



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2022

No. 99

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TAKANO).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.,

June 9, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK TAKANO 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:

Holy God, we humble ourselves and pray to You, yielding our wills to Yours, and giving ourselves over to Your authority. We pray that You would be merciful in Your discipline.

Search our hearts and melt all hardness that You find therein. Liberate us from the bonds of hostility that prevent us from living lives of love and compassion.

Inspire us also to humble ourselves and to unite in prayer as a nation. Search the soul of our society and speak into the pain and suffering. Hold us accountable to the countless ways we are inclined to stray from Your will.

Then silence the voices within and among us which vie for power and strive to eliminate cooperation. Remind us of Your desire for mutual and respectful dialogue and of our responsibility to respect those with whom You have called us to serve.

Call us not to listen for our own counsel but to heed Your own. Call us out when we hasten to judge the differences of opinion, rather than work

for the common good. And call us from our intransigence into Your transcendent presence that we would experience Your grace and be transformed by Your spirit.

May we serve the people—Your people—with kindness and wisdom this day.

In Your divine 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support reinstating the assault weapons ban.

The AR-15 has become the weapon of choice for shooters looking to kill as many people as possible in as little time as possible. Researchers estimate

that if we still had a Federal assault weapons ban we would see 70 percent fewer mass shooting deaths.

The number of mass shootings has skyrocketed since the original assault weapons ban expired in 2004. These weapons have been used in the deadliest shootings in our history from Sandy Hook to Parkland to Uvalde. They are weapons of war that have no place in our community.

This is the amount of damage which is done by one bullet fired by an AR-15 as it enters the body. That is the bullet. That is the size of the damage. The bodies of kids in Uvalde were riddled so badly with wounds that their parents had to use DNA tests to identify their own children. One family identified their child by their shoes—their shoes.

These weapons don't just kill. They slaughter, and they decimate. They are designed for death and maximum destruction. They have no place in our schools or in our streets or anywhere in our communities.

We know that the original assault weapons ban worked. We have to reinstate it before more innocent lives are lost.

REMEMBERING WORLD WAR II VETERANS

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this week we mark the 78th anniversary of the D-day landing in northern France.

Three years ago, I had the honor of visiting the Normandy coastline to see the Utah and Omaha beaches, to see the memorial where the 2nd Ranger Battalion made their heroic stand, and to see the graves of the men who did not come home and who are now buried in the French countryside.

Those who fought in Normandy and across France on the road to victory in

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H5413

Europe came from all walks of life. Those individuals were bound by a common goal: to stand for freedom and to liberate the oppressed. They were part of our Nation's Greatest Generation. And now as they grow older and move on to their eternal salvation, we must continue to remember their courage and to remember their sacrifice.

Their legacy of service and bravery is at the heart of what makes the United States the greatest nation on Earth.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the common-sense gun safety legislation my colleagues and I have introduced this week. The horrific shootings in Buffalo and Uvalde are a painful reminder that action to stop gun violence is long overdue and that Republicans' decades of stonewalling is an intentional decision to allow Americans, including children, to continue to be slaughtered.

In particular, the GOP and its gun policy puppet master, the NRA, is obsessed with assault weapons. As a marine, I ate, trained, patrolled, and slept with an assault weapon for 4 years. These are weapons of war designed to kill humans. There is no constitutional defense for civilian ownership of assault weapons even under the District of Columbia v. Heller interpretation of the Second Amendment, and there is certainly no rational explanation for why a mentally disturbed young man should be able to purchase a weapon of war along with high-capacity magazines with no questions asked.

The GOP needs to stand up to the NRA and its dangerous and juvenile obsession with assault weapons. Otherwise, this slaughter will continue.

REMEMBERING JAMES "JIMMY" GUY BURKE, JR.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of Jimmy Guy Burke, Jr., a loving father and husband, servant, leader, and veteran from the great State of Georgia.

Jimmy was born in Savannah in 1935 and grew up in Tybee Island where he lived and served throughout his life. He was devoted to his family and community and showed pride in being a true Irish Savannahian.

His Irish heritage was very close to his heart, as shown by him serving as a member of the St. Patrick's Day Committee for 65 years. He was even selected to be the distinguished grand marshal of the St. Patrick's Day parade in 1993.

He served in many ways, such as being the founding member of the Irish Heritage Society, being elected to the

Tybee Island City Council, and serving as the president of the Tybee Island Republicans. Jimmy also served his country in the United States Marine Corps Reserve for 8 years and the 117th Georgia Air National Guard for 3 years.

