receive his diploma and graduate from high school, she got the ball rolling, and she went above and beyond the call of duty. And so did Mr. Huisenga's original high school district, East Sac County.

Last Wednesday, alongside friends and family, Mr. Huisenga was awarded his high school diploma at the ripe age of 98 years old.

It is touching to hear this story of service. I want to honor not only Mrs. Gooding for her work in the community, for her compassion, and for going above and beyond, but I would also like to honor Mr. Huisenga for his sacrifice to our country in World War II and for his continued desire to learn, teaching us an important lesson that it is never too late in life to learn.

I thank everyone who helped Mr. Huisenga earn his diploma. They have all made us very proud. Congratulations on this incredible achievement.

CPI'S ASTONISHING INCREASE

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

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today the latest Consumer Price Index numbers were revealed, confirming what Americans buying gas, groceries, and other necessities already know. Over the past year, the CPI increased an astonishing 7 percent.

That is the highest inflation rate we have seen in four decades. The last time we saw inflation like this, the University of Georgia football program had already begun its historic 40-plus-year championship drought that ended this week.

This catastrophe could have been avoided, could have been headed off. But last July, despite economists insisting it was a fantasy, the Biden administration brushed off inflation concerns as just a transitory inconvenience.

Of course, Biden—or at least his string-pullers—knew better, but he did not want the daunting economic realities facing American families to get in the way of this massive socialist tax-and-spend agenda.

You don't need an economics degree to know that trillions more in government spending will drive up inflation. Unfortunately, that is exactly what we are seeing.

If the Biden administration and the House Democrats get their way and pass this harmful Build Back Better scheme with trillions more in spending, inflation will soar like never before.

Americans are suffering. We must defeat the Democratic agenda, restore fiscal sanity, and take meaningful steps to combat the record inflation crushing American families and businesses.

FBI SHOULD NOT INTIMIDATE PARENTS

(Mrs. MILLER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday news reports suggested that President Biden's Secretary of Education was involved in requesting a letter from the National School Boards Association, calling for the FBI to intimidate parents who have shown up to school board meetings.

The House Education and Labor Committee must hold immediate hearings with the Secretary so that we can ask him under oath if he solicited this memo.

The Federal Government should never treat parents like terrorists for showing up at public hearings to oppose the racist critical race theory or the perverted sex-ed curriculum that is being forced upon our children.

Parents are in charge of the school system, not liberal activists from Washington, D.C., who are using the FBI as their political police force.

GUARD AND RESERVE GI BILL PARITY ACT OF 2021

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 860, I call up the bill (H.R. 1836) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the time during which members of the Armed Forces serve on active duty for training qualifies for educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–25 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1836

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 ''Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD DUTY.

(a) OTHER QUALIFYING DUTY.—Section 3311(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(including'' each place it appears and inserting ''(including other qualifying duty and'';

(2) by striking ''(excluding'' each place it appears and inserting ''(including other qualifying duty but excluding''; and

(3) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''or other qualifying duty'' after ''active duty'' both places it appears.

(b) OTHER QUALIFYING DUTY DEFINED.—Section 3301 of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) The term 'other qualifying duty' means the following:

''(A) During the period beginning on August 1, 2025, and ending on July 31, 2032, active duty for training performed by a member of the Armed Forces—

''(i) on or after August 1, 2025; or

''(ii) before August 1, 2025, if such individual is a member of the Armed Forces on or after such date.

''(B) On or after August 1, 2032, duty performed before, on, or after such date that is—

''(i) active duty for training performed by a member of the Armed Forces; or

''(ii) inactive duty training performed by a member of the Armed Forces.''.

(c) TIME LIMITATION FOR USE OF ENTITLEMENT FOR OTHER QUALIFYING DUTY.—Section 3321 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

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

''(3) in the case of an individual whose entitlement is based on other qualifying duty performed—

''(A) before August 1, 2025, expires on the latter of—

''(i) the end of the 15-year period beginning on the date of the discharge or release of such individual from the Armed Forces; or

''(ii) August 1, 2040; or

''(B) on or after August 1, 2025, shall not expire.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO TWO PERIODS.—In the case of an individual subject to periods under paragraphs (1) and (3)(A) of subsection (a), the period under such paragraph (3)(A) shall apply to such individual's entitlement.''.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN HOUSING LOAN FEES.

(a) EXTENSION.—The loan fee table in section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''January 14, 2031'' each place it appears and inserting ''October 1, 2031''.

(b) IRRRL RATE.—The item in subparagraph (E) of the loan fee table under such section is amended to read as follows:

''(E)(i) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed on or after July 1, 2022, and before October 1, 2030)	*0.85*	*0.85*	*NA*
(ii) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed during a period not covered by clause (i))	*0.50*	*0.50*	*NA''.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1836, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1836, as amended, Representative LEVIN's Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021.

This bill is a long-needed fix to the unequal treatment of members of the Guard and Reserve for GI Bill purposes. Under current law, guard and reservists do not accrue education benefits the same as their Active-Duty counterparts, even when they are carrying out the same duties and taking on the same risks.

We live in a new age of national defense where we utilize the total force concept with an operational reserve, not a Strategic Reserve. We rely each day on guard and reservists to protect and defend our country. As we observed the anniversary of the January 6 attack on the Capitol, we were reminded of the brave Guard and Reserve troops who deployed to protect Congress, our staffs, and the foundation of our democracy.

We continue to rely on our Reserve components throughout the COVID–19 pandemic to activate and support public health response efforts across the country. The National Guard has been utilized at unprecedented levels in recent years.

Over the past 2 years, our Reserve components have fought wildfires, responded to protests, assisted with the withdrawal from Afghanistan, and even helped Afghan refugees settle in the United States.

It is time the Guard and Reserve benefits reflect the key work they are doing and the need for equity across the total force. It is time for every day in uniform to count.

The cadence of activations for guard and reservists has increased significantly over the last 5 years, and with that comes the need to meet mission readiness standards.

To prepare for the critical role they fulfill in our national defense, guard and reservists must frequently train, which means more days in uniform, more days away from their civilian life, and more days away from their families.

□ 1245

The GI Bill is both a recruitment and transition benefit to help servicemembers transition into civilian life and close the opportunity gap with their civilian peers.

Now, the Guard and Reserves need this more than ever as they are constantly transitioning between military, civilian employment, and family life, facing continuous disruptions.

This legislation rectifies the disparity and ensures that members of our Reserve forces know that every day they commit to our Nation counts, and that they will have the education benefits waiting for them when they fulfill their commitment.

In both this and the 116th Congress, we reformed and updated the Post-9/11 GI Bill to ensure students who are eligible have easy access to a high-quality education.

We have implemented strong student protections and we are holding bad acting institutions accountable when they fail to meet standards we set for veteran education.

Now, if servicemembers can step up and do their part day in and day out

while holding down civilian jobs and squeezing in time to take care of their families, then the least we can do here in Congress is to get out of the way of the solution.

Now, there are troubling reports of upticks in suicide among our guard and reservists.

One of the best ways we can address veteran health, mental health, and ultimate veteran suicide is by providing veterans with support and a pathway to a successful civilian life.

H.R. 1836, as amended, will give guard and reservists access to the opportunities that post-secondary education and training provide and improve their reintegration into civilian life.

This legislation is fully paid for and uses loan fee provisions that this Congress and prior Congresses have supported. In addition, even the Republican substitute uses the same offsets.

Besides just being the right thing to do, investing in equitable GI Bill benefits for guard and reservists will provide more than a tenfold return to our country.

Who are we to stand in the way of an educational benefit that will not only make our country stronger, but will benefit our military by having military servicemembers and our guard and reservists who are even more able to do their jobs on behalf of our national defense? I can't wait to see what our servicemembers will do with this opportunity, and I know it will make our country a better country.

This legislation is endorsed by numerous VSOs, including the American Legion, the VFW, the Student Veterans of America, the National Guard Association of the United States, Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, and Reserve Officers of America.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD letters of support and statements from the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Guard Association of the United States, Military-Veterans Advocacy, and the Reserve Officers of America.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC.

Tomorrow we are expecting the House to take votes on H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act. The American Legion supports this bill as our signature education priority for 2022, and we strongly urge Representative Valadao to stand for DC's National Guard troops and support its passage.

All 50 states have activated components of their National Guard in response to unforeseen challenges over the past two years. From protecting borders to delivering pandemic aid and supporting local law enforcement our National Guard and Reserve troops have responded to new challenges like never before. Often, they are leaving both their families and civilian employers for an extended amount of time sometimes taking a sizeable pay cut with them. Yet despite all we ask of them, too often they are denied a cornerstone benefit for our nation's veterans: the GI Bill.

This is because servicemembers are activated under non-DNE title 32 orders which VA statutes currently don't recognize as valid ''active duty'' time. H.R. 1836 would fix this disparity by expanding access to the Post-9/11 GI Bill for servicemembers activated under Title 32 orders towards benefits eligibility.

The American Legion urges support for H.R. 1836.

Thank you and happy to answer any questions.

JOHN KAMIN,
Legislative Associate, Legislative Division.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

DO THE RIGHT THING FOR GUARD AND RESERVE MEMBERS

Now is the time for Congress to pass legislation to allow National Guard and Reserve members to rightfully earn GI Bill benefits for their time served. National Guard and Reserve members serve alongside active duty service members and consistently make sacrifices without always earning VA education benefits. Congress must act to expand eligibility to allow the increasingly frequent activations of these service members to count toward Post-9/11 GI Bill eligibility.

The VFW strongly supports H.R. 1836, Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021, to ensure equity of benefits for Reserve component service members. This bill would allow any day in uniform receiving military pay to count toward Post-9/11 GI Bill eligibility, allowing activated National Guard and Reserve members to earn this education benefit and achieve upward mobility. For years, the sacrifices of these service members have been overlooked in achieving GI Bill eligibility. These inequities have been further highlighted through the COVID–19 pandemic as National Guard and Reserve members stood on the front lines administering relief and health services. The time is now for parity with all the armed forces in earning their VA education benefits.

Contact your representatives today and tell them to support the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021. Congress must pass this crucially needed legislation now. National Guard and Reserve members have been waiting long enough!

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC.

Good Morning, I am writing to express the National Guard Association's strong support for H.R. 1836—the bipartisan Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, that will be considered this week on the House floor. This bill caps a years-long effort to recognize the service and sacrifice of our National Guard. In addition to acknowledging the service of our Guard Soldiers and Airmen, this bill will prove a hugely significant recruiting and retention tool as we continually deploy Guard units to contingencies both at home and abroad.

While we understand the concerns relating to costs in the out years, we ask that you vote NO on the Substitute amendment (H.R. 2047). While this amendment would reduce long term costs, it significantly reduces the reach and impact of the legislative change and eliminates the central goal of parity in benefit as it relates to training H.R. 1836 is trying to accomplish.

The bipartisan H.R. 1836 will prove to be the most significant Post-9/11 G.I. Bill change specifically for the Reserve Component since the creation of the program itself and we are excited for the prospect of this bill passing the House of Representatives. Additionally, we look forward to continued bipartisan discussions with your Senate colleagues as we work towards final language on this critical issue to your National Guard servicemembers.

Thanks for your consideration, please feel free to reach out for any additional information.

Best,

JULIAN CARDINALE,
Joint Legislative Affairs Manager.

MILITARY-VETERANS ADVOCACY, INC.,
Slidell, Louisiana, January 10, 2022.

Hon. MIKE LEVIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEVIN, On behalf of Military-Veterans Advocacy® (MVA™), we would like to pledge our support for HR 1836.

This bill will ensure that the time during which members of the Armed Forces serve on active duty for training qualifies for educational assistance under the Post–9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Specifically, the bill adjusts the type of service that entitles a member of the Armed Forces, reserves, or National Guard to such assistance. Under the bill, service by a reservist or National Guard member that is entitled to pay counts toward benefit eligibility. Such service includes training, active military service, inactive training, and general duty for which basic pay is warranted.

You may use this letter as evidence of our support for this bill. Feel free to use it in Committee or in press releases.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. WELLS,
Chairman of the Board.

ROA

RESERVE STRENGTH RESERVE LIFE

ACTION CENTER—VOTE FOR HR 1836, GI BILL PARITY ACT

Floor vote today on H.R. 1836! This bill expands eligibility for Post-9/11 GI Bill educational assistance to include all paid points days for National Guard and Reserve service members. This means that service members can earn GI Bill eligibility days for training, active military service, inactive training, and general duty for which basic pay is warranted. Active duty earns benefits when training, and this bill would allow the Guard and Reserve to earn the same benefit.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Speaker NANCY PELOSI and Leader STENY HOYER for considering this legislation today, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to support this legislation to ensure every day a guard or reservist spends in uniform counts toward earning vital GI Bill benefits.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1836, as amended, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021.

While I support the intent of this bill, I do not believe that it is the right solution for our Nation's guard and reservists at this time.

Founded in 1636, the National Guard evolved from groups of colonial militias into one of the toughest and one of the most professional fighting forces in the world.

From defeating the British during the American Revolution, to fighting in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Reserve component has served in every major conflict in the history of this Nation.

In recent years, the Guard and Reserve have been called up more often as their missions have changed.

These brave men and women are not only on the front lines overseas, but they are also deployed at home to protect the southern border and assist in the response to COVID–19, among others.

We must never forget the sacrifices the men and women in the Guard and Reserve make when the Federal Government calls on them to serve.

I agree that Congress must take a hard look at duty status reform and the potential expansion of benefits for guard and reservists. But this bill before us today would be an unwise expansion of benefits.

The higher level of sacrifice of Active-Duty servicemembers is reflected in the higher level of benefits provided by the VA. This is why the government recognizes the increased sacrifices of the Reserve component when they are called up on most Federal Active-Duty orders.

I believe that one of the biggest misunderstandings in this debate is that many of the types of Federal Active-Duty service that members of the National Guard and Reserve perform already qualify for the GI Bill eligibility.

I support the goal of ensuring that all time spent on nontraining Active Duty Federal orders should count towards GI Bill eligibility.

However, the bill before us today would go far beyond that and provide eligibility for the GI Bill for service related to annual training and drilling weekends.

Training has never counted towards eligibility, and members of the Guard and Reserve know that when they sign up. Let me say that again. Training has never counted towards eligibility with members of the Guard and Reserves. They knew it when they signed up. It is the additional call-ups to Federal Active-Duty service that members of the Guard and Reserve may not know about.

This type of service would be covered by Congressman MOORE's amendment, which I believe is a better alternative.

Also, covering training is the largest cost driver of this bill, which leads to my second point.

The CBO projects that the expansion of benefits laid out in this bill would require nearly $2 billion in mandatory offsets for the first 10 years following enactment. While these costs are paid for in the current budget window, that does not tell the whole story.

CBO also estimates that this bill will cost taxpayers more than $5 billion in each of the next four decades after fiscal year 2032. This would equate to at least 20 billion extra dollars over the next 50 years.

None of these extra costs are offset, which means our children and grandchildren will be paying for them and be paying them off for many years to come.

In a tight fiscal environment, I believe that full Active-Duty benefits for training and drilling is a bridge too far. I am also concerned that the offsets that are used in this bill should be saved for higher priority issues like expanding services to toxic-exposed veterans.

Addressing the needs of toxic-exposed veterans is both my and Chairman TAKANO's number one priority that we are trying to deal with right now. That could require Congress to find hundreds of billions of dollars in offsets. Offsets are few and far between in the Veterans' Affairs Committee. We will need every penny of them to enact these needed reforms that we were talking about earlier.

Earlier this week before the Rules Committee, Chairman TAKANO indicated that $2 billion is an insignificant amount compared to the potential full cost of addressing toxic exposure, and therefore, is not worthy to try to save here. I disagree.

It is silly that I even have to say this, but $2 billion is a lot of money. It is worth saving. Ask any taxpayer. And remember, the people we are talking about are taxpayers, as well.

Like me, my constituents and many Americans are concerned that Congress doles out billions of taxpayer dollars like candy. That must end. We can provide needed benefits for veterans without burdening future generations. But that requires Congress to make tough decisions and to put first things first.

Many of my concerns could have been discussed, debated, and possibly even addressed if the majority had conducted the proper level of engagement with committee members, VA, and other stakeholders on this bill.

The majority did not hold a single legislative hearing on this bill this Congress. As such, we were not able to receive views from the committee members, the administration, the mortgage industry, or veteran service organizations. Those views are a critical part of the legislative process.

Why was this bill not put on the agenda for one of the two legislative hearings the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held this Congress?

This is no way to responsibly legislate, and I implore Chairman TAKANO to go back to our committee's bipartisan tradition of conducting full legislative due diligence before sending bills to the House floor.

In closing, I am supportive of reviewing and, where warranted, expanding benefits for members of the Guard and Reserve. However, we must do so in a way that is fiscally responsible, appropriate, and respects the many differences between Guard and Reserve service and Active-Duty service.

The bill before us today does not meet that standard.

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

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

Before I yield to my distinguished colleague, I am going to make a few remarks in reference to what the ranking member said.

I will first say that the bill has been in the public for more than 2 years. In fact, the committee held a Guard-and-Reserve-only benefits hearing just over a year ago to review the disparity in these benefits, and we have worked closely with the stakeholders, as evidenced by the numerous numbers of VSOs whose support letters I entered into the RECORD earlier. And we also worked with the minority to ensure that this bill achieves the aims that we intend.

We have also worked closely with the Department of Defense and VA to ensure all Guard and Reserve members are covered.

The VSOs have been asking for this reform, and that is why we stand with them in support of H.R. 1836.

Now, moreover, it is not accurate to say that before the Rules Committee yesterday I characterized the $2 billion cost of this bill, which is paid for, as insignificant. I merely compared it to the idea that we should use this bill as part of an offset for the $300 billion or so that we are going to need for toxic exposure. And I thank the ranking member for joining together in trying to find a solution for our toxic-exposed veterans.

However, that $300 billion, I know we are going to figure out how to take care of that. It is really not a choice; it is a moral obligation we have to those veterans that were exposed to burn pits. It is not a choice. It is a cost of war, and we have got to rise together as a body. We found $30 billion willy-nilly to add to the National Defense Authorization Act. We will find the $300 billion. We don't need to be nickel and diming our reservists and our Guard units and deny them the days that should count toward their GI Bill benefits because they are doing every bit the same sort of readiness training that our Active-Duty servicemembers are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), my good friend and chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity who is also the author of this very impressive bill.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman TAKANO for yielding and for his support and partnership on this legislation and all the work that he does leading our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, bipartisan legislation I introduced to deliver some basic fairness in the way we provide GI Bill benefits for the men and women who serve our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the GI Bill has allowed millions of veterans to pursue higher education and find rewarding career paths.

□ 1300

Servicemembers consistently cite GI Bill benefits as one of the top reasons

they choose to serve in our Armed Forces because of the opportunities those benefits provide for them and their families. However, the way that we allow servicemembers to accrue GI benefits is inherently unfair. While Active-Duty servicemembers receive credit for GI Bill benefits every day that they are in the service, Guard and Reserve members only accrue those benefits in very limited circumstances.

That disparity continues to exist despite the fact that Guard and Reserve members are increasingly taking on the same risks and doing the same jobs as their Active-Duty counterparts. We have seen this trend for decades but it has become especially pronounced over the last 2 years.

In response to the attack on our Capitol on January 6 of last year, 25,000 National Guard members mobilized from 54 States and territories to protect this institution. For a time, they slept on the cold, hard floors of this building. National Guard members have also deployed across our country to support the COVID–19 response, including Guard members who deployed from Ohio, Maryland, Delaware, and Georgia to assist healthcare operations this month.

In 2020, 1,300 soldiers and airmen from five different States were mobilized to fight wildfires in my State of California and throughout the West Coast. Not only are these National Guard and Reserve members risking their lives to serve our country, but they are also forced to put their civilian lives on hold when they are called up, leaving behind their families and interrupting civilian careers. Similarly, they are forced to put their lives on hold every time they are called up for training. In some of those settings they are serving side by side with Active Duty members doing similar jobs and facing similar risks, but they are not earning the same GI Bill benefits as their peers. That is unacceptable and it is shameful that we have asked Guard and Reserve members to step up in response to natural disasters, the pandemic, and an attack on our democracy without providing them with this fundamental benefit.

Clearly, it is long past time that we provide some basic fairness in the way that we allow Guard and Reserve members to accrue these benefits. The legislation that we are considering today will do exactly that, with a simple fix to ensure that every day they spend in uniform counts towards their GI Bill benefits.

Now, I know my friends on the other side of the aisle might raise concerns about the costs of expanding eligibility for these benefits, and I would note that this bill includes provisions my Republican colleagues have supported in the past to help defray the cost of veterans' benefits. And to my colleagues who still are not willing to pay for these benefits, I would ask them to share their concerns directly with Guard and Reserve members the next time they are deployed in response to a natural disaster or other emergency in the community that they represent.

So I think we all want the same thing. My friends across the aisle, us on this side of the aisle, we all want the same thing. We all want to provide benefits to those who have served our country. I believe that in good faith. I do think that we have to not pay lip service, though. We have to make sure that we support servicemembers and not just when it is politically convenient. We don't need half measures. We don't need things that shortchange our servicemembers. So I think it is time for us to step up. It is time to give them the benefits they have earned for protecting the American people in a way now that they are doing unlike before. And that is what this bill aims to do.

As the chairman mentioned, it has support from a wide range of veteran service organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Student Veterans of America, the National Guard Association of the United States, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, and Reserve Officers Association. They are asking us to pass this bill, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, today because they agree that it is past time to provide some basic fairness in the way that we provide GI Bill benefits to Guard and Reserve members.

Mr. Speaker, passing this bipartisan bill is the right thing to do for all the men and women who serve and protect our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye.''

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, just quickly before I yield time to my colleague from Ohio, I would like to remind the Members that training for members of National Guard and Reserve has never been counted towards GI Bill eligibility. Members of Guard and Reserve know that, as I said in my opening, when they sign up.

Now, the Democrat majority did not hold a legislative hearing on this bill, so to that extent, the expansion of eligibility was needed to increase recruitment and retention within the Guard and Reserve component and DOD, but DOD did not have the opportunity to testify to that before the committee because we didn't meet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), who has actually served both in the Reserve and Active component of our military.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act.

As a member of the Army Reserve, I know the critical role that reservists and members of the National Guard play in defending our great Nation. Unfortunately, I also know firsthand that sometimes unique skills and experiences the guardsmen and reservists bring to the table have been discounted or underutilized. That has always bothered me, as I personally know of the expertise that exists in our Guard and Reserve and their capabilities.

Great strides have been made to value the Reserve and Guard like we value Active Duty, and we have come a long way and we need to continue that work. At the same time, I also know that Active Duty requires a level of commitment that does differ from the Guard and Reserve. Unfortunately, this bill has significant problems that prevent me from supporting it, which could have been worked out in the committee process had there been a full legislative hearing on it. And that is why I say I stand to discuss this bill because this is the first opportunity I have really had to discuss it.

H.R. 1836 would provide guard and reservists with Active-Duty service credit towards GI Bill eligibility for every day they are in uniform, on Federal orders, including training. So this is a status that has never been counted towards educational benefits.

Now, as cochair of the Congressional Bipartisan Burn Pits Caucus, the committee's highest priority this Congress has been working to address the health effects that toxic exposures in the military, including from burn pits. I am very concerned that the substantial spending in this bill could pull away from those efforts to address toxic exposure in this tight fiscal environment.

I also have concerns that this legislation might continue a slow creep of a permanent Federalizing of the National Guard, which was never the intent. We must be mindful not to usurp State authority of the Guard. What I do believe would be appropriate, however, would be to allow guardsmen and reservists to accrue GI Bill eligibility for any time spent on Federal Active-Duty service other than training, as many in this body that serve here in Congress have done as Guard and Reserve.

I was called to Active Duty for 15 months; 12 months in Iraq. That should count. And that is a discussion we should have had, and what actually should maybe count and what should not because I think there is common ground. But we haven't had a chance to discuss it. There is just the bill. Representative MOORE has offered a substitute amendment which would do exactly that, and I hope my colleagues will support that amendment, like I do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill as offered and to instead support Representative MOORE's substitute amendment.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of instances where training time and readiness training has counted towards the GI Bill. We talk about the basic training that reservists and Guard unit members go through. That has counted toward the GI Bill. And if there is a worry about the Federalization, Federal dollars already pay for the training days that we are seeking for the Guard unit members and the reservists to get credit for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN),

my good friend, member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Modernization.

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to rise in support of H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act. I am so grateful for the sacrifices and the services of all our National Guard and Reserve members. They stand ready at a moment's notice to protect our Nation, our democracy, and the health of our communities.

Two instances jump out at me when I think of the heroism of the Indiana National Guard members from this past year. The first was being able to spend time with our brave National Guard members last year in the cafeteria of the Department of Labor on the other side of the Capitol complex when they bravely rushed to our Nation's Capitol to defend our Constitution and to protect our democracy.

The second was when I was able to stand side by side with them in the city of Gary when they operated a Federal COVID–19 vaccine site, which provided over 60,000 vaccines in Northwest Indiana at a critical time during our pandemic.

The First District is also home to the proud Slovak community. And I am particularly appreciative that the Indiana National Guard has a flourishing military partnership with our strong ally, the country of Slovakia. We also have the 113th Engineering National Guard, which I have shared time with, who the men and women have sacrificed their time, dedication, and efforts to go over to Afghanistan. What this bill does is it gives us the opportunity to have equitable training and equitable educational opportunity for our National Guardsmen.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation today has the opportunity to treat their Active Duty service on par with all branches of the military and ensure that every day the National Guard Reserve member serves our Nation in uniform is a day that counts toward their GI Bill benefits.

Thank you to the leadership of Congressman MIKE LEVIN, Chairman TAKANO, and all of my fellow members of the Committee on Veteran Affairs for your commitment to our Guard and Reserve members and for bringing this measure to the floor today.

I also thank Chairman TAKANO on his leadership to protect the National Guardsmen on the burn pits and the toxic fumes that we have passed and how we are providing benefits and making sure that that is distributed fairly and equitably and making sure they receive the benefits necessary.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), a man who has truly experienced what it is to serve, the highest ranking officer that serves in this body today.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BOST for yielding me the time. I am always proud to stand on this floor and talk about the men and women who serve our country. And it is our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition today to H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021. And it kind of saddens me that I have to rise in opposition because while this bill, well-intentioned, is unfortunately potentially prone to unintended consequences on the overall readiness of our Armed Forces, Active Reserve and Guard. But first I must note that these issues could have been brought to light earlier had this piece of legislation gone through regular order, received proper consideration across all the normal things that we historically have done. It received no legislative hearings, foregoing the opportunity to receive input from key stakeholders, veteran service organizations, new committee members on both sides of the aisle, and even the Biden administration.

Without that engagement, we are just left with a bill that in its current form, which would count guard and reservists Federal Active-Duty service days towards GI eligibility, including for training. And there is a very subtle difference. In fact, it is a very exact difference in law between Active Duty for training and Active Duty.

I spent much of my 40-year Marine Corps career in the Reserve component. And in fact, a little known part of my bio, my first 2 years off of Active Duty in the Marine Corps, I spent 2 years as a member of the Rhode Island National Guard. So not only Active component, Reserve component, but also a guardsman as well.

And my final assignment for 4½ years, I had the blessing and the opportunity to command the Marine Corps Reserve, roughly 100,000 folks in 183 sites across the country at a time when we are deploying them at never-before-seen rates.

I will always stand by the unwavering service and sacrifice given by the men and women in the Reserve component and the National Guard.

□ 1315

This bill, however, may unintentionally become an obstacle to the recruitment and retention efforts of our Active component military. We are in a time, and have been for over 40 years, of an all-recruited force on all levels.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, even as Governors offer non-GI Bill education benefits to their Guard, the parity with Active-Duty Forces that this bill is seeking for the Guard and Reserves, again, could impact our Active-Duty military, which we need to be ready at all times, considering today's global threats.

Today, more than 4 years after my colleagues and I passed into law an unprecedented GI Bill expansion to allow any veteran to use these GI Bill benefits without restriction of time, so they are good to go for as long as they live, I still believe there are many ways we can work responsibly to expand these benefits.

For these reasons, I will be voting in favor of my friend and colleague Mr. MOORE's benefit expansion amendment to ensure guard and reservists accrue GI Bill eligibility during any and all Federal Active-Duty days that are not training days.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill and support the Moore amendment.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the committee who also serves as the chair of our Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies in Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act. I thank Chairman TAKANO and Representative LEVIN for their important work on this legislation that finally acknowledges the undervalued service of our guard and reservists. The sponsors' sentiments ring true: Every day in uniform counts. At least it should count. It should count more.

In Ohio, there are over 11,400 National Guard members performing strategic and operational duties to whom we owe enormous gratitude.

Our National Guard protects our homeland and supports the mission of our troops abroad. It provides critical support to people in times of urgent need, from natural disasters to the public health COVID emergency we are in right now.

The National Guard and Reserves have been an invaluable readiness resource throughout the COVID–19 pandemic and are continuing to fill critical roles in response to the pandemic.

In my home State of Ohio, the Ohio National Guard has helped Ohio food banks distribute over 56 million pounds of food at 14 food banks and warehouses, including the Toledo Northwestern Ohio Food Bank. They have provided food banks the support they needed to keep children, seniors, veterans, and families fed during these very trying times.

They set up COVID–19 testing clinics and traveled the State to keep our communities safe. They are currently stationed at 12 testing locations across Ohio.

Thanks to President Biden's executive actions, 2,300 Guard members have been activated across Ohio to help hospitals and public health experts care for those most in need so all the omicron variant patients that are flooding

our hospitals have some hope of survival.

The service and dedication of our National Guard and Reserves require that we appropriately recognize and appreciate their sacrifices. While the debt we owe them cannot be fully repaid, the legislation before us ensures that these honorable men and women will receive the proper access to the educational benefits they so rightly deserve.

Providing these important GI Bill benefits will undoubtedly aid the recruitment and retention of National Guard units at home and abroad while further investing in our servicemembers' futures.

With six National Guard sites in my own congressional district and several Reserve units nearby, I know that this legislation will have a deep and lasting impact on our State's residents and those who answer the call to serve.

It is certainly my privilege to represent these guard and reservists in Congress, and I am proud to support enhancing the benefits that they can have access to and deserve for their service. May God be with all our men and women in uniform.

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

Mr. Speaker, just to clear up some statements that I think were made by some of the people while talking, it was brought up that we actually have already dealt with toxic exposures, and we haven't. It is vitally important to understand that.

Those costs that we are still going to be looking at, whether it is 300 or 150 or whatever it is, we haven't found that out or figured that out yet. It is vitally important to understand that it is still out there, and there is going to be a cost.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), someone from our side of the aisle who does a great job and that we trust tremendously to watch our costs and watch our spending.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, before we vote on new legislation, it is very important that we have an honest look at the price tag. As Republican leader of the House Budget Committee, it is my responsibility to track how new spending impacts our Nation's bottom line.

Every time Washington passes unpaid-for legislation that adds a new benefit or program, or expands an existing one, our fiscal problems get much worse. At each one of these moments, we take another step toward either raising taxes on middle- and low-income working-class Americans or asking China for another IOU.

Look no further than the $2 trillion Biden bailout bill that was passed back in March. It added trillions to our Nation's debt.

Also, the $5 trillion BBB that was passed out of this House would add trillions to our debt. According to the Congressional Budget Office, which is the official scorekeeper for Congress, the true cost of the bill before us is hidden. The true cost before us is hidden. Why?

On paper, the bill appears paid for. However, the new spending does not begin until 2025, and then the expansion of benefits does not go into effect until after the budget window in 2032. Meanwhile, the pay-fors all go away within the 10-year window. This is a creative way for Democrats to use budget gimmicks and delay program start dates to push through billions in unpaid-for spending.

These types of budget gimmicks are exactly what Democrats have been doing with the $5 trillion spending bill that was called out and why Senators on the other side of the building will not support the legislation.

Congress must stop kidding itself with fanciful accounting. Stop pretending that creating and expanding government programs, especially mandatory spending programs, won't come with a real fiscal impact. Start being honest with the American people about the true price tag and the consequences of their reckless actions.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, there has been an honest reckoning and an honest assessment by the CBO, and this bill is paid for according to the rules, the same rules that my Republican counterparts observe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), a member of the Financial Services Committee, where he is chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. I rise today in support of this legislation because the Guard and Reserve deserve parity. They have been there for us, and we must be there for them.

When natural disasters beset the land and there are wildfires on the West Coast, they are there. When hurricanes ravage the Gulf Coast, they are there. When tornadic activities are within all the midsection of the country, they are there. They have been there for us, and we must be there for them.

They do leave their families, just as the Active-Duty servicepersons do. Yes, they leave their children. They leave their wives. They leave newborns. They come to severe and protect us, just as they did after the assault on the Capitol.

They were here to prevent democracy from being eroded. They were here to protect the President and the Vice President. They have been here for us, and we must be there for them.

They have been there when many of us had no other hope other than to have them show up to defend us.

I remember Katrina. I remember what was happening in New Orleans. I went down there. I saw the National Guard come in. I saw them protect and defend.

We have a duty and an obligation to them, and this is our opportunity to fulfill it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for what you are doing today for a multiplicity of reasons, one being that I don't want to see what happened to the Merchant Marine happen to the National Guard and the Reserve. It took them 44 years to get GI benefits. We cannot allow this to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am there, I am here, and I will be there for them.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate with many others, and so many times it is being misunderstood that the Guard and Reserve don't receive these benefits when they are called up on Federal—they actually do on many of the Federal orders. The Moore amendment would allow that to occur.

I think many of our Members are confused on what they actually are receiving time for toward their GI Bill. I want to express again what we are saying is that the overreach here that occurs is that one weekend a month, 2 weeks a year, they know when they sign up that that is the difference. It is not going to be credited.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN), my good friend who serves on the Education and Labor Committee with myself and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to ensure that our veterans have the resources they need to access care after serving.

Every year, brave men and women enlist in the military, seeking to serve their country, pursue a better life, and obtain benefits and security for their future. This means being able to afford college and having access to housing, healthcare, and other opportunities.

Our troops are deployed into active war zones that too often leave veterans with PTSD, suicidal ideation, anxiety, addiction, depression, and other mental health challenges.

Regardless of what congressional district you live in, you will always take what happens in your service back home with you.

□ 1330

But when they return, our government has failed to provide them with the care and support they deserve.

The outcome is a veterans suicide crisis. The suicide rate for veterans is 1.5 times higher than the rate of nonveteran adults, and I see this in my district. I have had veterans call my office as a last resort after not being able to access the healthcare they need at the VA. My constituent services team has had multiple cases of veterans struggling with suicidal ideation and other mental health challenges who have expressed an immense frustration that no

one in our government seems to care about their well-being. Our veterans deserve better, and we must do better.

I am grateful for incredible organizations in my district like Black Veterans for Social Justice, Veterans for Peace, and The American Legion who are leading with care, working to support our veterans' mental health by destigmatizing mental health care and connecting veterans to mental health professionals. They regularly host support groups for veterans with mental health challenges, advocate for a stronger VA system, and provide one-on-one opportunities for veterans to learn about benefits available to them.

Our amendment to H.R. 1836 builds upon their work to ensure that when transitioning to civilian life, veterans receive information about what healthcare and mental healthcare services are available to them, including how to access the Veterans Crisis Line and seek mental health support. This amendment also specifies that this information should be provided to veterans in a manner that helps destigmatize mental health and encourages veterans to reach out.

These are important steps toward creating a society in which every single veteran has access to universal, high-quality healthcare and is empowered to seek out the mental health support they need to thrive.

If you are a veteran who is struggling with mental health challenges, please know that you are not alone and that seeking out mental health support is an important step toward feeling better. During these especially difficult times, we must care for ourselves and for one another.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, it is my esteemed honor and privilege to yield 1 minute to a champion and staunch advocate who is unparalleled in her support for our Nation's 22 million veterans. This Congress with her support we have continued to preserve the sacred trust of our men and women in uniform and the 200,000 servicemembers who become veterans each year.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I am referring to the Speaker of this great House from the great State of California, my own State.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor and for yielding.

We owe our veterans everything. They make us the home of the brave and the land of the free. They protect our democracy. They and their families make us so very, very proud.

I thank the gentleman again, Mr. TAKANO, as chair of the committee, and Mr. LEVIN for his leadership on this particular legislation which I will acknowledge in a moment.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, nearly eight decades ago when Congress enacted the first GI Bill, our Nation made a bipartisan and unbreakable promise: that every hero who steps forward to defend our Nation deserves the tools to succeed when they come home. Today, the House will proudly take another strong step toward fulfilling that pledge.

On behalf of the Congress, I commend the outstanding leadership of the committee chair, MARK TAKANO, who has ensured that the Veterans' Affairs Committee remains committed to its long legacy of bipartisanship. I salute the chair of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Congressman MIKE LEVIN of California, both for leading on this important legislation every step of the way and for his lifetime advocacy on behalf of our military communities.

Every time our Nation seeks to strengthen and expand benefits for veterans, we have listened closely to our men and women in uniform and our veterans, taking their insight and expertise into account. We continue to listen to them today as we continue to build upon our progress and appropriately honor their service.

On a regular basis we have a meeting with our veterans service organizations. The American Legion is very much a part of that, as well as other groups reflecting our involvement in other wars since World War II, and we still have a few veterans from then.

What is interesting about this legislation today to me is that, again, it sprang from listening to our men and women in uniform and our veterans as to what their needs are. That is exactly how the first GI Bill came to be.

The veterans of World War I, recognizing the disadvantages that they were at after World War I, came forth with the proposal to have the GI Bill. So this was passed and signed by Franklin Roosevelt during World War II at the suggestion of veterans of World War I.

During the dark days of the Second World War and after listening to the calls of the brave veterans of World War I, President Roosevelt made clear the urgent moral imperative of supporting our returning soldiers.

In a message to Congress in November 1943, he said,

''The members of the Armed Forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and they are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.''

I am very proud that my father, Thomas D'Alesandro, was in this Chamber. He was a Member of Congress from Baltimore when the President said that. His brother would be lost shortly thereafter in the battle leading up to the Battle of the Bulge.

Less than a year later, Congress enacted the first GI Bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote marking a turning point in how our Nation cares for our veterans. In doing so, we made a transformational investment in our servicemembers, opening the doors to a college education and home ownership, launching millions of families into the middle class.

In 2008 it was my great privilege to serve as Speaker as the Congress took a crucial step to bring these benefits into the 21st century. With the Post-9/11 GI Bill—passed on a strong bipartisan vote and signed into law by President George W. Bush—we expanded the promise of a full, 4-year college education to veterans in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we ensured subsequent legislation that their families could also take advantage of that benefit. In 2017 we strengthened this law by improving benefits and closing gaps in eligibility so that we can best serve those who served our Nation.

Yet, today, too many veterans still do not receive equal access to the life-changing benefits they have earned. Over the last few decades, our valiant reservists and guardsmen have become even more integral to America's national security strategy. Our reservists often serve side by side with Active-Duty servicemembers, do the same jobs, and incur the same risks. And as our Nation has battled the pandemic, our communities have relied on our guardsmen to help protect our Nation from the deadly virus.

These heroes are essential to keeping our families and our Nation safe, but current law falls short of delivering the benefits they deserve. With the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, we will ensure that every day our reservists and guardsmen heroes serve in uniform count toward their GI benefits. In doing so, we will lift up hundreds of thousands of current and future veterans across the Nation so that they, too, will have the opportunities they need to thrive in the 21st century economy.

Let me be clear: ensuring every servicemember has equal access to hard-earned benefits is an issue of fairness. When the House passes this legislation today, we will build on the proud, bipartisan progress forged by generations of lawmakers in this Chamber and in the Senate as well, we show our heroes that they will always have our unwavering support, and we honor the sacrifice on the battlefield. The military vows that on the battlefield we will leave no soldier behind, and when they come home, we pledge that we will leave no veteran behind.

There is so much more that we can learn from listening to our veterans and our servicemembers that we must do, so that they can take their strongest position when they come home.

Mr. Speaker, in this all-American spirit, I urge a very strong ''aye'' vote for this legislation.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his leadership and MIKE LEVIN for his relentless persistence for the benefit of our veterans as a member of that important committee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I think Members of the House need to understand because many speakers, including the previous speaker, brought up the fact that those who serve should receive these benefits who actually serve on the battlefield. When they do, they do. Under this existing system right now they receive that benefit.

What we are talking about now is an expansion to those days of reservist, the weekend a month and the 2 weeks a year. It is completely different from the fact when they are on Federal orders, and the Moore amendment would actually deal with that and take care of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here today to offer this MTR.

If we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to consider an amendment to H.R. 1836 which ensures members of the Armed Forces granted a general discharge under honorable conditions solely for refusing the COVID–19 vaccine are eligible for the GI Bill education benefits of which the Speaker just spoke about.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore ask unanimous consent to include 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on August 24, 2021, the Secretary of Defense issued a directive requiring mandatory COVID–19 vaccination for all servicemembers, including those in the Ready Reserve and the National Guard. Despite the challenges this vaccine mandate currently faces in the Supreme Court, the Defense Department has proceeded to discharge those who refuse the vaccine.

Hundreds of soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and guardians have already been discharged, and as many as 20,000 servicemembers remain at risk over being involuntarily removed from service. It is outrageous.

To prevent those who have refused the vaccine from being dishonorably discharged, Congress included a provision in the fiscal year 2022 National Defense Authorization Act limiting discharges for failure to receive the COVID–19 vaccine to either an honorable discharge or a general discharge under honorable conditions.

This change succeeded in stopping further disciplinary action or court-martial for those who refuse the vaccine, however it potentially leaves many veterans in limbo between leaving the service with full benefits or having their education benefits stripped as they walk out the door.

As many of my veteran colleagues in this Chamber know, those servicemembers who receive a general discharge under honorable conditions are ineligible for the Montgomery and Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits due to restrictions Congress implemented in 2011.