He will continue to smile down on Savannah and Tybee Island through his family and his noble service to the Irish community.

Jimmy will surely be missed by all who knew him.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PELL GRANT PROGRAM

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Pell Grant Program.

Fifty years ago, Congress amended the Higher Education Act by creating the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant to provide direct financial aid to low-income students so that they would have the same opportunities and the same access to higher education as others.

Since then, the Pell Grant has been a cornerstone investment in the lives and futures of nearly 80 million students across the country.

In my district, more than \$123 million in Pell grants have been awarded to students just last year. Think of the difference that has made.

As a former educator myself, I know that cost is one of the largest barriers to higher education, and here in Congress I will continue to do everything in my power to support the Pell Grant Program and ensure it continues to break down that very barrier.

THE BUCK STOPS AT THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

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

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, a survey by The Wall Street Journal found that 83 percent of Americans describe the state of the economy as poor or not so good. President Biden's approval ratings are in free fall, and the American people are correct in holding him accountable for skyrocketing prices.

Since entering office, President Biden's policies of Big Government spending and attacks on American energy have weakened America's economy and placed enormous burdens on working families.

My Republican colleagues and I have called on President Biden to reverse course. The President should take immediate steps to unleash American energy, stop the out-of-control spending, and focus on the real issues that are hitting Americans in their pocketbooks.

President Biden is completely out of touch. What is worse, our children and grandchildren will be responsible for

paying for his mess. President Biden must stop blaming others for his failures and start embracing the solutions that are in the best interests of the American people.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, yesterday during the debate on guns, Representative JORDAN and a few others on the Republican side said that the Second Amendment and the right to guns was a God-given right.

I don't know anything in the Old Testament where God spoke to guns. I do know He spoke to Moses and gave him the Ten Commandments and said nothing about AR-15s or guns. But He said: Thou shall not kill.

In the New Testament I don't think Jesus said anything about guns or AR-15s, but He did say: You shall beat your swords into plowshares.

We are all created in the image of God, and I am sure God would not like His powers, His name, and His authority used to endorse the killing of young people through weapons that he was allegedly giving, AR-15s. God would look askance at that type of logic.

God bless America.

RECOGNIZING VIRGINIA'S NCAA DIVISION I MEN'S TENNIS CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate student athletes from the University of Virginia for their success in winning the 2022 NCAA Division I Men's Tennis National Championship.

Each year the NCAA supports student athletes from roughly 1,100 institutions of higher learning sponsoring 90 championships in 24 sports. Over half a million student athletes from across the United States compete each year for a national championship.

Winning an NCAA championship is truly a remarkable achievement and something deserving of celebration.

On Sunday, May 22, 2022, the many years of hard work and perseverance of these UVA student athletes paid off. They defeated Kentucky 4-0, securing the program's fifth NCAA Division I Men's Tennis National Championship, all coming in the last 10 years.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to congratulate these student athletes and the University of Virginia for this great achievement.

BIDEN INFLATION

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, as the Biden inflation worsens and Americans are forced to choose between buying groceries or filling their gas tanks, Democrats will hold a prime time, Hollywood-produced sham hearing of their unconstitutional Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack.

Most Americans won't watch. In fact, America's most-watched news source, FOX News, won't even be covering the hearing live. That won't stop Democrats from trying to pull out all the stops to do whatever they can to distract the American people from their inability to effectively govern.

They have even hired a slick ABC News producer to produce the hearing to ensure their spectacle is ready for prime time.

I hope, come November, when folks head to the polls they remember Democrats decided to put politics first instead of focusing on the real-life issues we all face today. It is truly a shame.

□ 0915

FEDERAL EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1153, I call up the bill (H.R. 2377) to authorize the issuance of extreme risk protection orders, 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 1153, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-46, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 117-356, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2377

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 "Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. FEDERAL EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDERS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§932. Extreme risk protection orders

"(a) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section—
 "(1) the term 'court' means a district court of the United States;

"(2) the term 'designated law enforcement officer' means a law enforcement officer, designated by a United States marshal, who agrees to receive firearms, ammunition, and permits, as applicable, surrendered under subsection (f);

"(3) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts;

"(4) the term 'ex parte Federal extreme risk protection order' or 'ex parte Federal order' means a Federal extreme risk protection order issued under subsection (c);

"(5) the term 'Federal extreme risk protection order' means an order issued by a Federal court

that enjoins an individual from purchasing, possessing, or receiving, in or affecting interstate and foreign commerce, a firearm or ammunition;

"(6) the term 'family or household member', with respect to a Federal order respondent, means any—

"(A) parent, spouse, sibling, or child related by blood, marriage, or adoption to the respondent;

"(B) dating partner of the respondent;

"(C) individual who has a child in common with the respondent, regardless of whether the individual has—

"(i) been married to the respondent; or

"(ii) lived together with the respondent at any time;

"(D) individual who resides or has resided with the respondent during the past year;

"(E) domestic partner of the respondent;

"(F) individual who has a legal parent-child relationship with the respondent, including a stepparent-stepchild and grandparent-grandchild relationship; and

"(G) individual who is acting or has acted as the legal guardian of the respondent;

"(7) the term 'Federal order petitioner' means an individual authorized to petition for an ex parte or long-term Federal extreme risk protection order under subsection (b)(1);

"(8) the term 'Federal order respondent' means an individual named in the petition for an ex parte or long-term Federal extreme risk protection order or subject to an ex parte or long-term Federal extreme risk protection order;

"(9) the term 'long-term Federal extreme risk protection order' or 'long-term Federal order' means a Federal extreme risk protection order issued under subsection (d);

"(10) the term 'mental health agency' means an agency of a State, Tribal, or local government or its contracted agency that is responsible for mental health services or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse services; and

"(11) the term 'national instant criminal background check system' means the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901).

"(b) *PETITION.*—

"(1) *IN GENERAL.*—A family or household member of the applicable individual, or a law enforcement officer, may submit to an appropriate district court of the United States a petition requesting that the court issue an ex parte Federal extreme risk protection order or long-term Federal extreme risk protection order with respect to an individual.

"(2) *NO FEES.*—A court or law enforcement agency may not charge a petitioner or respondent any fee for—

"(A) filing, issuing, serving, or reporting an extreme risk protection order;

"(B) a petition for an extreme risk protection order or any pleading, subpoena, warrant, or motion in connection with an extreme risk protection order; or

"(C) any order or order to show cause necessary to obtain or give effect to this section.

"(3) *CONFIDENTIALITY.*—A Federal order petitioner who is a law enforcement officer may provide the identity of the petitioner's sources, and any identifying information, to the court under seal.

"(c) *EX PARTE ORDERS.*—

"(1) *TIMING.*—

"(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a court that receives a petition for an ex parte Federal order under subsection (b) shall grant or deny the petition on the date on which the petition is submitted.

"(B) *LATE PETITIONS.*—If a court receives a petition for an ex parte Federal order submitted under subsection (b) too late in the day to permit effective review, the court shall grant or deny the petition on the next day of judicial business at a time early enough to permit the court to file an order with the clerk of the court during that day.

"(2) *EVIDENCE REQUIRED.*—Before issuing an ex parte Federal order, a court shall require that the petitioner for such order submit a signed affidavit, sworn to before the court, that—

"(A) explains why such petitioner believes that the Federal order respondent poses a risk of imminent personal injury to self or another individual, by purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm or ammunition; and

"(B) describes the interactions and conversations of the petitioner with—

"(i) the respondent; or

"(ii) another individual, if such petitioner believes that information obtained from that individual is credible and reliable.

"(3) *STANDARD FOR ISSUANCE OF ORDER.*—A court may issue an ex parte Federal order only upon a finding of probable cause to believe that—

"(A) the Federal order respondent poses a risk of imminent personal injury to self or another individual, by purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm or ammunition; and

"(B) the order is necessary to prevent the injury described in subparagraph (A).

"(4) *DURATION.*—An ex parte Federal order shall expire on the earlier of—

"(A) the date that is 14 days after the date of issuance; or

"(B) the date on which the court determines whether to issue a long-term Federal order with respect to the respondent.

"(d) *LONG-TERM FEDERAL ORDERS.*—

"(1) *HEARING REQUIRED.*—If a court receives a petition for a long-term Federal extreme risk protection order for a respondent under subsection (b), the court shall hold a hearing to determine whether to issue a long-term Federal order with respect to the respondent either—

"(A)(i) if the court issues an ex parte order with respect to the respondent, not later than 72 hours after the ex parte order is served on the respondent; or

"(ii) if the respondent waives the right to a hearing within the 72-hour period under clause (i), or the court does not issue an ex parte order, within 14 days after the date on which the court receives the petition; or

"(B) in no event later than 14 days after the date on which the court receives the petition.