While this change was intended to open eligibility status to members of the National Guard, there will now be a group of veterans who have served honorably up until the point of refusing COVID–19 vaccine who will now have their education benefits completely wiped out.

For those who may not know the full breadth of education benefits entitled to a veteran, let me give you just a couple of items. A veteran who was served at least 36 months on Active Duty is entitled to 100 percent of Post-9/11 GI benefits. That includes full tuition coverage for public schools, or roughly $26,000 annually for private education or apprenticeships.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That veteran also receives a monthly housing allowance which varies by location, plus $1,000 annually to cover books and other school supplies. Add that up, and we are talking about well over $100,000 worth of education benefits a veteran loses simply by having their discharge characterized as general under honorable.

□ 1345

And let's be clear on who this is truly affecting, Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about recruits who are fresh out of basic training or those discharged at the MEPS station. These are men and women who have done their time, who have paid their dues, and who have served with distinction up until the point of refusing this vaccine.

And now we are going to tell them that we don't care how spotless their record may have been beforehand because they made a moral, ethical and even religious objection to a vaccine?

Those who have fought to defend our country should not be deprived of the benefits they so rightly deserve simply for refusing to comply with this divisive, and potentially unlawful, vaccine mandate.

My motion to recommit corrects this disparity by ensuring any member of the armed services who receives a general discharge under honorable conditions solely for the refusal of the COVID–19 vaccine is entitled to education benefits.

We are a country that rewards our heroes, not punishes them, and this motion to recommit makes sure of that. I urge the adoption of this motion to recommit.

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

The issue of how servicemembers are disciplined for refusing to take the vaccine has already been addressed in the National Defense Authorization Act. It already states plainly that there could be a general discharge, or an other-than-honorable discharge, or an honorable discharge. So there is, it seems to me, an irrelevance or it is unnecessary, this proposed MTR. So we already have a solution that has been agreed to in the Armed Services space and jurisdiction.

That being said, I do not have any further speakers, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am ready to close, but there are a few things in the closing that I want to be sure and bring up.

First off, the GI Bill cannot be included in—was not included, and those benefits would be removed if they refuse to take the vaccine. So the MTR is actually a legitimate motion that is something that we do need to deal with that was not taken care of in that bill.

And just so you know, a vitally important issue that was brought up by General Bergman, our speakers that we have had here today, they don't take this lightly. They are very serious about this. They have served themselves. They have served in these capacities. They understand the concern. And the concern of retention in the Active Forces is a serious concern.

We just received notice that the Army raised its max bonus for new recruits to $50,000 due to struggling in trying to get people to come on to Active Reserve. By offering this benefit above and beyond that has been a concern of many of those that have expressed that concern.

But let me tell you this on this debate today. I want to thank Chairman TAKANO and others for a thoughtful and respectful debate, which is vitally important on an issue like this.

I also want to thank Congressman LEVIN. His passion on these issues was truly present as well, and we understand that.

You know, I am a former marine. I am a former active marine. I am a marine because, you know, once you are a marine you are always a marine. That is vitally important to remember. And as a father of a marine and a grandfather of a marine, these issues are personal to me.

Now, I understand the sacrifices that members of our National Guard make every day. And I think some of the things that were spoken of here today confuse the fact that when they get called up to Active Duty, go over to Iraq, go to Afghanistan, those qualify towards their GI bill. It does. And I am not opposed to them receiving education benefits, nor was anybody that spoke here today.

But the Guard and Reserve is that; it is a Guard and Reserve. And whenever they are activated, yes, they should receive those benefits. That is why the Moore amendment is so vitally important that we are going to be talking on

later as well. If we adopt that, it will cover everything except that component that those Guard and Reserve members knew when they joined, that they didn't get those benefits for that 1 weekend a month and those 2 weeks a year.

And why is that? Because it is a separate standing than an Active-Duty military personnel.

This discussion—and I know we all want to respect our Guard and Reserve, but this is not the way to do it. Doing it in the right order, hearing from everyone in committee, discussing these issues, bringing them up, and getting input from those stakeholders that are involved, was the proper way to do this; not to do it here on the floor in this manner.

I think the debate has been really good. I hope that the people that are listening understand. I hope that our colleagues understand what it is; that a vote against this is not a vote against the Guard and Reserve. A vote against this is simply saying, no, there is another way that is more fiscally responsible, that will still offer benefits and reward those for their service. But this is not the right way.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the underlying bill, ''yes'' on the amendments that we are coming up with, but ''no'' on the underlying bill.

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

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

I will, in closing, say that the minority has not raised a substantive argument, a serious argument against the substance of this bill. This is a good, good piece of legislation, one that is agreed to and supported by numerous veterans service organizations.

To the issue of and to the objection raised by the minority over a lack of process and a lack of regular order, this is simply not true. We have had ample opportunity for the minority to have input in numerous hearings related to this topic.

And as to the concern over recruitment and retention of our Active-Duty Forces, I will remind my esteemed ranking member, or the esteemed ranking member, for whom I have great admiration for his own service and the service of his family in the military, that we turned to the Guard and Reserve in greater and greater dependence in the post-9/11 era. And because we were able to turn to them, we did not have to have discussions about a draft.

We had issues recruiting folks for our military in the early aughts to the numbers that we needed, and we had to turn to the Reserve and the Guard. So we need good incentives and great retention incentives for our Guard units and our Reserve units all across this country because we aren't going to depend on them less. In fact, we are going to depend on them more.

And the tempo of the training, all we are saying is that the readiness training they undergo is no less than the readiness training of our Active-Duty troops. Regardless of whether they knew or didn't know at the beginning when they signed up as reservists or guardsmen, they deserve to have every day count.

Now is the time for Congress and this House to say that every day of readiness training should count toward GI bill eligibility.

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

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the bipartisan amendment that I have put forward, along with my colleagues DEBORAH ROSS, JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, and JAMAAL BOWMAN.

As my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have made clear, our Nation owes a tremendous debt to our veterans.

I am pleased that this week, the House will take up a bill to help improve access to services and benefits that our men and women in uniform have earned.

H.R. 1836—the National Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021—would allow Members of the National Guard and Reserves to count time spend in training towards their Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits.

I am so proud of the men and women in Wisconsin's National Guard who have mobilized throughout our nation's history in support of overseas combat operations in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, during both world wars, the Spanish-American War, and the Civil War and are now engaged in their longest ever domestic mobilization, to combat COVID–19.

They are a key part of our communities and to efforts to protect and defend our nation.

Our amendment to this bill simply attempts to help ensure that the VA take every opportunity to ensure that new veterans who are leaving or about to transition from active duty are aware of the VA benefits they may be eligible for, including critical health care services.

Unfortunately, too many vets leave the military without knowing what they are eligible for at the VA or do not have the documentation they need to prove their eligibility. As a result, they can find themselves missing out on critical benefits and services they need or trying to navigate bureaucratic red tape, without success, to try and find the right answers. These men and women answered the call to serve their country and it is our responsibility to honor the debt our Nation owes them for their service.

We can do better. And that must start with providing as much information as early as possible to those who could be eligible for VA benefits or services.

Our amendment requires the VA to inform new veterans of the medical care and services for which they are eligible, including community care; mental healthcare, care relating to military sexual trauma; and any other information the Secretary deems appropriate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 1836, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act, which will expand eligibility for post-9/11 G.I. Bill educational benefits to members of the National Guard and the Reserves.

Current law defines the term ''active duty'' as those individuals who are on full-time duty in the active military service of the United States, including full-time training duty, annual training duty, and attendance, while in the active military service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

H.R. 1836, will expand eligibility criteria to include those training in full-time National Guard duty, which includes the National Guard, the Army National Guard, and the Air National Guard, as well as those same members when performing active duty.

Under current rules, service members need three years on active-duty to be eligible for full Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits, which include 36 months of in-state college tuition, a monthly living stipend and other payouts.

Reaching that amount of time mobilized to active-duty is difficult for guardsmen and reservists, and outdated and confusing eligibility requirements means the difference of tens of thousands of dollars for college for those individuals.

For example, the deployment of thousands of Guard troops to Capitol Hill following the January 6 attack counted towards GI Bill eligibility, because the mission was being paid for with federal funds.

However, troops mobilized for crowd control during racial equality protests in Washington, D.C., last summer were not able to count that time, because those missions weren't funded by federal dollars.

Some other riot response missions across the nation were funded by federal funds, and did count towards the education benefits.

Similarly, tens of thousands of Guard and Reserve troops have been mobilized for pandemic response missions over the last two years, but their eligibility varies depending on the specific orders and units involved.

For years, members of the National Guard and Reserve Components have been disadvantaged and overlooked in the accumulation of their education benefits while performing the same or similar service as their Active-Duty counterparts.

Time and time again, through natural disasters, global pandemics, and threats to our democracy, our National Guard and Reserve members have answered the call to serve.

But despite taking on the same risks and doing the same jobs as their active-duty counterparts, these service members don't have access to the same benefits.

This has become much clearer and more severe during the COVID–19 pandemic.

Members of the National Guard and Reserve Component have risked their lives on the front lines of this pandemic, administering aid and protecting the Capitol on training status.

Our brave men and women continue to selflessly answer our nation's call and are long overdue the benefits befitting their service.

The Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021 will ensure the men and women of the National Guard are entitled to GI Bill education benefits when activated for service either for training or for operational needs of our country, just like their Active- Duty counterparts.

I want to thank all of our armed serviceman and women for their selfless dedication to our protection every day.

In my home state of Texas, the National Guard has been deployed time and time again to assist citizens and save lives during numerous natural disasters, including the Winter

Freeze of last February and the tragic Hurricane Harvey.

The Texas National Guard is host to nearly 21,000 troops, including its army and air components.

The National Guard is a diverse force that includes all ethnicities:

White: 69 percent;

Black: 15 percent;

Hispanic: 10 percent;

Asian: 3 percent;

Male: 83.1 percent;

Female: 16.9 percent

This bill, in which we further the benefits and recognition that our servicemen and women deserve, also reminds us that we have an overriding duty to protect the health and dignity of those serving today.

For this reason, I would like to discuss the crisis that our National Guardsmen and Guardswomen have been thrust into at the Texas Governor's direction on our Southern Border.

In March 2021, the Texas Governor launched the ill-fated and ineffective Operation Lone Star which he claimed was necessary to stem a so-called invasion of migrants at Texas' southern border.

As of November 2021, more than 10,000 Texas National Guardsmen have been deployed to the southern border in pursuit of this folly.

According to published media accounts, National Guard members who have been activated for Operation Lone Star are experiencing habitual pay delays and poor working conditions during the border mission, including being exposed to COVID–19, and many are missing the equipment necessary for safety and mission success.

In addition, the National Guard has faced austere conditions and limited resources, leading to unsanitary conditions such as the lack of portable restrooms.

Rather than addressing these conditions, just last week the Texas Governor filed a frivolous lawsuit in federal court challenging the authority of President Biden, the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces to require that members of the National Guard be vaccinated against COVID–19.

There is no merit to this nuisance law suit as demonstrated by the summary rejection of similar arguments raised by neighboring Oklahoma Governor Stitt.

The Texas Governor's failure to comply with the policies intended to reduce the spread of COVID–19 among the Armed Forces will mean that there will be less military personnel available national disasters that have struck Texas in recent years, such as the winter freeze of last year.

This will also mean that there are fewer personnel to respond to any attacks on the homeland.

Encouraged by the Texas Governor's obstinacy, about 40 percent of the members of the Texas Army National Guard are refusing to get vaccinated, which puts at risk their colleagues and the persons they are sworn to defend and protect.

National Guardsmen and Guardswomen deployed in this disastrous mission at the Texas Governor's insistence face the deadly spread of COVID–19, unsanitary conditions, lack of pay, and a lack of a certain future.

These uniformed men and women deserve better, and some of them, seeing no alternative to their present reality, have decided to end it all.

Five National guard soldiers have shot and killed themselves in the past three months, and one more survived a suicide attempt.

One of these men, private first class Joshua R. Cortez, was preparing to accept a ''lifetime job'' with one of the nation's biggest health insurance companies in late October last year, but the Texas National Guard had other ideas.

Operation Lone Star required involuntary activations to meet the Texas Governor's troop quotas, and Cortez was one of the soldiers tapped to go on state active duty orders—with no idea how long the mission would last.

In November, the 21-year-old mechanic requested a hardship release from the mission: ''I've been waiting for this job and I'm on my way to getting hired . . . I missed my first opportunity in September when I had to go on the flood mission in Louisiana. . . . I can not miss this opportunity because it is my last opportunity for this lifetime job.''

Cortez's company commander recommended approval. But his battalion commander and brigade commander disapproved.

Within 36 hours of his request being denied, Cortez drove to a parking lot in northwest San Antonio and shot himself in the head.

Three other soldiers tied to Operation Lone Star have died by suicide, including:

Sgt. Jose L. De Hoyos was found dead in Laredo, Texas, on Oct. 26. He was a member of the 949th Brigade Support Battalion's headquarters company.

1st Sgt. John ''Kenny'' Crutcher died Nov. 12, as time ran out on his temporary hardship waiver. He was the top NCO for B Company, 3rd Battalion, 144th Infantry.

1st Lt. Charles Williams, a platoon leader in Crutcher's company, died at home overnight Dec. 17 while on pass.

The string of suicides raises urgent questions about the mission's conditions and purpose, as well as the way it's organized and manned through indefinite involuntary call-ups.

This is an excellent and common-sense bill that will enhance the benefits of our servicemen and women.

We must also act to ensure that our servicemen and women are protected from COVID–19, both for their own safety and the safety of our nation.

When called to action, the National Guard performs the name duties as our active duty forces, oftentimes in extraordinarily difficult situations.

Although we cannot bring back the lives lost due to the Texas Governor's misguided actions, we can remember the names of those we have lost and work to ensure that we treat all members of our military equally and with dignity and respect.

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

Each further amendment printed in part A of House Report 117–225 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 a division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 117–225.

Ms. ROSS. 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:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 4. PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO VETERANS DURING TRANSITION TO CIVILIAN LIFE.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—In providing information to new veterans regarding benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary shall ensure that the information includes the following:

(1) A description of the medical care and services for which the veteran will be eligible under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, including with respect to—

(A) community care under section 1703 of such title;

(B) mental health care, including how to access the Veterans Crisis Line established under section 1720F(h) of such title; and

(C) care relating to military sexual trauma (as defined in section 1166 of such title).

(2) Any other information that the Secretary determines appropriate, including information about the services and benefits to which the veteran may be entitled.

(b) MANNER.—The Secretary shall provide the information under subsection (a) in a manner that promotes the destigmatization of mental health care and encourages veterans to reach out for support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for my bipartisan amendment, which will require the VA to notify transitioning servicemembers of the services for which they are personally eligible.

Notification must include information about mental healthcare, community care under the MISSION Act, and care related to military sexual trauma.

Troubling reports have found that many transitioning veterans are not aware of the health benefits available to them through the VA. A recent Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General report found that the DOD has failed to provide proper mental health screening and care for transitioning veterans; in part, because so many veterans do not understand what care is available to them.

The transition away from active service can be a tumultuous time during which many new veterans face mental health issues. Left unaddressed, these issues can be debilitating and deadly.

My father served as a psychiatrist in the Air Force during the Vietnam era. He witnessed firsthand the need for proper and timely mental healthcare among veterans. But mental health resources at the VA can only be helpful to those who know of their existence.

We owe a debt of gratitude to our veterans, and they deserve gold-standard and seamless access to the benefits that they have earned.

My amendment will help new veterans understand and access the care to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Congressman BOWMAN, and Congresswoman MOORE for joining me in offering this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman ROSS' amendment would require VA to share information regarding mental healthcare, community care, and other services to veterans who have recently transitioned out of the military.

Leaving the military can be a difficult and vulnerable time for many veterans. It is critical that separating servicemembers receive support as they restart their civilian lives. Part of that is ensuring that they are educated and empowered to take advantage of the benefits they earned by serving the Nation in uniform.

Now, right now, the education occurs primarily through the Transition Assistance Program, or TAP. TAP was created in 1990, and always includes information on the VA care, benefits and services that those transitioning out of the military may be eligible for.

Now, TAP is a great program, and it is vitally important because those of us who are older veterans, the only tap we got was on the shoulder and a hey, good to see you; have a great life. But now TAP actually has that opportunity.

In addition, the Trump administration began the Solid Start program in 2019. Through Solid Start, all new veterans are contacted by the VA three times during their first year out of uniform. Those contacts occur 90, 180, and 360 days after separation from service and are a priceless opportunity for newly separated servicemembers to connect with the VA.

□ 1400

Congresswoman ROSS' amendment would require that the VA provide information to those new veterans, including information regarding the healthcare, including mental health, community care, military sexual trauma, and the Veterans Crisis Line.

As I indicated, the VA already provides new veterans with information during TAP and through the Solid Start program. This amendment simply ensures that the materials VA provides to new veterans specifically includes these subjects.

For that reason, I am in support of her amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support that. I thank Congresswoman ROSS and the cosponsors of this amendment for their work, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the chairman of Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Ross, González-Colón, Moore, and Bowman amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, there is no way better way to connect veterans with medical care and services than first making sure that they are aware of the care that they have earned with their service.

The Ross amendment makes sure that VA informs our veterans of this care they have earned just as they are entering civilian life.

The first months are crucial in a veteran's transition out of the military, and the Ross amendment ensures that veterans are aware of what kind of care and support they can access and how they can access it.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Ross amendment.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, this amendment will help new veterans understand the specific benefits that they have and that they have earned through their service. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment, the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MOORE OF ALABAMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 117–225.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD WHO PERFORM CERTAIN FULL-TIME DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3301(1)(C)(ii) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(not including training)'' after ''title 32''; and

(2) by striking ''for the purpose of responding to a national emergency declared by the President and supported by Federal funds''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2022.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENTS OF IRRRL RATE.

Subparagraph (E) of the loan fee table under section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(E)(i) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed on or after July 1, 2022, and before August 8, 2022)	0.85	0.85	NA
(ii) Interest rate reduction refinancing loan (closed during a period not covered by clause (i))	0.50	0.50	NA''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to replace the underlying bill with the text of my bill, H.R. 2047.

This amendment would provide additional eligibility for members of the National Guard who are called up on Federal Active-Duty orders for service other than for training.

As a former member of the National Guard, I know all too well the challenges that they face. The National Guard has transitioned in recent years from a reserve force for domestic missions to a full-time force operating around the globe.

My amendment would remove the Presidential declaration requirement that has restricted benefits for so many members of the National Guard in the past. It would make it so that members of the National Guard would receive eligibility for the time spent under any Federal Active-Duty orders that are not for training.

This would provide eligibility for Federal benefits to those who support COVID–19 relief, respond to natural disasters, and protect our southern border.

I agree with Chairman LEVIN that we must take a hard look at duty status reform and the expansion of benefits afforded to the National Guard and the Reserve component while operating under Federal Active-Duty orders.

My amendment would make it clear that if you are called up on Federal orders for something other than training, you should receive eligibility for GI Bill benefits.

However, I am concerned that the expansion proposed in his bill is a little too broad. We should allow the DOD to complete their efforts to better align benefits to certain duty statuses before we move forward with such a broad expansion. I think General Bergman hit on that point today, that we need to give them time to work through the process.

An expansion of every day in uniform could cost over $2 billion over the next

10 years in mandatory benefits, where my expansion is only $16 million.

We talked about inflation in the hearing today. We have seen the highest increase in 40 years. I think we need to try to get a handle on this kind of runaway spending. I think my approach is more surgical, if you will. It allows the benefits to our Guard and servicemembers without just painting a broad brush for everyone in uniform.

My amendment ensures that members of the National Guard that are called to action receive access to educational programs, like all other veterans, while doing so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Finally, I would like to thank Ranking Member BOST and all his staff for their support on this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to highlight for the sponsor of this amendment, Representative MOORE, and all Members, just how severely this amendment would harm National Guard and reservists from their States and districts.

Congressman MOORE represents the great State of Alabama. Despite being the 24th most populous State in the Union, Alabama has the 12th largest National Guard in the Nation by number of servicemembers. Among the units in the Alabama National Guard that the Moore amendment would shortchange by eliminating training days—and I say training days are also readiness days—is the Alabama 20th Special Forces Group.

Members from this group, and units like it, must complete roughly 2 full years of training, from basic training to completion of the arduous and highly competitive Special Forces Qualification Course, just to be qualified as Special Forces Green Berets.

In order to maintain a high level of readiness and be ready to deploy when our Nation calls on them, these servicemembers must constantly attend additional training to maintain certifications and proficiencies critical to their jobs as reservists.

To be clear, this training is conducted at Active-Duty schools right alongside their Active-Duty counterparts, yet guard and reservists don't receive the same credit for the days they are in uniform, despite maintaining the exact same readiness requirements.

Readiness matters. Consider this: In 2013, reservists spent 87,000 days on title 32 orders, which is how the Reserve Force assists with floods, hurricanes, and other significant events. However, in 2021, that number had grown to 9.5 million days.

This amendment would continue to uphold this unequal policy and prevent members of the Alabama 20th Group from accruing days of service for training. Training is another word for readiness.

Some States and servicemembers from units like Alabama's 20th Group carry a heavier burden, but this example is not unique to Alabama. All across the country, Guard and Reserve members from every State put their civilian lives on hold in defense of our Nation. They give much of themselves, their sweat, blood, and sometimes even the ultimate sacrifice in service. Whether during training or deployment, they deserve the same benefits for their days in service. They have earned it.

Finally, I would also note that the Moore amendment uses the same IRRRL rate change found in H.R. 1836, which we agree is a fair update to the IRRRL program.

Let's be clear: A vote for this amendment is a direct statement to our Guard and Reserve servicemembers that you don't think their days in service are equal to those of their Active Duty counterparts.

Representative MOORE served in the National Guard, and I thank and commend him for that service. Now, I know that he is a humble man, like most of our servicemembers, but I think his days in service should be honored and given their due credit. I know he may have participated in ROTC, but if his education wasn't fully paid for by that program, then I think he should be given credit for his National Guard service for GI Bill eligibility.

Madam Speaker, I urge Representative MOORE to reconsider his submission of this amendment, and I urge all Members to oppose the Moore amendment.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Congressman MOORE's amendment to H.R. 1836, as amended, the Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act of 2021.

While I do not support the underlying text of the bill, I believe that Congressman MOORE's amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, would make important, commonsense changes to it.

The underlying bill would make a vast and costly expansion of benefits to Guard and Reserve members to include GI Bill eligibility for every day in uniform under Federal orders. This includes GI Bill eligibility for weekend drills and training.

As I stated during the general debate earlier, I believe that this bill's $2 billion mandatory cost is using rare offsets that take away from the priorities this committee has in serving our Nation's veterans. That is why today I stand in support of Congressman MOORE's amendment.

These substituted provisions would simplify current law so that any time spent on Federal Active Duty by members of the Guard and Reserve for service other than for training would count toward GI Bill eligibility. This would include service in support of protecting the southern border, federally funded missions in support of efforts to combat COVID–19, and other critical Active Duty missions.

The amendment would only require $16 million in mandatory offsets, compared to the $2 billion the underlying bill would cost.

Not only is this policy change good for our Nation's veterans, but it also does not burden our children, grandchildren, and future generations of American taxpayers with tens of billions of dollars over several decades in unfunded offset costs like the underlying bill would.

This is without question a more measurable and fiscally responsible approach to more fully honor the valuable service that these men and women of the Guard and Reserve perform.

I want to thank Congressman MOORE for his hard work on the amendment. Before yielding back, I would like to say that if a person votes against this bill, it is not a vote against the Guard and Reserve. It is a vote for the taxpayers, which Guard and Reserves are also taxpayers. It is the reason why we should have had a more full debate on this bill in committee so these things could have been brought up.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say there is nothing commonsense about this amendment. Injustice to our reservists and our Guard units is not common sense. Unfairness to our guard and reservists is not common sense.

To say that this is a fiscal burden to our Nation, who depends on our guard and reservists in natural disasters and who our Nation will rely on even more in the future, that is not common sense.

Madam Speaker, it is time to make every day of readiness training that our reservists and our Guard unit members perform count toward their GI Bill eligibility.

The GI Bill, as Speaker PELOSI has said, did amazing things for this Nation in the post-World War II era. That same amazing contribution of our reservists and our guardsmen will continue.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 860, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE).

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

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 225, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—198

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

NAYS—225

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
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)
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
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
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—9

Cartwright
Cheney
Cline
Higgins (LA)
McClintock
Palmer
Rogers (AL)
Webster (FL)
Williams (TX)

□ 1451

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. BEYER, CORREA, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, SCHIFF, CONNOLLY, and ROY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FEENSTRA, CAWTHORN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. FITZPATRICK changed their 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

Adams (Ross)
Auchincloss (Clark (MA))
Barragán (Beyer)
Bass (Cicilline)
Bera (Kilmer)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bonamici (Kuster)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Swalwell)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brownley (Kuster)
Bush (Bowman)
Butterfield (Kildee)
Cárdenas (Soto)
Casten (Underwood)
Chu (Clark (MA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
Crawford (Stewart)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Jackson Lee)
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
DelBene (Kilmer)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doggett (Raskin)
Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly)
Evans (Mfume)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (Boebert)
Garamendi (Sherman)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Grothman (Fitzgerald)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Hudson (McHenry)
Jacobs (NY) (Garbarino)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Case)
Katko (Meijer)
Kim (CA) (Steel)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kind (Connolly)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamborn (McHenry)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Lee (CA) (Khanna)
Leger Fernandez (Clark (MA))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Mace (Timmons)
Maloney, Sean Patrick (Jeffries)
Matsui (Thompson (CA))
McCaul (Ellzey)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Kuster)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Beyer)
Nadler (Pallone)
Napolitano (Correa)
Ocasio-Cortez (Bowman)
Panetta (Kildee)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (García (IL))
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Reschenthaler (Armstrong)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Ruppersberger (Trone)
Rush (Kaptur)
Salazar (Gimenez)
Schrier (Spanberger)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Speier (Escobar)
Stansbury (Jacobs (CA))
Stanton (Levin (CA))
Suozzi (Raskin)
Titus (Connolly)
Tlaib (Khanna)
Torres (NY) (Cicilline)
Vela (Correa)
Waltz (Mast)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam 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:

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. Fitzgerald of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1836 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES GRANTED A GENERAL DISCHARGE UNDER HONORABLE CONDITIONS ON THE SOLE BASIS THAT SUCH MEMBER FAILED TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER TO RECEIVE A VACCINE FOR COVID–19.

(a) ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3011(a)(3)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''an honorable discharge;'' and inserting an em dash; and

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

''(i) an honorable discharge; or

''(ii) a general discharge under honorable conditions on the sole basis that the individual failed to obey a lawful order to receive a vaccine for COVID–19;''.

(b) POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 3311(c) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) A general discharge under honorable conditions on the sole basis that the individual failed to obey a lawful order to receive a vaccine for COVID–19.''.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 219, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—204

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
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)
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
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
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)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—219

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

NOT VOTING—9

Cartwright
Cheney
Cline
Higgins (LA)
McClintock
Palmer
Rogers (AL)
Webster (FL)
Williams (TX)

□ 1518

Mr. O'HALLERAN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Ross)
Auchincloss (Clark (MA))
Barragán (Beyer)
Bass (Cicilline)
Bera (Kilmer)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bonamici (Kuster)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Swalwell)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brownley (Kuster)
Bush (Bowman)
Butterfield (Kildee)
Cárdenas (Soto)
Casten (Underwood)
Chu (Clark (MA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
Crawford (Stewart)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Jackson Lee)
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
DelBene (Kilmer)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doggett (Raskin)
Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly)
Evans (Mfume)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (Boebert)
Garamendi (Sherman)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Grothman (Fitzgerald)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Hudson (McHenry)
Jacobs (NY) (Garbarino)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Case)
Katko (Meijer)
Kim (CA) (Steel)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kind (Connolly)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamborn (McHenry)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Lee (CA) (Khanna)
Leger Fernandez (Clark (MA))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Mace (Timmons)
Maloney, Sean Patrick (Jeffries)
Matsui (Thompson (CA))
McCaul (Ellzey)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Kuster)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Beyer)
Nadler (Pallone)
Napolitano (Correa)
Ocasio-Cortez (Bowman)
Panetta (Kildee)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (García (IL))
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Reschenthaler (Armstrong)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Ruppersberger (Trone)
Rush (Kaptur)
Salazar (Gimenez)
Schrier (Spanberger)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Speier (Escobar)
Stansbury (Jacobs (CA))
Stanton (Levin (CA))
Suozzi (Raskin)
Titus (Connolly)
Tlaib (Khanna)
Torres (NY) (Cicilline)
Vela (Correa)
Waltz (Mast)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 135, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—287

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bucshon
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (LA)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NAYS—135

Aderholt
Allen
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Budd
Burchett
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cloud
Clyde
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Donalds
Duncan
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Hice (GA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Issa
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Keller
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Norman
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Womack
Young

NOT VOTING—10

Buck
Cartwright
Cheney
Cline
Higgins (LA)
McClintock
Palmer
Rogers (AL)
Webster (FL)
Williams (TX)

□ 1620

Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. WAGNER, and Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota and SMUCKER changed their 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

Adams (Ross)
Auchincloss (Clark (MA))
Barragán (Beyer)
Bass (Cicilline)
Bera (Kilmer)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bonamici (Kuster)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Swalwell)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brownley (Kuster)
Bush (Bowman)
Butterfield (Kildee)
Cárdenas (Soto)
Casten (Underwood)
Chu (Clark (MA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
Crawford (Stewart)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Jackson Lee)
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
DelBene (Kilmer)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doggett (Raskin)
Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly)
Evans (Mfume)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (Boebert)
Garamendi (Sherman)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Grothman (Fitzgerald)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Hudson (McHenry)
Jacobs (NY) (Garbarino)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kahele (Case)
Katko (Meijer)
Kim (CA) (Steel)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kind (Connolly)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamborn (McHenry)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Lee (CA) (Khanna)
Leger Fernandez (Clark (MA))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Mace (Timmons)
Maloney, Sean Patrick (Jeffries)
Matsui (Thompson (CA))
McCaul (Ellzey)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Kuster)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Beyer)
Nadler (Pallone)
Napolitano (Correa)
Ocasio-Cortez (Bowman)
Panetta (Kildee)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (García (IL))
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Reschenthaler (Armstrong)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Ruppersberger (Trone)
Rush (Kaptur)
Salazar (Gimenez)
Schrier (Spanberger)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Joyce (PA))
Speier (Escobar)
Stansbury (Jacobs (CA))
Stanton (Levin (CA))
Suozzi (Raskin)
Titus (Connolly)
Tlaib (Khanna)
Torres (NY) (Cicilline)
Vela (Correa)
Waltz (Mast)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2130

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5746, NASA ENHANCED USE LEASING EXTENSION ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117–226) on the resolution (H. Res. 868) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5746) 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5746, NASA ENHANCED USE LEASING EXTENSION ACT OF 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 868 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 868

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5746) 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, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-28. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs.

FISCHBACH), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, today the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, House Resolution 868, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 5746.

The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of the Freedom to Vote, John R. Lewis Act. The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their designees.

Madam Speaker, this is about more than a bill, and it is about more than a process. This is a rescue mission to save American democracy. Because right now, we are in the midst of the most significant period of voter suppression in recent history.

All across the country, in service to a lie started by the former President and spread by some in this very body, State legislatures are moving to make it harder for people to cast their ballot. Polling places are being closed so the nearest location is now miles and miles away. Early voting times are being slashed during this global pandemic, so it is now too unsafe for some people to vote. Purges of voting rolls, including faulty voter purges, are becoming more likely and more common. And strict voter ID laws are being used to disenfranchise more and more people from casting their ballots.

Madam Speaker, in one State, it has even become illegal to provide voters waiting in line with food and water. That is why we are here today, because some believe that the only way for them to win is to rig an election. This is voter nullification pure and simple.

Now, many on the other side want us to turn a blind eye to all of this, just like they turned a blind eye to the insurrection and the creeping authoritarianism. Well, I am not willing to look away. People fought and died for the freedom to vote in this country. We served with someone who nearly gave his life for the right to vote—Congressman John Lewis.

He was beaten by mobs using baseball bats and chains, attacked by racist members of the KKK, and even thrown in jail. But still, still he fought for the freedom to vote. If he was willing to withstand all that to do what is right, then certainly we can cast a vote to defend our democracy.

John once said, ''Change often takes time. It rarely happens all at once. In the movement, we didn't know how history would play itself out. When we were getting arrested or waiting in jail or standing in unmovable lines on the courthouse steps, we didn't know what would happen, but we knew it had to happen.''

Madam Speaker, I don't know what will happen in the Senate, but I know that this vote has to happen, because the freedom to vote is under assault. We have a system today that undermines the civil rights of the young, the poor, and those who don't look like me. It is a system that has allowed Presidents to win elections despite losing the popular vote. It is a system that has allowed politicians to gerrymander their way into office. And it is a system that gives the 26 least popular States, representing just 17 percent of the country, the chance to derail legislation that the vast majority of Americans support.

Madam Speaker, that is the reality of the Senate filibuster. And make no mistake, despite the claims by some, the filibuster is not sacrosanct. It has been changed over 161 times in the last five decades. And nowhere—nowhere—does it appear in the Constitution of the United States.

Just recently, a bipartisan group of Senators came together to advance a filibuster carveout to raise the debt ceiling. Now, I am glad that they did. That was the right thing to do. A default would have been catastrophic for our economy. Certainly, allowing a carveout for voting rights is also the right thing to do.

We need to pass the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act to ensure that every American has the ability to make their voice and vote heard in our democracy. And I wish we could get a majority of Republicans to support voting rights. You know, they used to. The Voting Rights Act was reauthorized four times with overwhelming bipartisan support, including in 2006 under the Presidency of Republican George W. Bush.

But something has changed. This isn't your grandfather's Republican Party anymore. It is a party defined by the big lie, wild conspiracy theories, and winning elections by trying to suppress the vote. To set a standard that we must act on this bill or that the Senate should act on filibuster reform only if Republicans come along is a fool's errand.

Madam Speaker, on what planet are the people causing the problem going to help solve it?

Now, I would rather be on the side of John Lewis than cast my lot with the big lie. I would rather go it alone to defend our democracy than do nothing together. And yes, I would rather lose an election than win by rigging the outcome. This fight may not be new but it has never been more urgent.

Madam Speaker, history is watching. And this moment is bigger than any of us. With the future of our democracy in the balance, I pray that my colleagues join me in saying the same and supporting this rule and the underlying measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the Representative from Massachusetts for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, today we were informed by the majority at the last minute that we would be brought in to discuss the NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act of 2021, which was amended by the Senate and will be amended yet again here in the House, if this rule passes.

I don't think anyone here is surprised by yet another last-minute meeting, but I am starting to feel the effects from all of the whiplash over the last year. This time, House Democrats seek to insert the Freedom to Vote Act and the Voting Rights Advancement Act as a last-ditch effort to cater to the Senate majority's sporadic attempts to get something passed for their radical base, even though we all know neither of these bills will pass through the Senate.

House Democrats and Senator SCHUMER still need bipartisan support for this partisan bill. And certain other Senators in their party have yet to cede to the fringe of their party and go nuclear on a longstanding Senate principle, the filibuster. Whatever the thought process behind this effort tonight, it is disappointing that it is yet another deeply partisan attempt to Federalize all elections.

Madam Speaker, the Constitution places the responsibility for elections at the State level and has a long history of letting each State run their own elections. But H.R. 4, a component of this bill, would grant the Federal Government unprecedented control over State and local elections. It would empower the Attorney General to bully States and force them to seek Federal approval before making changes to their own voting laws.

Madam Speaker, this is an assault on the rights of States and local governments to manage their own elections. The right to vote is one of our most fundamental rights as citizens. It is upsetting to see the majority take advantage of this important issue because they are so desperate to maintain their power. This can be seen almost explicitly in the Freedom to Vote Act, which includes a new campaign finance provision that would ensure certain candidates receive millions of dollars in public funding for running a campaign.

The majority does not discuss this provision very often, but do the American people really want public dollars to go to fund campaigns?

State oversight in elections is important. Like so many things, the majority fails to recognize what works best for one State is not necessarily going to work in another State or across the

country. States know what practices work best for their voters, as they have done throughout history. It was not hard to find many flaws in this bill, and I was able to do so with less than an hour's time. But I remained disappointed in the priorities and practices of this majority.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2140

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, today is my birthday, and I could not think of a better gift for the American people.

In the last 24 hours, we found that five States—Republicans—decided to put in false certifications to determine that Trump actually won the November 2020 election. In a bill in Texas that was passed after the big lie, they allowed the legislature to overturn a duly held election.

Do you not think there is a siege on the rightful vote of Americans no matter who they are, of people of color and young people?

I am so happy that we decided to move forward on the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act that will stop the detrimental gerrymandering that wants to eliminate Members of color.

It is time now that the relic of the filibuster no longer promotes discrimination and racism but frankly that we move on protecting democracy, on cradling democracy, on recognizing that we are patriots who stand to support the idea of the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I support this rule because the Constitution rules and the American people deserve the right to vote.

Madam Speaker, as Chair of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Homeland Security, and Terrorism, and a senior member of the Homeland Security, and Budget Committees, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate for the Senate Amendment to H.R. 5746, the "Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act."

We are here tonight because we must act, and this legislation provides the tools to address discriminatory practices and seeks to protect all Americans' right to vote.

On August 6, 1965, in the Rotunda of the Capitol, President Johnson addressed the nation before signing the Voting Rights Act—considered the most effective civil rights statute ever enacted by Congress:

"The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men."

This bill is the result of tireless work and compromise by my colleagues in the House and my colleagues in the Senate.

The signing of the Voting Rights Act came after, in that same year, in Selma, Alabama, hundreds of heroic souls risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on "Bloody Sunday," "Turnaround Tuesday," or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery.

Those "foot soldiers" of Selma, brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals.

The foot soldiers marched because they believed that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote.

On that day, Sunday, March 7, 1965, more than 600 civil rights demonstrators, including our beloved former colleague, the late Congressman John Lewis of Georgia, were brutally attacked by state and local police at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery in support of the right to vote.

"Bloody Sunday" was a defining moment in American history because it crystallized for the nation the necessity of enacting a strong and effective federal law to protect the right to vote of every American.

However, since the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the right to vote has been under constant assault.

The Voting Rights Act was enacted at a time when many African Americans in southern states had been denied the right to vote, and when attempting to register, organize, or even assist others in their attempt to register to vote meant risking their jobs, homes, and racial violence.

Prior to the enactment of the VRA, litigation initiated under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 failed to eliminate discrimination in voting because jurisdictions simply shifted to different tactics in order to disenfranchise African Americans.

Nearly fifty-seven years later, we face another turning point in the life of the nation and for the dignity of men and women and the destiny of democracy.

Although the Supreme Court has described the right to vote as the one right that is preservative of all others, this "powerful instrument that can break down the walls of injustice" faces grave threats.

The threat stems from the decision issued in June 2013 by the Supreme Court in *Shelby County* v. *Holder*, 570 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b) of the VRA, and paralyzed the application of the VRA's Section 5 preclearance requirements.

According to the Supreme Court majority, the reason for striking down Section 4(b) was that "times change."

Now, the Court was right; times have changed.

But what the Court did not fully appreciate is that the positive changes it cited are due almost entirely to the existence and vigorous enforcement of the Voting Rights Act, and that is why the Voting Rights Act is still needed.

As Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated in Shelby County v. Holder, "[t]hrowing out preclearance when it has worked and is continuing to work to stop discriminatory changes is like throwing away your umbrella in a rainstorm because you are not getting wet."

The current Supreme Court majority has simply never understood, or refuses to accept, the fundamental importance of the right to vote, free of discriminatory hurdles and obstacles.

In fact, were it not for the 24th Amendment, I venture to say that this conservative majority on the Court would subject poll taxes and literacy tests to the review standard enunciated in Brnovich v. DNC.

Protecting voting rights and combating voter suppression schemes are two of the critical challenges facing our great democracy.

Without safeguards to ensure that all citizens have equal access to the polls, more injustices are likely to occur and the voices of millions silenced.

And this is exactly what we have seen over this past year.

The polarization of Americans is ever increasing, as seen during the 2020 election through tactics meant to impede the right of certain Americans to vote, such as the removal of mailboxes and the closing of postal stations in order to impede mail-in voting.

After the former president was soundly defeated at the ballot box in what experts unanimously proclaim was the most secure election in history, still the former president and his cronies propagated the Big Lie that the election was illegitimate because it was rife with fraud.

The former president persisted in this specious claim even though, despite ample opportunities to do so, they produced not a scintilla of evidence to persuade any of the 61 state and federal courts that entertained the claims.

But to this has been added reactionary state laws passed or introduced to suppress, abridge, restrict, or deny the right to vote of millions of eligible Americans, particularly persons of color, young persons and persons with disabilities, and working parents, precisely the constellation of persons whose votes determined the outcome of the 2020 presidential election.

In the aftermath of the 2020 election, according to the Brennan Center For Justice, between January 1 and July 14, 2021, at least 18 states enacted 30 laws that restrict access to the vote, some making mail voting and early voting more difficult, others imposing harsher voter ID requirements, and making faulty voter purges more likely.

In total, more than 400 bills with provisions that restrict voting access have been introduced in 49 states in the 2021 legislative sessions.

My home state of Texas is ground zero for this desperate effort to hold back an American future led by the ascendant coalition of young, racially diverse and all other tolerant, imaginative, and innovative voters who became energized and inspired by Barack Obama in 2008 and the belief in a new and just America.

To combat not their ideas but instead their increasing numbers, the Republican legislature and Governor of Texas passed and signed into law SB1, which:

Bans drive-thru voting, 24-hour voting, and the distribution of mailin ballot applications;

imposes new and extraneous ID requirements for voting by mail;

authorizing "free movement" to partisan poll watchers, effectively turning them into vote suppression vigilantes;

requires monthly checks of voting rolls to facilitate purging unwanted voters; and

imposes onerous new rules for voter assistance.

All of this is more than enough to sound the warning bell that we are now engaged, as President Lincoln observed at Gettysburg, in a

great contest testing the proposition that this nation, or any nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men and women are created equal, can long endure.

This is the present crisis in which we find ourselves and it indeed is soul trying.

But as Thomas Paine wrote on Christmas Eve in 1776:

"The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands by it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: it is dearness only that gives everything its value."

The work for civil rights and voting rights involved tens of thousands of individuals who fought to correct the course of the nation by setting it on a path of equal rights and justice for all.

The efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King, Ralph Abernathy, Andrew Young, Hosea Williams, Coretta Scott King, and John Robert Lewis, among others, as well as the thousands of foot soldiers in the civil rights movement succeeded in waking the nation to the idea that change was needed.

The result of their work was the establishment of protections that allowed voters of every race, creed, color, and political belief to cast ballots free of interference or threat.

The blood spilled during these difficult times is not forgotten by the communities that saw and experienced these battles, which is why laws like Texas SB1 cannot go unanswered by the United States House of Representatives and Senate.

To meet the challenge we have been called upon to face and overcome, what is needed is for men and women of courage, conscience, and conviction to step forward and come to the aid of their country by passing the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act to strengthen the foundation of our democracy upon which all else depends, including the important necessary investments to Build Back Better and mitigate the effects of Climate Change.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule governing debate of Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I am prevented by House rules from using the profanity that I would like to because I stand here absolutely outraged. I am outraged because the Democrats have outdone themselves with this lie. I am outraged because the Democrats have made a mockery of bipartisan collaboration for cheap political gain. I am outraged because Democrats have not an ounce of respect for this institution or the rules or the consequences of their actions in this Chamber.

A few hours ago, H.R. 5746 was the NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act, a simple three-page bill that was good for NASA, good for our space industry, and good for our taxpayers, a bill that I was very proud to cosponsor.

Now, in the dark of night, this bill has been hijacked and mutilated to become the latest iteration of the Democrats' Federal takeover of our election system—a wolf in sheep's clothing. In fact, the only thing left from this original bill is its number.

What is worse, I can't even remove my name as a cosponsor. Isn't it ironic that the same bill the Democrats are using as a vehicle to steal elections in perpetuity was itself stolen? I can't say that I am surprised. Just like with elections, if they can't do it legally, Democrats will find a way to hijack and steal it—all of this from the party who claims Republicans are the obstructionists. Give me a break.

Madam Speaker, I demand that my name be removed from this Trojan horse, and I urge every single one of my colleagues to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am not going to be lectured about respect for this institution by anybody who after a violent attack against this Capitol, the people who work here, this democracy—after a violent attack, them then coming to this House floor and voting to overturn, to nullify the will of the American people with no basis of fact at all to do that. I will not be lectured by anybody who would do such a thing. Quite frankly, I think it is unconscionable.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee, for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor tonight to enable us to fight for voting rights tomorrow when we vote for the legislation. Many of us will have more to say tomorrow on the substance of that bill, but I just want to place this action in time.

Today is a historic day because we are taking a big step forward thanks to the leadership of the distinguished majority leader in the Senate, CHUCK SCHUMER. We are in a position now to take a step forward with this rule to enable us to debate the bill tomorrow to fight for voting rights.

Yesterday, President Biden made it crystal clear that the Senate must find a path forward to enshrine critical voting rights legislation into law. That was yesterday.

Today, House Democrats will take another step to defend our democracy with legislation called the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act. We will send it to the Senate for urgent consideration after we debate it and vote on it tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank JOHN SARBANES from Maryland. This is a bill that we have voted on in the last Congress but also in this Congress, in this House of Representatives. We voted for the For the People Act, which is the essence of the legislation we are considering now. It was H.R. 1 in the House.

In addition to that, it is attached to H.R. 4, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, which will be part of this package tomorrow because of the leadership of CHUCK SCHUMER; JOHN SARBANES; ZOE LOFGREN; TERRI SEWELL, who has carried this legislation again and again; Mr. BUTTERFIELD; the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. NADLER; and so many people.

□ 2150

We have had this debate over and over again in the House and in this Congress, so when I hear people say, "Oh, here comes a bill that has never seen the light of day," no. We had a vote in the House on this already. We had a vote on this in the House already, and this is as it came back to us this time from the Senate.

Yesterday, as I said, the President made it crystal clear that we had to get something done. Again, Mr. MCGOVERN is giving us that opportunity now. So I just want to say that is why this is necessary. It has been said in the gentleman's committee this evening—but let me just be brief because the night is getting on—since we passed the bill before, and in the course of the year, the Republicans have continued their assault on voting rights in our country.

Nearly 400 bills were introduced, 20 of them enacted into law, which not only suppressed the vote, making it harder for people of color and people with disabilities—people—to vote, but also legislation to nullify the vote.

It doesn't matter how the people vote; it matters how the people we appoint decide how they vote. That is not a democracy. It strikes to the heart of a democracy.

It strikes to the heart of a democracy, and that is why this legislation is even more necessary than when it was first introduced. It is a continuation in legislatures across the country of the assault that was made on this Capitol to undermine the Constitution, the Capitol, the Congress, and our democracy on January 6.

As the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned earlier, there was not even a vote to accept on the part of many on the other side of the aisle the results of that election. I thank Mr. MCGOVERN not only for his leadership tonight but for that dangerous day for him to take over the chair after the security spirited me out because of threats on my life.

So, again, this is urgent. It is a repeat of what we have done and done again and again. We are glad that the Senate is ready to receive this next iteration with very little change from what we had passed before.

In Georgia, when President Biden delivered a clarion call to defend our democracy, he said: "I will not yield. I will not flinch. I will defend your right," he said to folks, "to vote and our democracy against all enemies, foreign and domestic. And so the question

is: Where will the institution of the United States Senate stand?''

Well, we will see. We had the question of the filibuster. Now, until we had this debate on this voting rights and filibuster has become a discussion, what was your view, Madam Speaker, of what that word meant?

When somebody said they were going to filibuster something or they were engaged in a filibuster, you thought they were going to talk for a long time, to filibuster, to talk for a long time, not to obstruct justice, not to obstruct debate, not to obstruct the majority to be able to take a vote, to discuss something.

By passing the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act, the Democratic House will make clear that we in this House stand with the President, yes, but with the American people to fight for voting rights.

Nothing less is at stake than our democracy. The sanctity of the vote and the integrity of our elections is what is at stake.

I thank all of our colleagues who participated in this for their committed leadership for the people in the fight for voting rights.

Madam Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am glad that it was brought up tonight, those who have served and been willing to give their lives for this country.

If we are going to talk about numbers, let's talk about the numbers in 2020. More people voted in 2020 than ever in the history of this country before, yet we are talking about suppression.

Well, under Democratic leadership, our country is breaking records: record-high inflation, record-high illegal border crossings, historic levels of drug and human trafficking across the border, skyrocketing energy prices, surging crime rates, and countless empty shelves in grocery stores across the country.

Americans are watching the dollar of their paycheck literally shrink before their eyes in real time as inflation spikes to the highest levels that we have seen in 40 years.

The border is an absolute disaster. I was there last week. Illegal border crossings are, again, the highest ever, with close to 2 million illegal apprehensions under President Biden's watch. Fentanyl has crossed our southern border at levels that we have never seen before, and it is the leading killer of young adults in this country—100,000-plus lives in 2021.

Instead of bolstering American energy security, the White House is spending their time lobbying for a Russian pipeline that will most certainly be used as a weapon against our allies in Eastern Europe.

The policies of this administration and the Democratic Congress have led us into a record-breaking season of crises. But instead of working to fix these issues, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to distract the American people.

Do we really think that Americans aren't paying attention?

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PFLUGER. Tonight, Democrats are twisting the rules to pass a bill to nationalize our election system, allowing for hard-earned taxpayer dollars to finance political campaigns and handing control of congressional district boundaries to the powers that be in Washington, requiring States to allow felons to vote, and overriding wildly popular voter ID laws.

To reference the President's disappointing speech yesterday, supporting voter ID or opposing this Washington power grab does not make you George Wallace or Jefferson Davis. That is nonsense. Americans deserve a President and a government that will lead us out of crises, not create them.

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

Let me just remind my colleagues that voter suppression takes many forms. Sometimes it is Republican State legislatures making it more difficult for people to vote. Sometimes it is members of bodies like this that, on one hand, brag about the record turnout in the last election but have been working overtime to try to nullify and to try to disqualify the votes of the people of this country. It is stunning.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a July 2, 2021, U.S. News and World Report article titled ''Report: Republican-Led State Legislatures Pass Dozens of Restrictive Voting Laws in 2021.''

[From U.S. News, July 2, 2021]

REPORT: REPUBLICAN-LED STATE LEGISLATURES PASS DOZENS OF RESTRICTIVE VOTING LAWS IN 2021

(By Horus Alas)

STATES WITH REPUBLICAN LEGISLATURES HAVE PASSED WAVES OF NEW LAWS MAKING IT HARDER FOR CONSTITUENTS TO VOTE IN RESPONSE TO THE 2020 ELECTION, EXPERTS SAY

The Supreme Court issued a new ruling on Thursday that upheld two Arizona laws restricting organizations' ability to collect mail-in ballots as well as invalidating ballots cast in the wrong precinct. Critics say the court's decision further erodes landmark voting protections codified by the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The court's ruling follows a report finding that as of mid-June, 17 states had passed 28 laws making it harder for constituents to vote in 2021, according to the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University's School of Law. The report notes that the last year a similar number of laws passed restricting access to the ballot was 2011—when 14 states had enacted 19 such measures by October.

Eliza Sweren-Becker, a voting rights and elections counsel at the Brennan Center, called the new wave of voting laws ''an unprecedented assault on voting rights'' as well as ''a voter suppression effort we haven't seen since the likes of Jim Crow.''

The nation's high court previously gutted a key provision of the Voting Rights Act in 2013, when Chief Justice John Roberts wrote a majority opinion arguing that jurisdictions with a history of racial discrimination in voting should no longer be subject to oversight from the Department of Justice before effecting changes to their voting laws.

The Brennan Center report attributes this year's batch of restrictive voting laws to ''racist voter fraud allegations behind the Big Lie (a reference to former President Donald Trump's repeated false claims of a rigged election) and a desire to prevent future elections from achieving the historic turnout seen in 2020.''

Commenting on the former president's claims of mass voter fraud, Sweren-Becker says, ''We know that's false, but we have officials at the state level passing these laws making it harder for people to vote.''

Some of the specific provisions in these laws that can have a negative impact on voter turnout according to the Brennan Center include restrictions on voting by mail—some 63.9 million ballots had been sent as of Election Day 2020, data from the U.S. Elections Project indicated—challenges to in-person voting, and limitations on the number of mail ballot drop boxes in precincts.

According to Sweren-Becker, Republican lawmakers in state legislatures across the country are capitalizing on Trump's repeated claims of voter fraud to pass these measures.

''What is very clear is that we had a very successful election last year with historic turnout that was certified as one of the safest, most secure elections,'' she says. ''And we are hearing (about claims of voter fraud) as pretextual motives .... These laws are being enacted in Republican-controlled legislatures, in many cases on purely party-line votes.''

States differ in their structuring of these laws as well.

The report specifically calls out Florida, Georgia and Iowa for passing comprehensive omnibus bills that ''undertake a full-fledged assault on voting.'' In contrast, certain states including Arkansas and Montana have passed piecemeal voting restrictions through four separate bills each.

Sweren-Becker says advocates are considering two primary avenues to challenge some of these new voting laws: court litigation and federal voting reform legislation.

''Litigation is happening already, in states like Georgia, Iowa, Florida. But that is a piecemeal state-by-state approach,'' she says. ''And that's why a federal policy like the For the People Act and the John Lewis Voting Rights Act are so necessary because they will be applicable to people across the country.''

As of mid-June, Senate Democrats were still wrangling the necessary votes to pass either of these voting rights measures in the face of expected unified Republican opposition.

But even as some states face litigation for measures they've passed, others still have active legislative sessions where observers worry that more voting restriction measures may follow.

Sweren-Becker says voting rights advocates should focus on pressuring state lawmakers in Pennsylvania—a state with a Republican-controlled legislature that adjourns in December—and Texas, where a special session will begin July 8, after Democrats walked out on a vote for a bill that would increase vote by mail restrictions and limit early voting hours at the end of the regular session.

Despite outcry from Democrats, Texas Gov. Greg Abbott has struck a defiant tone on his state's omnibus voting measure, SB7. In response to a tweet from the Texas Attorney General detailing the booking of a suspect charged with voter fraud, Abbott wrote: ''Voter fraud is real and Texas will prosecute it whenever and wherever it happens. We will continue to make it easy to vote but hard to cheat.''

Sweren-Becker says the frenetic pace of this year's restrictive voting bills—the Brennan Center's report noted 61 bills with restrictive provisions continuing to move through 18 state legislatures as of June 21—makes it ''essential to pass federal democracy reform that ensures that people can freely and safely cast their ballots.''

And while these bills' language tends to omit race, Sweren-Becker says that several of their provisions do end up targeting access to the ballot for voters of color.

She notes ''the policy in the Texas bill that banned early voting hours during the Sunday before Election Day, which very clearly targets souls to the polls efforts that are clearly organized by Black churches,'' as well as increased challenges to voting by mail, ''after a wave of increased mail voting last year, and particularly by voters of color and young voters.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, one voting rights expert said in this piece that we are in the midst of ''a voter suppression effort we haven't seen since the likes of Jim Crow.''

To suggest that this isn't happening is to ignore reality.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this bill we got in short order tonight does not reflect the actual text, and once again, the Rules Committee had very short notice to consider the text without really any chance of being able to read it. Certainly, we are now on the floor with no chance to amend it.

It is supposed to be a NASA-focused bill, but it is actually a Trojan horse, a Trojan horse the Democrats are using to drastically change election law and do it without any input from Republicans, no input in the Rules Committee, no input here on the floor, and no chance to amend it in the House Administration Committee.

It is a messaging bill from Democrats to get a bill quickly passed in the Senate while they have an agreement. We saw how difficult their chaotic attempts to pass Build Back Better became and how that bill eventually failed.

It is ridiculous that such large changes to longstanding law would happen approaching the middle of the night when the American people likely won't realize until after the fact what we have done. And that could be no surprise.

Does anybody really think the American people voted for 8 percent inflation, for gas lines, for gas at over $4 a gallon, and for a chaotic foreign policy that has caused the death of many of our allies and many of our servicemen as the exit from Afghanistan showed?

No. No one voted for that. Yet we are told that there is no problem, that we will just push ahead and we are going to get this done.

We have a lot of issues that we could face, that Americans are facing right now. There is no oversight of the COVID relief bills amid reporting of waste and abuse. Inflation is sky-high; grocery shelves are empty; and the crisis continues on our southern border.

□ 2200

Congress has provided over $5 trillion in coronavirus relief funds, but no oversight. Billions of dollars remain unspent, and inflation is at its highest level in decades.

Right before Christmas the President said everybody ought to get a COVID test and, by golly, he would make them available. They are not available today. I went online and ordered some because I thought, this may be important. I received them 2½ weeks later. Of course, I paid for them. These weren't free from the government.

But there aren't enough COVID tests, and the hospitals and healthcare facilities are on life support.

What is our administration doing? What is our Democratic leadership in Congress doing? Nothing.

Our response should not be so uncoordinated and ineffective going into the third year of this pandemic. And let me just point out, we have not had a single hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, where we have jurisdiction over this, on this very issue.

Another national crisis are the hundreds of thousands of migrants pouring over our southern border since President Biden took office and declared an open border. Our frontline border officials are overwhelmed and underresourced. The open now sign remains on.

And even more concerning, we require our Federal agents to take a vaccine. It is a mandated vaccine. And yet, the people coming in, it is voluntary. We will give them a vaccine if they would like, but of course, they don't have to take it.

And I will tell you, being down in El Paso last week, it is all about getting these kids in the ORR facility, getting them pushed through and getting them placed with families. The average length of stay now at Fort Bliss is down to 12 days. That means no background check.

What are you going to do when the stories start emerging about how these children have been misplaced and abused in the locations that we now—the government—are sending them? We are providing the last mile to the cartels' business.

These crises remain unresolved. Congress could work on these. We are supposed to do that. We are the people's Representatives, and yet we spend our time in the middle of the night doing something that will never become law.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a December 24, 2021 Guardian Article entitled ''Report Shows the Extent of Republican Efforts to Sabotage Democracy.''

[From The Guardian, Dec, 24, 2021]

REPORT SHOWS THE EXTENT OF REPUBLICAN EFFORTS TO SABOTAGE DEMOCRACY

The Republican assault on free and fair elections instigated by Donald Trump is gathering pace, with efforts to sabotage the normal workings of American democracy sweeping state legislatures across the US.

A year that began with the violent insurrection at the US Capitol is ending with an unprecedented push to politicize, criminalize or in other ways subvert the nonpartisan administration of elections. A year-end report from pro-democracy groups identifies no fewer than 262 bills introduced in 41 states that hijack the election process.

Of those, 32 bills have become law in 17 states.

The largest number of bills is concentrated in precisely those states that became the focus of Trump's Stop the Steal campaign to block the peaceful transfer of power after he lost the 2020 presidential election to Joe Biden. Arizona, where Trump supporters insisted on an ''audit'' to challenge Biden's victory in the state, has introduced 20 subversion bills, and Georgia where Trump attempted to browbeat the top election official to find extra votes for him has introduced 15 bills.

Texas, whose ultra-right Republican group has made the state the ground zero of voter suppression and election interference, has introduced as many as 59 bills.

''We're seeing an effort to hijack elections in this country, and ultimately, to take power away from the American people. If we don't want politicians deciding our elections, we all need to start paying attention,'' said Joanna Lydgate, CEO of the States United Democracy Center which is one of the three groups behind the report. Protect Democracy and Law Forward also participated.

One of the key ways that Trump-inspired state lawmakers have tried to sabotage future elections is by changing the rules to give legislatures control over vote counts. In Pennsylvania, a bill passed in the wake of Trump's defeat that sought to rewrite the state's election law was vetoed by Democratic governor Tom Wolf.

Now hard-right lawmakers are trying to bypass Wolf's veto power by proposing a constitutional amendment that would give the legislature the power to overrule the state's chief elections officer and create a permanent audit of election counts subject to its own will.

In several states, nonpartisan election officials who for years have administered ballots impartially are being replaced by hyper-partisan conspiracy theorists and advocates of Trump's false claims that the election was rigged. In Michigan, county Republican groups in eight of the 11 largest counties have systematically replaced professional administration officials with ''stop the steal'' extremists.

Several secretaries of state, the top election officials responsible for presidential election counts, are being challenged by extreme Republicans who participated in trying to overturn the 2020 result. Trump has endorsed for the role Mark Finchem in Arizona, Jody Hice in Georgia and Kristina Karamo in Michigan who have all claimed falsely that Trump won and should now be in his second term in the White House.

Jess Marsden, Counsel at Protect Democracy, said that the nationwide trend of state legislatures attempting to interfere with the

work of nonpartisan election officials was gaining momentum. It's leading us down an antidemocratic path toward an election crisis,'' she said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, more than 260 bills were introduced in 41 States last year to hijack the election process. If this isn't a national emergency, I don't know what the hell is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, Republicans will offer an amendment to the rule allowing for the immediate consideration of H. Res. 866.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, this resolution states clearly that the right to vote is fundamental to democracy, and that legitimate elections are those which are safe from foreign interference, including illegal votes from foreigners.

The resolution denounces the practice by some cities in America of giving the right to vote to noncitizens, including foreigners who have violated our laws by being here illegally in the U.S.

The resolution states firmly that the House of Representatives recognizes that allowing illegal immigrants the right to vote devalues the vote of every United States citizen.

Madam Speaker, I present this amendment, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring up my resolution, H. Res. 866, to highlight how imperative it is for election integrity and voter confidence that only American citizens vote in our elections.

As Members of Congress, most of us have attended a naturalization ceremony or two during our time of service. We have watched these very moving ceremonies as these prospective Americans take the oath of allegiance to the United States of America. They pledge their allegiance to our country. They swear to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

It is one of those moments that makes America the greatest country on Earth. They have earned the right to vote in our elections.

What New York City and others are doing, by allowing nearly a million noncitizens to vote, is a slap in the face to those who worked hard for that sacred right. While I don't support what New York is doing by any means, it is our job 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. It is really just not practical.

Currently, 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 they are not citizens on their driver's license applications.

However, several of these noncitizens voted in the 2018 and 2019 elections. This does nothing to bolster voter confidence in our elections. In fact, Madam Speaker, it does the opposite.

Not only does this undermine the integrity of our elections, but the mistake by Illinois could also have had dire consequences for these individuals if they seek citizenship in the future.

All of this could be prevented if States were actually maintaining accurate voter rolls, which has been required by Federal law for nearly 30 years.

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. This is especially critical as my friends on the other side of the aisle push for a Federal takeover of elections.

Let's defeat the previous question so that we can take a stand with my resolution to support only citizens voting in our elections and encourage States to adopt reforms that don't put noncitizens at risk of intentionally or unintentionally breaking the law by illegally voting in Federal elections.

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

Let me just say to my colleagues, this is kind of pathetic. It is a nonbinding resolution that does nothing, and I guess attacks immigrant parents who are involved in local school boards, I guess.

But I mean, really? I mean, this is your response to what is happening all across this country in terms of the attacks on voting rights?

The bill that we are talking about bringing to the floor, let me just tell you some of the things it does. Our bill, which will become law, would enhance protections for individuals with disabilities.

It would make Election Day a national holiday. It would improve election security by requiring post-election audits and voter-verifiable paper records of votes.

It would protect elections from foreign interference. It would promote digital ad transparency.

It would end partisan gerrymandering. I can go on and on and on and on.

But the difference here is that I think we recognize, and I think, unfortunately, this has become a partisan issue because I think there are a lot of Independent voters and Republican voters across the country who are concerned, like Democrats in the House are, about the attacks on voting rights.

I mean, the idea that we have one State that passed a law that said it is going to be illegal to give people water who wait in a line to be able to cast their vote? And we know in some States, people have to wait for hours and hours and hours to vote. But somehow, that would be criminalized; that that would be forbidden? I mean, give me a break.

I mean, I don't know what the hell happened to the Republican Party. I mean, I don't know when they decided that the basis for who they are was a big lie.

We had an election in 2020. As one of my colleagues pointed out, a lot of people showed up and voted. I mean, the people who voted returned me and returned my Republican colleagues and brought new Members to this body.

And yet, they have been working overtime to embrace a big lie, after a violent insurrection, where people's lives were threatened. Our staff, the people who work here, their lives were threatened. Madam Speaker, 140 Capitol police officers were injured. After all of that, they still embraced the big lie and are working to try to nullify the legitimate votes of the people of this country.

□ 2210

It is stunning to me.

So, yeah, to take this, whatever it is, meaningless, nonbinding resolution, and, I guess, maybe you can say you are for something. But it is nothing. It is pathetic. Or we can actually do something about protecting the right of every single person in this country to vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my colleague from Massachusetts that I believe in 2016 he also objected to certification of the election. It doesn't always sound like that when he speaks about the objections.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, just this morning, we learned that inflation rose 7 percent over the past year, the highest rate since 1982. We have empty shelves, and we have unfilled jobs due to the labor shortages across the country. Schools are shutting down again, crime is soaring in our cities, and faith in our institutions is in rapid decline.

What are Washington Democrats focused on? They want to blow up the rules of Congress so they can pass their extremist agenda to federalize local elections, legalize ballot harvesting,

ban voter ID requirements, and fund their own campaigns with precious taxpayer dollars. It is truly unbelievable to the people back home.

CHUCK SCHUMER says this is a response to the 2020 election and the State election laws passed in 2021. That is obviously not a true statement, because the bill they are peddling was first introduced in 2019.

Joe Biden says it is to stave off the reemergence of a second Jim Crow era in States like Texas and Georgia which passed election integrity measures this year. But that is a ridiculous charge. Literally, it is the opposite of the facts that any person can verify with a single internet search.

The truth is, Georgia's law has more days of early, in-person voting than Joe Biden's own home State of Delaware.

The 2020 election saw the highest turnout of voters in 120 years, and according to the Pew Research Center, 94 percent of Americans agree it is ''easy to vote.''

There is no widespread voter suppression in this country, and everybody knows it. In fact, voter registration disparities between minority and nonminority voters in States like Texas, Florida, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana are below the national average and lower than Democrat-run States like New York, California, and Delaware. Those are the facts.

For Democrats, the only problem they are seeking to solve is the problem of how to secure for themselves more votes.

We have heard in New York, Democrats recently voted to allow foreign citizens to vote in American elections. You heard it right. It is a blatantly unconstitutional scheme that defies the most basic rule of our system. Seventh grade civics: American elections should be decided by American citizens. New York's ridiculous new law has been challenged in court. We don't know what the outcome of that is going to be, but we can all take a stand here tonight to reaffirm to the people of this great Nation that their legally cast votes will not be watered down and negated by the ballots of noncitizens.

Madam Speaker, if the previous question is defeated, Republicans will amend the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that acknowledges this simple truth: Allowing illegal immigrants and noncitizens the right to vote devalues the franchise and diminishes the voting power of United States citizens.

We all have an opportunity to go on record right here tonight to make our positions on that issue clear. I urge my colleagues to reaffirm the rights of U.S. citizens and vote ''no'' on the previous question.

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

Let me remind everybody: If you vote ''no'' on the previous question like my Republican colleagues would like you to do, you get to pass a meaningless, nonbinding resolution. Wow, what a courageous thing my friends are doing today.

Let me just say to my colleague from Minnesota, Mrs. FISCHBACH, whom I have a lot of respect for, yes, some of us raised objections in 2016 because we were concerned about Russian interference in our election. I think the Mueller report actually proved that we were right on that.

But let me ask her: How many votes did we have? None. Of all the people that objected, how much time did it take? Less than 8 minutes. How many Capitol Police, Mrs. FISCHBACH, were wounded that day? None. How much violence occurred in this Capitol that day? There was none. How much property was destroyed that day? None.

Compare that to what happened here, when many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, after a violent insurrection, after an attack on this democracy, came here, with absolutely no basis of fact or evidence, and voted to nullify the results of a free and fair election in the United States of America.

So when people in this country express concern—not just Democrats, but Independents and Republicans—when people express concern about the future of our democracy, that is what they are talking about.

Voting rights are under attack in State after State after State. We see what State legislatures are doing. But the right to vote is also being attacked when we have Members of this Chamber who actively try to subvert the will of the American people.

So you may think it is no big deal. Maybe you think that is what you have to do to try to maintain power. But the bottom line is, as John Lewis said, the right to vote is precious; it is almost sacred. We all have to come together, Democrats and Republicans, and we have to stand up and we have to protect it. That is what this is about.

So talk about whatever you want to talk about, but the bottom line is, we need to do this. This is the right thing to do. And by proceeding in this way, we will at least ensure that there is a debate in the United States Senate, and hopefully there will be a vote to actually make this into the law of the land.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind everyone that the issue here is the Federal takeover of elections. The statement that was made was about someone objecting to the certification and how that was somehow wrong. I just wanted to simply remind my colleague that he himself had voted that way and many of the Democrats have, over the years, voted to object to certification.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, once again, we find ourselves on the floor of the House of Representatives debating legislation to enact the great takeover of elections by partisan Federal bureaucrats and their friends across the aisle and prohibit the most basic voting rights and security measures entrusted to the States and the American people.

The so-called Freedom to Vote Act: John R. Lewis Act, which Democrats hope to attach as a rider to nongermane legislation, will undermine the very integrity of our elections, not improve and increase access to voting, a mission we all share.

The right to vote is sacred and represents the most important expression of self-governance as American citizens. This legislation will further erode the confidence of the voters who have already lost faith in our ability to ensure free and fair elections.

President Biden and his allies in Congress are yet again pushing unconstitutional legislation to ban popular voter ID laws and mandate ballot harvesting. This includes States that have already passed these commonsense laws to bolster election integrity and guarantee that each citizen is guaranteed one vote in each election, not more than one.

This legislation also burdens the American taxpayer with the obligation to fund political campaigns, even for those whom they don't support. Worse, this pair of bills will open the door for noncitizens to vote, thus undermining and diluting the power of sworn citizens to control their government.

In my home State, Democrats—one-party rule in New York City; one-party rule in Albany—are already enacting these radical policies that drive a dagger into the heart of self-governance. This deliberate act to erode our democracy and to weaken the voting power of American citizens is not only wrong; it is unconstitutional.

Article II of the New York State Constitution explicitly states that: ''Every citizen shall be entitled to vote at every election . . .'' Section 5–102 of New York Election Law states: ''No person shall be qualified to register for and vote at any election unless he'' or she ''is a citizen of the United States . . .'' Finally, the 15th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution also protects the right of all eligible citizens to vote.

Subversive legislation, such as the law allowing noncitizens to vote signed recently into law in New York City, and most of the provisions that we are debating today, will, if passed, undermine the core principles of freedom and individual rights that are enshrined and protected by our constitutional Republic.

In fact, a recent ABC News/Ipsos poll found that a mere 20 percent of the public was very confident in the integrity of our election system.

Our democratic principles and the belief in the idea of ''one person, one

vote'' are under attack. When our citizens lose faith in the integrity of our elections, this is what happens.

We are at a crossroads.

□ 2220

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. TENNEY. Too many precious American souls have sacrificed life and limb to protect our sacred right to vote. Now is the time to choose self-governance by, of, and for the people, not a takeover and surrender to partisan bureaucrats.

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

Just a few quick things. One is, you know, I got a little whiplash here because, on the one hand, I am hearing my friends say they don't want Federal interference in local elections, yet that is what they are proposing here. Except I guess they are not because this is nonbinding and doesn't mean anything. I just point that out for the record.

Secondly, I know my colleague from Minnesota. I may have misheard her when she said that I voted to nullify the election in 2016. There were no votes on any of the State electoral college results. I am a stickler for accuracy on things like that.

Thirdly, let me remind people why we are here today. We are here to pass the Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act, which would expand automatic voter registration and same-day registration. It would expand early voting. It would enhance protections for individuals with disabilities. It would make election day a national holiday. It would improve election security. It would protect elections from foreign interference.

It will do things that, quite frankly, I think most reasonable people—I don't care what their politics may be—would think is the right thing to do.

Unfortunately, what is reasonable amongst the American people is not always reasonable here in the Congress. I think the effort that my Republican colleagues are engaged in really is about nullifying results that they don't like.

Well, do you know what? We all want to win elections, but sometimes we lose. It is not pleasant. But if that is what the people want, then the people should get what they want.

Madam Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support what we are doing here today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I have not heard any compelling arguments for pushing either of these bills forward because the flaws are clear. We cannot create a one-size-fits-all election system imposed from Washington that requires States to provide automatic same-day voter registration, prevents States from removing dormant voters from rolls, and overrides State ID laws.

The Freedom to Vote Act would also guarantee public dollars would go into certain candidates' coffers. This is all nothing more than a partisan play for the Democrats to federalize all of America's elections. They are pushing it because they think it will help them stay in power. Historically, States have had oversight of their own elections.

While there is always room for improvement, let's keep the Federal Government out of it and leave the States to handle their own elections, as has been done in the past.

I oppose the rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for her service in this Congress and her service on the Rules Committee.

She said that she hasn't heard any compelling arguments why we should pass these bills. Maybe she wasn't listening to me because I think I made a lot of compelling arguments here today about why these bills are incredibly important.

Something is badly, badly broken, and we must have the courage to fix it, even if that means fixing it alone. That is what it means to do the right thing, politics be damned.

This is about more than petty partisanship. This is about whether we defend democracy or we sit back and watch its demise. I could never live with myself if I did nothing, and I think I speak for a lot of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I wish there were more colleagues on the other side of the aisle who felt that way.

Working with my colleagues, I am going to try to do everything possible to stem the insidious tide of voter suppression in this country and the attempts to nullify the will of the American people because there is no guarantee that America will forever be a democracy. It isn't planted in our soil. It isn't floating through our air. It is us. We are the only ones who can guarantee democracy prevails, and this vote is about nothing less.

I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the underlying measure.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 868

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H.Res. 866) recognizing that allowing illegal immigrants the right to vote devalues the franchise and diminishes the voting power of United States citizens. All points of order against consideration of the resolution are waived. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.Res. 866.

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

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

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 201, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

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)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
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
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—201

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
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
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)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Roy
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)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Cartwright
Cline
Harris
Higgins (LA)
McClintock
Palmer
Rogers (AL)
Rouzer
Rutherford
Webster (FL)
Williams (TX)
Wittman

□ 2302

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. TORRES of California changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Ross)
Auchincloss (Clark (MA))
Barragán (Beyer)
Bass (Cicilline)
Bera (Kilmer)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bonamici (Kuster)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Gallego)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brownley (Kuster)
Bush (Bowman)
Butterfield (Kildee)
Cárdenas (Soto)
Casten (Underwood)
Castor (Soto)
Chu (Clark (MA))
Cleaver (Davids (KS))
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
Crawford (Stewart)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Jackson Lee)
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
DelBene (Kilmer)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doggett (Raskin)
Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly)
Evans (Mfume)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (Boebert)
Garamendi (Sherman)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gomez (Gallego)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Granger (Carter (TX))
Grijalva (García (IL))
Grothman (Fitzgerald)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Hudson (McHenry)
Jacobs (NY) (Garbarino)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Joyce (PA) (Keller)
Kahele (Case)
Katko (Meijer)
Kim (CA) (Steel)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kind (Connolly)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamborn (McHenry)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Lee (CA) (Khanna)
Leger Fernandez (Clark (MA))
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Mace (Timmons)
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Wasserman Schultz)
Maloney, Sean Patrick (Jeffries)
Matsui (Thompson (CA))
McCaul (Ellzey)
McCollum (Craig)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Kuster)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Beyer)
Nadler (Pallone)
Napolitano (Correa)
Ocasio-Cortez (Bowman)
Panetta (Kildee)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (García (IL))
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Reed (McHenry)
Reschenthaler (Armstrong)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Ruppersberger (Trone)
Rush (Kaptur)
Salazar (Gimenez)
Schrier (Spanberger)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Keller)
Speier (Escobar)
Stansbury (Jacobs (CA))
Stanton (Levin (CA))
Suozzi (Raskin)
Swalwell (Gallego)
Titus (Connolly)
Tlaib (Khanna)
Torres (NY) (Cicilline)
Vargas (Correa)
Vela (Correa)
Waltz (Mast)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)
Wilson (SC) (Rice (SC))

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 202, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

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)
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
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
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—202

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
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
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)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
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)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Cartwright
Cline
Harris
Higgins (LA)
McClintock
Palmer
Rogers (AL)
Rutherford
Webster (FL)
Williams (TX)
Wittman

□ 2325

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Adams (Ross)
Auchincloss (Clark (MA))
Barragán (Beyer)
Bass (Cicilline)
Bera (Kilmer)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Bonamici (Kuster)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Gallego)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brownley (Kuster)
Bush (Bowman)
Butterfield (Kildee)
Cárdenas (Soto)
Casten (Underwood)
Castor (Soto)
Chu (Clark (MA))
Cleaver (Davids (KS))
Cohen (Beyer)
Cooper (Clark (MA))
Crawford (Stewart)
Crist (Soto)
Cuellar (Jackson Lee)
DeFazio (Brown (MD))
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
DelBene (Kilmer)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)
Doggett (Raskin)
Doyle, Michael F. (Connolly)
Evans (Mfume)
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (Boebert)
Garamendi (Sherman)
Gohmert (Weber (TX))
Gomez (Gallego)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Granger (Carter (TX))
Grijalva (García (IL))
Grothman (Fitzgerald)
Hagedorn (Carl)
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Hudson (McHenry)
Jacobs (NY) (Garbarino)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Joyce (PA) (Keller)
Kahele (Case)
Katko (Meijer)
Kim (CA) (Steel)
Kim (NJ) (Pallone)
Kind (Connolly)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lamborn (McHenry)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Soto)
Lee (CA) (Khanna)
Leger Fernandez (Clark (MA))
Lesko (Miller (WV))
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Mace (Timmons)
Maloney, Carolyn B. (Wasserman Schultz)
Maloney, Sean Patrick (Jeffries)
Matsui (Thompson (CA))
McCaul (Ellzey)
McCollum (Craig)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Kuster)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Beyer)
Nadler (Pallone)
Napolitano (Correa)
Ocasio-Cortez (Bowman)
Panetta (Kildee)
Payne (Pallone)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Pressley (García (IL))
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Reed (McHenry)
Reschenthaler (Armstrong)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Ruppersberger (Trone)
Rush (Kaptur)
Salazar (Gimenez)
Schrier (Spanberger)
Sires (Pallone)
Smucker (Keller)
Speier (Escobar)
Stansbury (Jacobs (CA))
Stanton (Levin (CA))
Suozzi (Raskin)
Swalwell (Gallego)
Titus (Connolly)
Tlaib (Khanna)
Torres (NY) (Cicilline)
Vargas (Correa)
Vela (Correa)
Waltz (Mast)
Waters (Takano)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)
Wilson (SC) (Rice (SC))

THE SENATE SHOULD PASS VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the Senate to protect our fundamental right to vote.

Communities of color are disproportionately targeted by the wave of voter suppression laws we have seen across America. These attacks are just the latest battle in the centuries-long, racially fueled war on voting rights in our country.

But the right to vote is foundational to our democracy. Without it, we would cease to be a government of, by, and for the people.

This is a life-and-death issue for America itself. The late Congressman John Lewis wrote that ''Democracy is not a state. It is an act.''

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to act, to prioritize democracy and ensure access to the ballot box is not undermined. I urge them to send voting rights legislation to President Biden's desk to be signed into law.

□ 2330

CELEBRATING NATIONAL PHARMACISTS DAY

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a very important day we are celebrating today, National Pharmacists Day.

Today we take time to recognize and appreciate all of our communities' pharmacists and everything that they do for their patients.

During the pandemic, pharmacists joined with the frontline workers to help alleviate the pandemic by distributing lifesaving medicines to their patients.

Pharmacists are an integral part of each and every community. They keep people safe and healthy.

As a pharmacist, I am proud to take time today to recognize and honor my colleagues nationwide. In a world where our frontline workers are heroes, we must not forget those who bond with their patients and ensure lifesaving and correct dosages are being distributed properly.

I am proud of my time spent as a pharmacist, and I am very grateful for my colleagues and what they do to better their communities.

Take time today to thank your local pharmacist and appreciate all that they do. Thank you all for your service to our towns, our cities, and our States.

MOVING THE ECONOMY FORWARD

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reflect on the remarkable progress of our Nation's economy over the previous 12 months in what I suspect history will label the Biden boom.

The progress achieved in 2021, helped along by the American Rescue Plan, is unmatched in American history. Our economy is growing at its fastest rate in 40 years. The Nation added 6.4 million new jobs, and unemployment is now at 3.9 percent, representing the sharpest ever 1-year decline.

J.P. Morgan CEO Jamie Dimon recently said: ''The consumer balance sheet has never been in better shape,'' predicting continued extraordinary growth.

A Bloomberg analysis found that President Biden's first year is ranked either first or second among Presidents for, among other things, GDP growth, S&P 500 performance, nonfarm payrolls, manufacturing jobs, and business productivity.

I recognize we still have real challenges, including worker shortages, supply chain disruptions, and inflation. But working together, Congress and President Biden are positioned to move our economy forward and get us through this pandemic stronger than when we went in.

Whether Republican, Democrat, Independent, or anything else, every American should be celebrating the resilience of the American spirit.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LOU GALLIKER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Lou Galliker, the longtime president of Galliker Dairy Company, who passed away in December surrounded by his family. He was 87 years old.

The Galliker Dairy Company is a third-generation, family-owned, regional dairy company headquartered in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, since 1914. Lou was chairman and president for more than half a century. He turned his family's dairy business into one of the largest enterprises in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the mid-Atlantic region.

Galliker Dairy distributes ice cream, milk, iced tea, and other beverages throughout several States.

Mr. Speaker, Lou was a giant of the dairy world who served as a board

member of the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and as a president of the Quality Chekd independent dairy processors cooperative.

He was equally devoted to the Johnstown community, which he served in various capacities over the years. As president of the Chamber of Commerce and the greater Johnstown Jaycees and a board member of several other organizations, Lou was always committed to the region's success.

Lou Galliker was an incredible force for good in the Johnstown region, and he leaves a legacy that will be remembered for years to come. My prayers are with his family.

HONORING DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

It is often said that his were the words of a giant who could galvanize all of America around the wonderful concept of the ''beloved community.''

Dr. King was assassinated in 1968, and so many have come from his spirit, but I thought this year, in the midst of the very divisive fight for voting rights, we could just remember his marches, his words, believing in a dream, and recognizing the goodness of America.

He marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. He walked with our friend John Robert Lewis and his other friends Hosea Williams, Reverend Andrew Young, and Ralph David Abernathy. And he always thought that he could never give up, as he went to the White House with Lyndon Baines Johnson and insisted on the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

We must honor him in these coming days not by words and tributes but by doing the right thing, building on the democracy that he so much dreamed for, even though his life was cut short, and to thank his family—Martin Luther King III and all of his children and his wife—for the sacrifice they made for America. I pay tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

ENERGY PRICES AT ALL-TIME HIGHS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, many areas in northern California and across my district have seen record snowfall due to recent winter storms. That is good in a lot of ways, but we have seen that tens of thousands of residents have been without power for several weeks in freezing temperatures, and our Governor has banned the use of gas-powered generators as a heat and electricity source.

Meanwhile, those who do still have power face all-time high energy costs as they try to heat their homes, thanks to President Biden's anti-domestic energy policies.