"(2) *NOTICE AND OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD.*—

"(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The court shall provide the Federal order respondent with notice and the opportunity to be heard at a hearing under this subsection, sufficient to protect the due process rights of the respondent.

"(B) *RIGHT TO COUNSEL.*—

"(i) *IN GENERAL.*—At a hearing under this subsection, the Federal order respondent may be represented by counsel who is—

"(I) chosen by the respondent; and

"(II) authorized to practice at such a hearing.

"(ii) *COURT-PROVIDED COUNSEL.*—If the Federal order respondent is financially unable to obtain representation by counsel, the court, at the request of the respondent, shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the respondent is represented by an attorney with respect to the petition.

"(3) *BURDEN OF PROOF; STANDARD.*—At a hearing under this subsection, the Federal order petitioner—

"(A) shall have the burden of proving all material facts; and

"(B) shall be required to demonstrate, by clear and convincing evidence, that—

"(i) the respondent to such order poses a risk of personal injury to self or another individual, during the period to be covered by the proposed Federal extreme risk protection order, by purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm or ammunition; and

"(ii) the order is necessary to prevent the injury described in clause (i).

"(4) *ISSUANCE.*—Upon a showing of clear and convincing evidence under paragraph (3), the court shall issue a long-term Federal order with

respect to the respondent that shall be in effect for a period of not more than 180 days.

“(5) DENIAL.—If the court finds that there is not clear and convincing evidence to support the issuance of a long-term Federal order, the court shall dissolve any *ex parte* Federal order then in effect with respect to the respondent.

“(6) RENEWAL.—

“(A) NOTICE OF SCHEDULED EXPIRATION.—Thirty days before the date on which a long-term Federal order is scheduled to expire, the court that issued the order shall—

“(i) notify the petitioner and the respondent to such order that the order is scheduled to expire; and

“(ii) advise the petitioner and the respondent of the procedures for seeking a renewal of the order under this paragraph.

“(B) PETITION.—If a family or household member of the Federal order respondent, or a law enforcement officer, believes that the conditions under paragraph (3)(B) continue to apply with respect to a respondent who is subject to a long-term Federal order, the family or household member or law enforcement officer may submit to the court that issued the order a petition for a renewal of the order.

“(C) HEARING.—A court that receives a petition submitted under subparagraph (B) shall hold a hearing to determine whether to issue a renewed long-term Federal order with respect to the respondent.

“(D) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES.—The requirements under paragraphs (2) through (5) shall apply to the consideration of a petition for a renewed long-term Federal order submitted under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

“(E) ISSUANCE.—Upon a showing by clear and convincing evidence that the conditions under paragraph (3)(B) continue to apply with respect to the respondent, the court shall issue a renewed long-term Federal order with respect to the respondent.

“(e) FACTORS TO CONSIDER.—In determining whether to issue a Federal extreme risk protection order, a court—

“(1) shall consider factors including—

“(A) a recent threat or act of violence by the respondent directed toward another individual;

“(B) a recent threat or act of violence by the respondent directed toward self;

“(C) a recent act of cruelty to an animal by the respondent; and

“(D) evidence of ongoing abuse of a controlled substance or alcohol by the respondent that has led to a threat or act of violence directed to self or another individual; and

“(2) may consider other factors, including—

“(A) the reckless use, display, or brandishing of a firearm by the respondent;

“(B) a history of violence or attempted violence by the respondent against another individual; and

“(C) evidence of an explicit or implicit threat made by the person through any medium that demonstrate that the person poses a risk of personal injury to self or another individual.

“(f) RELINQUISHMENT OF FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION.—

“(1) ORDER OF SURRENDER.—Upon issuance of an *ex parte* Federal order or long-term Federal order, the court shall order the respondent to such order to surrender all firearms and ammunition that the respondent possesses or owns, in or affecting interstate commerce, as well as any permit authorizing the respondent to purchase or possess firearms (including a concealed carry permit), to—

“(A) the United States Marshals Service; or

“(B) a designated law enforcement officer.

“(2) SURRENDER AND REMOVAL.—

“(A) MANNER OF SERVICE.—

“(i) PERSONAL SERVICE.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a United States marshal or designated law enforcement officer shall serve a Federal extreme risk protection order on a respondent by handing the order to the respondent to such order.