On President Biden's first day of office, he canceled the Keystone pipeline, effectively killing 11,000 American energy jobs and stopping new exploration for oil, which has driven up energy prices and increased our dependence on foreign oil from China, Russia, and the Middle East.

The cost of having our homes heated has increased 30 percent since last winter, and more than one in four Americans reported they were forced to forgo other basic expenses to pay their energy bill in this last year.

Under the climate agenda President Biden has, gas prices are up nearly 60 percent. The cost of propane, kerosene, firewood, and energy are all up over 30 percent from this time last year.

We must reverse these damaging and unnecessary policies and reduce our reliance on foreign oil before more harm can be done to the American people and our economy.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 789. An act to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CORREA). Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 13, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2021, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 8 AND NOV. 11, 2021

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Frank Pallone	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Gregory Meeks	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Raul Grijalva	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Kathy Castor	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Betty McCollum	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Chellie Pingree	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Bill Keating	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Suzanne Bonamici	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Jared Huffman	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Julia Brownley	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Alan Lowenthal	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Don Beyer	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Brendan Boyle	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Adriano Espaillat	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Sean Casten	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Veronica Escobar	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Mike Levin	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Joe Neguse	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Hon. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Wyndee Parker	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Terri McCullough	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Kate Knudson	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Emily Berret	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Kelsey Smith	11/5	11/11	United Kingdom		4,642.00		1,758.20				6,400.20
Kenneth DeGraff	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Carlos Paz	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
James Marrow	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Tiffany Guarascio	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Sophia Lafargue	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 8 AND NOV. 11, 2021—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Ana Unruh-Cohen	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Lora Snyder	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Priyanka Hooghan	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Kim Campbell	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Dr. Brian Monahan	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
MG William Walker	11/8	11/11	United Kingdom		2,321.00		(3)				2,321.00
Committee total											92,277.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Dec. 10, 2021.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2021

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bruce Westerman	11/8	11/9	Qatar		434.65		8,721.75		43.11		9,199.51
	11/9	11/10	Israel		595.00				2,428.97		3,023.97
	11/10	11/12	Germany		856.00				20.00		876.00
Committee total					1,885.65		8,721.75		2,492.08		13,099.48

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, Jan. 6, 2022.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2021

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. James McGovern	10/3	10/8	Colombia		459.00		818.15		577.62		1,854.77
Cynthia Buhl	10/3	10/8	Colombia		459.00		772.65				1,231.65
Matthew Bonaccorsi	10/3	10/8	Colombia		459.00		799.95				1,258.95
Committee total					1,377.00		2,390.75		577.62		4,345.37

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN, Jan. 6, 2022.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–3099. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities and definitions — Final Priorities and Definitions-Secretary's Supplemental Priorities and Definitions for Discretionary Grants Programs [Docket ID: ED-2021-OPEPD-0054] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC–3100. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC–3101. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC–3102. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Prescription Drug and Health Care Spending [CMS-9905-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AU66) received December 9, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3103. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Possession, Use, and Transfer of Select Agents and Toxins-Addition of SARS-CoV/SARS-CoV-2 Chimeric Viruses Resulting From Any Deliberate Manipulation of SARS-CoV-2 To Incorporate Nucleic Acids Coding for SARS-CoV Virulence Factors to the HHS List of Select Agents and Toxins [Docket No.: CDC-2021-0119] (RIN: 0920-AA79) received January 11, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3104. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program: Adding the Category of Vaccines Recommended for Pregnant Women to the Vaccine Injury Table [RIN: 0906-AB27] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3105. A letter from the Policy Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of 2019 Light Duty Truck Lines Subject to the Requirements of This Standard and Exempted Vehicle Lines for Model Year 2019 [Docket No.: NHTSA-2019-0056] (RIN: 2127-AM24) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3106. A letter from the Policy Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Technical Corrections and Clarifications Related to Tires and Rims [Docket No.: NHTSA-2019-0074] (RIN: 2127-AL87) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3107. A letter from the Policy Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anthropomorphic Test Devices; Q3s 3-Year-Old Child Side Impact Test Dummy; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No.: NHTSA-2020-0088] (RIN: 2127-AM38] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3108. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule —

Managing Transmission Line Ratings [Docket No.: RM20-16-000; Order No.: 881] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3109. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety of Water Power Projects and Project Works [Docket No.: RM20-9-000; Order No. 880] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–3110. A letter from the Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Regulations [Docket No.: 211103-0224] (RIN: 0648-BI01) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–3111. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule withdrawal — Modification of Registration Requirement for Petitioners Seeking To File Cap-Subject H-1B Petitions, Implementation of Vacatur [RIN: 1615-AC61] received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3112. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Training Requirements for an Airline Transport Pilot Certificate Issued Concurrently With a Single-Engine Airplane Type Rating [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1050; Amdt. No.: 61-149] (RIN: 2120-AL23) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–3113. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0201; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01346-T; Amendment 39-21790; AD 2021-22-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 11, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–3114. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0577; Project Identifier AD-2021-00470-E; Amendment 39-21787; AD 2021-22-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–3115. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0885; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00966-R; Amendment 39-21786; AD 2021-22-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–3116. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0461; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00156-R; Amendment 39-21775; AD 2021-22-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–3117. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0572; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00391-R; Amendment 39-21778; AD 2021-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–3118. A letter from the Regulations Writer — Federal Register Liaison, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for Four Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2021-0043] (RIN: 0960-AI65) received January 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 868. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5746) 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 (Rept. 117–226). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 6373. A bill to establish the Digital Literacy and Equity Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself and Mr. MEIJER):

H.R. 6374. A bill to implement the recommendations of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense with respect to mitigation of foreign suppliers in the pharmaceutical supply chain of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KIND, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mrs. KIM of California):

H.R. 6375. A bill to permit COPS grants to be used for the purpose of increasing the compensation and hiring of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DEAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MANNING, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WILD, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 6376. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for a certain work-study allowance paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who pursue programs of rehabilitation, education, or training on at least a half-time basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. KAHELE):

H.R. 6377. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to purchase and make available for free rapid tests for SARS-CoV-2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 6378. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to notify the Governor of a State prior to the date on which any alien without lawful status under the immigration laws is transported to, housed in, or resettled in such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 6379. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to bring the non-monetary policy related functions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System into the appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. STEIL, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. OBERNOLTE):

H.R. 6380. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a grant program to make grants to the parents of students enrolled in elementary schools or secondary schools that, for any reason related to COVID-19, are failing to provide in-person instruction for each enrolled student for each school day of school year 2021-2022, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. COOPER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 6381. A bill to assist entrepreneurs and support development of the creative economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial 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 Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. ROY, Mrs. LESKO, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 6382. A bill to nullify the order of the Mayor of the District of Columbia imposing a vaccine entry requirement for certain establishments and facilities, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROY, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 6383. A bill to prohibit the purchase of public or private real estate located in the United States by foreign persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 6384. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve certain notifications provided to qualified beneficiaries by group health plans in the case of COBRA qualifying events; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 6385. A bill to provide, manufacture, and distribute high quality N-95 respirator masks for every individual in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic using the Defense Production Act and other means; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. BOST, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 6386. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 West Schaumburg Road in Schaumburg, Illinois, as the ''Veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 6387. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 6388. A bill to make updates to the National Strategy for Combating Terrorist and Other Illicit Financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 6389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for mandatory restitution or civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 6390. A bill to make financial assistance under the Rural Energy for America program available with respect to certain electric vehicle supply equipment expenses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 6391. A bill to ensure continued United States leadership in space and low-earth orbit; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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 Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Res. 866. A resolution recognizing that allowing illegal immigrants the right to vote devalues the franchise and diminishes the voting power of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. GIMENEZ):

H. Res. 867. A resolution commending the actions of Cuban human rights and democracy activist Jose Daniel Ferrer Garcia, and all pro-democracy and human rights activists, in demanding fundamental civil liberties in Cuba and speaking out against Cuba's brutal, totalitarian Communist regime; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H. Res. 869. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the enforcement of committee subpoenas to executive branch officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

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 Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 6373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. HOULAHAN:

H.R. 6374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ''necessary and proper'' clause of Artlcle 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 6375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 6376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 6377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 6378.

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. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 6379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 6380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 6381.

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.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 6382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 6383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 6384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, Sec 8

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 6385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H.R. 6386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 6387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 6388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to ''impose taxes and spend the money collected to pay debts and provide for the ''common defence'' and ''general welfare.''

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 6389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 6390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 6391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Subject VIII.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 69: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 263: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H.R. 336: Ms. PORTER, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 475: Mr. MEIJER.

H.R. 566: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 571: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 622: Ms. MANNING, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 682: Mr. GIBBS, Ms. LETLOW, and Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 748: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 751: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 783: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 815: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 942: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 1012: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1013: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1086: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 1095: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1210: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 1219: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1235: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1259: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1274: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 1297: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1309: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1351: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1474: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 1531: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1534: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 1569: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 1577: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1640: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1809: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 1842: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 1919: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1946: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 1948: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1967: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 2020: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H.R. 2047: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. LATURNER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 2099: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 2161: Mr. WELCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 2178: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 2192: Ms. MACE.

H.R. 2234: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 2240: Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 2244: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2252: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BASS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2298: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 2510: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 2519: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 2543: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 2558: Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 2616: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2638: Mr. BACON, Ms. MENG, Ms. WILD, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2670: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2690: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 2837: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3075: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 3134: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 3262: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 3269: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 3281: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3484: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 3525: Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 3554: Ms. BOURDEAUX.

H.R. 3596: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 3685: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 3692: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 3753: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 3808: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3860: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3897: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3938: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 4096: Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 4130: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 4287: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 4290: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 4323: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 4331: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 4471: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4479: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 4496: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 4614: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 4645: Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 4649: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4690: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 4725: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4750: Mr. LIEU, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4769: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 4826: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.

H.R. 4838: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 4986: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5067: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 5136: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 5145: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 5218: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 5232: Mr. NEHLS, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 5247: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5255: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 5416: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5468: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5517: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 5527: Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 5562: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 5577: Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 5598: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 5735: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 5736: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 5739: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 5754: Mr. KAHELE, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 5775: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 5781: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 5834: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 5835: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 5874: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 5883: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 5884: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 5899: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 5922: Ms. MANNING and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 5963: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 5981: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 6015: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 6037: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 6059: Mr. CROW and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 6109: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 6121: Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 6132: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 6152: Mr. MEIJER.

H.R. 6225: Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. LIEU, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 6226: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 6227: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 6238: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 6247: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 6264: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 6298: Mr. FEENSTRA and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 6299: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 25: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H. Res. 103: Mr. MOULTON.

H. Res. 121: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2022 No. 8

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, January 10, 2022)

The Senate met at 12:30 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, 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, who causes the morning stars to sing together, Your presence fills us with joy. Show our lawmakers the path that leads to life. As they strive to serve You faithfully, guide their steps to the destination You choose.

Lord, remind them that You know their hearts and hear their requests for help. Continue to be their refuge and strength, a very present help in troubled times. Keep Your people safe and surround them with the shield of Your favor.

We pray in Your strong 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Amitabha Bose, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant 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 (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 12 months ago, a newly inaugurated President Biden stood on the west front of the Capitol, and here is what he had to say:

My whole soul is in this: bringing America together, uniting our people, uniting our nation.

Yesterday, that very same man delivered a deliberately divisive speech that was designed to pull our country further apart.

Twelve months ago, this President said we should see each other not as adversaries but as neighbors. Yesterday, he called millions of Americans his domestic ''enemies.''

Twelve months ago, the President called on Americans to ''join forces, stop the shouting, lower the temperature,'' but yesterday, he shouted that if you disagree with him, you are George Wallace. George Wallace? If you don't pass the laws he wants, you are Bull Connor. And if you oppose giving Democrats untrammeled one-party control of the country, well, you are Jefferson Davis.

Twelve months ago, this President said ''disagreement must not lead to disunion.'' Ah, but yesterday, he invoked the bloody disunion of the Civil War—the Civil War—to demonize Americans who disagree with him. He compared—listen to this—a bipartisan majority of Senators to literal traitors. How profoundly—profoundly—un-Presidential.

Look, I have known, liked, and personally respected Joe Biden for many years. I did not recognize the man at the podium yesterday.

American voters did not give President Biden a mandate for very much. He got a tied Senate and negative coattails in the House—the narrowest majorities in over a century. The President did not get a mandate to transform America or reshape society, but he did arguably get a mandate to do just one central thing that he campaigned on. Here is what that was: Bridge a divided country; lower the temperature; dial down the perpetual air of crisis in our politics. That is the one central promise that Joe Biden made. It is the one job citizens actually hired him to do. It is the one project that would have actually been consistent—consistent—with the Congress that voters elected. Ah, but President Biden has chosen to fail his own test.

The President's rant—rant—yesterday was incoherent, incorrect, and beneath his office. He used the phrase ''Jim Crow 2.0'' to demagogue a law that makes the franchise more accessible than in his own State of Delaware. He blasted Georgia's procedures

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

Printed on recycled paper.

regarding local election officials while pushing national legislation with almost identical language on that issue.

The President implied that things like wildly popular ID laws are—listen to this—''totalitarian.'' Totalitarian? Ironically, on the same day, Washington, DC's Democratic mayor told citizens to bring both a photo ID and a vaccine card anytime they leave the house.

The President repeatedly invoked the January 6 riot, while himself using irresponsible, delegitimizing rhetoric that undermines our democracy.

The sitting President of the United States compared American States to ''totalitarian states.'' He said our country will be an ''autocracy'' if he does not get his way—if he does not get his way.

So the world saw our Commander in Chief propagandize against his own country—his own country—to a degree that would have made Pravda blush. There was no consistent standard behind anything the President said. He trampled through some of the most sensitive and sacred parts of our Nation's past. He invoked times when activists bled and when soldiers died, all to demagogue voting laws that are more expansive than what Democrats have on the books in his own home State.

Georgia has more days of early voting than Delaware or New York. Georgia has no-excuse absentee voting, which Delaware and New York do not have. If Georgia or Texas presents Jim Crow emergencies, then so do a whole lot of Democratic-run States.

The Senate Democratic leader has gone on cable TV saying Georgia ''is greatly restricting or eliminating early voting.'' That is a lie, provably false. Georgia has more early voting than New York. The Democratic leader has tried to fearmonger about one rural Georgia county that condensed multiple voting locations into one—one rural Georgia county. Well, the county is overwhelmingly red. They were clearly not involved in trying to suppress Democratic votes—70 percent Republican in that one county in 2020.

So take a step back for a minute. President Biden's story is that democracy is on death's door, but he spent 9 months chasing a reckless taxing-and-spending spree before addressing it. It must not be that much of an emergency. Citizens are meant to believe a return of Jim Crow is on the table, but this was only President Biden's sixth priority after he was blocked from spending $5 trillion on windmills and welfare. Democrats' own behavior refutes their false hysteria.

Twelve months ago, the President said that ''politics need not be a raging fire destroying everything in its path.'' That was just 12 months ago, but yesterday, he poured a giant can of gasoline on the fire.

Twelve months ago, the President said every disagreement doesn't have to be a cause for total war, but yesterday, he said anyone who opposes smashing the Senate—smashing the Senate—and letting Democrats rewrite election law is a domestic ''enemy'' and—listen to this—a traitor like Jefferson Davis.

One week ago, President Biden gave a January 6 lecture about not stoking political violence—1 week ago. Yesterday, with the world's largest megaphone, he invoked the literal Civil War and said we are on the doorstep of ''autocracy.'' He talked about domestic ''enemies''—rhetoric unbecoming of a President of the United States.

In less than a year, ''restoring the soul of America'' has become this: Agree with me or you are a bigot. Agree with me or you are a bigot—from lowering the temperature to invoking totalitarian States and the Civil War.

This inflammatory rhetoric was not an attempt to persuade skeptical Democrat or Republican Senators. This whole display—this whole display—in fact, you could not invent a better advertisement for the legislative filibuster than a President abandoning rational persuasion for pure demagoguery. You could not invent a better advertisement for the legislative filibuster than what we have just seen: a President abandoning rational persuasion for pure—pure—demagoguery.

A President shouting that 52 Senators and millions of Americans are racist unless he gets whatever he wants is proving exactly why the Framers built the Senate to check his power.

This whole display is the best possible argument for preserving—preserving—the Senate rules that extend deliberation, force bipartisan compromise, and let cooler heads prevail. Nothing proves it better than this episode. It offers a perfect case study in why Senator Biden was right about the filibuster and President Biden is wrong.

One respected scholar explained it this way:

> The smallest majority we've ever seen in our politics is trying to change the rules for how people get elected in every [single] state. . . . That's just about the best argument for the filibuster you could possibly imagine.

The citizens of the greatest country in the world deserve for their elected officials to treat them like grownups. The adults of America deserve to hear from the adults in Washington, DC.

I will close with some basic truths.

Obviously, our country is more divided than it should be, no doubt.

In recent years, I have vocally criticized people across the political spectrum who have sought to legitimatize elections when they win and delegitimize democracy when they are polling badly or when they lose.

I criticized the top Democrats' hysteria after 2016, when their rhetoric had 66 percent of Democrats across America falsely convinced that Russia had hacked our voting machines and changed the tallies. Sixty-six percent of Democrats thought that after 2016. I criticized Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats who spent the runup to 2020 hyping conspiracy theories and suggesting the election would presumptively be illegitimate if their side lost.

In December 2020 and January of last year, our side of the aisle defended our constitutional process despite political pressure, and we had, of course, a literal mob. But now it is President Biden and Leader SCHUMER and other Washington Democrats who don't like their poll numbers. So they are reversing their tune yet again. The people who spent November 2020 through January 2021 preaching sermons about the strength and the sanctity of our democracy are now undertaking to delegitimize the next election in case they lose it.

We have a sitting President—a sitting President—invoking the Civil War, shouting about totalitarianism and labeling millions of Americans his domestic enemies.

We have a Senate Democratic leader who now frequently calls American elections ''a rigged game.''

Look, this will not be repaired with more lies, more outrage, and more rulebreaking.

Unfortunately, President Biden has rejected the better angels of our nature. So it is the Senate's responsibility to protect the country. This institution was constructed as a firewall against exactly—exactly—the kind of rage and false hysteria we saw on full display yesterday. It falls to the Senate to put America on a better track. It falls to us. So this institution cannot give in to dishonorable tactics. We cannot surrender to this recklessness. We have to stand up, stand strong, protect the Senate, and defend the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to applaud the Republican leader, the Senator from Kentucky, for saying what needed to be said. If there is a unique role for the U.S. Senate in our system of government, it is to be the place where debate and deliberation, common sense and compromise, prevail over demagoguery.

And, unfortunately, what we heard from President Biden yesterday was sheer demagoguery. And I agree that it was not only unbecoming of the President of the United States; it was, frankly, embarrassing. Many of us were embarrassed for him that he would resort to that sort of rhetoric, particularly when Members of his own political party are not on board asking him to do what he wants to do, which is to break the rules of the U.S. Senate.

So until this debate began, many Americans probably didn't think twice about something called the filibuster. And as we have all tried to explain why it is important and what role the filibuster plays in our system of government, I think it is perhaps best described as a mechanism to force us to

do what doesn't come naturally, and that is to build consensus, to work together in the best interest of the country, and to pass laws that will endure, not those that will be reversed with the new majority, with the next election.

When you think about a country like ours, with 330 million people, as diverse as it is, it just makes sense for us to have fulsome debate and deliberation, because the risk of making mistakes, of unintended consequences, is great, and there is no body in America that can fix mistakes made by the U.S. Congress.

So deliberation is an important function, and that is why forcing us to do what doesn't come naturally, which means to work together and build consensus to get 60 votes to cut off debate, is such a critical role.

Well, unfortunately, our colleagues have—according to the Democratic leader and the majority leader—our colleagues have chosen to leave bipartisanship and tradition at the door in order to grow their own political power.

Make no mistake, they face an uphill battle. Two of our Democratic colleagues have stated their outright opposition, and I imagine others who hold the same view who have not wanted to catch the slings and arrows that have made their way toward the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from West Virginia.

There are many other Democratic Senators who hold the same concerns in private. Still, the majority leader is determined to light the Senate rule book on fire.

As this Chamber considers such an extreme move, I want to share some wise words from one of our former colleagues. That would be former Senator Joe Biden. The current President served in the Senate for three and a half decades and held a deep reverence for the rules and the traditions and the norms that govern this body—at least, he did. Back in 2005, the Senate was weighing whether or not to eliminate the 60-vote requirement for certain judicial nominees. At that time we had a Republican majority and a Democratic minority. The shoe was on the other foot. But Senator Biden—or then-Senator Biden—was absolutely clear about his feelings on the matter. He said: Eliminating the filibuster—the so-called nuclear option—is ''an example of the arrogance of power''—''the arrogance of power.''

Now, that is not an ambiguous statement. That is not a qualified statement. That is not a contingent statement. That is a declarative statement about what eliminating the filibuster is—an arrogance of power.

Back in 2005, then-Senator Biden believed that changing the rules to benefit yourself or your political party is an example of that arrogance of power. And he called it ''a fundamental power grab by the majority party.'' But now President Biden obviously holds the exact opposite view. In other words, he has done a spectacular flip-flop.

Now that his party is the one in power, he is not only OK with the idea of this arrogance of power, this power grab, he endorses it. He advocates for it.

He is willing to use some of the strongest rhetoric I have ever heard come from a President of the United States to condemn it, to condemn the filibuster and endorse its destruction. In Georgia, yesterday, President Biden made his new position on the filibuster crystal clear. He said: ''Let the majority prevail.''

The move he once called ''a fundamental power grab'' is now his new legislative strategy. And President Biden isn't the only one to have done a complete flip-flop when it comes to the filibuster, when it is opportunistic, when it is convenient, when it is expedient.

Senator DURBIN, the Democratic majority whip, also used to have a deep respect for the traditions of the Senate. He said that, if the filibuster were eliminated, ''that would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to our Founding Fathers.'' But his respect for these traditions, these norms, these rules dissipated when it became a political inconvenience.

Last year, Senator DURBIN, the Senator from Illinois, said the filibuster ''has become the death grip of democracy.''

I am not sure if he is proud of it now, but Senator SCHUMER was also an advocate for the filibuster in the not-so-distant past. Just a few years ago—again, when the shoe was on the other foot and Democrats were a minority, and Republicans were a majority—he said we should ''build a fire wall around the legislative filibuster'' to protect the Senate from ''the winds of short-term electoral change.''

Well, today, for sure, the winds have shifted. The Senator who once supported the filibuster now finds himself as the majority leader, trying to appease the most radical elements in his political base.

Where does he stand on the filibuster today? Well, he is whipping votes to eliminate it. Democrats who once hailed the filibuster as a vital stabilizing force in our government now call it a weapon of mass destruction, a mockery of American democracy, and even a Jim Crow relic.

Let's not forget that, just about a year and a half ago, Democrats used this Jim Crow relic to block an anti-lynching bill. That is right. I was here on the Senate floor when the now-Vice President of the United States, KAMALA HARRIS, and CORY BOOKER from New Jersey, our colleague from New Jersey, participated in a filibuster to block a motion to proceed to a police reform bill that contained their own anti-lynching bill in it. Shocking to me. They didn't even want to begin discussion of the bill—their own anti-lynching bill.

Well, now that Democrats control all levers of government, they have tossed their previous convictions in the trash. Their agenda, securing a result that will result in a permanent partisan advantage, that is their sole focus. Our colleagues seem to have been blinded by the possibility of short-term victories, and they are ignoring the longer term repercussions, because, in the Senate, what goes around comes around.

Let's say that Democrats muster enough support to take a wrecking ball to the Senate rules. They blow up the rules and pass this so-called election bill with only 50 votes plus the tie-breaking vote of the Vice President. They would likely spend the rest of the year checking other items off of their radical wish list. This idea about a carve-out for one kind of bill is just malarkey, to use the President's term.

They would clearly use this to craft new laws to curb Second Amendment rights, expand access to abortion, and decimate important industries in the United States like the oil and gas industry. At the same time, the President is asking for Vladimir Putin and OPEC to pump more oil because the price of gasoline has gone through the roof.

Well, our colleagues like the sound of that—eliminating the filibuster—but they aren't prepared for what inevitably would come next.

The great genius of our system and of our country is that power is not absolute, and, ultimately, all power lies in the hands of we the people, and we are all directly accountable to the people we represent.

If voters reject Democrats' power grab and hand Republicans the Senate majority, Democrats would, if they were successful today or tomorrow, have zero impact on the legislative process. You could just ignore Democrats and plow your way to a certain result. They would have no way of stopping legislation they absolutely abhor from becoming law, and the States they represent, represented by Democratic Senators, those Senators would be irrelevant. Think about that.

All of us worked hard to get here. All of us are proud of the fact that our voters elected us to represent them in this most august body known on the planet, but if you happen to be in the minority, under the current position taken by the President and the majority leader and our Senate Democratic friends—almost all of them—those Senators elected in blue States would have zero impact. They might as well not even show up.

If voters reject the Democrats' power grab and hand Republicans the majority, they would have no say in the legislative process, if they are successful.

A Republican-controlled Senate could pass new laws to protect the right to life, secure the border, expand and enhance Second Amendment rights under the Constitution, and much, much more.

If that were to happen, would Democrats stand by the rules change that they are debating and advocating for

today? Would they stand by their decision to silence the minority party and minority Senators? Would they agree with President Biden's statement, ''Let the majority prevail''?

Well, we don't have to wonder because we have seen this movie before. Our colleagues have already expressed regrets over the previous filibuster carve-out.

Contrary to the strong statement Democrats made in 2005 advocating for the filibuster to be maintained, they started chipping away at it just 8 years later.

In 2013, Democrats eliminated the 60-vote threshold for judicial nominees, and the move has haunted them for nearly a decade and resulted in the confirmation of three Supreme Court Justices during President Trump's term of office.

Back then, when they invoked the nuclear option, Leader MCCONNELL said:

> You will regret this, and you may regret this a lot sooner than you think.

Reflecting on that moment a few years ago, Senator BENNET, one of our Colorado colleagues, was clear. He said Senator MCCONNELL was right.

Under the previous administration, the Republican-led Senate confirmed more than 230 conservative judges, all thanks to the Democrats' elimination of the filibuster when it comes to nominations.

The senior Senator from Colorado isn't the only one who has shown remorse after ending up on the losing side of that rules change. Senator TESTER, our colleague from Montana, said voting on that rule change was ''probably the biggest mistake [he] ever made.''

Senator SHAHEEN, our colleague from New Hampshire, concluded that ''it has not served us well.''

Even Senator SCHUMER, the majority leader, has said that ''I wish it hadn't happened.''

And as a reminder, this is only in reference to Federal judges. These individuals hold tremendous power, no mistake about it.

But now we are talking about rule changes that stipulate how laws are made, not how nominations are considered. This is the so-called legislative calendar, and what happens in the wake of this change would impact every single family across the country.

When Republicans, inevitably, at some point, take the majority again, it would be a simple thing, with 51 votes, to dismantle all of the laws that our Democratic colleagues have passed if they were to eliminate the filibuster. Then, of course, when Democrats take control again, the reverse would happen.

You know, I think that the 60-vote requirement is forcing us to do something that doesn't come natural, and that is to force us to work together to build consensus. I think that is what the American people want us to do, to work together. And the filibuster, that 60-vote requirement to close off debate, forces us to do just that. It eliminates the possibility that we can, with a mere majority of 51 votes, have our way, only to see it reversed after the next election. That is not good for the country. That is not good for our constituents. That doesn't create the sort of predictable, enduring laws that the American people should be able to rely on.

Well, when it comes to eliminating the filibuster, Senator Biden's line about ''the arrogance of power'' is exactly that. At some point, the shoe will be on the other foot—it always happens—which is why no party, neither party, has been so shortsighted, until now, to try to eliminate the legislative filibuster. No party has ever been so power hungry and so shortsighted as to shatter the norms and traditions of this institution.

I would like to close with one more quote from then-Senator Biden back in 2005. He said:

> What shortsightedness, and what a price history will exact on those who support this radical move.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, last week, the Vice President of the United States told us that a riot that happened here in the U.S. Capitol last year was the equivalent of the day in which Japan attacked us at Pearl Harbor and the United States was pulled into a world war that took the lives of over 3 percent of the world's population.

And yesterday, we were treated to the President telling us that election laws that are being passed by various States across the country over the last year are basically the same, the equivalent, of the segregation that existed in this country in the 1950s and 1960s and before.

Now, look, if your daily routine is to wake up in the morning and turn on MSNBC as you ride your Peloton and then you go on Twitter as you are drinking your caramel macchiato and then you are reading the New York Times as you are eating your avocado toast, I imagine all this makes perfect sense to you. After all, for these people, they believe this ridiculous narrative that every Republican—every Republican—is an insurrectionist, probably a racist, wants to overthrow the U.S. Government, and wants to destroy democracy.

The good news is that the overwhelming majority of Americans happen to live back here on planet Earth. And what they are worried about, to the extent they even pay attention to any of this stuff that has been said over the last 2 weeks—what they are really worried about is the fact that everything costs more; you go to the grocery store and the shelves are empty; they have a small business and they hire someone on Monday who just disappears on Thursday and never comes back; you have got, every day, thousands of people illegally entering the United States across an open border; and, by the way, we have a surge in violent crime and lawlessness across the country. That is probably what they are worried about—in fact, I know it is—on a daily basis.

But to the extent they have paid attention to any of this, let me tell you something. First of all, I think almost everyone would tell you that what happened on January 6 here was a terrible thing; it should never have happened; and it should never happen again.

But I don't care how many candlelight vigils and musical performances you have from the cast of ''Hamilton,'' you are not going to convince, at least most normal and sane people, that our government last year was almost overthrown by a guy wearing a Viking hat and Speedos. OK?

And I don't care, you know, how many of these speeches the President gives in which he shouts out this hyperbole and all this melodrama, you are not going to convince people that having a State pass a law that says, for example, that you have to produce an identification is the same as segregation.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that that is what most people in this country are worried about—inflation and all these other things—that is not what we are working on here. That is not what we will spend this week on. That is not what the priority of this administration has been. That is not what the President is giving speeches about. You may care about inflation back home. They care about the fact—their crisis is that there are some laws in this country, for example, some States in this country, that do not automatically force everyone to register to vote. They just automatically register them. Well, that is the crisis.

They don't care that store shelves are empty. In fact, they have denied that the store shelves are actually empty.

For them, the real problem is that States have laws, for example, that don't allow these roving gangs of activists to bully people into turning over their ballot so they can show up at 6:59 p.m. on election day and just dump it on an elections official.

And by the way, they don't seem overly concerned that there are Americans that will be fired or not allowed into a restaurant unless they can produce their papers, their vaccine card.

The real problem is how dare you ask them to produce a voter ID—a photo ID in order to vote. That is their real problem.

So how can this be? I mean, how can there be such an enormous disconnect between what real people in the real world care about and are talking about on a daily basis and what we are going to spend our time talking about here and these speeches that have been given over the last week?

It isn't about the Capitol riot. Everyone agrees the Capitol riot was terrible and shouldn't have happened—I think most everyone does. But these are some of the same people who downplayed over 700 riots, thousands of cases of looting that happened in America in the summer of 2020.

It most certainly isn't about election laws that have been passed in the last year. They have been pushing these same bills with different titles and different names—they have been pushing all of this for the better part of a decade.

And it certainly isn't about voting rights. It is easier than it has ever been in the history of the United States to register to vote and to vote. And the proof is that in 2020, we had the highest turnout in over 100-and-something years. This isn't about any of that.

If you are paying attention, let me tell you what this is about. This is about power. It is about power. This is about changing the rules of the Senate so they have the power to ram through—to ram through—an election law. And this is about ramming through an election law to make sure that they never lose power, to make it easier to win elections for them and, therefore, have power for perpetuity.

You want to talk about defending democracy? Let's talk about the Americans, real people, who are afraid to donate to a political campaign, to put a bumper sticker on their car, to tell people who they voted for. They are afraid because they don't want to get canceled; they don't want to get boycotted; they don't want to get harassed—so they are afraid. They don't want to get smeared.

Do you want to talk about totalitarianism? Let's talk about the fact that the Attorney General of the United States has said let's go after some of these parents complaining at school boards and treat them as domestic terrorists.

And, listen, if you want to talk about segregation, then let's talk about a system of education that is both separate and unequal, divided between the people who can afford to spend $50,000 or $60,000 a year to send their kids to a fancy school where they get SAT tutoring and they get all kinds of advantages and the thousands—no, millions—of American parents who are Hispanic and African American and others who have no choice whatsoever as to where their kids go to school. They have no voice. They have to send their kid to the school the government tells them.

These people don't care about any of this because it is about power. It is not just the power to change election laws. We have seen it. It is about the power to tell you what you are allowed to say. It is about the power to tell you where you are allowed to go. It is about the power to tell you what you are allowed to do. It is about the power to intimidate, to destroy, to smear, to call a racist, a bigot, a hater anyone who dares get in your way, anyone who dares disagree with you. It is about the power to do that.

Well, let me tell you something. I was raised by and have lived my entire life alongside people who lost their country, the country of their birth, to power-hungry people just like that.

I warn you, do not stand by and allow it to happen to this one.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

JANUARY 6

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish it were the case that everyone agrees that what happened here on January 6 was an abomination, but that is simply not true. That is simply not true. Many of my Republican colleagues will say the right things on the Senate floor—occasionally will whisper the right things to us when the cameras aren't watching. But a recent poll—a nonpartisan Monmouth University poll—asked Republican voters whether or not they thought January 6 was a legitimate protest. And guess what. Half of Republican voters in this country say that the invasion of this Capitol that involved chants for the death of the Vice President, a gallows outside the U.S. Capitol—half of Republicans believe that that was a legitimate protest. Seven out of ten Republicans today don't believe that Joe Biden is the legitimate President. They believe that Donald Trump won the election, despite the fact that he lost by 7 million votes.

And the reason for that is mostly that the leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, has been legitimizing violence, urged those protests and that insurrection attempt, cheered them at the end of the day on January 6, and also because we have seen mostly silence from mainstream Republicans who know better but don't want to pick a fight with President Trump.

So, yes, we are worried about the future of our Republic. We are worried about the future of our Republic because a mainstream political party has gotten behind the idea that power matters more than elections; that violence is a legitimate means of protest.

So this idea that everybody agrees that January 6 was an abomination just isn't true. It is not true, and that is, in part, why we are so worried.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. President, I want to talk about two subjects today, and the first is this question of the rules of the Senate because I have listened with great interest over the last few days as my Republican colleagues have come down to the floor to extol the virtues of Senate tradition. They explained the danger of changing the rules so that the majority vote in the Senate can pass legislation.

It doesn't sound like a radical idea; that if the majority of Senators want a piece of legislation to pass, it should pass. But this idea that the filibuster is part of the original design of our democracy or our Senate or that the current use of the filibuster is consistent with Senate tradition is just not true.

Our Founding Fathers—yes, they built a system of government that was designed to make rapid change, even change supported by the majority of voters, really, really hard to implement.

They designed two different legislative Chambers, the President with veto power, staggered terms for Senators, but our Founding Fathers considered a supermajority requirement for legislation in the Congress, and they rejected it as too great a limitation on the will of the people.

Now, admittedly, at the time of our founding, there were other checks on the voters' will being quickly transformed into policy changes. Back then, for instance, only White men could vote. The citizenry at the time wasn't even trusted to directly elect the Members of this body. But in the decades that followed, the American people demanded more democracy, and they got it.

Why? Because as our grand experiment of democracy continues, we saw proof of concept. The people could be trusted to govern themselves. They could choose leaders who were more able, more honest, more effective than any King or Queen or Sultan or Emperor.

So we extended the franchise universally. We decided to have the Senate be directly elected, and as America expanded, the new States out in the West, they gobbled up even more democracy. The West decided to elect not just legislators but judges and prosecutors, dog catchers and insurance commissioners. The majoritarian rule, as America grew, became addictive, and as our country grew, our citizens demanded more of it.

Now, in the context of the Founders' intentions and the long-term trend toward more democracy, this 60-vote requirement, this supermajority requirement in the Senate, which doesn't exist in any other high-income democracy—it stands out like a sore, rotting thumb. This anti-majoritarian drain clog is designed intentionally to stop the majority of Americans from getting what they want from government because that is what it is.

Why should it not be up to the voters and not politicians to decide the laws of this Nation?

With a 60-vote threshold, that decision is robbed from voters. Given that only one-third of the Senate is up for election every 2 years, it is just impossible for voters on their own to move one party from, say, 46 or 48 Members of this body to 60 Members in one election, and we all know this.

But right now the American public is in no mood for the choices of elites to be continually substituted for their collective judgment. Right now, Americans are in a pretty revolutionary mood, and you can understand why. More Americans today than at any time in recent history see themselves

on the precipice of financial and spiritual ruin. So why on Earth would our message amidst this growing populous tempest be to tell voters that rules are required to protect them from their bad judgment, to take from them purposely the ability to change policies whenever and however they wish?

Now, Senate Republicans will say that even though the filibuster is anti-majoritarian—right, it is. It says that even if the public installs a majority in the Senate that wants policy A, the rules are going to be constructed in the Senate to prevent it from happening. Senate Republicans will say that even though it is anti-majoritarian, it is for good reason because, as I have heard many of my colleagues say, it promotes compromise.

Well, I have been in the Senate now for 8, 9 years. Once in a blue Moon, like this summer on the infrastructure bill, there is a big bipartisan achievement. But anyone who believes that the rules of the Senate right now incentivizes bipartisanship should just watch the Senate for, like, a few days.

Today, the 60-vote threshold just allows the minority to sit back and say, no, no, no, over and over again, in large part, because its usage has changed so much. It didn't used to be that the filibuster, the 60-vote threshold, was applied to everything.

Up until the 1970s, cloture votes were almost nonexistent in the Senate. Big things routinely passed with 50 votes. Think about this. In 1994, Senator FEINSTEIN forced a vote here on one of the most controversial topics that we could talk about—a ban on assault weapons. It received, in 1994, fewer votes than did the Manchin-Toomey background checks bill 30 years later. But the assault weapons ban, arguably way more controversial than the background checks bill, passed and became law while the background checks bill didn't. Why? Because in 1994, many important votes, even the assault weapons ban, were allowed to proceed on a majority-vote basis.

That all changed, mostly when Democrats won the Senate in 2007, and Barack Obama was elected President. But no matter who started this policy of applying the 60-vote threshold to everything, today both parties use it. Democrats used it when we were in the minority.

The practice of the filibuster doesn't jibe with this clarion call of adhering to Senate tradition because Senate tradition is not to use the 60-vote threshold on everything. Let's be honest. We are not going back to a world in which Senators self-regulate the filibuster. And there is no sign that the claim the filibuster is an incentive for bipartisanship is going to suddenly become true.

Today, millions of voters are wondering why they vote to change the people who get elected but then nothing actually changes.

We should have a better answer than just Senate tradition.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. President, President Biden's decision to remove our remaining troops from Afghanistan was the right one, no question about it.

President Trump set the Biden administration up for failure. Trump's agreement with the Taliban committed us to withdrawing all of our troops, and had Biden torn up that agreement, he would have had to send tens of thousands of troops into Afghanistan to push back the Trump-era Taliban gains. The American public would not have supported another Afghanistan troop surge and for good reason. The overnight collapse of the Afghan Army and Government was, frankly, proof that 20 years of nation building had failed, and another 20 years wasn't going to result in a different outcome.

President Biden made the right decision to leave. The American people, by a large margin, support that decision.

But right now we need to be honest. The question of what to do now, as Afghanistan crumbles into a nightmarish failed state, is a moral knot almost impossible to untangle.

As chair of the Foreign Relations subcommittee that oversees Afghanistan policy, I thought a lot about this question, and I have come to a few conclusions that I want to share quickly with my colleagues.

First, let's just take a minute to talk about what it is like to be living in Afghanistan right now. It is a nightmare. Once the U.S. military occupation and all the foreign aid that came with it disappeared, the Afghanistan economy collapsed, predictably.

Today, winter is setting in, and more than half of the population—23 million people—don't have enough food to eat. By this summer, 97 percent of Afghans will be living below the poverty line, trying to survive on less than $2 a day. With 9 million people just one step away from famine, this humanitarian crisis could kill more Afghans than the past 20 years of war.

And herein lies the quandary. On one side is what sounds like a pretty clear and convincing argument. Essentially, the Taliban has to own this. We warned the Taliban that this collapse would occur if they took the nation by force. That is why we sat at a table with them and tried to explain that it was in their best interests and the best interests of the nation for the Taliban to share power with the elected Afghan Government.

But the Taliban did not listen. They took Kabul and should own the results. To send billions to solve the humanitarian crisis they caused would be to bail the Taliban out and incentivize other insurgent groups to make similar, rash decisions.

But on the other hand is an equally clear and convincing argument.

We stood by the Afghan people for two decades—protecting them, working with them. We spent hundreds of billions of dollars helping to raise up the future of millions Afghan families, women, and girls. And now those same Afghans, those same families, the ones who, frankly, have nothing to do with the Taliban are dying, potentially, by the tens of thousands. And we have the power to do something about it. How could we let the Afghan people die needlessly if we have the power to stop it?

Now, we possess this power because it is U.S. policy toward the Taliban government that is contributory toward this crisis. It is not the proximate cause, but it is contributory. When Kabul fell suddenly last August, the administration sensibly froze $7 billion of the former Afghan Government's assets that are held at the Federal Reserve that we didn't want the Taliban to control. But that money isn't ours; it rightfully belongs to the Afghan people. Further, our sanctions on the Taliban—completely justified because of the Taliban's embrace of terrorism—essentially handcuffs the Afghan economy and therefore contributes to the country's economic descent. So we need to understand that our policies are contributing to the humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan.

But what if these two points—that the Taliban should own this and that we can't stand by, idly, while people die—what if they aren't in 100-percent contrast? What if we could help the Afghan people without directly empowering the Taliban? Wouldn't that be the best possible answer?

The good news is, is that the middle road is possible. I am going to be honest. It is not easy, but it is possible.

Over the last 20 years, the United States has spent billions in our taxpayer dollars to build schools and health clinics and a robust civil service. The number of schools today, for instance, is five times higher in Afghanistan than it was in 2001. That is because of American investment.

We can and we should find ways to pay the salaries of those who work at these nonpolitical institutions through the U.N. and NGOs on the ground, going around the Taliban-led government to keep those essential services running and to inject some much needed money into the economy. Again, this isn't easy to do, but it is worthwhile given the stakes.

We can also support the U.N. directly. Yesterday, the U.N. asked for a $4.5 billion call in humanitarian aid to stave off catastrophe in Afghanistan. This is the largest single-country appeal in history. That should tell you about the scale of the crisis that we are facing. It is larger than what we see in Syria or Yemen or Ethiopia.

I support the administration's decision to dedicate an additional $308 million in humanitarian aid to Afghanistan. That money can help save lives. But Congress should authorize more.

Make no mistake, the Taliban and, frankly, 20 years of corrupt Afghan Government do own this debacle. The choices they made have led to this day.

But our hands aren't clean. Our mismanaged occupation is part of the story.

Right now, as the Afghan economy collapses and families face starvation, burying our heads in the sand is not a solution. We can find ways to save lives without unreasonably empowering the Taliban.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Arkansas.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. COTTON. Madam President:

Right now, we are on the precipice of a constitutional crisis. We are about to step into the abyss. I want to talk for a few minutes why we are on that precipice and why we are looking into the abyss.

> Let me first ask a fundamental question: What is the crisis that calls for the undoing of two centuries of tradition? . . . Are . . . Senators merely doing their jobs as legislators, responding to a generalized public calling for the abolition of the filibuster? Clearly not. It is not the American people at large who are demanding detonation of the nuclear option.
>
> [T]he nuclear option is being pushed largely by the radioactive rhetoric of a small band of radicals who hold in their hands the political fortunes of the President.
>
> Constitutional scholars will tell us that the reason we have these rules in the Senate—unlimited debate, two-thirds to change the rules, the idea that 60 have to close off debate—is embodied in the spirit and rule of the Constitution. . . . That is what the Constitution is all about, and we all know it.
>
> It is the Senate where the Founding Fathers established a repository of checks and balances. It is not like the House of Representatives where the majority leader or the Speaker can snap his fingers and get what he wants. . . . On important issues, the Founding Fathers wanted—and they were correct in my judgment—that the slimmest majority should not always govern. . . . The Senate is not a majoritarian body.
>
> The bottom line is very simple: The ideologues in the Senate want to turn what the Founding Fathers called the cooling saucer of democracy into the rubber stamp of dictatorship. . . . They want to make this country into a banana republic where if you don't get your way, you change the rules! Are we going to let them? It'll be a doomsday for democracy if we do.
>
> I, for one, hope and pray that it will not come to this. But I assure my colleagues, at least speaking for this Senator . . . I will do everything I can to prevent the nuclear option from being invoked not for the sake of myself or my party but for the sake of this great Republic and its traditions.

Those are powerful words, but they are not mine. Every word of my speech today was originally spoken by our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from New York, CHUCK SCHUMER. Senator SCHUMER spoke so eloquently in defense of the Senate's rules, customs, and traditions when the fortunes of his party looked a little different. My, how times have changed. Now it is Senator SCHUMER's fingers that are hovering over the nuclear button, ready to destroy the Senate for partisan advantage.

Think about it. The narrowest majority in Senate history wants to break the Senate rules to control how voters in every State elect Senators. Could there be a better argument to preserving the Senate's rules, customs, and traditions?

So, before it is too late, let us reflect on the wise and eloquent words of Senator SCHUMER's, words that are as true today as they were when he spoke them, even if Senator SCHUMER is singing a different tune today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, the Senate is designed to be a place where the Members of the minority party and the millions of Americans they represent are heard. In this Senate, the minority could not be any bigger. In fact, if the minority were any bigger, we would be in the majority. This is a 50–50 Senate, and it is no time to take away the protections that the Senate for almost 200 years has afforded to the minority. The considerations given to the minority are important not only to the Senators and the millions of people they represent, but I think they are important in how the country moves forward.

I served in the House. I like the House. I watch the House as closely as any Senator does. Every time the House changes, the House passes a bunch of pretty dramatic legislation. Then it comes to the Senate. That dramatic legislation they passed in the House doesn't go anywhere in the Senate. When the House changes again—and it has a number of times in the last 20 years—the other side comes in and passes legislation that reverses all of that and maybe does a little dramatic legislation of their own that also doesn't go anywhere when it gets to the Senate.

If all laws were passed by a simple majority, there would be the potential for the majority to rewrite the country's laws constantly, no matter how small the shift in power was. It is always a mistake, frankly, to act like you have a mandate if you don't have one. It is a mistake for the country to change direction dramatically before the country has had time to think about it. The bureaucratic whiplash could be enormous. The economic impact could be enormous of the changing policies on regulation and taxes and everything else in a dramatic way every time one side gets some small advantage over the other side.

For the past year, we have heard a constant refrain from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the legislative filibuster—the supermajority to move to finalize a piece of legislation—must be reformed. At the present moment, we are hearing it must be reformed only, maybe, for elections, that we should have a carve-out for elections. Just a few weeks ago, it had to be reformed to have a carve-out for the debt ceiling. I am sure, if we had done either of those things, in a few weeks, we would be talking about a third carve-out. And what are we doing it for? We are doing it for what I see as a federalization of the election process.

When asked in a Morning Consult/POLITICO poll that was just released today—so this is something the American people have just weighed in on today. When they were asked which of the three voting ideas that were polled should be a top priority of the Congress in the voting area—one was reforming Congress's role in counting electoral votes; one was expanding voting access; one was expanding the oversight of the State changes in elections—they were all beaten by ''none of the above.'' ''None of the above'' got more votes in that poll than some of the top priorities the Democrats were talking about.

We hear that we have to extend the Voting Rights Act. We have even titled the Voting Rights Act after a person whom I served with in the House, whom I traveled with, whom I had a close friendship with—John Lewis. That would be a good reason for me to vote for the Voting Rights Act, and certainly I voted to extend the Voting Rights Act before. In fact, I would vote to extend the Voting Rights Act today, and I would even be more happy to vote for the Voting Rights Act today if it were the Voting Rights Act that just happened to be named for John Lewis. The Voting Rights Act in 1965 was 12 pages. The extensions have all been about the same size. This bill has another 110 pages of additional legislative things that don't deal with the principles of the Voting Rights Act at all; they deal with the Federal Government's taking over the election process.

We have seen our colleagues talk about this in one bill after another. I think the motives are pretty transparent right now; it is another way to break the filibuster. But we hear that the laws that States are passing—and by the way, the States have been passing election laws for the whole country, as it relates to their States, for a little over 200 years now. The Constitution was pretty specific as to who would conduct elections in the country and who would set the rules and regulations in the country for those elections.

We hear that these laws are very restrictive. Now, mostly, these laws are laws that the legislatures leaned forward, as they should have, in my opinion, in a pandemic environment. It was an election that, in at least 100 years, we had never conducted anything like with the pandemic experience we were in. So they leaned forward. They allowed things that had never been allowed before: more mail-in voting, voting from your car, voting from a parking lot, all sorts of things. Then those same legislatures looked back at what had happened as a result of that and said: Do we want to keep all of this as if we were going to have a pandemic every year or do we want to keep part of it? In every case that I have looked

at, the changes in election law made it easier to vote in 2021 than it was in the last election before the pandemic.

I would encourage all of my colleagues, who are such sudden experts on Utah and Iowa and other election laws, to look at the 2018 election laws and see how they compare. What the legislatures did was exactly what you would hope they would do—respond to a crisis and, when the crisis is over, evaluate how much of that we want to keep as part of our permanent system and how much of it was only in crisis.

What do these laws do?

In Utah, the State legislature determined it would be appropriate for the Lieutenant Governor, who is the chief election official of Utah, to get the names of deceased individuals from the Social Security Administration and give them to county officials, who would take their names off the rolls. That is listed as one of the things that make it harder to vote—well, harder to vote for dead people. That is fine. I, actually, asked this question in a hearing of someone—one of the election-monitoring people who said this was difficult.

I said: Well, what about that?

He said: The Social Security Administration is often wrong.

Well, if anybody is going to get something straightened out pretty quickly, it would be a living person who no longer is getting their Social Security check because the Social Security Administration had them on a list of people who were deceased. What a foolish argument that was for that to be a repressive thing.

In Georgia, the State legislature adjusted their mail-in ballot deadline to ensure voters who requested mail-in ballots got their ballots with enough time to cast them. They brought their date more in line with the advice of the U.S. Postal Service. The truth is that lots of States did this.

States like Georgia and Florida now include specific provisions in State law that allow for the use of drop boxes. In fact, they have to have at least one in every county. There were no drop boxes in Georgia anywhere before the 2020 elections. Now there have to be drop boxes everywhere, and it has to be understood where those locations can be found.

States like Iowa and Georgia implemented more early voting days than the so-called Freedom to Vote Act would require. In fact, these States had more days of early voting than many States that have Democrat-led legislatures, like New York and Connecticut and the President's home State of Delaware.

They also forgot that many Republican States, like Arizona, Florida, and Georgia, have already implemented no-excuse absentee voting.

I was an election official for 20 years, part of that as the chief election official in our State, the secretary of state. I am absolutely confident that nobody takes the security of the elections and the confidence in the elections and the ability to register and vote in an easy way more seriously than people who are directly answerable to their neighbors, if they are the local official, or to the people who vote for them, if they are the State official.

President Obama said in 2016 that the diversity of this statewide system was one of the strengths of our system—the State-run system—and one of the reasons it would make it really hard for any outside entity—any foreign entity, any outside group—to truly try to rig a national election.

I have got more to say. I am going to submit the rest of my remarks for the record. I am sure there will be more time to talk about this next week.

On ballot harvesting, 62 percent of people in one poll are opposed to ballot harvesting. Ballot harvesting is when you ask somebody to give you their ballot. You say: I will turn it in for you.

Well, maybe—who would know?

I will put it in the mail for you.

Who would know? If it never gets to the counting place, it just got lost in the mail.

One of the reasons it might have gotten lost in the mail is the ballot harvester knows, with almost certainty, that the way you marked your ballot is not the way the ballot harvester would prefer to have the ballots marked.

Seventy percent of Americans support voter maintenance. That is eliminated in many ways by the law being proposed.

One proposal even went so far as to tell States the kind of paper their ballots would be printed on. If you really want to make it easy to impact an election, be sure that somebody knows the exact paper that every entity in America prints their ballots on and gets some of that to use to try to divert the election and make the election less secure.

We are going to hear a lot about this over the next couple of days. I certainly would welcome the opportunity to have more time, and I am sure I will have more time, to talk about what is in these bills, both the State bills and the Federal bills, as opposed to what people are saying is in both bills.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, the Senator from Missouri is exactly right. We are going to hear so much about this, and the reason is, as the American people hear about this so-called election bill, what they are realizing is, it is not something that is going to make their local election safer. It is something that is going to put that power in Washington, DC.

Now, what we are hearing from the majority leader and the Democratic leadership is that they have got to get rid of the filibuster in order to push forward this election bill, adding States, packing courts—all of this laundry list of a socialist agenda that they are planning to execute.

So what I want to do today for a couple of minutes is just walk us down memory lane as to what people have had to say, what our Democratic colleagues have had to say about the filibuster.

In May of 2005, then-Senator Joe Biden came to the floor and he vigorously jumped into the middle of a debate over the filibuster. He said that things would go very wrong if his colleagues decided to blow up the rules to get their way. What is interesting about Senator Biden's position is that it had almost nothing to do with his policy goals.

Here is his quote:

> Folks who want to see this change want to eliminate one of the procedural mechanisms designed for the express purpose of guaranteeing individual rights, and they also have a consequence, and would undermine the protections of a minority point of view in the heat of majority excess.

He understood, at that point in time, the importance of preserving the Senate's institutional power and abiding by standards that not only welcome but require deliberation and compromise.

Well, what a difference a few years and a Senate majority can make. Today, we are having the exact same debate, but the power my Democratic colleagues won in the last election has changed their minds about breaking the Senate to get their way. The problem is, the Senate is not broken. It does not need their changes.

But the rules no longer matter to the majority leader, even though he said as recently as 2017:

> [L]et us go no further down this road. I hope the Republican leader and I can, in the coming months, find a way to build a firewall around the legislative filibuster, which is the most important distinction between the Senate and the House. Without the 60-vote threshold for legislation, the Senate becomes a majoritarian institution like the House, much more subject to the winds of short-term electoral change.

Well, my, my, my, how about that? He understood the dangers of legislative whiplash, even when he was in the minority. So did my colleague Senator DURBIN, who said in 2018 that he believed that ending the filibuster would ''be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created, going back to our Founding Fathers.''

Well, I am going to ask the Senators from New York and Illinois: What happened here? What changed their minds so drastically? They have done a 180.

I would ask the same question of many of my Democratic colleagues. In 2017, 32 Senate Democrats—yes, that is correct, 32, many of whom are still serving in this Chamber today—signed onto a bipartisan letter in support of the filibuster. Now, they, too, have changed their minds. It makes you wonder: What is everybody on the Democratic aisle drinking these days?

This is no way to run the world's greatest deliberative body, but it is a great way to destroy it. Between 2017 and today, many Senate Democrats

changed their minds about how to handle the filibuster.

Over the past year, we have watched Joe Biden and the Democrats attack more than one institution forming the foundation of this Nation. The Supreme Court, the First Amendment, the Second Amendment, limits on the power of the Executive, and, now, the Senate rules have all proved to be inconvenient to their agenda and ended up on the chopping block. That is where they are putting them.

My Democratic colleagues may be frustrated, but that is just too bad. The Senate was not designed to rubberstamp legislation that is so belligerently foolish it can't tempt a single Republican vote—not one. No.

The Senate was designed to protect the American people and the institution itself from shortsighted leadership.

My colleagues claim that all they are asking for is one teeny little carve-out—just one. But I would remind them that there is only so much carving you can do before you reduce the entire thing to dust. And based on their track record, we have no reason to trust that they will stop carving and put down the knife rather than use it to hold the Senate hostage the next time they can't scrounge up the votes to check something off their to-do list.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, since the founding of our Republic, the Senate has existed to encourage extended debate and protect the rights of the minority party.

Over the centuries, as various political parties have risen and fallen from power, the Senate's rules have been respected and followed. One of those rules is the legislative filibuster, which protects the minority party's rights by requiring a 60-vote threshold to pass legislation in the Senate.

Unfortunately, many of today's Democrats in Washington only care about one thing: radically transforming this Nation into a new socialist state. And they will use any means necessary to keep their grip on the Federal Government.

Now we are seeing Democrat leadership in the Congress wield their historically narrow majority to push one partisan bill after another without even attempting to get Republican input or support. Instead of working together with their Republican colleagues, they are searching for ways to make it easier to jam through progressive, socialist policies without any compromise. Just look at the majority leader's most recent statements on the filibuster.

Last week, the majority leader wrote a letter to all Democrat Senators explaining his plans to fundamentally and permanently alter the rules of the U.S. Senate and change the legislative filibuster. His statements could not be more hypocritical or self-serving.

The legislative filibuster, which has been in place for decades, has been repeatedly defended as a vital and necessary rule to protect the minority party's rights, including by Barack Obama, Joe Biden, Kamala Harris, and even Senator SCHUMER.

In 2017, Senator SCHUMER urged then-Majority Leader MCCONNELL to ''find a way to build a firewall around the legislative filibuster,'' which is the most important distinction between the Senate and the House.

He went on to say:

> Without the 60-vote threshold for legislation, the Senate becomes a majoritarian institution like the House, much more subject to the winds of short-term electoral change. No Senator would like to see that happen, so let's find a way to further protect the 60-vote rule for legislation.

These are the direct quotes from the Senator from New York. He called the filibuster the most important distinction between the Senate and the House, and now he is turning his back on them.

Of course, my colleague from New York isn't the only one caught in a bind here by previous statements and actions. Just remember that, in 2018, the current Senate majority whip, Senator DICK DURBIN, said doing away with the legislative filibuster ''would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to our Founding Fathers.''

He further admitted: ''We have to acknowledge our respect for the minority, and that is what the Senate tries to do in its composition and its procedure.''

Or remember in 2017, when 32 Democrats signed a bipartisan letter urging Senate leadership to keep the sacred part of the Senate intact. Most of those same Senators who defended minority party rights are still in office today, but only one has expressed any opposition to Senator SCHUMER's plans to destroy the filibuster, now that he is in the majority.

And just last Congress, most of the Democrat caucus used a filibuster to block a police reform bill from my Republican colleague TIM SCOTT and a bill that would have protected newborn babies who survived attempted abortions.

So my Democrat colleagues think the filibuster is great when it works in their favor, but they can't stand it when it blocks their radical socialist agenda, an agenda we know the American people do not support.

So why the change of mind? Why are they willing to be so blatantly hypocritical and so obviously flip-flop? Because they know if they pull this off and pass this radical, dangerous bill to federalize elections, it will all but secure their power into the future. That is what we are talking about here.

Democrats want to push through this bill that will completely upend our current election system, and they are willing to abandon their principles and flip-flop on the filibuster if it means permanently maintaining power.

Senator SCHUMER admitted it earlier today on MSNBC. He said the quiet part out loud and explained that Democrat Senators are saying things like ''I'll lose my election'' or ''We'll lose our majority'' if they don't change the filibuster to pass their election takeover bill.

Democrats say this is about ''voting rights.'' It isn't. The right to vote is more readily accessible and easily exercised by eligible voters across the country than ever before. This is really about federalizing our elections and enacting policies that they think will give them an advantage in future elections. And all along the way, they will revel in their hypocrisy and self-righteously pretend that they are ''protecting democracy.''

But make no mistake, a change to the filibuster won't protect democracy. It will ruin it.

Democrats in this Chamber can posture all they want, but the American people see them for what they really are: self-serving, power-hungry politicians.

We all know that if the Democrats' bill was good, if it included policies that would actually improve our Nation's elections, it would pass. But there is nothing in the bill worth voting for. The Democrats' bill is an assault on American elections. It will fuel voter fraud, waste taxpayer dollars on political campaigns and attack ads, and make it nearly impossible to conduct fair elections that our citizens can trust.

We need an end to this self-serving hypocrisy, and we need Members who will stand up for what is right. I am urging my Democratic colleagues to see past their party's own partisan, short-term interests, and I ask them to consider the health and future of our democracy. That is what the American people deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, just this week, we saw the College Football National Championship game. A lot of tremendous athletes engaged in tremendous feats of skill and strength, but I have to say, there wasn't an athlete on the field who demonstrated the flexibility that we are seeing in the U.S. Senate right now. We are today seeing Democrats in the Senate, with the active encouragement of President Joe Biden, engaging in not one but two partisan power grabs and doing them both with a twist. Let me explain.

Democrats are desperate to hold on to power. It is their No. 1 priority. It is more important than anything else. It is more important than jobs and our economy to Democrats. It is more important than getting kids back to school. It is more important than defeating COVID. Nothing matters more to today's Democrats than staying in power no matter what.

How do we know that? Well, the very first bill introduced in the House of

Representatives, H.R. 1, is a bill many of us call the ''Corrupt Politicians Act.'' It is a bill designed to keep Democrats in power forever. That was NANCY PELOSI's No. 1 priority.

The very first bill introduced in this Chamber, S. 1, is likewise the ''Corrupt Politicians Act,'' a bill designed to keep Democrats in power forever. It is the No. 1 priority of elected Democrats.

When that failed to get sufficient votes to pass, Democrats shifted to option 1B. Option 1B has the same objective—keep Democrats in power forever—but it is through a little twist, a sleight of hand. Now, Democrats want to subject every significant decision concerning voting to the unreviewable—in most instances—arbitrary power of an unelected bureaucrat in the Federal Department of Justice.

My State of Texas has 29 million people. Those 29 million people have democratic rights. They have rights to elect legislatures that reflect their views, their policies, their values. Do you know what Senate Democrats say? We don't care. We don't care what those 29 million people want; we, the Democrats, want to stay in power.

So let's take, for example, photo ID. I have in my wallet my driver's license. Most people do. Voter ID is a policy that is supported by the overwhelming majority of Americans. Roughly 80 percent of Americans support voter ID, requiring a driver's license to vote. Two-thirds of African-American voters support voter ID. It is overwhelmingly supported across the country.

Do you know who doesn't support it? Elected Democrats. Sadly, every single Democrat in this Chamber has been willing to go on board with proposals to strike down voter ID laws. Here is what the Democrats want to do: They want to say that even though the voters of Texas want voter ID because we want elections with integrity—we want to know that if you come in and vote and say your name is John Doe, that you are not somebody else pretending to be that person—congressional Democrats don't care. They want to have an unelected bureaucrat with the ability to strike that down—and likewise with ballot harvesting.

Ballot harvesting is one of the most corrupt practices in this country. It is the practice whereby paid political operatives go and collect the ballots of other people. So, for example, you have a young operative from the DNC come into a nursing home and go room to room. Now, some of those residents may no longer be competent to make a choice. They may not be aware of their surroundings. But for an unscrupulous operative, that doesn't stop them. That operative can sit there and say: Sir or ma'am, you want to vote for so-and-so, don't you? They can fill out the ballot for them.

Do you know what? If there is some obstreperous senior in a nursing home who says, ''Gosh, I really want to vote for the other guy,'' well, it is very simple for the unscrupulous operative to take that ballot—ah, this ballot is for the other guy—and magically it ends up in the trash, never gets mailed in. They can just mail in the ballots they agree with and throw away the ballots they disagree with.

There is a reason the majority of States have made ballot harvesting illegal: It invites voter fraud. By the way, it wasn't long ago when people on both sides of the aisle recognized this.

The most significant bipartisan effort examining voter fraud: the study of a bipartisan Commission called the Carter-Baker Commission. Baker is former Republican Secretary of State James Baker. Carter is former Democratic President Jimmy Carter. The Carter-Baker Commission concluded that voter ID was an important step to stopping voter fraud. The Carter-Baker Commission concluded that voter fraud was a real and significant problem undermining the integrity of elections. The Carter-Baker Commission identified ballot harvesting as one of the most dangerous practices encouraging voter fraud.

As I said, the Carter in Carter-Baker Commission was former Democratic President Jimmy Carter—hardly a rightwing Republican operative by any stretch of the imagination.

It used to be, when sanity was permissible in the Democratic Party, that people would acknowledge the obvious. Unfortunately, we are in hyperpartisan times. So, today, Senate Democrats want to be able to have laws on voter ID, want to have laws prohibiting ballot harvesting struck down by one unelected bureaucrat.

By the way, who is that bureaucrat? Currently, it is a woman named Kristen Clarke, head of the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice. Ms. Clarke is one of the most radical, partisan nominees ever to serve in the U.S. Department of Justice. She is one of the leading advocates in the country for abolishing the police.

By the way, every single Democrat in this Chamber voted to confirm her despite the fact that she is one of the leading advocates in the country for abolishing the police. She has been a hardcore, leftwing, partisan advocate her entire life.

Now, she is entitled to have her views. She is entitled to believe those views passionately. But here is what Senate Democrats want to do: They want to take this one person and say she can strike down the laws adopted by legislatures elected by 29 million Texans. That is extraordinary.

Now, what could justify such a thing? Well, we saw Joe Biden give an incredibly demagogic, racist speech accusing half the country of being racist, of being Bull Connor.

The Democrats say this is Jim Crow 2.0. You know, Madam President, ironically and I think inadvertently, the Democrats are telling the truth. They don't mean to be, but they are. What was Jim Crow 1.0? Jim Crow 1.0 was laws that were written almost exclusively by elected Democrats. If you look at the authors of Jim Crow, they were Democrats, as were the founders of the Ku Klux Klan. The purpose of Jim Crow laws was to do one thing: stop the voters from voting Democrats out of office because, if you look at the African Americans who were freed from slavery, they were electing Republicans. In many instances, they were electing Black Republicans. And the Democrats didn't want that. How dare the voters select someone not from their party. So Jim Crow was written to strip the right to vote from the voters who dared to vote against Democrats.

Well, fast-forward to today. The ''Corrupt Politicians Act'' is Jim Crow 2.0. It is once again written by Democrats to strip the right to vote from the American people to prevent them from voting Democrats out of office.

Listen, a lot of Democrats are really nervous right now. Pretty much everyone in Washington recognizes that in November, we are going to see a wave election. Pretty much everyone in Washington understands that in November, Republicans are going to retake the House of Representatives, probably by a big margin, and there is a very good possibility we will retake the Senate as well.

Democrats can't defend their policies. They can't defend the rampant inflation that is hammering seniors and working-class people across the country. They can't defend the chaos at the open borders. They can't defend the jobs being destroyed. They can't defend the lawless and abusive vaccine mandates. And they certainly can't defend their catastrophic surrender and failure in Afghanistan.

It has gotten so bad that when Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS went down to the State of Georgia, Stacey Abrams, the Democratic candidate running for Governor in Georgia—and, I would note, Stacey Abrams still maintains to this day she won the last election. She insists the last election was stolen and she is the sitting Governor. Apparently this is a reelect campaign. Stacey Abrams refused to show up, to be seen with Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS. Even while Biden was giving this racially demagogic speech, which Stacey Abrams has made a career of doing, Ms. Abrams did not show up for the speech. She said she had a scheduling conflict.

The Presiding Officer and I have both served some time in the Senate. We have both seen instances where the President of the United States was visiting our home States. I can tell you, as a Senator, you make time to be there if you want to be there. It is clear that Ms. Abrams did not want to be there, that she looked at Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS and sees their poll numbers plummeting, she sees their policies failing, and she wanted to be nowhere near that.

So what is the Democrats' approach? If they can't win on the merits, if they

can't defend their policy failures, if they can't convince the voters, then let's go back to the Jim Crow policies the Democrats authored to begin with. This is Jim Crow 2.0: Strip away the power of the voters to make a choice, put an unelected bureaucrat in charge of election laws, and throw out the decisions of 29 million Texans.

I will tell the Presiding Officer this: Democrats don't get to claim they are defending democracy when they are literally taking away the rights of democratically elected legislatures. That is many things, but it ain't democracy. One unelected bureaucrat overruling 29 million Texans is not democracy; it is a power grab.

But I told you this was a power grab on top of a power grab with a twist. The second power grab is, how are they going to try to pass the ''Corrupt Politicians Act''? They are going to do it by nuking the filibuster.

The rules of the Senate written in that book that sits on the dais in front of you say that to proceed to legislation takes 60 votes in this Senate. It takes 60 percent of the Senators. Those are the Senate rules. They are black and white. They are clear. If you don't like the Senate rules, there is a way to change that. You can amend the Senate rules. It takes 67 votes to amend the Senate rules.

A number of us have proposed amending the Senate rules. I myself have repeatedly gone to Democrats saying I would be happy to work with Democrats on proposals to amend the Senate rules to allow Senators on both sides to offer more amendments. Democrats haven't been willing to do so. Instead, what Democrats intend to do—what they want to do, what President Biden is urging them to do—is to break the Senate rules, to change the Senate rules. It is called nuking the filibuster.

If their plan is successful, Senator SCHUMER will stand up and seek a ruling from the Chair as to whether it takes 60 votes or 50 votes to proceed to legislation.

The Chair will say—if the Chair is following the rules—it takes 60 votes. And then Senator SCHUMER will move to reconsider the ruling of the Chair and overrule the ruling of the Chair and say: Even though the words on the page say 60 votes, from now on it is 50. It is another brazen power grab.

There may be some folks at home who are a little cynical of the partisan time we find ourselves in, who are skeptical of claims, perhaps, made by both sides. But maybe you are a Democrat at home. And I am a Republican. I am a conservative Republican. You might be saying: Do you know what? If it is CRUZ saying it, I am a Democrat; I don't believe him.

I understand this. This is a very partisan time. There are a lot of disagreements. So if you are a Democrat at home and you are inclined not to believe what I say, I am going to suggest, perhaps, some people you can believe.

I told you it was a double power grab with a twist. I want to point to you the words of President Joe Biden. If you are not inclined to believe a Republican, maybe you will believe Joe Biden. Here is what Joe Biden said in 2019. This is not 1964. This is not 1954—2019, a couple of years ago. ''Ending the filibuster is a very dangerous move.''

If you are at home and don't believe Republicans, do you believe Joe Biden? Was he lying when he said ''Ending the filibuster is a very dangerous move'' or was he telling the truth? Because that is what Joe Biden said just a couple of years ago.

Now, maybe you say: Well, he was on a campaign. People say things. You can't hold him to fault for saying that. That is not fair.

OK, all right, so now you don't believe me, and you don't believe Joe Biden. But let's see if we can find someone else. How about someone who serves in this Chamber right now? How about someone who is the Senate majority leader right now? How about Senator CHUCK SCHUMER?

If you haven't actually watched this speech, I would encourage you to go pull out your phone and Google it. You can find it really easily. Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, in 2005, gave a speech. I am going read to you verbatim what he said. He said: ''They want, because they can't get their way . . . to change the rules midstream.''

What would be the effect of that? You change the rules midstream. You nuke the filibuster. What would be the effect of that? According to CHUCK SCHUMER, the effect of that is ''to wash away 200 years of history.'' That is what SCHUMER says is the effect. ''Washing away 200 years of history''—that sound serious.

Anything else?

''They want to make this country into a banana republic, where if you don't get your way, you change the rules''—''wash away 200 years of history . . . make this country into a banana republic.''

That is pretty serious stuff. That ought to concern us. But at least that is the worst it gets, right? Well, actually, no. SCHUMER continued: ''It'll be doomsday for democracy if we do.''

There are reporters teeming the U.S. Capitol. Any reporter who wants to be something other than a partisan shill and mouthpiece for the Democrats ought to ask every single Democrat: Senator so-and-so, do you agree with CHUCK SCHUMER that ending the filibuster will turn our Nation into a banana republic? Do you agree, Senator so-and-so, that ending the filibuster would be doomsday for democracy?

And, by the way, if there are any reporters left who actually have journalistic ethics, you shouldn't just ask JOE MANCHIN and KYRSTEN SINEMA. Right now, they are the lone Democrats with the gumption to stand up for democracy. But you ought to ask all 50 of them, every single one of the Democrats: Do you agree with CHUCK SCHUMER that ending the filibuster is doomsday for democracy? And if not, why? Is it just that your team is the one that can't get their way? Now it is your side that wants to change the rules midstream. Now it is your side that, if you don't get your way, you change the rules.

Was Joe Biden lying in 2019? Was Senator SCHUMER lying in 2005? I don't know. You ought to ask them. A double power grab with a twist: Jim Crow 2.0, seizing Federal elections, striking down the laws adopted by democratic legislatures, putting an unelected radical leftist bureaucrat in charge of elections with more power—this one leftist bureaucrat—than all 29 million people in the State of Texas, doing so by breaking the Senate rules to change the rules. And the twist is with a dose of hypocrisy—unusual even for this place.

Look, if a Senator serves long enough, there will be times when they may vote a little bit this way or a little bit that way. There are lots of Senators that have had tensions with prior positions. I cannot think of another time when a Senator has voted for something that he has called ''doomsday for democracy.'' That is not just a little hypocritical. And, by the way, all the Democrats agreed with him. They were all standing shoulder to shoulder.

In 2005, when Senator SCHUMER said this, he was either lying or telling the truth. If he was lying, I guess you should ask him why he was lying. If he was telling the truth, I guess you should ask 48 Democrats who don't care why they are willing to vote for doomsday for democracy.

If you want to understand the dangers of this double power grab with a twist, look no further than the vicious, partisan, divisive, hateful speech President Biden gave, insulting half this country; oddly enough, blaming Republicans for the sins of his own party—the Democratic Party—who wrote Jim Crow and founded the KKK.

All of us were sitting outside the Capitol when President Biden gave his inauguration speech, when he talked about unity, when he talked about healing. Do you want to see the vicious partisanship that ending the filibuster will produce? You saw it. A double power grab, with a twist of hypocrisy.

If there is a Democrat in this Chamber who gives a damn about democracy, let me urge you: Don't vote for what your own leader has called ''doomsday for democracy.''

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the Senate is, indeed, a peculiar institution. Despite what some might expect, and despite how it might be portrayed from the outside, Senators genuinely strive to be collegial, even when—especially when—they hold strong political and policy disagreements. In fact, the Senate rules have strict prohibitions on insulting the character of another Member or a State. That is because debate is a fundamental part of the Senate. I

mean, it is part of our culture in this institution. That is how this institution earned the moniker as the world's greatest deliberative body.

Some in this body, unfortunately, want to change all that. They seek to trample over more than two centuries of precedent, procedure, and politeness. They are attempting to break the rules that require a two-thirds supermajority—67 votes—to change the rules. They want to ignore that requirement and stiff-arm this historic institution in a way that would obliterate the requirement that those in the majority hear the voices of and work with those in the minority.

That requirement—sometimes colloquially referred to as the filibuster—is one of the most powerful constraints or checks on human nature, not only in the Senate but in the entirety of the U.S. Government. If the filibuster were removed, everything from regulatory structures to tax rates, the size of the Supreme Court, the makeup of the military, the criminal code, and much, much more could change drastically every few years. Keeping track of the law and its fluctuating requirements would be impossible for the most capable of lawyers, let alone the average American subject to all those laws. Our business landscape would be obliterated under the ever-changing commands of the Federal Government. Americans would be worse off in almost every sense I can think of. In countless ways, the American people would be harmed by this unfortunate decision.

Our system is designed specifically to control those whims and those passions, to make sure that their impact on the law doesn't cause the law to become this ever-changing, ever-fluctuating creature that can't be anticipated.

Our Constitution was designed to protect the rights, the voices, and the influence of those not in the majority. Laws that significantly impact the lives of hundreds of millions of people should, in fact, be difficult to pass.

In fact, the Senate has applied these principles into almost every mechanism of the institution. Most laws pass by unanimous consent or by simple voice vote after hearty consideration and frequent amendments through a process known as the hotline. That would essentially cease to function if the minority had no significant influence. Opportunities for amending these often smaller and somewhat less controversial bills would be foreclosed, crippling the careful consideration needed. Bills would have to be forced through often on party-line votes over the objection, suspicion, or protest of the minority.

But beyond building consensus and maintaining the function of the Senate, the filibuster serves as the keel on a very large ship. It prevents the waves and passions of each new election from drastically changing the laws of the country. It is a stabilizer of sorts, one that prevents our Nation's course from being jerked around to oscillating extremes.

I was asked recently if the Senate is broken. I responded by saying that the only sense in which I think the Senate is significantly broken, or at least undermined in the way that it is supposed to operate, is in its neglect of substantive debate and opportunities for amendments for each individual Member. The filibuster protects the remaining debate, amendment, and consideration available to Members of this body, whether those Members are of the majority party or of the minority party.

So removing the filibuster, on the other hand, would irreparably render the Senate beyond recognition. The partisan vitriol and disregard for opposing Senators would eat away at this place, at our norms, our customs, and, ultimately, our Republic.

Now, at least until recently, many Senate Democrats—most, in fact—held these beliefs as well. In 2017, 27 of them, including now-Vice President HARRIS, signed a letter urging the preservation of the filibuster. Many of those Members still serve today, and I encourage them to consider their past advice.

By the way, that was a letter I signed, along with nearly every Member of the Senate from the Republican Party. We signed on to that notwithstanding the fact that Republicans held majorities in the Senate and in the House and a Republican President was serving in the White House. We did so because even though some short-term gain could have been achieved by nuking the filibuster then, we all understood what I think we still all understand today, which is that it would inflict irreparable harm on the Senate, and even more than the Senate, on those represented here. It would irreparably harm the American people to do away with it.

Senator SCHUMER, the leader of this destructive current effort, has himself in the past given grave, dire warnings about what this tactic—making the filibuster a thing of the past—would mean. We heard many quotes today, and in one that sticks out in my mind in particular, he said that attempts like that to nuke the filibuster are ''what we call abuse of power.'' He also said in that same quote that even if you have 51 percent of the vote, you still don't get your way 100 percent of the time. He is absolutely right. That describes the Senate, it describes its rules, and it describes so much about how our system of government works. It even describes the system of checks and balances built into our Constitution.

The vertical protection of federalism says many of our laws—in fact, most of them—are supposed to be made at the State and local level and not within Washington, and the horizontal protection—that of federalism—says that we are going to have one branch that makes the laws, one that enforces them, and one that interprets them.

In that same document, it gives both Chambers of Congress the authority to set our own rules. Even though the 60-vote cloture standard is not itself mandated by the Constitution, the authority to add it, to adopt it, as the Senate has, is in the Constitution, and its ends, more importantly, are entirely consistent with this principle of checks and balances, with this notion that Senator SCHUMER eloquently referred to. The mere fact that you have 51 percent of the vote doesn't entitle you to get your way 100 percent of the time. Now, this circumstance is particularly poignant given that he doesn't even have 51 percent of the votes in this Chamber, no. This is deadlocked 50 to 50.

He is also right that this is what we call an abuse of power. Indeed, breaking the rules to grab power is an abuse. This attempt is so transparent that even Senator SCHUMER has told the media that his Members are concerned about losing their elections and the majority if they can't use this tactic to federally take over our election system. It is sad, it is tragic, and it is unacceptable.

I warn them that the American people see through this ploy. They know what is happening, and they know why. They were promised a return to cordial statesmanship. They were promised unity. This attempt mocks both of these promises. It mocks the U.S. Senate. It mocks our system of checks and balances. Most tragically, it mocks the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, first, I would like to wish a very happy and healthy new year to you and to all of our staff and pages who make the Senate run so efficiently every single day and frequently late into the night. The world's most deliberative body has unpredictable hours, which all too often means missing important events with family because we are here going back and forth on the pressing issues of the day.

This is why we have a Senate, after all—to give voice to the various viewpoints of Americans from each State and then try to resolve those differences. It isn't always easy since, unlike the House of Representatives, the Senate's unique rules require us to work together across party lines.

I know what it is like to work with my Democratic friends. In fact, I was named as one of the most bipartisan Senators of either party in the past 25 years. That is what it takes to get things done here because the rules force us to reach consensus.

The Senate was created specifically to prevent a mob rule mentality. James Madison, the father of the Constitution, described the Senate as the ''anchor'' of the Federal Government that would act as a ''necessary fence against fickleness and passion.'' George

Washington famously said that the Senate was established to cool legislation passed by the House in the same way that a saucer cools hot tea.

Folks, we certainly have seen a lot of hot mess coming over from the House. It is very concerning that the saucer intended to cool heated passions is itself beginning to boil over as a result of hot air from within.

Senate Democrats are threatening to blow up the Senate to fundamentally change the U.S. Senate and to radically transform our country. It cannot be understated how detrimental this action would be to America. It would unravel two centuries of American representative democracy. It would silence millions of Americans and destroy what comity remains within this body.

I have to ask my colleagues, which side of history do you want to be on? Do you want to go down in history books as the ones who turned the Senate, the world's most deliberative body, into the House of Representatives?

The law of our land would dramatically sway back and forth, and the resulting political uncertainty would all but erase what little trust the people have in our governing institutions and lead to even greater political divisions. I don't think this is a future any of us want and certainly not the one that was promised by President Biden when he pledged—when he pledged—to the American people not to divide but to unify our country.

When the threat of blowing up the Senate arose during Mr. Biden's time in this institution, he spoke passionately against it. I don't often quote Joe Biden, but I would urge you all to listen to his full speech on the matter.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

Then-Senator Biden warned:

> History will judge us harshly, in my view, if we eliminate over 200 years of precedent and procedure in this body and, I might add, doing it by breaking a second rule of the Senate, and that is changing the rules of the Senate by a mere majority vote.

Senator Biden concluded:

> This nuclear option is ultimately an example of the arrogance of power. It is a fundamental power grab by the majority party.

Flash-forward 17 years later. Joe Biden is still in Washington, and he and his Democratic counterparts are the ones who are exercising that arrogance of power.

Now as the President, Biden just yesterday declared:

> We have no option but to change the Senate rules, including getting rid of the filibuster.

So how and why are we at a point where nuking the Senate could even be a possibility? Plain and simple: The Democratic leader, who has participated in hundreds of filibusters over the past 5 years—hundreds, folks; hundreds—wants to have his way regardless of the longstanding rules of this institution, the viewpoints of other Senators, or even, folks—get this—the wishes of the citizens of his own State.

Just last week, the Democratic leader said the filibuster was being used to ''embarrass the will of majority,'' and therefore ''the Senate will debate and consider changes to the Senate rules on or before January 17.''

Folks, it is not the Senate rules embarrassing the majority but, rather, their two-sided flip-flopping on the importance of the filibuster to this institution and to our democracy.

Not so long ago, the Democratic leader said that eliminating the filibuster would turn ''the cooling saucer of democracy into the rubber stamp of dictatorship.'' It will be ''a doomsday for democracy.'' Today, he is the one with the finger on the nuclear button, all because he can't get his way.

This is the kind of power grab you would expect from tyrants in socialist nations, who seem to be where the Democrats are taking many of their cues from these days. Tyranny is no way to run a democracy, and destroying the U.S. Senate for a power grab is certainly not the example we should be setting for the rest of the world.

But the hypocrisy doesn't end there, folks. Democrats are manufacturing hysteria that Republican-controlled States are placing what they consider ''unfair restrictions'' on voting as an excuse to blow up the Senate and thereby clear a pathway for the rest of their radical liberal agenda. The irony here is that New York, home of the Democratic leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, and Delaware, home of President Biden, have some of the most restrictive absentee voting laws in the entire country.

Just this past November, the Democratic leader's constituents—his constituents—overwhelmingly voted down a ballot initiative to allow absentee voting without providing an excuse and another proposal to permit unregistered voters from registering and then voting on election day. They were voted down—his constituents. So in New York, the only way to qualify for an absentee ballot is to be out of the country or sick or have a physical disability. No other reasons are permitted.

Now the senior Senator from New York is threatening to destroy the Senate to override the wishes of the residents of his very own State who voted against the policies he is trying to impose on every other State. Did you catch that, folks? He is overriding the will of the people in his own State. Does that sound like democracy to you? It is not Senate Republicans blocking the Democrat leader's agenda; it is his own constituents.

Folks, the reality is, this election takeover bill is just the beginning, used as an excuse by the majority leader to then break the Senate and strengthen his own grip on power.

This party boss mentality may work in New York, but, folks, the Senate is not Tammany Hall. While Senate Democrats would have you believe Republicans are somehow limiting the rights of Americans to vote, they, in fact, are the ones plotting to silence millions of Americans.

The same partisans on the other side of the aisle who ''boasted'' of—air quotes right here, folks, you see them—they ''boasted'' just about a year ago of resisting. Just a year ago, they were encouraging resisting; filibustering and blocking just about every proposal or nominee put forth by the prior President.

Now they call this tool a threat to democracy. Remember, less than 2 years ago, following the very tragic death of George Floyd, the Senator from New York voted to block consideration of a police reform bill put forward by my friend Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina.

That is just one of the many other examples of commonsense bills the Democrats blocked for purely partisan reasons.

The real threat to democracy isn't the filibuster but those politicians who abuse the power with which they have been entrusted. The Democratic leader has already put a choke hold on democracy right here in the Senate, abusing his position to singlehandedly block other Senators from offering amendments to bills he chooses to bring to the floor.

If the majority wants to demonstrate a commitment to democracy, why not start right here in the Senate? Instead of threatening to have less deliberation, why not commit to more? Let's bring up bills that have already had broad bipartisan support, and let's allow more votes on amendments.

But rather than starting this new year with a resolution to take this approach and make the Senate a true example of democracy in action, where every voice is heard and respected, the Democratic leader penned each of us a bombastic letter written with the left's usual dramatic flair and theatrics, comparing the filibuster to a dead hand and promising to permanently alter the Senate unless we bend to his wishes.

The senior Senator from New York should leave the theater for Broadway, where it belongs. And before casting a vote that could fundamentally change the Senate forever, I would urge my Democratic colleagues to take some advice about the intended behavior of the Senate from our Nation's greatest statesman, George Washington, and cool it.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

VOL. 151, NO. 69—MAY 23, 2005

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, my friends and colleagues, I have not been here as long as Senator Byrd, and no one fully understands the Senate as well as Senator Byrd, but I have been here for over three decades. This is the single most significant vote any one of

us will cast in my 32 years in the Senate. I suspect the Senator would agree with that.

We should make no mistake. This nuclear option is ultimately an example of the arrogance of power. It is a fundamental power grab by the majority party, propelled by its extreme right and designed to change the reading of the Constitution, particularly as it relates to individual rights and property rights. It is nothing more or nothing less. Let me take a few moments to explain that.

Folks who want to see this change want to eliminate one of the procedural mechanisms designed for the express purpose of guaranteeing individual rights, and they also have a consequence, and would undermine the protections of a minority point of view in the heat of majority excess. We have been through these periods before in American history but never, to the best of my knowledge, has any party been so bold as to fundamentally attempt to change the structure of this body.

Why else would the majority party attempt one of the most fundamental changes in the 216-year history of this Senate on the grounds that they are being denied ten of 218 Federal judges, three of whom have stepped down? What shortsightedness, and what a price history will exact on those who support this radical move.

It is important we state frankly, if for no other reason than the historical record, why this is being done. The extreme right of the Republican Party is attempting to hijack the Federal courts by emasculating the courts' independence and changing one of the unique foundations of the Senate; that is, the requirement for the protection of the right of individual Senators to guarantee the independence of the Federal Judiciary.

This is being done in the name of fairness? Quite frankly, it is the ultimate act of unfairness to alter the unique responsibility of the Senate and to do so by breaking the very rules of the Senate.

Mark my words, what is at stake here is not the politics of 2005, but the Federal Judiciary in the country in the year 2025. This is the single most significant vote, as I said earlier, that I will have cast in my 32 years in the Senate. The extreme Republican right has made Federal appellate Judge Douglas Ginsburg's ''Constitution in Exile'' framework their top priority.

It is their purpose to reshape the Federal courts so as to guarantee a reading of the Constitution consistent with Judge Ginsburg's radical views of the fifth amendment's taking clause, the nondelegation doctrine, the 11th amendment, and the 10th amendment. I suspect some listening to me and some of the press will think I am exaggerating. I respectfully suggest they read Judge Ginsburg's ideas about the ''Constitution in Exile.'' Read it and understand what is at work here.

If anyone doubts what I am saying, I suggest you ask yourself the rhetorical question, Why, for the first time since 1789, is the Republican-controlled Senate attempting to change the rule of unlimited debate, eliminate it, as it relates to Federal judges for the circuit court or the Supreme Court?

If you doubt what I said, please read what Judge Ginsburg has written and listen to what Michael Greve of the American Enterprise Institute has said:

I think what is really needed here is a fundamental intellectual assault on the entire New Deal edifice. We want to withdraw judicial support for the entire modern welfare state.

Read: Social Security, workmen's comp. Read: National Labor Relations Board. Read: FDA. Read: What all the byproduct of that shift in constitutional philosophy that took place in the 1930s meant.

We are going to hear more about what I characterize as radical view—maybe it is unfair to say radical—a fundamental view and what, at the least, must be characterized as a stark departure from current constitutional jurisprudence. Click on to American Enterprise Institute Web site www.aei.org. Read what they say. Read what the purpose is. It is not about seeking a conservative court or placing conservative Justices on the bench. The courts are already conservative.

Seven of the nine Supreme Court Justices appointed by Republican Presidents Nixon, Ford, Reagan, and Bush 1—seven of nine. Ten of 13 Federal circuit courts of appeal dominated by Republican appointees, appointed by Presidents Nixon, Ford, Reagan, Bush 1, and Bush 2; 58 percent of the circuit court judges appointed by Presidents Nixon, Ford, Reagan, Bush 1, or Bush 2. No, my friends and colleagues, this is not about building a conservative court. We already have a conservative court. This is about guaranteeing a Supreme Court made up of men and women such as those who sat on the Court in 1910 and 1920. Those who believe, as Justice Janice Rogers Brown of California does, that the Constitution has been in exile since the New Deal.

My friends and colleagues, the nuclear option is not an isolated instance. It is part of a broader plan to pack the court with fundamentalist judges and to cower existing conservative judges to toe the extreme party line.

You all heard what Tom DeLay said after the Federal courts refused to bend to the whip of the radical right in the Schiavo case. Mr. DeLay declared: ''The time will come for men responsible for this to answer for their behavior.''

Even current conservative Supreme Court Justices are looking over their shoulder, with one extremist recalling the despicable slogan of Joseph Stalin—and I am not making this up—in reference to a Reagan Republican appointee, Justice Kennedy, when he said: ''No man, no problem''—absent his presence, we have no problem.

Let me remind you, as I said, Justice Kennedy was appointed by President Reagan.

Have they never heard of the independence of the judiciary—as fundamental a part of our constitutional system of checks and balances as there is today; which is literally the envy of the entire world, and the fear of the extremist part of the world? An independent judiciary is their greatest fear.

Why are radicals focusing on the court? Well, first of all, it is their time to be in absolute political control. It is like, why did Willy Sutton rob banks? He said: Because that is where the money is. Why try it now—for the first time in history—to eliminate extended debate? Well, because they control every lever of the Federal Government. That is the very reason why we have the filibuster rule. So when one party, when one interest controls all levers of Government, one man or one woman can stand on the floor of the Senate and resist, if need be, the passions of the moment.

But there is a second reason why they are focusing on the courts. That is because they have been unable to get their agenda passed through the legislative bodies. Think about it. With all the talk about how they represent the majority of the American people, none of their agenda has passed as it relates to the fifth amendment, as it relates to zoning laws, as it relates to the ability of Federal agencies, such as the Food and Drug Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, to do their jobs.

Read what they write when they write about the nondelegation doctrine. That simply means, we in the Congress, as they read the Constitution, cannot delegate to the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to set limits on how much of a percentage of carcinogens can be admitted into the air or admitted into the water. They insist that we, the Senate, have to vote on every one of those rules, that we, the Senate and the House, with the ability of the President to veto, would have to vote on any and all drugs that are approved or not approved.

If you think I am exaggerating, look at these Web sites. These are not a bunch of wackos. These are a bunch of very bright, very smart, very well-educated intellectuals who see these Federal restraints as a restraint upon competition, a restraint upon growth, a restraint upon the powerful.

The American people see what is going on. They are too smart, and they are too practical. They might not know the meaning of the nondelegation doctrine, they might not know the clause of the fifth amendment relating to property, they may not know the meaning of the tenth and eleventh amendments as interpreted by Judge Ginsburg and others, but they know that the strength of our country lies in common sense and our common pragmatism, which is antithetical to the poisons of the extremes on either side.

The American people will soon learn that Justice Janice Rogers Brown—one of the nominees who we are not allowing to be confirmed, one of the ostensible reasons for this nuclear option being employed—has decried the Supreme Court's ''socialist revolution of 1937.'' Read Social Security. Read what they write and listen to what they say. The very year that a 5-to-4 Court upheld the constitutionality of Social Security against a strong challenge—1937—Social Security almost failed by one vote.

It was challenged in the Supreme Court as being confiscatory. People argued then that a Government has no right to demand that everyone pay into the system, no right to demand that every employer pay into the system. Some of you may agree with that. It is a legitimate argument, but one rejected by the Supreme Court in 1937, that Justice Brown refers to as the ''socialist revolution of 1937.''

If it had not been for some of the things they had already done, nobody would believe what I am saying here. These guys mean what they say. The American people are going to soon learn that one of the leaders of the constitutional exile school, the group that wants to reinstate the Constitution as it existed in 1920, said of another filibustered judge, William Pryor that ''Pryor is the key to this puzzle. There's nobody like him. I think he's sensational. He gets almost all of it.''

That is the reason why I oppose him. He gets all of it. And you are about to get all of it if they prevail. We will not have to debate about Social Security on this floor.

So the radical right makes its power play now when they control all political centers of power, however temporary. The radical push through the nuclear option and then pack the courts with unimpeded judges who, by current estimations, will serve an average of 25 years. The right is focused on packing the courts because their agenda is so radical that they are unwilling to come directly to you, the American people, and tell you what they intend.

Without the filibuster, President Bush will send over more and more judges of this nature, with perhaps three or four Supreme Court nominations. And there will be nothing—nothing—that any moderate Republican friends and I will be able to do about it.

Judges who will influence the rights of average Americans: The ability to sue your HMO that denies you your rights; the ability to keep strip clubs out of your neighborhood—because they make zoning laws unconstitutional—without you paying to keep the

person from building; the ability to protect the land your kids play on, the water they drink, the air they breathe, and the privacy of your family in your own home.

Remember, many of my colleagues say there is no such thing as a right to privacy in any iteration under the Constitution of the United States of America. Fortunately, we have had a majority of judges who disagreed with that over the past 70 years. But hang on, folks. The fight over judges, at bottom, is not about abortion and not about God, it is about giving greater power to the already powerful. The fight is about maintaining our civil rights protections, about workplace safety and worker protections, about effective oversight of financial markets, and protecting against insider trading. It is about Social Security. What is really at stake in this debate is, point blank, the shape of our constitutional system for the next generation.

The nuclear option is a twofer. It excises, friends, our courts and, at the same time, emasculates the Senate. Put simply, the nuclear option would transform the Senate from the so-called cooling saucer our Founding Fathers talked about to cool the passions of the day to a pure majoritarian body like a Parliament. We have heard a lot in recent weeks about the rights of the majority and obstructionism. But the Senate is not meant to be a place of pure majoritarianism.

Is majority rule what you really want? Do my Republican colleagues really want majority rule in this Senate? Let me remind you, 44 of us Democrats represent 161 million people. One hundred sixty-one million Americans voted for these 44 Democrats. Do you know how many Americans voted for the 55 of you? One hundred thirty-one million. If this were about pure majorities, my party represents more people in America than the Republican Party does. But that is not what it is about. Wyoming, the home State of the Vice President, the President of this body, gets one Senator for every 246,000 citizens; California, gets one Senator for 17 million Americans. More Americans voted for Vice President Gore than they did Governor Bush. By majoritarian logic, Vice President Gore won the election.

Republicans control the Senate, and they have decided they are going to change the rule. At its core, the filibuster is not about stopping a nominee or a bill, it is about compromise and moderation. That is why the Founders put unlimited debate in. When you have to—and I have never conducted a filibuster—but if I did, the purpose would be that you have to deal with me as one Senator. It does not mean I get my way. It means you may have to compromise. You may have to see my side of the argument. That is what it is about, engendering compromise and moderation.

Ladies and gentlemen, the nuclear option extinguishes the power of Independents and moderates in this Senate. That is it. They are done. Moderates are important only if you need to get 60 votes to satisfy cloture. They are much less important if you need only 50 votes. I understand the frustration of our Republican colleagues. I have been here 32 years, most of the time in the majority. Whenever you are in the majority, it is frustrating to see the other side block a bill or a nominee you support. I have walked in your shoes, and I get it.

I get it so much that what brought me to the Senate was the fight for civil rights. My State, to its great shame, was segregated by law, was a slave State. I came here to fight it. But even I understood, with all the passion I felt as a 29-year-old kid running for the Senate, the purpose—the purpose—of extended debate. Getting rid of the filibuster has long-term consequences. If there is one thing I have learned in my years here, once you change the rules and surrender the Senate's institutional power, you never get it back. And we are about to break the rules to change the rules.

I do not want to hear about ''fair play'' from my friends. Under our rules, you are required to get ⅔ of the votes to change the rules. Watch what happens when the majority leader stands up and says to the Vice President—if we go forward with this—he calls the question. One of us, I expect our leader, on the Democratic side will stand up and say: Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is this parliamentarily appropriate? In every other case since I have been here, for 32 years, the Presiding Officer leans down to the Parliamentarian and says: What is the rule, Mr. Parliamentarian? The Parliamentarian turns and tells them.

Hold your breath, Parliamentarian. He is not going to look to you because he knows what you would say. He would say: This is not parliamentarily appropriate. You cannot change the Senate rules by a pure majority vote.

So if any of you think I am exaggerating, watch on television, watch when this happens, and watch the Vice President ignore—he is not required to look to an unelected officer, but that has been the practice for 218 years. He will not look down and say: What is the ruling? He will make the ruling, which is a lie, a lie about the rule.

Isn't what is really going on here that the majority does not want to hear what others have to say, even if it is the truth? Senator Moynihan, my good friend who I served with for years, said: You are entitled to your own opinion but not your own facts.

The nuclear option abandons America's sense of fair play. It is the one thing this country stands for: Not tilting the playing field on the side of those who control and own the field.

I say to my friends on the Republican side: You may own the field right now, but you won't own it forever. I pray God when the Democrats take back control, we don't make the kind of naked power grab you are doing. But I am afraid you will teach my new colleagues the wrong lessons.

We are the only Senate in the Senate as temporary custodians of the Senate. The Senate will go on. Mark my words, history will judge this Republican majority harshly, if it makes this catastrophic move.

Ms. ERNST. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 15 minutes and Senators PADILLA and CANTWELL for up to 5 minutes each prior to the scheduled vote.

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

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there are several issues swirling around the Senate at this moment. They relate to the voting rights of Americans. They relate to the voting rights of Senators—interesting that they would both be on parallel tracks as we debate them on the floor. It appears that the voting rights of Americans is witnessing a historic shift. You see, my Democratic Party, and yours, in history has a spotty record when it comes to voting rights. In fact, Southern States—then in the thrall of the Democratic Party—wrote a terrible record after the Civil War.

We released African Americans from slavery, guaranteed them the right to vote, and then watched what happened. There was jubilation all over the country, I believe, for the most part, and there was jubilation in the southern States by African Americans who had newfound freedoms they never dreamed of with the end of slavery. And they took them to heart. They did register to vote.

And there were dramatic differences in many States because in many States the slave population, the African-American population, was much larger than any voting had ever reflected, and now they had the chance. And as they were elected to local offices and even congressional seats and even a senatorial seat, there was a backlash from the White population.

This period of Reconstruction after the Civil War lapsed into a period of denial of the right to vote and elaborate plans by Whites—White Democrats, I might add—in southern States to manufacture obstacles to the voting of African Americans—poll taxes, for example, literacy tests, things that had little or nothing to do with citizenship but were designed expressly to jeopardize the voting opportunities for those without advanced educations or the kind of clout necessary to overcome.

And so the net result was the South went White again in terms of its political leadership. It was known as Jim Crow. And the Democratic Party of that day was behind it. The opposition came from Abraham Lincoln's party, the Republican Party. They were the ones for abolition of slavery. They were the ones who supported Reconstruction. They were the ones, by and large, who sent the Federal troops in to enforce equality in the South. But, ultimately, sadly, as a result of a brokered Presidential election, there was a concession made that gave to the Democrat Party-controlled South States' rights to determine voting standards. And that was the situation that applied in the United States from that period of time in the mid-19th century, until the 1960s, when this issue was debated anew, right here in Washington, right here in this Chamber.

And those who opposed striking down the Jim Crow laws, those who opposed efforts to deny to African Americans the right to vote, asserted one abiding principle: States rights. The States should be allowed to make this decision. It didn't go very far. It took a lot of years of debate, I might add, I don't want to oversimplify it.

But anyone who took the time to read this book, the Constitution of the United States, understands it is explicit. It doesn't take long to read the sections that are applying.

Listen to this and think in your mind whether there is any question who has the authority to determine the rules of Federal elections. And I read: ''Article I, section 4—The Times, Places, and

Manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.''

The 15th Amendment went further on the issue of race, and the net result of it was the passage of some laws in the 1960s, the Voting Rights Act, and the establishment of standards to open up opportunities to vote in the South for people of color.

It took that long from the late 19th century to the 1960s before that issue was addressed effectively. But for the longest time, it became a consensus issue. Republicans were as supportive of this as Democrats. In fact, proportionally, they were more supportive. The Republican Party—the party of Abraham Lincoln—rejected the theory of States rights and said there will be Federal standards that are created and will be enforced on a bipartisan basis by Presidents of both parties.

It was an amazing evolution in America, considering what we had been through, a civil war and all that followed, to have reached the point where we said that the Federal Government could review decisions made by States if they, in any way, discriminate on a racial basis or any other basis in terms of ethnic identity.

That was so popular and so bipartisan that for years the renewal of that law was automatic. There was hardly a dissenting vote. Boy, have times changed. They have changed to the point where the Democratic Party is now supportive of the Voting Rights Act and what it sought to achieve. And the party of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Party, comes to the floor every day and argues States rights.

Yes, we are back into that mode again, but the argument is coming from the Republican side of the aisle. The tables have turned. The Democratic Party of the South is a different party today, thank goodness, and a party that stands for the principle that people are entitled to the right to vote.

So we staged a national election in 2020. In light of the pandemic that was looming over this Nation, we opened up opportunities to vote, and two things happened. We had the most dramatic turnout of voters in the United States of America for the office of President. We had never seen that kind of turnout of voters.

And No. 2, when the Agencies of government took a close look at the votes that were cast, they found no evidence—virtually none—of voter fraud or manipulation of the outcome of the election.

It was obvious to all who were honest about it, including some Republicans who have said as much in the last few days. But one man dissented. That man, of course, was the former President of the United States, Donald Trump, the loser—the official loser—in the 2020 election.

He is still in total denial. His momentous ego cannot countenance the possibility of rejection by the American voters, and so he claims the Big Lie that somehow or another this vote was stolen from the poor little former President. Though he can't come up with any evidence to prove any aspect of that and has failed miserably virtually every time he has gone to Federal court to argue it, he still continues to make that argument.

It was that argument that was the inspiration behind the insurrectionist mob that was here in the Capitol Building a little over a year ago trying to stop the electoral college vote count. They failed, as they should have. The Constitution prevailed. The will of the American people prevailed. And so in legislatures across the country, including the State of Wisconsin, we see Republican legislatures saying that we are unhappy with the results in the 2020 election; we want to change the rules when it comes to voting in our State.

And almost without exception, every change in these Republican legislatures results in a limited time to vote, a limited ability to vote, new obstacles to vote, and on and on and on.

I have yet to see any of these Republican-led leislatures demonstrate an effort to the contrary, to expand the right to vote.

And so based on article I, section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, we have written a bill, a bill that establishes basic standards of voting across America as this document envisioned: standards for voter registration, standards for absentee ballots, standards for same-day registration, standards for making election day a national holiday. Every one of these things that we have proposed in our pending legislation is an expansion of opportunities to vote for eligible voters.

It gets down to the bottom line: When it comes to eligible voters, should we create obstacles of hardship or should we make it easy for them to vote without endangering their families, without losing their jobs, without hardship?

I think that is the basic mission of a democratic legislature, is it not: the greatest possible participation of the greatest number of voters? Then let them decide on issue after issue.

So that is the issue of voting rights in America that now comes to the floor of the U.S. Senate.

On the question of the voting rights of Senators, it is interesting to me, every morning, that those in the Chamber start the session by pledging allegiance to the flag. It is apparent, from some of the arguments on the Republican side, that they want to start this meeting of the Senate each day additionally with a pledge of allegiance to the filibuster.

Now, that is strange, because if you have any history in the U.S. Senate, you know what the filibuster has become. It is not an occasional problem and challenge. It is now the standard.

The filibuster, you see, requires 60 votes for passage of a measure in a body of 100 people. It is an extraordinary majority. It gives power to the minority, which the Senate, of course, was designed to do by giving two seats—two Senate seats—to every State, large and small, but it goes a step further.

Despite what you may have heard on the floor earlier, the use of the filibuster—I should say the abuse of the filibuster—has led to the elimination, virtually, of debate and amendments on the floor.

I have often said that if you are suffering from insomnia and watch C–SPAN and turn on the U.S. Senate, you will see a perfect room and structure for a wedding reception because there is always plenty of room on the floor of the Senate. We should be leasing this out and using the money to reduce the national debt, the Senators use it so infrequently.

There was a time—can you believe this now?—10 years ago, there was a time when 12 appropriation bills would come out of the committees and come to the floor and be subject to amendments, and we would take turns offering amendments to all 12 appropriations bills. That was the ordinary course of business. It is no longer the case. It hasn't been that way for 10 years.

And when it comes to the debate and amendments on all the other items, the numbers tell the story.

I want to thank my friend JEFF MERKLEY, who has done amazing research on the Senate and its procedures.

In the 109th Congress, we considered 314 amendments. That declined to just 26 amendments under Republican leadership in the last Congress. Twenty-six amendments in a year? Compared to 314? Thank you, to the filibuster. That is where we are today. Thank you, to the 60-vote requirement. That is where we are today. And thanks to my colleagues on the Republican side who are trying to ignore those numbers. They are so graphic.

On nominations, there were only three cloture motions in the history of the United States before 1975—three. After 1975 to now, 852 times cloture has been filed on nominations—852 weeks of Senate time potentially obstructed.

That is the Senate today. That is the Senate under a filibuster. And if this Senate is going to join the House in establishing standards for equal voting rights across America, the filibuster is the obstacle.

I know this story personally. I introduced the DREAM Act 20 years ago—20 years ago. And you say: Senator, I thought you were a hotshot legislator. What are you waiting for? Pass it. I sure wish I could.

I brought it to the Senate floor five times in that 20-year period, the DREAM Act to help young people living in this country to have a chance, a pathway to citizenship. On five different occasions it has been stopped by

filibuster. Don't tell me the filibuster opens debate and opportunity. The filibuster has shut down debate on the DREAM Act five times in the last 20 years, and that is just one isolated example that is personal to me. That is what the filibuster is all about. It is stopping us from doing anything substantial on voting rights. It is stopping us from passing the DREAM Act. It is stopping us from passing meaningful immigration reform.

The filibuster is designed for people who want to say no—no to progress, no to government, no to the Senate being engaged in the issues that affect the American people and families.

I have seen colleagues come to the floor on the Republican side with quotes from me defending the filibuster. That was when I was a hopeful person in the Senate.

My hope has been dashed by reality—by the reality of a Senate that has been shut down when it comes to national debate and shut down when it comes to national achievement.

That, to me, has got to come to an end. I am prepared to sit down with any Republicans of good will—and Democrats included—and come up with some meaningful rules.

You know, incidentally, that we are sitting here with a calendar that is loaded with nominations? It is not the filibuster, but it is something quite near to it, where one or two Republican Senators have decided that they don't want to take the ordinary course for nominations. They want to drag them out interminably.

That is unfair to President Biden. It is unfair to the American people. If you want to defeat a nomination, do your best. But to stop the debate of the Senate on these nominations to impose your will and to slow down the business of the Senate, I think is an unacceptable standard.

And so for the voting rights of American to have a chance to be protected and for the voting rights of Senators to finally be engaged on the floor in that process, we have to be ready to make a change. I am ready. And as I said, I am ready to do it on a bipartisan basis. But for goodness' sake, this empty, silent Chamber is no indication of what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they created this legislature.

We are supposed to be engaged in debate, not afraid of debate. We shouldn't be running off and hiding behind 60 votes. I am open for change. I wish some Republicans would join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from California.

NOMINATION OF GABRIEL P. SANCHEZ

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in confirming Justice Gabriel Sanchez to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Justice Sanchez has long be held in high esteem in California's legal circles. He brings thoughtfulness and empathy to every decision that he makes.

He was born and raised in Los Angeles and was the proud son of a single mother from Mexico. She raised him while working tirelessly to make ends meet. With her unwavering support, Justice Sanchez went on to earn degrees from Yale College, from Cambridge University, and graduated from Yale Law School.

He began his legal career as a law clerk to Judge Richard Paez on the Ninth Circuit, the same court where he is now nominated to serve. Justice Sanchez then went into private practice, as many young lawyers do, but he committed himself to engaging in the community deeply by providing pro bono legal services, so much so that in the year 2010, he earned a social justice award from the ACLU of Southern California for his work representing farm workers in a lawsuit to enforce workplace safety protections to help prevent deadly heat illnesses.

Justice Sanchez went on to serve with distinction in California State government; first, as a deputy attorney general, and then as a deputy legal affairs secretary to then-Governor Brown. There, he proved himself to be a critical thinker, a creative problem-solver, and a dedicated public servant.

In recognition of his work and his service, his even-handed judgments, and his great legal talent, Governor Brown appointed Justice Sanchez to the California Court of Appeals in 2018.

Justice Sanchez has earned a reputation as an outstanding jurist committed to justice for all.

I am confident that he will bring the same dedication to the bench of the Ninth Circuit, and I am proud to support his confirmation today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON BOSE NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bose nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Bennet	Blunt
Barrasso	Blumenthal	Booker
Brown	Kaine	Rosen
Burr	Kelly	Rounds
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Lummis	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Sullivan
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Thune
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Duckworth	Moran	Toomey
Durbin	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Fischer	Murphy	Warner
Gillibrand	Murray	Warnock
Graham	Ossoff	Warren
Grassley	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wicker
Heinrich	Portman	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Reed	Young
Hirono	Romney	

NAYS—29

Blackburn	Hagerty	McConnell
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Braun	Hoeven	Risch
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Sasse
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	

NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Sanders	Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, I ask to execute the previous order with respect to the Sanchez nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gabriel P. Sanchez, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

VOTE ON SANCHEZ NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Duckworth	Klobuchar
Bennet	Durbin	Leahy
Blumenthal	Feinstein	Luján
Booker	Gillibrand	Manchin
Brown	Graham	Markey
Cantwell	Hassan	Menendez
Cardin	Heinrich	Merkley
Carper	Hickenlooper	Murkowski
Casey	Hirono	Murphy
Collins	Kaine	Murray
Coons	Kelly	Ossoff
Cortez Masto	King	Padilla

Peters	Sinema	Warnock
Reed	Smith	Warren
Rosen	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Sanders	Tester	Wyden
Schumer	Van Hollen	
Shaheen	Warner	

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Schatz

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from South Dakota.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the Democrats' campaign to break the Senate continues.

I want to read a quote:

> The ideologues in the Senate want to turn what the Founding Fathers called the cooling saucer of democracy into the rubber stamp of dictatorship.

Not my words—those are the words of the current Senate Democrat leader back in 2005 when filibuster changes were under discussion. The current Democrat leader was once, in fact, a defender of the filibuster and the role it plays in ensuring that the minority party in the Senate and the Americans it represents have a voice. In fact, the minority leader at various times has described trying to get rid of the filibuster as ''doomsday for democracy.'' He described those who were behind the effort to try to get rid of the filibuster as being in support of turning America into ''a banana republic.'' Those were statements made by the current Democrat leader when he was defending the filibuster in years past.

In fact, a lot of my colleagues across the aisle have defended the filibuster and used the filibuster repeatedly when they were in the minority. In the last Congress alone, Democrats filibustered COVID relief legislation until they got a bill that they could support. They filibustered police reform legislation. They filibustered Israel legislation. They filibustered pro-life legislation—and on and on.

While Republicans certainly didn't enjoy it when Democrats used the filibuster when we were in the majority, we recognized that it meant that our Senate was working the way that the Founders intended—as a place of compromise and deliberation, where the minority, as well as the majority, was represented. That is why we resisted repeated calls from the former President, our party's President, when we had the majority to abolish the filibuster.

Abolishing the filibuster certainly would have made it easier for us to advance important legislation—legislation that was of value to Members on our side, things that we wanted to see get done—but we knew that sacrificing the long-term good of the Senate and the country for short-term gain was not an acceptable course of action.

Let's be very clear that the gain would have been short term. If we had abolished the legislative filibuster, we could have passed a lot of important legislation, only to see it overturned as soon as Democrats took control of the legislative and executive branches. Once we returned to unified Republican government, we could, of course, have put our original legislation back in place. That is the kind ping-ponging that would be terrible for our country.

Sharp changes in Federal policy every few years would mean endless confusion for Americans. Plus, free of the moderating influence of the filibuster, legislation would almost unquestionably become more extreme, which would harden and intensify partisan division not just here in Congress but in the country as a whole. Ordinary citizens would look ever more distrustful at government, which would quickly come to be seen as government for Americans of one party only—the party of power.

Democrats should know all of the things that I am saying. After all, they were in the minority just 1 year ago. It is hard for me to understand how they could forget that. Do they think that because they have the majority now, that they will always have it? History would beg to differ.

I realize the Democrats have hopes that if they pass their election legislation, it will help them stay in power, but surely—surely—Democrats don't believe that they can maintain a permanent hold on government. There have been some pretty robust Senate majorities in American history, but sooner or later, power has always shifted, and the Presidency has shifted too.

Even if Democrats succeed in all of their election machinations, the day will come—and probably sooner rather than later—when their party will return to the minority, and I suspect that at that point, they would bitterly regret the loss of the legislative filibuster.

Democrats have already had cause to regret the loss of the filibuster for judicial nominations. More than one Democrat Senator has openly admitted regretting Democrats' move to abolish the filibuster for judges and other nominees.

The unravelling of the filibuster for judicial nominations should be a lesson to both parties on how well weakening the filibuster or creating a filibuster carve-out would work. Democrats carved out a filibuster exception for executive and judicial nominees, and Republicans took it to its logical conclusion.

A legislative filibuster carve-out would be the end of the legislative filibuster, period.

If Democrats' carve out an exception for election legislation, a future Senate would be likely to carve out an exception for something else and so on and so forth, until the filibuster was carved out of existence completely.

In fact, I strongly suspect that a filibuster carve-out solely for election legislation wouldn't even survive the coming year. I can imagine my Democrat colleagues quickly deciding that some other priority of theirs was also worthy of a special exemption. It is possible that the legislative filibuster would be gone before the end of this Congress.

Again, I urge my Democrat colleagues to remember their decision to remove the filibuster for judicial nominations and how quickly that came back to haunt them. They may like the idea of forcing through their legislation now, but sooner or later—and probably sooner—I can guarantee that they will regret it.

The filibuster and its protection for the rights of the minority are safe so long as neither party starts to chip away at it. Once one party starts weakening the filibuster, especially on a totally partisan basis, that will be the end of the filibuster and the end of real representation for the minority in Congress.

It is deeply disappointing that the Democrat leader and the President have abandoned their previous support for protecting representation for the minority. It is even more astonishing, really, that they have done so when they enjoy the narrowest majorities in Congress. It should be a reminder of how quickly Democrats could once again return to the minority and be in need of the legislative filibuster.

But I know that there are Democrats out there with serious doubts about their leadership's course of action. Some would express this doubt openly, but I suspect there are others who haven't spoken up who also have serious reservations. After all, a majority of the current Senate Democrat caucus signed a letter just 4 short years ago expressing their belief in the importance of the filibuster. I cannot believe that all of them would change their position merely because the political winds have shifted.

So I urge all of my Democrat colleagues to resist this blatant power grab by the Democrat leadership and preserve our longstanding commitment to representation for the minority in the U.S. Senate, the purpose for which this institution was created, and the Americans it represents.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

COMMENDING THE ACTIONS OF CUBAN HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACTIVIST JOSE DANIEL FERRER GARCIA, AND ALL PRO-DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVISTS, IN DEMANDING FUNDAMENTAL CIVIL LIBERTIES IN CUBA AND SPEAKING OUT AGAINST CUBA'S BRUTAL, TOTALITARIAN COMMUNIST REGIME

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, yesterday marked 6 months since July 11—a day when brave Cubans all across that island marched for democracy, cried out for freedom, and sent a clear message that the time was up for the illegitimate communist regime.

From Havana to Santa Clara to Santiago de Cuba, the message of ''Patria y Vida!'' could be heard from the people. Cuban families and demonstrators stood against the revolution's motto of ''Patria o Muerte'' to once again declare that the revolution had failed.

That failed revolution promised prosperity and equality for all, but the only equal thing about it was poverty, suffering, and oppression for all. We watched as families gathered outside the headquarters of the Cuban Communist Party to chant ''Cuba isn't yours!'' Their message was clear: It is time for a new day of freedom and democracy in Cuba.

Instead of listening to the cries of their people, the communist Cuban regime lashed out with violence and the oppression it has used for more than 60 years to silence opposition to its reign. The regime and its thugs kidnapped innocent democracy activists and kept others trapped in their homes. Right now, hundreds of Cubans have been indefinitely detained or unjustly sentenced to prison simply for demanding basic human rights.

Some of these protesters are facing prison sentences as long as 30 years. One of them is Jose Daniel Ferrer, the leader of the pro-democracy UNPACU group and a dedicated freedom and human rights activist. Since his detainment, I have had the chance to talk to his family several times. Each time we speak, the stories they tell me are more heartbreaking.

Jose Daniel is being tortured by the communist regime in an attempt to end his life. He is suffering from severe headaches, mouth bleeding, malnutrition, cough, and insomnia—all products of the cruel torture and inhumane treatment from the regime.

We can also think about Felix Navarro, another longtime freedom activist who helps lead a pro-democracy group on the island. He was arrested, not for demonstrating but for asking police about the status of some of the members of his group who had been detained.

Reports indicate even young teenagers are being detained indefinitely.

The unjust imprisonment, beatings, and torture of the Cuban people is abhorrent. It is inhumane, and it cannot be tolerated. It is clear that these actions stem from the regime's paralyzing fear over the freedom movement spreading across Cuba. They are terrified that there is a new day of freedom on the rise for the Cuban people, so they resort to total oppression and to the silencing of any mention of independence or freedom.

As the greatest beacon of freedom and democracy in the world, the United States must stand against the communist regime and with the Cuban people. I am thankful that U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Brian Nichols recently called for the immediate release of the July 11 demonstrators. Along with his calls, we need the voices of President Biden and Secretary Blinken, and their calls need to be coupled with action that actually pressures the illegitimate communist Cuban regime now.

It was only a couple of weeks ago when I called the White House to talk about the case of Jose Daniel Ferrer. The first time I called, they asked me to leave a message, so I did. When I called the next day, the White House hung up on me.

Throughout his entire first year in office, Joe Biden has been shamefully silent about Cuba. Just like he does with communist China, Biden's strategy on Cuba is to do the bare minimum. Even while the protests were ongoing, he did nothing to alleviate the suffering of the Cuban people.

Compare that to the Organization of American States. After I spoke with them a few weeks ago, Secretary General Luis Almagro issued a statement demanding the immediate release of all arbitrarily imprisoned political prisoners. He expressed special concern for the well-being of Jose Daniel Ferrer and urged the Cuban regime to allow a humanitarian mission that can immediately verify the state and situation of political prisoners in the country.

Why can't Joe Biden make that same request? Where is the President? He has had 6 months to help provide internet to the Cuban people to help disseminate information and help the freedom movement, but he has done nothing. His silence is appeasement, and those of us who love freedom will not simply sit by idly while he refuses to act.

As long as the illegitimate communist Cuban regime continues to deny the people their freedom, democracy, and basic human rights, I am going to fight alongside them and demand action.

Today, the Senate can do something. Today, the U.S. Senate can pass a resolution honoring Cuban activists like Jose Daniel Ferrer, condemning the Cuban dictatorship's repression, and calling for the international community to stand with the Cuban people. I have introduced a resolution that does exactly that, and it is something that everyone in the Chamber should agree with.

I am thankful for Senators MARCO RUBIO and MIKE BRAUN for cosponsoring this resolution. I am also thankful for MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Congresswoman SALAZAR, and Congressman GIMENEZ for introducing the companion resolution in the House.

We must make sure our message to the Cuban people is clear: America has not and will not forget you. We have seen your bravery and courage. We have heard your calls for freedom. You have risked everything for the freedom of Cubans across the island. You are an inspiration to us all.

I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in Spanish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(English translation of the statements made in Spanish are as follows:)

We must make sure our message to the Cuban people is clear: America has not and will not forget you.

We have seen your bravery and courage. We have heard your calls for freedom.

You have risked everything for the freedom of Cubans across the island. You are an inspiration to us all.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 489, which is at the desk. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me first say that I rise, in the first instance, before having heard the Senator's remarks, to say that I have serious concerns about the junior Senator from Florida's lack of respect for the regular order of the Senate.

On July 11, 2021, the Cuban people took to the streets in unprecedented protests, demanding democracy and the end of decades of dictatorship. Subsequently, the Senate came together in unanimous consent to pass my S. Res. 310. My bipartisan legislation expressed our unwavering solidarity with the Cuban people and called for the release of all political prisoners detained unjustly by the Diaz-Canel regime.

My legislation was the result of bipartisan negotiations, and it was approved unanimously by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That is what regular order looks like, and it is a process that strengthens the impact of our work on foreign policy when we can speak together in one voice to promote that foreign policy, whether it is to the Cuban regime or whether it is in any other place in the world.

Now, I need to make the point that the junior Senator from Florida routinely disregards this process. In this particular case, not only has this resolution not been marked up by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, not only is it not bipartisan—as far as I know, nobody has been offered even the

opportunity to join it—but it hasn't even been introduced so that the Parliamentarian would decide where it would be sent to committee for referral for consideration. It hasn't even been introduced. It has not received the review it deserves. In fact, it has not received any formal review.

As I have repeatedly said as the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I stand ready to work with any Member—and have done so—on initiatives that advance the national security interests of the United States and the defense of democracy and human rights. While there may be some urgent moments that require us to move legislation directly to the floor, regular order exists for a reason—to facilitate consensus and ensure that the legislation we consider on the floor reflects the input and expertise of Senators who sit on the relevant committees of jurisdiction.

Now, I have spent the last several days listening to my Republican colleagues talk about the fullness of legislative debate, of not preempting legislative debate, of not preempting prolonged legislative debate in the context of the filibuster. Here is a piece of legislation that hasn't even been introduced, but it is being brought directly to the floor. How does that promote legislative debate? It doesn't. It doesn't.

I happen to agree with the Senator about his focus here as it relates to those who are struggling inside of Cuba to create freedom, but I want to send a clarion message that I will not simply allow legislation that is in the purview of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to come directly to the floor without even an introduction, without review, without any debate, and then believe that one will just allow it to go through on unanimous consent. That is not how the Senate works.

I would urge the junior Senator from Florida to consider this for future legislative endeavors, especially as we are also concerned about the filibuster and extended debate. Well, this is the worst example of not having extended debate.

Lastly, I deeply disagree with the Senator's characterization—I wasn't even going to reference it—in having listened to his remarks, about the Biden administration. The Biden administration sanctioned individuals in Cuba, high-ranking individuals of the Cuban military, who have never been sanctioned before. The Biden administration led a multilateral effort for the condemnation of what happened in Cuba as a result of the citizens of Cuba seeking to simply redress their grievances against the dictatorship that exists there, and brought in countries that have never ever expressed themselves in such a way before. The Biden administration worked with the Secretary General of the OAS to take the strong position that the Senator referred to.

So I hate to say it, but this almost comes across as a naked, political, partisan effort to try to promote some perspective when, in fact, we should be embracing this together through regular order, in a bipartisan process, which the Cuban people, particularly those suffering inside of Cuba, deserve. However, because of this particular moment and at this particular time and having given the Senator good notice about other future endeavors—this is not the first time—I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 489) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I am glad to see this resolution pass.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senators MARCO RUBIO and MIKE BRAUN, for cosponsoring this resolution and Congressman DIAZ-BALART, Congresswoman SALAZAR, and Congressman GIMENEZ for supporting this resolution in the House.

In my roles as a U.S. Senator and the Governor of Florida, I have had the honor of meeting and speaking with countless Cubans who have risked their lives to flee Castro's brutal regime. Many of them came here with nothing, scarred by the oppression of the regime but hopeful for a new life. With what little they had, they started businesses and families and built thriving communities and are a major part of the economy of Florida.

We have all seen their resolve to fight for freedom, support their families, and contribute to their communities. They are an example of the American dream and a testimony to the ills of communism and socialism. The Cuban people are a source of inspiration for all of us. They show us what can be accomplished when you have freedom and opportunity.

That is why we continue to fight for the end of communism in Cuba and for the freedom and liberties of every Cuban family. It is why we should all join them and say ''Abajo la Dictadura!'' ''Patria, vida y Libertad!''

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

FILIBUSTER

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, our democracy is protected by its institutional checks on unlimited power. The three branches of government are not the only manifestation of the careful balancing achieved by the Framers of the Constitution. Within the legislative branch, the Senate's unique traditions protect the rights of the minority party by allowing extended debate and by requiring a supermajority vote to pass legislation, with few exceptions. These rules have helped to make the U.S. Senate the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Before commenting further on the importance of the extended debate and the 60-vote requirement for passing legislation, I want to point out a critical protection built into the Senate's procedures. Changing the rules requires 67 votes, not 60 votes, not 51 votes—67 votes.

But in a power grab that would be incredibly destructive to the functioning of the Senate, the Democratic leader is proposing to circumvent the rules in order to eviscerate the filibuster because he does not have anywhere near the 67 votes required to rewrite the Senate rules. Instead, he will propose to ''change the rules by breaking the rules,'' as former Democratic Senator Carl Levin, a true giant of the Senate, put it when arguing against a similar ploy in 2013.

As one of Senator Levin's predecessors, Arthur Vandenberg, warned in 1949, if the majority can change the rules of the Senate at will, ''there are no rules except the transient, unregulated wishes of a majority of whatever quorum is temporarily in control of the Senate.''

Both Senators Levin and Vandenberg actually favored the rule change being considered at the time, but each recognized that ''breaking the rules to change the rules'' would irreparably harm the Senate and, thus, our country.

Democrats well understand the consequences of what they are proposing. Just 5 short years ago, Senator Chris Coons and I wrote a letter urging Senate leaders to preserve the 60-vote threshold for legislation. That letter was signed by 61 Senators: 28 Republicans, 32 Democrats, and 1 Independent. This total not only represented a majority of Senators but also a majority of the Republican caucus, a majority of the Democratic Caucus, and the current Vice President.

How well I remember seeking signatures on the Senate floor for that letter. Holding a green folder with the letter inside, I approached Senators on both sides of the aisle to achieve my goal of a total of 60 Senators signing, representing a majority of each caucus.

Not a single Senator whom I approached said no to signing the letter, not one. Quite the contrary, each was eager to sign the letter, and many thanked me for leading the effort to make clear that whatever our disagreements on a supermajority vote for nominees, they were firmly committed to keeping the filibuster for legislation. They understood its vital importance to the Senate and to our country.

This is what our letter stated, in part:

> [W]e are united in our determination to preserve the ability of Members to engage in extended debate when bills are on the Senate floor.
>
> We are mindful of the unique role the Senate plays in the legislative process, and we are steadfastly committed to ensuring that this great American institution continues to serve as the world's greatest deliberative body. Therefore, we are asking you to join us

in opposing any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Senators to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as we consider legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bipartisan letter, dated April 7, 2017, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER: We are writing to urge you to support our efforts to preserve existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the United States Senate. Senators have expressed a variety of opinions about the appropriateness of limiting debate when we are considering judicial and executive branch nominations. Regardless of our past disagreements on that issue, we are united in our determination to preserve the ability of Members to engage in extended debate when bills are on the Senate floor.

We are mindful of the unique role the Senate plays in the legislative process, and we are steadfastly committed to ensuring that this great American institution continues to serve as the world's greatest deliberative body. Therefore, we are asking you to join us in opposing any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Senators to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as we consider legislation before this body in the future.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Collins; Orrin Hatch; Claire McCaskill; Lisa Murkowski; Christopher A. Coons; Joe Manchin; John McCain; Patrick Leahy; Roger Wicker; Luther Strange; Angus King; Michael Bennet; Amy Klobuchar; Robert P. Casey, Jr.; Martin Heinrich.

John Boozman; Lindsey Graham; Richard Burr; Mark Warner; Jerry Moran; Roy Blunt; Marco Rubio; Jeanne Shaheen; Thom Tillis; Sherrod Brown; Shelley Moore Capito; Kirsten E. Gillibrand; Brian Schatz; Michael Enzi; Dean Heller.

Cory Booker; Mazie Hirono; Dianne Feinstein; John Thune; Bill Cassidy; Heidi Heitkamp; Jeff Flake; Chuck Grassley; Maria Cantwell; Rob Portman; Lamar Alexander; John Kennedy; Jon Tester; Tom Carper; Pat Roberts.

Maggie Hassan; Tammy Duckworth; Jack Reed; Thad Cochran; Joe Donnelly; Ben Sasse; Todd Young; Kamala Harris; Bill Nelson; Johnny Isakson; Ed Markey; Mike Lee; Debbie Stabenow; Sheldon Whitehouse; Robert Menendez; Tim Kaine.

Ms. COLLINS. The culture of the Senate is built upon a foundation of respect and cooperation that is meant to transcend partisanship. It is a culture in which legislative goals are reached with patience, persuasion, and perseverance, not raw power.

I implore my colleagues to consider the ramifications for our country. Do we want laws enacted one year to be repealed 2 years later on a simple majority vote and then perhaps reenacted in another 2 years by just 51 votes?

Do we want major laws, significant changes in policy, to be rammed through the Senate without thoughtful debate and bipartisan support?

At a time when our country is deeply and closely divided, do we really want to worsen the polarization by improving significant changes in public policy by a narrow partisan vote?

We are now on the brink of heading down that dangerous road, a slippery slope toward a tyranny of the majority. Limiting the ability of Senators to engage in a debate on legislative matters would give the majority party unprecedented power to push through major changes without careful deliberation or bipartisan cooperation. Such a move would have lasting implications, as future majorities—whether Republican or Democratic—would have little incentive to work with the other party.

It is crucial that we work together and find common ground on the issues that matter most to the American people. Changing longstanding Senate rules to benefit one political party would discourage efforts to forge consensus and only serve to reinforce bitter partisan divisions.

I urge my colleagues to stand against this calamitous change and for the principles of compromise and cooperation that have long defined and been the hallmarks of the U.S. Senate.

Let us listen to the admonition of the Democratic leader when he spoke against changing the rules in 2017: ''Let us go no further down this road.''

Thank you.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT JOHN ''BIG JOHN'' QUINTRELL

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today, I have the distinct honor of recognizing John ''Big John'' Quintrell of Helena, MT, for bravely serving our Nation during the Vietnam war and for his dedication to supporting the heroes who fought alongside him.

John served honorably in Vietnam from 1968 to 1969 with the Wolfhounds. I understand there are some Wolfhounds watching tonight. The Wolfhounds are the 2nd Battalion, 27th Infantry Regiment, 25th Infantry Division. And he received honors, including the Bronze Star with Valor and the Purple Heart.

Upon returning home, John was met with hostility and was shamed for his sacrifice in Vietnam by his fellow Americans. For the next 35 years, John, like so many of our veterans, kept that pain to himself.

In 2004, John opened a box—a box filled with items that brought back memories of Vietnam—and he was inspired to host a reunion for his fellow Vietnam veterans.

For the very first time in over 35 years, these men were reunited. John's reunion gave these often-forgotten heroes a sense of peace, a sense of acceptance, friendship, and healing. And following that successful reunion, John and the other Wolfhounds were on a mission to find others who served beside them.

And since 2004, John has connected with over 125 Wolfhounds, and many have attended 1 of the 9 reunions John planned. After hearing John's story, his children and grandchildren worked to keep these reunions going and the legacy alive.

John's support for his fellow Wolfhounds extends far beyond the reunions he planned. In 2018, John decided to document the stories of the Wolfhounds and their time in Vietnam. To date, John has conducted over 90—90—video interviews, and because of John's work, future generations will have the opportunity to hear their relatives' firsthand account of service in Vietnam.

John decided to share his own story by publishing a book entitled ''My 365 Days With the Wolfhounds in Vietnam,'' and he did that in 2021.

John's honest account of his experience in the Vietnam war has given countless veterans and their family members a sense of understanding, as well as healing. After years of suppressing memories of his time in Vietnam, John now shares his story. He shares his story with others and encourages them to share their own experience and find their own path to healing.

A big thanks to John's passion, and because of his dedication in supporting his fellow veterans, many soldiers are once again proud of their sacrifice to our great Nation. You see, John epitomizes the heart of a Montana veteran, whose selfless service has reached far beyond the battlefield. So I want to thank John. I want to thank John for his service to our great country and for the kindness he has shown to the heroes who served alongside him.

John, keep up the great work because you make Montana proud, and you make America proud.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this week, the Democrats are forcing yet another show vote on the so-called voting rights legislation. They claim the right to vote is under attack by the States, and there is nothing that could be further from the truth.

Ahead of the 2020 elections, everyone from Vice President KAMALA HARRIS to Eric Holder to Stacey Abrams claimed that they were experiencing a wave of voter suppression. Now, that is very significant—a wave of voter suppression, as if they have to do something to change our system.

And the facts are so clear on that. You know, people lie around here, but the facts don't lie. The Census Bureau reported that the turnout in last year's election was 66.8 percent. Now, that was the highest voter turnout of the 21st century, and that turnout was higher across all demographics, as well as including minorities.

More than 90 percent of Americans think it is easy to vote. More than a third of them think the rules should be more stringent than they are today, and there is a good argument for that. But that argument is prevailing right now.

So once you see that the Democrats' Big Lie of rampant voter suppression is clearly false, why are they pushing this election takeover bill? They want to nationalize elections, putting the Federal Government in charge of something that the Constitution clearly says belongs to the State.

And just a few examples of what the bill would do: It would line the pockets of candidates with taxpayer dollars in order to run for office. It would restrict commonsense voter ID, supported by over 75 percent of the Americans, and mandate mail-in ballots and allow ballot trafficking—trafficking, that is when the unsupervised political operatives collect and submit absentee ballots—and it would make election day a Federal holiday, costing somewhere close to $1 billion each time that it would be used.

Now, you don't have to take my word for it on how radical this is. Oklahoma's election board secretary—keep in mind, as in most States, it is nonpolitical, nonpartisan in any way, and the guy's name is Paul Ziriax. He has called SCHUMER's legislation a ''recipe for chaos.''

Democrats can feel the American people turning against their agenda. And so they are desperate to rig elections in their favor, and they will do so by whatever means necessary—even killing rules that make the Senate the Senate.

This would poison bipartisan compromise in the Senate forever. My Democratic colleagues want you to forget that they were for the filibuster before they were against it. Just 5 years ago, 33 Senate Democrats, including then-Senator HARRIS, penned a letter demanding that we defend and retain it forever. So they were demanding that we retain the filibuster. But now they changed their mind, which means that they either have amnesia or that they see an opportunity to force their radical agenda on the American families.

If Democrats get their way on the filibuster, they won't stop taking over our elections. They will also pass their Green New Deal, their abortion on demand, amnesty, and pack the Supreme Court with activists to uphold their unconstitutional agenda.

I want to close by sharing a comment on the filibuster. The quote is this:

Getting rid of the filibuster has long-term consequences. If there's one thing that I have learned in my years here, once you change the rules and surrender the Senate's institutional power, you never get it back.

Now, I didn't say that. That was said by President Joe Biden. He said it just in those words, and that might be the first time that we agree on something.

Likewise, Senator SCHUMER also said that getting rid of the legislative filibuster would be ''doomsday for democracy.'' And I happen to agree with him on that, too.

I have served the people of Oklahoma in the Senate longer than anyone in history, and I feel strongly that the one thing that has protected our democratic Republic and ensured bipartisanship more than any other single thing is the Senate's protection of the voice of the minority.

That is what we are famous for. There is no one else that has that as a function to do it, and yet I am seeing some of the things that are going on right now.

President Biden said—keep this in mind—back in 2005: We have got to keep the filibuster.

Then in 2021, just the other day, he said: We have got to kill the filibuster.

He said that yesterday.

Senator SCHUMER, back in 2005, said killing the filibuster will be ''doomsday for democracy,'' and now SCHUMER wants to kill the filibuster.

Senator COONS said, back in 2018: ''I am committed to never voting to change the legislative filibuster.'' And now he is supporting killing the filibuster.

Senator KLOBUCHAR, back in 2017, said: ''Let's keep that 60-vote threshold in place,'' which is the filibuster.

And now she said, just a few days ago: ''I would personally get rid of the filibuster.''

So here is what we are faced with: We know what is right, and we know what is wrong. It is very clear. Yet they are desperately trying to take a position that they have had for a long period of time. So we will continue to protect it. Both the President and Senator SCHUMER are trying to kill the filibuster, and we are not going to let that happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, it is always an honor to address the people of the United States from the floor of the U.S. Senate, and tonight is no exception.

I want to thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his wonderful remarks.

In order to form a more perfect Union, our Founding Fathers gave us a government that filters the will of the majority through a deliberative process of amendment and debate. For centuries, this has meant that legislative change, while slower in the United States than in some other countries, is moderated through healthy compromises and informed by a greater number of voices. This, in turn, has tended to give us legislation that benefits more Americans.

In recent decades, one of the most important factors in this process has been the Senate filibuster. It is one of the defining characteristics that sets the Senate apart from the House, and I served in the House. I remember how frustrating it was to send bill after bill to the Senate only to watch those bills die.

But because the House is set up on a more partisan basis, some of the bills we sent over here were pretty partisan. So the Senate has a chance to either look at those and reject them as purely partisan or, more frequently, take up bills that have been crafted on a bipartisan basis in this body, and I respect that.

The House is about simple majority rule, but the Senate, thanks in part to the filibuster, is defined by the rights of the minority party. Simply put, it gives the party not in power a voice to speak for forgotten Americans and for small States like Wyoming.

I am continually amazed at the whiplash-inducing about-face that Senate Democrats are doing on this issue. It was mentioned earlier by the previous speaker. Senate Democrats may be trying to end the filibuster today, but until recently, they sang a very different tune. As was pointed out, Majority Leader SCHUMER, in 2005, said that abolishing the filibuster would be doomsday for democracy—doomsday. Majority Whip DURBIN said in 2018 that ending the filibuster would be the end of the Senate as was originally devised and created going back to our Founding Fathers. Vice President HARRIS signed a letter in 2017, with 31 Democratic Senators, urging the protection of the filibuster. President Biden was also a big supporter of the filibuster, calling it a Senator's right to require 60 votes for legislation and claiming that efforts to undermine the filibuster are a ''power grab'' by the majority party.

Well, today President Biden and Senate Democrats are trying to do just that, grab power. They are trying to overhaul our voting system by nuking the filibuster and seizing unchecked power.

Some of their more levelheaded and forward-thinking colleagues really are hesitant to do that. To their great credit and to the benefit of the institution of the Senate, my colleagues KYRSTEN SINEMA and JOE MANCHIN recognize that what goes around comes around. Senator MANCHIN criticized the idea of a filibuster carve-out for election takeover legislation saying that ''anytime there's a carve-out, you eat the whole turkey.'' There is nothing left.

Senator SINEMA wrote in the Washington Post that Democrats had more to lose than gain by changing filibuster rules, noting that the best way to achieve durable lasting results is through bipartisan cooperation.

You know, I agree. We saw earlier this year, the infrastructure bill was the product of bipartisan discussion,

and it produced legislation that had an overwhelming majority of the votes in the Senate. Now, I was not a ''yes'' vote on that bill. I was a ''no'' vote on that bill. I felt it spent too much money, but I will say this. It was a fine work product that was developed by people of good will in both parties. They accepted ideas that I had and that others of us had who eventually voted against the bill, and they worked tirelessly for months. They would not give up because they recognized that when you can get a significant majority in this Senate to support something on a bipartisan basis, you have a better product for the Nation.

And I will say, I am proud of their work. I compliment them as frequently as I can for that work product, even though I didn't vote for it. It was an example of true bipartisanship, a true bipartisan compromise.

That is another reason that I have worked with my friend from Arizona Senator SINEMA and with my friend from Oregon RON WYDEN on financial innovation. I had never met RON WYDEN until that bill. That infrastructure bill came to the floor, and it had an amendment on the definition of broker that would apply in financial innovation instances. It did not adequately represent what really happens in the world of digital assets.

So Senator WYDEN and I met here on the floor. We became friends and started working on financial innovation issues, digital assets. And even though we were unsuccessful in changing the definition of ''broker'' in that bill, it forged a working friendship that I am confident will last for as long as I am here and as long as he is here together.

That is one of the reasons that I have come to believe so strongly in the filibuster. I saw it work in that specific piece of legislation, even in my first year in the U.S. Senate. It is why I have worked with SHELDON WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island on a foreign agent registration reform. It is why I have worked with other Members of the other party on issues where we see more common ground than we see differences.

If you want lasting change, it requires broad bipartisan support. Otherwise, the next administration will work to overturn your actions.

The last time Democrats changed the filibuster, it ultimately led to three Supreme Court Justices picked by President Trump. If Democrats thought that was bad, they should think carefully before changing the filibuster for other legislation. We should all think long and hard, as we prepare to vote, over this radical proposal.

I implore my Democratic colleagues, consider when the Senate was in Republican hands and when President Trump wanted Republicans to end the filibuster. Republicans rejected the Republican President's request to end the filibuster, and they did it out of respect for this institution. I am sure it was frustrating for the previous President. In some ways, it was frustrating for people like me.

I was not in Washington during the 4 years of the Trump Presidency. I was here during the 8 years of the Obama Presidency, serving in the House. I was not here during the Trump Presidency. I was back in Wyoming. In that time, you know, we were characterized as being a big red State, where a bunch of people in a ''basket of deplorables''—I was in there with them—were living and clinging to their guns and their Bibles and we were treated like outcasts in our own country and it felt antagonistic. It was part of what creates this great divide that this country is in right now. That is how we felt about ourselves.

I have to tell you, that is how we felt when President Biden went to Georgia and gave a speech and compared anyone who didn't support election reform to people like George Wallace. He compared people in my State and me, quite frankly, to a bunch of racists. That rhetoric is so damaging to trying to heal this country.

We all know our Nation is divided right now. Yesterday didn't help. If we want a more perfect Union than we have today, we need more compromise, not less. That is why we have institutional norms like the filibuster. When one party starts tearing up the norms, they might gain in the short term, but they do irreversible, lasting damage not only to our institutions but to our ''e pluribus unum,'' ''out of many, one.'' If we want to be one, we should keep the filibuster in place.

As those entrusted with the upkeep of our Constitution for future generations, we need to take a longer term view of what will be best for the country, not just our short-term political aspirations. Our Founders understood that the ends do not always justify the means. That is why we have the separation of powers—two Chambers of Congress and a Bill of Rights that protects the individuals, that protects freedom. Sometimes you have to choose the harder right over the easier wrong. Compromise is hard. I will tell you, I am not all that good at it. I am trying to learn from the people in this Senate Chamber who are so successful at it.

You know, the American people have placed a great deal of faith in each one of us to get this done. I have faith in us as well.

I will admit that I really disliked my first year in this U.S. Senate. It was a huge disappointment to me. It was ugly. It was nasty. It seemed un-American.

But I still have faith in us. We need to protect our institutions. One of those institutions is the filibuster. I think it will allow us to continue to be a nation that is out of many and yet is still one. God willing, that will be the case.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO RABBI MOSHE FELLER

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Rabbi Moshe Feller for the beautiful prayer he offered us this week. He could be considered a prolific guest chaplain—having led both Houses of Congress in prayer a combined 10 times over the last several decades. Each time, his wisdom, his faith in God, and his regard for the work of this body have all shined through. Today was no exception.

It was particularly special to know that he was joined by one of his sons, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Feller, as well as three of his grandchildren, Rabbi Tzemach Feller, Rabbi Yossi Feller, and Moussie Feller. I am confident that his other son, Rabbi Levi Feller, and his many other grandchildren were excitedly watching from home. And I know that if Mindelle, Rabbi Moshe Feller's wife of 56 years who passed away in 2017, were still with us today, she too would be so proud.

I have had the honor of meeting Rabbi Feller many times over the years, and I am glad he was able to return to this Chamber today.

In addition to being the longest serving Rabbi in Minnesota, Rabbi Feller leads the Upper Midwest Merkos Chabad Lubavitch in St. Paul and is a member of the board of Merkos L'Inyonei Chinuch, the education arm of the International Chabad movement. Through his work, he mentors and inspires people of all faiths in Minnesota and across the country. A passionate and dedicated leader, he has been instrumental in cultivating Jewish life in Minnesota, and his numerous contributions have enriched our State as a whole.

Whether by overseeing the founding and establishment of over 30 Jewish institutions in the Midwest or by serving as a counselor and mentor to those seeking to grow closer to their faith, Rabbi Feller unwaveringly answers the call.

With his remarks this morning, Rabbi Feller offered a clarion reminder

that the work we do in this body, to pass just laws, is not just important—it is sacred. I will be holding his words close to my heart, and I am sure my esteemed colleagues will be doing the same.

Thank you to Rabbi Moshe Feller for joining us this morning. I look forward to seeing you back in Minnesota.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3488. A bill to counter the aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine and Eastern European allies, to expedite security assistance to Ukraine to bolster Ukraine's defense capabilities, and to impose sanctions relating to the actions of the Russian Federation with respect to Ukraine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Joseph Donnelly, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Holy See.

Nominee: Joseph S. Donnelly.

Post: Ambassador to Holy See.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: Akin Gump Federal PAC (2019, 2020)—$6996 (12 donations of $583 each). Joe Biden for President (2020)—$2800; Tim Ryan for Senate (2021)—$2800; Frank Mrvan for Congress (2021)—$1000.

Spouse: Joe Donnelly for Senate (2017)—$340 (from Jill Donnelly); Joe Biden for president (2018)—$500 (from Jill Donnelly).

Donald Armin Blome, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Nominee: Donald Armin Blome.

Post: Ambassador to Pakistan.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Spouse: Debra L. Blome.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

No contributions.

Michele Taylor, of Georgia, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Council.

Nominee: Michele Taylor.

Post: Rank of Ambassador during tenure of service as the United States Representative to the United Nations Human Rights Council.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $3,000, 06/04/21, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $10, 05/03/21, N Dakota Democratic Party; $2,900, 03/22/21, Warnock for Georgia; $2,900, 01/26/21, Rosen for Nevada; $700, 01/26/21, Rosen for Nevada; $5,000, 12/11/20, Kaine for Common Ground PAC; $2,800, 11/30/20, Warnock for Georgia; $2,164.51, 10/29/20, Biden Victory Fund; $25, 10/25/20, Biden Victory Fund; $250, 10/15/20, Friends of Lucy McBath; $360, 10/15/20, Booker Victory Fund; $25, 10/14/20, Biden Victory Fund; $800, 10/13/20, Biden Victory Fund; $1,000, 10/13/20, Biden Victory Fund; $180, 10/07/20, Smart Solutions for the Silver State PAC; $180, 10/05/20, Carolyn Bordeaux; $1,800, 09/19/20, Mark Kelly for Senate; $250, 09/09/20, Citizens for Waters; $2,800, 09/05/20, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $2,800, 09/02/20, Theresa Greenfield for Iowa; $100, 08/12/20, Biden Victory Fund; $180, 07/29/20, Biden Victory Fund; $2,800, 07/25/20, Biden for President; $5, 07/25/20, Biden Victory Fund; $200, 04/01/20, Warnock for Georgia; $2,800, 03/31/20, Teresa Tomlinson for Senate; $2,800, 12/29/19, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; $2,800, 12/13/19, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $360, 11/04/19, Iowa Democratic Party; $2,800, 04/20/19, Biden for President; $5,000, 02/05/19, American Possibilities PAC; $500, 02/04/19, Congressional Black Caucus PAC; $180, 01/11/19, Blake for NY; $2,700, 10/31/18, Rosen Victory Fund; $2,700, 10/13/18, Malinowski for Congress; $1,000, 09/20/18, Citizens for Waters; $150, 05/24/18, Democratic Party of Georgia; $1,800, 05/14/18, Bill Nelson for Senate; $1,000, 02/08/18, Heidi for Senate; $2,000, 12/31/17, McCaskill for Missouri; $2,700, 11/11/17, Rosen for Nevada; $2,700, 09/23/17, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $5,000, 09/19/17, American Possibilities PAC; $2,700, 06/02/17, Kaine Victory Fund; $2,700, 05/10/17, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; $333.33, 04/23/17, Stabenow for US Senate; $333.33, 04/23/17, Klobuchar for Minnesota; $333.34, 04/23/17, Tammy Baldwin for Senate; $71, 04/03/17, Jon Ossoff for Congress; $2,500, 03/15/17, Fearless for the People PAC; $1,000, 01/31/17, Jon Ossoff for Congress; $2,700, 01/18/17, Kaine for Virginia; $250, 01/10/17, DSCC.

Spouse: Kenneth Taylor: $36, 12/05/20, ACTBLUE—JDCA PAC; $2,800, 09/15/20, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $2,800, 06/30/20, Biden for President; $2,800, 04/20/19, Biden for President; $2,700, 08/29/18, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $180, 07/18/18, Kevin Abel for Congress, Inc.; $2,700, 01/29/18, Kaine Victory Fund; $2,700, 12/31/17, Tom Malinowski for Congress; $2,300, 06/02/17, Kaine Victory Fund; $100, 05/13/17, Debbie Wasserman Schultz for Congress; $2,700, 01/19/17, Kaine Victory Fund.

Christopher R. Hill, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Serbia.

Nominee: Christopher Robert Hill.

Post: Serbia.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

Self and (wife) Julie: $1,000, 8/5/2019, Joe Biden; $50, 10/20/2019, Joe Biden; $50, 11/4/2019, Joe Biden; $50, 12/10/2019, Joe Biden; $50, 1/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 2/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 3/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 4/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 5/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 6/10/2020, Joe Biden; $21, 6/23/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 7/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 8/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 9/10/2020, Joe Biden; $50, 10/10/2020, Joe Biden.

Lisa A. Carty, of Maryland, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Nominee: Lisa Carty.

Post: Representative of the United States of America to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador and Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

Lisa Carty*: $500, 9/13/20, Biden Victory Fund; Lisa Carty*: $500, 8/21/20, Biden Victory Fund; Lisa Carty*: $100, 6/19/18, S.Hader/Act Blue; Lisa Carty: $250, 12/17/17, S.Hader/Act Blue.

William Burns: $500, 10/14/20, Biden for President; William Burns: $100, 9/14/20, Biden/ActBlue; William Burns: $100, 9/7/20, Act Blue; William Burns: $500, 5/13/20, Biden for President; William Burns: $2,500, 4/28/20, International Paper/PAC; William Burns: $500, 11/22/19, Biden for President; William Burns: $3,000, 5/01/19, International Paper/PAC; William Burns: $3,000, 8/24/18, International Paper/PAC; William Burns: $100, 6/28/18, Act Blue; William Burns: $100, 2/24/18, Act Blue/Meier; William Burns: $3,000, 11/13/17, International Paper/PAC; William Burns: $250, 9/18/17, Meier for Congress; William Burns: $250, 6/13/17, Meier for Congress.

*Please note that the contributions marked with an asterisk are double reported on the FEC.Gov website.

Laura S. H. Holgate, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Laura S. H. Holgate.

Post: Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

From Self: $313, 2018, Biggins for Virginia; $500, 2018, MJ for Texas; $500, 2018, DNC Services Corp./Dem. Nat'l Committee; $100, 2019, ActBlue; $1000, 2019, Dan for Colorado; $500, 2019, Dan for Colorado; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $100, 2020, Biden for President; $100, 2020, ActBlue; $500, 2020, Bollier for Kansas; $500, 2020, Brady Pac; $100, 2020, Biden for President; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $250, 2020, Biden for President; $113.20, 2020, Biden for President; $250, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; $500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; $500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $500, 2020, Biden for President; $500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; $113.20, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; $500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; $500, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; $250, 2020, Andy Kim for Congress; $250, 2020, Andy Kim for Congress; $113.20, 2020, ActBlue; $100, 2020, ActBlue.

Amy Gutmann, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Nominee: Amy Gutmann.

Post: Ambassador to Germany.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Michael Doyle (spouse): $2,800, 4/25/2019, Biden For President.

Eric M. Garcetti, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of India.

Nominee: Eric Michael Garcetti.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of India.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: $125.00, 04/16/2021, California Democratic Party; $82.97, 09/12/2020, DNC Services Corp/ Democratic National Committee; $182.97, 09/12/2020, DNC Services Corp/ Democratic National Committee; $182.97, 09/12/2020, Biden Victory Fund; $82.97, 09/12/2020, Biden Victory Fund; $2,800, 09/01/2020, Biden for President; $500, 04/29/2020, Deborah Ross for Congress; $2,800, 02/08/2020, Biden for President.

Spouse: $2,800, 12/29/2019, CORY 2020; $1,000, 05/15/2019, DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee; $1,500, 07/16/2018, Stonewall Democratic Club FED PAC.

Oren E. Whyche-Shaw, of Maryland, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years.

Enoh T. Ebong, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Trade and Development Agency.

Alice P. Albright, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

Lisa A. Carty, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nomination of Leon Skarshinski.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with John Breidenstine and ending with Michael Lally, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 19, 2021.

By Ms. STABENOW for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Chavonda J. Jacobs-Young, of Georgia, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics.

*Margo Schlanger, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Martha Williams, of Montana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

*Henry Christopher Frey, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 3481. A bill to secure the dignity and safety of incarcerated women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3482. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3493 Burnet Avenue in Cincinnati, Ohio, as the ''John H. Leahr and Herbert M. Heilbrun Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COONS:

S. 3483. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend increased dependency and indemnity compensation paid to surviving spouses of veterans who die from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, regardless of how long the veterans had such disease prior to death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3484. A bill to establish the New York-New Jersey Watershed Restoration Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 3485. A bill to ensure that the right to vote shall not be impaired due to vaccination status; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 3486. A bill to provide, manufacture, and distribute high quality N–95 respirator masks for every individual in the United States during the COVID–19 pandemic using the Defense Production Act and other means; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3487. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase death gratuities and funeral allowances for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 3488. A bill to counter the aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine and Eastern European allies, to expedite security assistance to Ukraine to bolster Ukraine's defense capabilities, and to impose sanctions relating to the actions of the Russian Federation with respect to Ukraine, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 3489. A bill to establish or continue a multidisciplinary research program to advance the discovery and preclinical development of medical products for priority virus families and other viral pathogens with a significant potential to cause a pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 3490. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to bring the non-monetary policy related functions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System into the appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3491. A bill to establish a commission to reform and modernize the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 3492. A bill to address the importance of foreign affairs training in national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3493. A bill to require guidance on extending expiration dates for certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. KELLY):

S. 3494. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require Members of Congress and their spouses and dependents to place certain assets into blind trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Ms. ERNST, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3495. A bill to create a point of order against spending that will increase inflation unless inflation is not greater than 4.5 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. Res. 487. A resolution congratulating the University of Wisconsin Badgers on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Volleyball Championship; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. Res. 488. A resolution congratulating the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire Blugolds on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Women's Volleyball Championship; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 489. A resolution commending the actions of Cuban human rights and democracy activist Jose Daniel Ferrer Garcia, and all pro-democracy and human rights activists, in demanding fundamental civil liberties in Cuba and speaking out against Cuba's brutal, totalitarian Communist regime; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 72

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 72, a bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

S. 98

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 98, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for neighborhood revitalization, and for other purposes.

S. 456

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 464

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 464, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 880, a bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes.

S. 902

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 902, a bill to authorize a grant program for the development and implementation of housing supply and affordability plans, and for other purposes.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to require online marketplaces to collect, verify, and disclose certain information regarding high-volume third party sellers of consumer products to inform consumers.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1596, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National World War II Memorial in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

S. 1725

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1725, a bill to grant a Federal charter to the National American Indian Veterans, Incorporated.

S. 2710

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2710, a bill to promote competition and reduce gatekeeper power in the app economy, increase choice, improve quality, and reduce costs for consumers.

S. 3052

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 3052, a bill to promote free and fair elections, democracy, political freedoms, and human rights in Cambodia, and for other purposes.

S. 3232

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3232, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety rule for freestanding clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related death or injury, and for other purposes.

S. 3318

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3318, a bill to deter foreign financial institutions from providing banking services for the benefit of foreign terrorist organizations and from facilitating or promoting payments for acts of terrorism.

S. 3380

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3380, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from retroactively reducing certain determinations under the Renewable Fuel Program, and for other purposes.

S. 3412

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3412, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to enforce the rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to COVID–19 vaccine and mask requirements for Head Start programs.

S. 3436

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3436, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to entities responsible for the planning, construction, or operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline and their corporate officers and to apply congressional review under the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act to the removal of sanctions relating to Nord Stream 2, and for other purposes.

S. 3463

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3463, a bill to impose sanctions and other measures in response to the failure of the Government of the People's Republic of China to allow an investigation into the origins of COVID–19 at suspect laboratories in Wuhan.

S. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 35, a resolution condemning the military coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military's detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained and for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 390

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 390, a resolution expressing appreciation for the State of Qatar's efforts to assist the United States during Operation Allies Refuge.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 3492. A bill to address the importance of foreign affairs training in national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce an act, co-sponsored

by Senator HAGERTY, that addresses the importance of foreign affairs training to national security and, more specifically, intends to improve training and professional development of the Foreign Service officers and civil service staff at the U.S. State Department.

This act calls for the State Department to move beyond its traditional approach towards a more robust professional training program, incorporating innovative education and training courses, methods, and opportunities. Employees of the State Department have a long, honorable tradition of providing excellence in diplomacy, but it is time to modernize the training and professional development they receive, enabling them to more effectively promote our national security interests abroad and ensuring the retention of our best and brightest employees.

The legislation will accomplish the following: provide a more effective and updated training program for employees of the State Department, to include increased virtual instruction that is interactive and more accessible to personnel deployed around the world, as well as increased training provided by partner organizations such as universities, industry entities, and nongovernmental organization, NGOs: establish a Chief Learning Officer position to serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of State and strategist for State Department training and development; and establish a nonpartisan Board of Visitors to provide independent advice and recommendations regarding training at the Foreign Service Institute.

Other key elements of the legislation include establishment of a clear link between required employee training and promotional opportunities and assignments at the State Department; a ''training float'' strategy that will allow 10 to 15 percent of Foreign Service and civil service officers and staff to participate in training at any given time; a call for the State Department to establish new fellowship programs for Foreign Service and civil service officers and staff in addition to the current Pearson and Brookings Fellowship Programs, allowing them to participate in short- and long-term opportunities at think tanks, nongovernmental organizations, the Department of Defense, industry entities, and relevant university programs; and establishment of a Center for Innovation in Training and a Provost position at the Foreign Service Institute, to evaluate all courses and curriculum offered by FSI and identify necessary updates to meet the frequent changes required by officers due to changing global dynamics.

The Department of State is a crucial national security agency, whose employees, both Foreign Service and civil service, require the best possible training at every stage of their careers to prepare them to promote and defend U.S. national interests and the health and safety of U.S. citizens abroad.

As chair of the Subcommittee on U.S. State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development, along with Ranking Member Senator HAGERTY, I have presided over the first two in a planned series of subcommittee hearings on modernization of the State Department. The most recent hearing, held in November of last year, made clear that the numerous studies issued about the State Department's need to change its culture, starting with an innovative training and professional development program, were on the mark.

During the hearing, we heard that ''everything is fine'' at State in terms of training, while the Department's retention rate indicates the loss of experienced Foreign Service officers and civil servants. External witnesses Ambassador David Miller, president of the Diplomatic Studies Foundation, and Joshua Marcuse, who formerly served as the Executive Director of the Defense Innovation Board, painted a very different picture, calling for an overarching effort to change the culture of the State Department—which as one of the oldest Federal Departments is steeped in tradition and protocol—to transform it once again into the lead Agency executing American foreign policy overseas.

The level of challenges the State Department faces now around the world are almost unprecedented, with the return of great power competition, the rise of authoritarianism, the collapse of Afghanistan, climate change, the COVID–19 pandemic, and—not least—assisting American citizens around the world. Professional education and training must be top priorities at the State Department, and we must strengthen the professionalization of our diplomats through a career-long program that focuses on mastery of substantive foreign policy issues, diplomatic expertise, superb customer service for American citizens abroad, and leadership.

Secretary of State Antony Blinken gave a speech last fall on ''Modernizing American Diplomacy,'' and one of the five pillars he described is that of building and retaining a diverse, dynamic, and entrepreneurial workforce, and empowering and equipping State Department employees to succeed. This bill will kick-start the rebuilding effort Mr. Blinken spoke about, putting the emphasis on training and professional development of the Department's greatest asset: its people.

I remain committed to continuing to work with the Biden administration and my colleagues in Congress to provide every opportunity for State Department employees to receive the best possible training at every stage of their careers, to prepare them to promote and defend U.S. national interests and the health and safety of U.S. citizens abroad.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3493. A bill to require guidance on extending expiration dates for certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight legislation I am introducing with the senior Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, to address prescription drug shortages. We rely on prescription drugs to battle infectious diseases like SARS–CoV–2, for the treatment of cancer and hormonal disorders and in countless other facets of modern medicine. When drug shortages, which are unforeseen supply disruptions, occur, healthcare teams must scramble to develop new plans of care because the optimal treatment is no longer available. The Drug Shortages Shelf Life Extension Act will help tackle drug shortages by enabling the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, to extend the shelf of certain drugs at risk of shortage in a safe fashion.

Prescription drug shortages are a persistent problem, leading to diminished access to vital medications and potentially catastrophic outcomes for patients. FDA wrote in its 2019 Drug Shortages Task Force Report that discarding drugs if they exceed an unnecessarily short expiration date can exacerbate drug shortages. Essentially, the shelf life for certain drugs can be safely extended, and I support empowering authorities to do so to prevent drug shortages.

Last year, I introduced the Drug Shortages Prevention & Quality Improvement Act. The legislation would address some of the main causes of drug shortages and provide solutions to mitigate their effects. The legislation would give the FDA additional tools to mitigate drug shortages, such as extending shelf lives for certain essential drugs. This legislation also seeks to address prescription drug shortages by creating incentives for manufacturers to upgrade their facilities to prevent shortages. Some of the facilities FDA has tied to drug shortages have been operating continually since the 1960s with minimal upgrades to manufacturing lines and facilities. The FDA Drug Shortages Task Force report found that quality concerns caused 62 percent of drug shortages from 2013 to 2017.

Last April, Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, HELP, Committee Chair MURRAY and Ranking Member BURR announced plans to develop a bipartisan initiative to prepare the Nation for future public health emergencies in light of the COVID–19 pandemic. I applaud this effort to modernize our national response efforts for the current pandemic and future pandemics and look forward to consideration of this legislation on the floor of the Senate. I was particularly pleased to see language included in the HELP Committee's discussion draft for this preparedness initiative from the Drug Shortages Shelf Life Extension Act. Extending shelf lives of certain

drugs is not only critical to prevent drug shortages but also to enable our prescription drug supply chain to be more responsive and better prepared to respond to public health emergencies.

Domestically, we continue to battle the COVID–19 pandemic. We are nearing record-high hospitalizations due to COVID–19, including record-high levels for children. In my State of Maryland, we have encountered a new record-high hospitalization level every day since December 29. For many patients, the severity and mortality rates are lower due to higher vaccination levels and better treatments gleaned from our experience in battling COVID–19 so far, but these high hospitalization rates are straining an already overburdened system.

As we continue fighting the pandemic, in addition to other diseases and illnesses, timely access to medications is essential for our healthcare providers and their patients. The Drug Shortages Shelf Life Extension Act would require FDA to update guidance tied to manufacturer testing of the shelf life of prescription drug and to report to Congress on actions taken to update the shelf life dates of relevant drugs. Shelf life expiration dates are established through regulations governing prescription drug stability testing, which need to be reexamined since they have not been amended since 1981. I look forward to working with the Biden administration as it implements this essential legislation and related regulations.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator COLLINS and me in support of the Drug Shortages Shelf Life Extension Act to improve access to essential prescription drugs and to prevent or mitigate future drug shortages. No one should have to go without essential prescriptions drugs when usable supplies are available but have potentially inaccurate use-by dates stamped on their box or bottle.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 487—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN BADGERS ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 487

Whereas, on December 18, 2021, the University of Wisconsin Badgers won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division I Women's Volleyball Championship and finished the season with an impressive record of 31 wins and 3 losses;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin women's volleyball team defeated the University of Nebraska Cornhuskers in a thrilling 5-set match to win the program's first ever national championship;

Whereas the following players should be congratulated for their hard work and dedication in representing the University of Wisconsin with dignity: Izzy Ashburn, Lauren Barnes, Joslyn Boyer, Giorgia Civita, Jade Demps, Liz Gregorski, MJ Hammill, Danielle Hart, Sydney Hilley, Lauren Jardine, Grace Loberg, Anna MacDonald, Julia Orzol, Sydney Reed, Dana Rettke, Devyn Robinson, Anna Smrek, and Julia Wohlert;

Whereas the Badgers were led by an outstanding coaching and support staff, including Kelly Sheffield, Brittany Dildine, Gary White, Jessica Williams, Annemarie Hickey, Mackenzie Long, Kristen Walker, Kevin Schultz, Katie Smith, Diane Nordstrom, and Bianca Miceli;

Whereas the championship point was scored by senior middle blocker Dana Rettke, the 2021 National Player of the Year and the only 5-time American Volleyball Coaches Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''AVCA'') First-Team All-American in NCAA Volleyball history;

Whereas freshman opposite hitter Anna Smrek was named the Most Outstanding Player of the NCAA National Championship, while Dana Rettke and Sydney Hilley were also named to the NCAA National Championship All-Tournament Team;

Whereas senior setter Sydney Hilley was also selected as the 2021 Senior CLASS Award recipient as the most outstanding senior student-athlete in Division I women's volleyball;

Whereas Assistant Coach Brittany Dildine was named the AVCA Division I National Assistant Coach of the Year;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin women's volleyball team—

(1) captured the 2021 Big Ten conference championship for the third consecutive season;

(2) featured 3 players who earned AVCA All-American honors at the end of the season, Dana Rettke, Sydney Hilley, and Lauren Barnes; and

(3) has had a history of players, past and present, who also represent the University of Wisconsin on the international stage;

Whereas the players and staff persevered through the challenges presented by the COVID–19 pandemic; and

Whereas the Badger women's volleyball team has brought great pride and honor to the University of Wisconsin and its alumni, loyal fans, and the State of Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Wisconsin Badgers on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Volleyball Championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to this championship season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, Rebecca Blank;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Wisconsin, Chris McIntosh; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Wisconsin volleyball team, Kelly Sheffield.

SENATE RESOLUTION 488—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EAU CLAIRE BLUGOLDS ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION III WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 488

Whereas, on November 20, 2021, the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire Blugolds won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Women's Volleyball Championship and finished the season with an impressive record of 35 wins and 3 losses;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire women's volleyball team defeated the Calvin University Knights in 3 sets to win the program's first ever national championship;

Whereas Ava Aldag, Makenzie Bachmann, Kendra Baierl, Arianna Barrett, Sophia Brown, Sheridan Dettmann, Hannah Flottmeyer, Sarah Kuchcik, Emma Macken, Libby Macken, Charlie Nelson, Clara Olson, Kelly Page, Olivia Rooney, Maren Saunders, Taylor Scalia, Erika Stensland, Victoria Van Dan, Abby Volk, and Jordan Witzel worked hard, showed great dedication, and represented the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire with dignity;

Whereas the coaching and support staff of the Blugolds, Kim Wudi, Alex Berger, Jodi Risen, Katrina Raskie, Dylan Graber, Robin Baker, Nick Hoven, Rachel Delanois, and Erin Sparks, guided the team throughout the season;

Whereas Assistant Coach Jodi Risen was named the American Volleyball Coaches Association Division III Assistant Coach of the Year;

Whereas the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire women's volleyball team—

(1) also captured the 2021 Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference regular season and tournament championships; and

(2) featured 3 players who earned American Volleyball Coaches Association All-American honors at the end of the season, specifically—

(A) Kendra Baierl;

(B) Charlie Nelson; and

(C) Arianna Barrett;

Whereas the players and staff of the Blugold women's volleyball team persevered through the challenges presented by the COVID–19 pandemic; and

Whereas the Blugold women's volleyball team has brought great pride and honor to the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and its alumni, loyal fans, and the State of Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire Blugolds on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III Women's Volleyball Championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to this championship season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, James C. Schmidt;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Dan Schumacher; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire women's volleyball team, Kim Wudi.

SENATE RESOLUTION 489—COMMENDING THE ACTIONS OF CUBAN HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACTIVIST JOSE DANIEL FERRER GARCIA, AND ALL PRO-DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVISTS, IN DEMANDING FUNDAMENTAL CIVIL LIBERTIES IN CUBA AND SPEAKING OUT AGAINST CUBA'S BRUTAL, TOTALITARIAN COMMUNIST REGIME

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 489

Whereas on July 11, 2021, protestors in more than 40 cities marched in the streets of Cuba to exercise their fundamental right to peacefully assemble and express their opposition to the Cuban regime, resulting in the largest anti-government demonstration on the island in decades;

Whereas the Cuban protestors, in a clear message—

(1) called for an end to communism, censorship, and oppression in Cuba; and

(2) demanded basic human rights and their God-given freedom;

Whereas during the July 2021 protests, in a crude and savage effort to silence the Cuban people, the Communist party—

(1) deployed a wave of terror throughout Cuba by unleashing its secret police and military forces on the peaceful protestors;

(2) harassed and threatened men, women, and children, some of whom were in their homes;

(3) abducted and tortured civil society leaders; and

(4) detained more than 1,300 Cubans, according to media reports;

Whereas Felix Navarro Rodriguez, a renowned pro-democracy activist who was arrested during the ''Black Spring'' of 2003, is the President of the Pedro Luis Boitel Abraham Democracy Party, and is a member of the Executive Secretariat of the Democratic Action Unity Table (MUAD), was arrested, then charged with the alleged crime of ''attack and public disorder'', after merely appearing at a police unit in Cuba to inquire about the status of members of his group who were detained during the July 11 protest;

Whereas in August 2021, Felix Navarro Rodriguez, in protest of his unlawful arrest, the terrible conditions in which he was being held and the cruelty he suffered in prison, went on a hunger strike for 30 days, remains isolated, is in a delicate state of health, and is restricted from communicating with his family;

Whereas José Daniel Ferrer Garcia, leader of the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU), is a Cuban human rights and democracy activist, who has worked incessantly to promote fundamental civil liberties for the Cuban people;

Whereas José Daniel Ferrer Garcia, who was born in Santiago de Cuba on July 29, 1970, has dedicated most of his adult life in peaceful protest against Cuba's brutal and totalitarian Communist dictatorship to ensure that Cubans are allowed to have a voice in matters concerning their own country;

Whereas José Daniel Ferrer Garcia was among the hundreds of activists who were unlawfully detained by the Cuban regime and has been unjustly imprisoned in isolation for nearly 180 days, where he has been subjected to physical and psychological torture by the brutal Communist Cuban regime;

Whereas according to José Daniel Ferrer Garcia's family, his health is dire, he is suffering from severe headaches, mouth bleeding, malnutrition, bouts of coughing, and the inability to sleep, all of which was caused by the cruel torture and inhumane treatment he received from the Cuban regime;

Whereas a host of other pro-democracy activists have been imprisoned solely for peacefully exercising their rights to freedom of expression, including Ciro Alexis Casanovas Pérez, Loreto Hernández García and wife, Donaida Pérez Paseiro, Didier Eduardo Almagro Toledo, Nidia Bienes Paseiro, Demis Valdés Sarduy, Misael Díaz Paseiro, Arianna López Roque, twin sisters Lisdani Rodríguez Isaac and Lisdiani Rodríguez Isaac, and Ivan Hernandez Carrillo;

Whereas during the week of Christmas 2021, many of these peaceful demonstrators were convicted on charges of sedition and sentenced to decades in prison just for demanding basic human rights; and

Whereas the totalitarian regime is terrified of brave and courageous leaders who stand resolute in fighting for a free Cuba, and will persecute, kidnap, torture, or kill anyone who stands up against their tyranny:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the repression of José Daniel Ferrer Garcia and all brave Cuban activists, and demands their immediate and unconditional release from prison;

(2) condemns the brutal torture and inhumane treatment of José Daniel Ferrer Garcia by the Cuban regime and calls for an immediate humanitarian medical visit by an independent human rights organization to him and to all political prisoners who have been unjustly and illegally detained by the Cuban regime since July 11, 2021;

(3) condemns Cuba's brutal totalitarian Communist dictatorship and demands an end to the suffering of the Cuban people and the impunity of the Cuban regime's human rights abusers;

(4) calls for the international community to stand with the Cuban people and against Cuba's totalitarian Communist regime for infringing on the freedom of thought, will, expression, assembly, and prosperity of the Cuban people; and

(5) commends the courage of the pro-democracy movement and all freedom activists in Cuba for risking everything to bring freedom to the Cuban people.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 2:45 p.m., to conduct a business meeting on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 2:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of he Senate on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2021 fourth quarter Mass Mailing report is Tuesday, January 25, 2022. An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable PDF document. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states ''none.''

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically at http://webster.senate.gov/secretary/mass_mailing_form.htm or e-mailed to OPR_MassMailings@sec.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224–0322.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3488

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3488) to counter the aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine and Eastern European allies, to expedite security assistance to Ukraine to bolster Ukraine's

defense capabilities, and to impose sanctions relating to the actions of the Russian Federation with respect to Ukraine, and for other purposes.

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 2022

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 10 a.m., Thursday, January 13; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3436, as provided under the previous order; further, that the Senate recess from 12:45 p.m. until 2:15 p.m.; that at 2:15 p.m., there be 30 minutes for debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on passage of S. 3436, as provided under the previous order.

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

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:04 p.m., recessed until Thursday, January 13, 2022, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 12, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

AMITABHA BOSE, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION.

THE JUDICIARY

GABRIEL P. SANCHEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE OF OHIO STATE SENATOR EDNA BROWN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to distinguished Ohio Senator Edna Brown, a trailblazer who recently passed away.

Edna Brown was a remarkable public servant from Toledo, Ohio, who dedicated her life and her three decades of service to improving the well-being and future of our community.

As the first and only African American to represent Lucas County in the Ohio Senate, she blazed a trail for many to follow at the highest level of elected office in Ohio.

She was a warm, inviting, and immensely kind person whose focus was always on public service and bettering the lives of the people she served, the people she truly loved.

Northwest Ohio lost a great champion. Her family lost a great mother and grandmother. America needs more people like Edna Brown in public service.

Her memory will live with us, and I know her legacy will inspire the next generation of Ohio's leaders, including women leaders.

I include in the RECORD her life story and obituary as a tribute to her persevering accomplishments for our Nation's betterment. Godspeed, Edna Brown. May the angels carry her very high, and may she rest in her peace.

.

SENATOR EDNA BROWN BIOGRAPHY

Edna Brown was elected to serve Ohio's 11th Senate District in November, 2010. She came from the Ohio House of Representatives, where she served Ohio's 48th House District. The Toledo native was a public school graduate who attended the University of Toledo and Mary Manse College. Her dedication to public service led to a 32–year career as an employee with the city of Toledo, followed by a six-year tenure on Toledo City Council.

She moved to the Statehouse in January 2002 to fill the House seat of then newly-elected Toledo mayor Jack Ford. Since her arrival, she worked tirelessly on issues of voting rights, health, violence against women and economic development.

Her idea to bring ''no excuse'' absentee voting to Ohio was incorporated into a bill that became state law in January 2006. For her efforts, the Ohio Association of Election Officials and the Ohio Secretary of State honored her with the Jack Wolfe Memorial Award as one of two ''Legislators of the Year.'' In 2007, Brown introduced a bill to immunize young women from the human papilloma virus, and a bill addressing violence in teen dating relationships.

Senator Brown served as a member of the House Finance & Appropriations Committee and as Chair of the Human Services Subcommittee. She also served on the House Commerce and Labor Committee, the Elections and Ethics Committee, and the Commerce and Labor Committee. Senator Brown sat on the Ohio Commission on Minority Health Board and served as Chair of the Ohio Children's Trust Fund. She was a member of the House Cancer Caucus.

Senator Brown was the First Vice President of the Ohio Legislative Black Caucus, and served on the Executive Committee the National Black Caucus of State Legislators. She also worked as state director for WILL/WAND, a non-partisan national organization for women legislators.

Senator Brown was very active in her hometown. She was instrumental in founding the Greater Toledo Urban League and sat on the Board of Directors. She was a past chair of the Administration Board for Braden United Methodist Church, and was a charter member of the Executive Women's Golf Association.

All of her efforts garnered Senator Brown numerous awards. She won an inaugural ''ROSA'' Award from the Toledo Board of Community Relations for living a life parallel to the example set by civil rights leader Rosa Parks. The Toledo YWCA also honored Brown as a 2007 Milestone Award recipient for her contributions and achievements and WILL/WAND honored her with a Pacesetter Award the same year.

SENATOR EDNA BROWN OBITUARY

Senator Edna R. Brown, a Servant to Toledo, Mentor to many and Friend to all, passed away peacefully in her home, Saturday, January 1, 2022.

She was born in Tuscaloosa Alabama, April 4, 1940, the oldest of ten children, to the union of Mr. and Mrs. Charlie and Pauline Hutton. She relocated to Toledo in 1952, attended The Jesup W. High Scott her freshman year in 1954 and graduated from The Harriett E. Whitney Vocational High School in 1958 and attended what was known as Mary Manse College and the University of Toledo. While at the University of Toledo, she accepted a position with the City of Toledo, which led to a 32–year career serving the Toledo Communities.

After retirement from the City of Toledo, Senator Brown began her career as an elected official. She was sworn into office January 3, 1994, to serve on Toledo City Council. When the late Jack Ford resigned from The Ohio House of Representatives to become Mayor of Toledo, Edna was appointed to serve the remainder of his term. Representative Brown was elected to a full term in 2002 and was re-elected four times. In 2010 Senator Brown won the Ohio State Senator seat, where she served as the Minority Whip and represented the 11th Senate District from 2011 until her retirement, December 31, 2018.

During her political career, Senator Brown sponsored and or co-sponsored legislation to benefit Veterans and their Families, Women, Children, and the Elderly. She was the original sponsor of the ''NO EXCUSE'' absentee voting for Ohio in 2005 and was the primary sponsor of HB 10 which addressed violence in teen dating. She proudly sponsored a bill to create Special License Plates for members of the Ohio Grand Lodge of Prince Hall Masons.

Senator Brown was preceded in death by parents; husband of 40 years Willie Brown; daughter, Carol Lewis; brothers, Charlie Hutton, Jr. and Joseph D. Hutton. She leaves to cherish her loving memory: daughters, Linda Armstrong, Christine Brown Daniels (Dayton OH) and Kathy (Johnado) Dadzie; thirteen grand and great-grandchildren; sisters Imogene Lott, Lula (Ruben) Aldridge and Essie Powell (Dayton, OH); brothers, Johnny Hutton and Dr. Thomas (Lucille) Hutton. Services of Remembrance for Senator Brown will be Private. The family requests, in lieu of flowers, donations be made to The Braden United Methodist Church.

''I have always strived to improve the lives of others, and find solace in knowing that I gave my all to the people of Lucas County,'' Senator Edna Brown.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO J. CARTER SEIBEL

HON. LLOYD SMUCKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to J. Carter Seibel, who passed away on December 28, 2021 at seventy-four years of age. A resident of Delta, Pennsylvania for nearly fifty years, Carter was a friend to many in the community. Nowhere was that more evident than during his time as a teacher at North Harford High School in Pylesville, Maryland where he taught for over two decades, touching the lives of countless students.

He established a German language program at North Harford, advised on the school's yearbook, and offered up his musical talents playing piano in the school's musicals. His love of music and the piano brought joy to many in the community as he played at numerous weddings and events, including some hosted by his former students. Carter also loved Delta as well, serving as a member of the Borough Council and working on initiatives aimed at promoting the borough.

We extend our sincere condolences to his wife, Cindy, as well as his children and grandchildren on Carter's passing. He will be missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARILYN STRICKLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Ms. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, had my vote for Call of the House been cast, it would have been recorded as present. Had I been present, I would have voted pres Roll Call No. 1.

HONORING 100 YEARS OF THE WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY BRONCO MARCHING BAND

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, during the fall of 2021, the Western Michigan University

Bronco Marching Band celebrated its 100th season on the field. As a former member of the Michigan Marching Band, I can attest that no college football game day is complete without the sights and sounds of a marching band, particularly in Michigan. Since its inception in 1915, the Bronco Marching Band has been a staple within the greater Kalamazoo and Michigan communities, and a fixture on WMU's campus, both at home and away sporting events, and at many other university occasions, such as its Annual Concert open to all members of the community. The BMB Football Pre-game and Half-time Performances are honored as recognizing timely and creative themes, regularly recognizing the BMB as "The Best Band in the MAC." The Bronco Marching Band serves as the keeper and curator of WMU traditions, providing the expected soundtrack for returning alumni in a way that recordings cannot. Its performances off campus have even broader impact through parades, exhibitions, and community service, including performances and media appearances in numerous Kalamazoo Holiday Events. Over the years, the BMB has also brought national attention to Michigan, Kalamazoo, and WMU during appearances at the International Bowl, Texas Bowl, Little Caesar's Pizza Bowl, Famous Idaho Potato Bowls (2), Cotton Bowl, First Responder Bowl, and the Quick Lane Bowl in Detroit. The BMB's dedicated 300+ members and staff, and thousands of BMB Alumni, have brought joy and Bronco Spirit to millions over the past century with hits such as "I've Got a Girl in Kalamazoo," and "Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight," as well as the beloved Bronco Fight Song. Congratulations again to the WMU Bronco Marching Band on this major milestone. I look forward to seeing what you achieve in the next 100 years. Go Broncos.

THE U.S. ECONOMY REMAINS #1 IN 2021, BUT WHAT ABOUT OUR FUTURE?

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mrs. McCLAIN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following op-ed.

MANY PUBLIC POLICY CONCERNS

While many public policy issues are greatly concerning—from COVID–19 to the crisis at our southern border to education gaps relative to our ability to compete economically—in our opinion, the following three are paramount for the U.S. Congress and Biden Administration.

THE SHRINKING INFLUENCE OF THE UNITED STATES AND NORTH AMERICA

In 1960, North American total global GDP was $597.42 billion or 43.7%, with the U.S. contributing $543 billion or just under 40 percent of the total global GDP of $1.367 trillion (China's 1960 global GDP by comparison was $59.72 billion or $4.39%).

China's 2021 global GDP grew to about $16.86 trillion or 17.86% of total global GDP. Comparatively, 2021 North American GDP declined to 27.9% of total global GDP, while Asia—led by China, Japan, India, and South Korea—produced 33.7% of global GDP and extended its faster growth pace lead to more than two decades.

AN OBJECTIVE AND REALISTIC VIEW OF CHINA IS NEEDED MORE THAN EVER IN WASHINGTON D.C.

On December 29, 2021 the Chinese Communist Party ordered Hong Kong police to raid the headquarters of Stand News, a pro-democracy Hong Kong-based news service critical of government policy coming out of Beijing. Seven Stand employees were arrested, and all remaining employees were dismissed. China's action is another violation of the Sino-British agreement signed in 1997 giving Hong Kong economic and political freedom until 2047. The West, and especially the United States, must not continue to turn a blind eye toward China's treatment of Hong Kong.

We also must reverse the current trend which has allowed China to gain superior numbers of military assets to ours in the South China Sea and off the coasts of our numerous Asian allies. As tensions grow with China over Taiwan, we must acknowledge Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi's comment: ''the U.S. will pay an unbearable price'' if we continue to support Taiwan. Our response must speak with conviction and specificity of the consequences China will suffer economically and potentially militarily if it moves against Taiwan, an important U.S. economic partner and champion of freedom and free enterprise.

With shortages of face masks to battle COVID–19 and computer chip delays that have challenged American automobile manufacturers, it should be apparent to both U.S. producers and consumers that U.S. businesses must rethink their previous supply chain strategy and be encouraged to produce more necessities at home.

Further, we must rally the world and hold China responsible for the COVID–19 outbreak and its consequences. It's the right thing to do and the only way to prevent a future outbreak.

We applaud Congress for passing a bill targeting China over Uyghur-forced labor practices. The measure prohibits imports from the Xinjiang region of China unless companies can prove the products were made without forced labor. We hope President Biden signs it immediately and more is done by the U.S. government and U.S. corporations to protect the rights and freedoms of Muslim Uyghurs living in China.

Broadening our view of China further, The Hill recently posited: Should a weakening and unstable Chinese economic model be as great a concern as a rising China? The answer is yes. China's concern over energy shortages, slowing economic growth and productivity, and debt now at 290% of GDP, demonstrates that confidence in the Chinese economic and political structure is teetering from within. In addition, recent crackdowns on the property and technology sectors will result in less flexibility and greater economic authoritarianism control over two sectors that account for 29 percent of Chinese GDP.

Our concerns regarding Chinese economic stability and their ability to execute their 5-year planning model hopefully will be a cause for concern within the greater Communist Party of China. Exposing the growing fragility and incompetence of the Chinese economic model could provide a boost for pro-market reform party members as they vote at the 2022 Communist Party Congress this fall. Open, honest and regular communication of China's current economic structural weaknesses could help market-friendly party members use data to thwart Xi Jinping's ambition to be only the third leader in the party's 100-year history elected to a third term. Perhaps a modern Chinese version of 'Radio-free Europe' would be useful in the months ahead?

U.S. ENERGY POLICY CONTINUES TO MAKE NO SENSE TO US

Oil prices continue to fluctuate, declining to the mid-$60's range weeks ago only to rebound to more than $77 a barrel currently. Many energy experts believe oil could trade at more than $100 a barrel in 2022 if the Biden Administration continues its illogical energy policy. Remember that U.S. oil and natural gas are among the cleanest carbon-based fuels by category available in the world today. In fact, U.S. production of clean fossil fuels has dramatically reduced the U.S. carbon footprint, making it the global leader in carbon reduction in the industrialized world over the last 30 years. However, if cleaner U.S. oil and natural gas continue to be removed from the U.S. and world markets due to the Biden Administration's policies, five nonsensical results will occur: 1) The policy will enhance the political and public policy initiatives of countries unfriendly to democracy like Russia and Iran; 2) European allies will become more dependent on unfriendly nations for their oil and natural gas needs, thereby weakening the security and economic prowess of Europe and the United States; 3) More ''dirtier'' Russian and Iranian oil and natural gas on global markets coupled with less from the U.S. means a sustained increase of lower quality and higher polluting fossil fuel products on global energy markets (in effect, the Biden Administration's policy will increase the global carbon footprint rather than reduce it, making the policy anti-green rather than the pro-green policy it's currently being promoted to represent); 4) The policy will employ thousands of Russians and Iranians in high-paying oil industry-related jobs when those good jobs could be here in the United States with workers paying taxes to the United States; and, 5) Billions of dollars of local, state and federal tax revenue from U.S. oil companies will be lost to the U.S. government at all levels in the months and years ahead.

CONCLUSION

The U.S. National Debt currently stands at $29.62 trillion (over $89,000 per U.S. man, woman, and child and just under $237,000 per U.S. taxpayer). Much of the current state of our national debt is due to excessive government spending on programs that are not needed while taking capital from private sector investments and U.S. national defense. It is crucial that U.S. fiscal, monetary and foreign policy focus on strategies that will grow U.S. capital investment, private sector job and economic growth, while defending the United States and our key allies. This is the only way to ensure that the United States will remain the world's only economic and military superpower.

BROOKWOOD FLORIDA'S 95TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brookwood Florida on 95 years of service. Brookwood Florida provides a home for girls, diverted by abuse, neglect, or family dysfunction, in which they learn to be self-sufficient and successful. They provide a unique, life-changing residential program for non-pregnant, non-addicted, at-risk girls between the ages of 13 and 21. Serving approximately 125 girls per year who have suffered abuse, neglect, homelessness, and

serious family dysfunction with a community-based program providing 24/7 care to help their clients move steadily toward self-sufficiency and reintegration within the community. I thank Brookwood Florida for their dedication to serving those in Tampa Bay and wish them continued success.

HONORING MR. J. DAVID VANDERVEEN

HON. ELISSA SLOTKIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. J. David VanderVeen on his retirement after 55 years of devoted service as director of Oakland County International Airport.

Mr. VanderVeen first took the reins as director of the airport on February 25, 1967—several years before the position of Oakland County county executive was even established. Since then, he's served under three elected county executives, seven Michigan governors, and a whopping eleven presidential administrations. Madam Speaker, to put this into perspective, Mr. VanderVeen has helmed the county airport longer than one-third of the Members of this Chamber have been alive.

However, beyond his record-breaking tenure, Mr. VanderVeen's accomplishments in that time truly stand out. Today, the runways at Oakland County International Airport capably handle an average of 120,000 takeoffs and landings per year, ranking it the twelfth-busiest general aviation airport in the world. In addition, over 150 corporations and more than 554 aircraft have entrusted the airport to serve as a base of operations, which contributes $1 billion annually to the local economy of southeast Michigan.

Even our state's notorious winter storms, the bane of so many airports across the Midwest, have been no match for Mr. VanderVeen. Among his proudest achievements is that the runways never once closed due to snow or ice—the airport's steadfast ground crews have worked around the clock to keep them operational, including in 1982 when football fans flew in from all over the country to see Super Bowl XVI at the Pontiac Silverdome.

Simply put, for more than half a century, Mr. VanderVeen's leadership has been a touchstone of Oakland County government. He doesn't just have institutional knowledge, he is the institution. And while others may have come and gone, Mr. VanderVeen has remained at his post, helping his colleagues as they navigate the challenges of a dynamic county and growing community.

Several years ago, when Oakland County's first county executive, Daniel T. Murphy, passed away, Mr. VandenVeen spoke at a service for his former boss, remarking that, ''Dan Murphy set the bar high for political leaders in this state.''

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that, like Mr. Murphy, Mr. VanderVeen has similarly set the bar high for public servants—both in our state and across our nation. He has been an instrumental part of the county's success story, and there is no question he leaves his successor enormous shoes to fill.

While I understand that Mr. VanderVeen will continue to represent the current county executive on the county's parks and recreation and airport committees, I know I speak for everyone when I say that he's more than earned some well-deserved time off.

To his friends and loved ones, particularly his wife, Shelagh, his four children, eight grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren, may they enjoy the time they now have to spend with him. And to all of my colleagues, may we take a page from Mr. VanderVeen's playbook and strive, as he did, to always put service before self. It's my honor to spotlight his incredible accomplishments.

HONORING AND COMMENDING THE WORK OF GRANT DUBOIS

HON. PAT FALLON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend the work of Mr. Grant Dubois in his tenure as the President of the Rockwall County Republican Men's Club.

Mr. Dubois has served as the Rockwall County Republican Men's Club for three consecutive years from 2019 to 2021 and was the youngest President in the club's history. As President, he facilitated a change in meeting venues from city park to a larger, more accommodating facility located in downtown Rockwall. The change in venue allowed for the club's growth.

Mr. Dubois also oversaw the two most successful fundraising golf tournaments the club has ever hosted. This golf tournament is named in honor of former member Ralph Hall. Perhaps his greatest accomplishment in his three years as the President of the Rockwall County Republican Men's Club is the record breaking growth in club membership. Despite the constraints of the pandemic, his tenure saw the club grow from 130 members to over 200.

I have requested the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to recognize the devotion of Mr. Grant Dubois to the Rockwall County Republican Men's Club. May God bless him and the future of the Rockwall County Republican Men's Club.

CELEBRATING THE TRICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF HAMPTON FALLS, NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the tricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Town of Hampton Falls, New Hampshire. Known as the Third Parish of Hampton prior to 1722, Hampton Falls was aptly renamed after falls on the Taylor River, their water used to power the watermills central to the town's early industries.

The earliest residents of Hampton Falls worked on farms and in the timber industry. The town has stayed close to these roots, remaining heavily invested in farmland. Hampton Falls is home to Applecrest Orchards, the town's largest employer, New Hampshire's oldest and largest orchard and the oldest continuously operated orchard in the nation.

In 1735, a mere 13 years after its establishment, Hampton Falls fell victim to a horrible bout of Throat Distemper that caused more than 200 deaths in the small population of less than 500, and that left only two homes in the community untouched. Since those troubling times, the town has flourished, reaching a population of more than 2,300. Hampton Falls is a small but mighty town, dedicated to maintaining its lands and protecting our environment. If the past three centuries are any indication on the future, Hampton Falls is sure to persevere and prosper for years to come.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I want to congratulate the Town of Hampton Falls on this incredible milestone. I look forward to a continued partnership with Hampton Falls and its residents who I am proud to represent in Congress.

RECOGNIZING DR. JOELY PROUDFIT AS MY CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize Carlsbad resident, educator, and fierce advocate for Indigenous peoples, Dr. Joely Proudfit, for my December Constituent of the Month. A Native Southern Californian and a Luiseño/Payómkawichum woman, Dr. Proudfit first tapped into her passion for activism in college as a way for her to stay connected to her Native ancestry and support Native peoples. As the first member of her family to complete a high school diploma, and now a renowned and tenured professor, Dr. Proudfit has dedicated her life's work to furthering the education and promotion of proper representation for Native Americans and Indigenous peoples in media and society.

Dr. Proudfit strives to serve as a role model to Native youth by encouraging all who enter her classroom that anyone can achieve success with self-determination and a desire for knowledge. Dr. Proudfit also uses her platform as an educator and highly visible advocate to shed light on the harmful stereotypes and false narratives perpetuated around American Indians and to change perceptions of tribal communities.

What makes California's 49th District so special is the rich blending of cultures, backgrounds, and walks of life throughout our communities. The voices and stories of Native Americans have fallen to the shadows far too often. I am so grateful to have leaders and role models like Dr. Proudfit who are the voices we need for these communities to be seen and heard. The contributions and voices of Native and Indigenous peoples are fundamental to our national story, and Dr. Proudfit's work to lift up tribal communities has made our community and our country stronger. I'm proud to recognize her as my December Constituent of the Month.

ROBERT DAMMINGER

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, a native of Paulsboro, New Jersey, Commissioner Director Damminger attended and graduated from Paulsboro High School. His commitment to public service began as he was elected to hold a seat on the Paulsboro Council, which he served in graciously for eleven years. He was a member of the Public works, Finance and the Water Sewer Committees as well as Chair of the Public Safety Committee for 10 years.

During his tenure, Commissioner Director Damminger has dutifully served eight terms over the span of eleven years on the County Board. Gloucester County being home to roughly three-hundred thousand residents, Commissioner Director Damminger has led his fellow commissioners on the mission to provide the highest level of service while also enhancing the quality of life in the County.

Commissioner Director Damminger's dedication to Gloucester County and its residents has resulted in efforts to permanently preserve more than twenty-thousand acres of farmland and open space. He also helped to secure millions in federal and state funding to improve the county's roads and infrastructure. Commissioner Director Damminger is a trailblazer, credited with making Gloucester County the first county in the great state of New Jersey to regionalize the correctional system, putting the county on pace to save taxpayers a quarter-of-a-billion dollars over the next twenty-five years. Although his successor will be chosen in the coming months, it is evident that Commissioner Director Damminger's impact on Gloucester County will be appreciated for years to come.

CONGRATULATING JAN OLIVER ON HER MANY YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to recognize and congratulate, the Committee's Chief Counsel, Jan Oliver on her upcoming retirement. Jan has been a stalwart for small businesses for years and has worked in public service for decades. From her time with now Senator PORTMAN to working at the White House to her service to this Committee, her steady guidance and counsel has always been welcomed. Jan, thank you for the thoughtful insight and analysis on all issues, including and especially those pertaining to regulations and its impact on small businesses.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. JUANITA CARRERE MITCHELL FOR CELEBRATING 110 YEARS OF LIFE

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 2022

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, life is precious, even if you live it for only a brief period of time. When you are blessed to live 110 years, one hundred and ten productive years, and be in relatively good health, good enough to talk several minutes with a Congressman who called your daughter to get some information, you are truly blessed.

Mrs. Juanita Mitchell was born December 15, 1911 in Nestor, Louisiana to Acklin and Cinderella Carrere. She remembers her grandmother cooking and people working in the field and harvesting the crops. She describes her grandfather as White, and remarks his family distanced themselves from him after he married a black woman, her grandmother.

Mrs. Mitchell and her family relocated to Chicago in 1919 following the death of her father. Her father left home going to New Orleans in preparation for war service. During his time in New Orleans, he took sick, was diagnosed with pneumonia, which became known as the plague. It was the loss of her father that prompted her mother to come to Chicago with her two girls. Mrs. Mitchell's relocation to Chicago was unsettling, when she came to Chicago in 1919 as race riots erupted. Mrs. Mitchell has vivid memories of these experiences and shares the events and how it felt as an 8-year-old child. She recalls hiding behind the piano in her uncle's home with her mother and younger sister. Juanita Mitchell lived through the Chicago race riots, the depression and segregated neighborhoods. She went on to marry and raise two children. Juanita Mitchell lived on 35th and Giles in Chicago. Her aunt and uncle, Dr. Carl White had a grocery store and his medical office across the street from Olivet Baptist Church.

Mrs. Mitchell attended Sunday School and church at Olivet Baptist Church. She attended Drake Elementary and Hyde Park High School. She then went on to business school and Washburn Trade where she studied Tailoring. Juanita and Morant Mitchell were married May 3, 1934. They celebrated 50 years of marriage in 1984. Mr. Mitchell died in 1987. Mrs. Mitchell was always civic minded. She is a life-long Eastern Star and is a past worthy matron.

In moving to Flossmoor at the age 85, she continued her community engagement, serving on the beautiful Action Committee for her subdivision and attending village and association meetings at the age of 110 years old, and she continues to be a member of the "Belles of Ballantrae".

Congratulations to Mrs. Juanita Carrere Mitchell, on living a long and outstanding life.

I thank Mary for bringing her mother to our attention. Mary, John, and other members of the family have been truly blessed to have her with them for all of their lives. May she continue to live and enjoy life.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 13, 2022 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed joint briefing on U.S. policy on Afghanistan.

CVC–200

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on National Parks

To hold hearings to examine the implementation of the Great American Outdoors Act.

SD–366

FEBRUARY 1

3 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. territories.

SD–366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S165–S194

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3481–3495, and S. Res. 487–489. **Pages S189–190**

Measures Passed:

Jose Daniel Ferrer Garcia: Senate agreed to S. Res. 489, commending the actions of Cuban human rights and democracy activist Jose Daniel Ferrer Garcia, and all pro-democracy and human rights activists, in demanding fundamental civil liberties in Cuba and speaking out against Cuba's brutal, totalitarian Communist regime. **Pages S183–184**

Protecting Europe's Energy Security Implementation Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, January 13, 2022, Senate begin consideration of S. 3436, to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to entities responsible for the planning, construction, or operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline and their corporate officers and to apply congressional review under the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act to the removal of sanctions relating to Nord Stream 2, as provided under the previous order of December 18, 2021; that at 2:15 p.m., there be 30 minutes for debate, equally divided between the two Leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of that time, Senate vote on passage of the bill, as provided under the agreement of December 18, 2021. **Page S194**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 68 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. EX. 6), Amitabha Bose, of New Jersey, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration.

Pages S165–181

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 7), Gabriel P. Sanchez, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit. **Pages S181–182**

Measures Read the First Time:

Pages S188, S193–194

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S188–189**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S190**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S190–193

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S193**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—7) **Pages S181–182**

Recess: Senate convened at 12:30 p.m. and recessed at 7:04 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 13, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S194.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Chavonda J. Jacobs-Young, of Georgia, to be Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics, and Margo Schlanger, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Agriculture.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Henry Christopher Frey, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Martha Williams, of Montana, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and 18 GSA resolutions.

WRDA OVERSIGHT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Water Resources Development Act, focusing on USACE implementation of water infrastructure projects, programs, and priorities, after receiving testimony from Michael L. Connor, Assistant Secretary

of the Army for Civil Works, and Lieutenant General Scott A. Spellmon, Chief of Engineers and Commanding General of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, both of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Amy Gutmann, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, Donald Armin Blome, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Christopher R. Hill, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Serbia, Joseph Donnelly, of Indiana, to be Ambassador to the Holy See, Michele Taylor, of Georgia, for the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service as United States Representative to the UN Human Rights Council, Eric M. Garcetti, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of India, Lisa A. Carty, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and Laura S. H. Holgate, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be Representative of the United States of America to the Vienna Office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State, Oren E. Whyche-Shaw, of Maryland, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank, Alice P. Albright, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Enoh T. Ebong, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Trade and Development Agency, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Sarah H. Cleveland, of New York, to be Legal Adviser, who was introduced by Senator Coons, James C. O'Brien, of Nebraska, to be Head of the Office of Sanctions Coordination, with the rank of Ambassador, George J. Tsunis, of New York, to be Ambassador to Greece, who was introduced by Senators Casey and Paul, and Beth Van Schaack, of California, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Criminal Justice, who was introduced by Senator Booker, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CLOSING THE DIGITAL DIVIDE

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine closing the digital divide in Native communities through infrastructure investment, after receiving testimony from Manuel Heart, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Towaoc, Colorado; William Smith, National Indian Health Board, Valdez, Alaska; Walter W. Haase, Navajo Tribal Utility Authority, Fort Defiance, Arizona; Carrie L. Billy, American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Alexandria, Virginia; Matthew Rantanen, National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.; Donavan Kealoha, Purple Mai'a Foundation, 'Aiea, Hawaii; and Hallie Bissett, Alaska Native Village Corporation Association, Anchorage.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Andre B. Mathis, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Jessica G. L. Clarke, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Hector Gonzalez, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, who were both introduced by Senator Schumer, Fred W. Slaughter, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, who was introduced by Senator Padilla, and Sharon Bradford Franklin, of Maryland, to be Chairman and Member, and Beth Ann Williams, of New Jersey, to be a Member, both of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATION

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Kenneth L. Wainstein, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 6373–6391; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 866–867 and 869, were introduced.

Pages H77–78

Additional Cosponsors: Page H79

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 868, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5746) 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. Rept. 117–226). Page H77

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Soto to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H45

Guard and Reserve GI Bill Parity Act: The House passed H.R. 1836, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the time during which members of the Armed Forces serve on active duty for training qualifies for educational assistance under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 287 yeas to 135 nays, Roll No. 6. Pages H50–64

Rejected the Fitzgerald motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Veterans Affairs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 204 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 5. Pages H62–63

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–25 shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs now printed in the bill. Page H50

Agreed to:

Ross amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–225) that requires the VA to inform new veterans of the medical care and services for which they are eligible, including community care under the MISSION Act; mental health care, including the Veterans Crisis Line; care relating to military sexual trauma; and any other information the Secretary deems appropriate. Pages H59–60

Rejected:

Moore (AL) amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–225) that sought to replace the base text of the bill with a fully paid-for expansion of GI Bill benefits to members of the Guard and Reserve who are on Federal Active Duty orders for missions other than training (by a yea-and-nay vote of 198 yeas to 225 nays, Roll No. 4). Pages H60–62

H. Res. 860, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1836) and (H.R. 4673) was agreed to yesterday, January 11th.

Recess: The House recessed at 4:23 p.m. and reconvened at 9:30 p.m. Page H64

NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 868, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 5746) 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, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 8, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 201 nays, Roll No. 7. Pages H64–74

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H62, H63, H63–64, H72–73, and H73–74.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 p.m. and adjourned at 11:37 p.m.

Committee Meetings

IMPLICATIONS OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE INVESTMENTS FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AMERICA

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Implications of Electric Vehicle Investments for Agriculture and Rural America''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPACT OF CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled ''Impact of Continuing Resolutions on the Department of Defense and Services''. Testimony was heard from General David H. Berger, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps; General Charles Q. Brown, Jr., Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force; Admiral Michael Gilday, Chief of Naval Operations of the U.S. Navy; General Joseph M. Martin, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army; Mike McCord, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller); and General John W. Raymond, Chief of Space Operations of the U.S. Space Force.

SENATE AMENDMENT TO NASA ENHANCED USE LEASING EXTENSION ACT OF 2021

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on the Senate Amendment to H.R. 5746, the ''NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act of 2021'' [Freedom to Vote: John R. Lewis Act]. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–3, a rule providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 5746. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on House Administration or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–28. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the motion. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule provides one hour of debate on the motion equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration or their designees. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lofgren, and Representatives Davis of Illinois and Sarbanes.

REVIEW OF SBA'S TOP MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES IN FISCAL YEAR 2022 AND SBA OIG'S SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Review of SBA's Top Management and Performance Challenges in Fiscal Year 2022 and SBA OIG's Semiannual Report to Congress''. Testimony was heard from Hannibal Ware, Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, U.S. Small Business Administration.

PROPOSALS FOR A WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2022: ADMINISTRATION PRIORITIES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled ''Proposals for a Water Resources Development Act of 2022: Administration Priorities''. Testimony was heard from Michael L. Connor, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of the Army; and Lieutenant General Scott A. Spellmon, Chief of Engineers and Commanding General, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Celeste Ann Wallander, of Maryland, Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, and John F. Plumb, of New York, each to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lael Brainard, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Sandra L. Thompson, of Maryland, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider the nominations of Robert McKinnon Califf, of North Carolina, to be Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, Jose Javier Rodriguez, of Florida, and Lisa M. Gomez, of New Jersey, both to be an Assistant Secretary, and David Weil, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, all of the Department of Labor, Amy Loyd, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary for Career, Technical, and Adult Education, Department of Education, Javier Ramirez, of Illinois, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director, Linda A. Puchala, of Maryland, to be Member of the National Mediation Board, and Susan Harthill, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, Time to be announced, S–211, Capitol.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Margaret A. Burnham, of Massachusetts, Gabrielle M. Dudley, of Georgia, Henry Klibanoff, of Georgia, and Brenda E. Stevenson, of California, each to be a Member of the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board, 10:15 a.m., VTC.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2992, to provide that certain discriminatory conduct by covered platforms shall be unlawful, and the nominations of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Leonard Philip Stark, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Bridget Meehan Brennan, Charles Esque Fleming, and David Augustin Ruiz, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, Victoria Marie Calvert, and Sarah Elisabeth Geraghty, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, John H. Chun, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, Jaqueline Scott Corley, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Dale E. Ho, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Charlotte N. Sweeney, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Hernan D. Vera, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Georgette Castner, to be United States District Judge for the District of

New Jersey, Ruth Bermudez Montenegro, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Julie Rebecca Rubin, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, Cristina D. Silva, and Anne Rachel Traum, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, Katherine Vidal, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and Ryan K. Buchanan, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, Andrew M. Luger, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota, Mark A. Totten, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Michigan, and Jason M. Frierson, to be United States Attorney for the District of Nevada, all of the Department of Justice, 9 a.m., SH–216.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine financial literacy, focusing on addressing the unique just-in-time decisions older Americans and people with disabilities face, 9:30 a.m., VTC.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, January 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of S. 3436, Protecting Europe's Energy Security Implementation Act.

At 2:15 p.m., there will be up to 30 minutes of debate on the bill, equally divided. Upon the use or yielding back of that time, Senate will vote on passage of the bill.

(Senate will recess from 12:45 p.m. until 2:15 p.m.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, January 13

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 5746—NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E30
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E32
Fallon, Pat, Tex., E31
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E29
Levin, Mike, Calif., E31
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E32
McClain, Lisa C., Mich., E30
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E32
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E31
Slotkin, Elissa, Mich., E31
Smucker, Lloyd, Pa., E29
Strickland, Marilyn, Wash., E29
Upton, Fred, Mich., E29

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.