“(ii) ALTERNATIVE SERVICE.—If the respondent cannot reasonably be located for service as described in clause (i), a Federal extreme risk protection order may be served on the respondent in any manner authorized under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

“(B) REMOVAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a United States marshal or designated law enforcement officer serving a Federal extreme risk protection order personally on the respondent shall—

“(i) request that all firearms and ammunition, in or affecting interstate commerce, as well as any permit authorizing the respondent to purchase or possess firearms (including a concealed carry permit), that the respondent possesses or owns—

“(I) be immediately surrendered to the United States marshal or designated law enforcement officer; or

“(II) at the option of the respondent, be immediately surrendered and sold to a federally licensed firearms dealer; and

“(ii) take possession of all firearms and ammunition described in clause (i) that are not sold under subclause (II) of that clause, as well as any permit described in that clause, that are—

“(I) surrendered;

“(II) in plain sight; or

“(III) discovered pursuant to a lawful search.

“(C) ALTERNATIVE SURRENDER.—If a United States marshal or designated law enforcement officer is not able to personally serve a Federal extreme risk protection order under subparagraph (A)(i), or is not reasonably able to take custody of the firearms, ammunition, and permits under subparagraph (B), the respondent shall surrender the firearms, ammunition, and permits in a safe manner to the control of a United States marshal or designated law enforcement officer not later than 48 hours after being served with the order.

“(3) RECEIPT.—

“(A) ISSUANCE.—At the time of surrender or removal under paragraph (2), a United States marshal or designated law enforcement officer taking possession of a firearm, ammunition, or a permit pursuant to a Federal extreme risk protection order shall—

“(i) issue a receipt identifying all firearms, ammunition, and permits that have been surrendered or removed; and

“(ii) provide a copy of the receipt issued under clause (i) to the respondent to such order.

“(B) FILING.—Not later than 72 hours after issuance of a receipt under subparagraph (A), the United States marshal who issued the receipt or designated another law enforcement officer to do so shall—

“(i) file the original receipt issued under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph with the court that issued the Federal extreme risk protection order; and

“(ii) ensure that the United States Marshals Service retains a copy of the receipt.

“(C) DESIGNATED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—If a designated law enforcement officer issues a receipt under subparagraph (A), the officer shall submit the original receipt and a copy of the receipt to the appropriate United States marshal to enable the United States marshal to comply with subparagraph (B).

“(4) FORFEITURE.—If a respondent knowingly attempts, in violation of a Federal extreme risk protection order, to access a firearm, ammunition, or a permit that was surrendered or removed under this subsection, the firearm, ammunition, or permit shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture under section 924(d).

“(g) RETURN OF FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION.—

“(1) NOTICE.—If a Federal extreme risk protection order is dissolved, or expires and is not renewed, the court that issued the order shall order the United States Marshals Service to—

“(A) confirm, through the national instant criminal background check system and any

other relevant law enforcement databases, that the respondent to such order may lawfully own and possess firearms and ammunition; and

“(B)(i) if the respondent may lawfully own and possess firearms and ammunition, notify the respondent that the respondent may retrieve each firearm, ammunition, or permit surrendered by or removed from the respondent under subsection (f); or

“(ii) if the respondent may not lawfully own or possess firearms and ammunition, notify the respondent that each firearm, ammunition, or permit surrendered by or removed from the respondent under subsection (f) will be returned only when the respondent demonstrates to the United States Marshals Service that the respondent may lawfully own and possess firearms and ammunition.

“(2) RETURN.—If a Federal extreme risk protection order is dissolved, or expires and is not renewed, and the United States Marshals Service confirms under paragraph (1)(A) that the respondent may lawfully own and possess firearms and ammunition, the court that issued the order shall order the entity that possesses each firearm, ammunition, or permit surrendered by or removed from the respondent under subsection (f) to return those items to the respondent.

“(h) RETURN OF FIREARMS AND AMMUNITION IMPROPERLY RECEIVED.—If a court, in a hearing under subsection (d), determines that a firearm or ammunition surrendered by or removed from a respondent under subsection (f) is owned by an individual other than the respondent, the court may order the United States marshal or designated law enforcement officer in possession of the firearm or ammunition to transfer the firearm or ammunition to that individual if—

“(1) the individual may lawfully own and possess firearms and ammunition; and

“(2) the individual will not provide the respondent with access to the firearm or ammunition.

“(i) PENALTY FOR FALSE REPORTING OR FRIVOLOUS PETITIONS.—An individual who knowingly submits materially false information to the court in a petition for a Federal extreme risk protection order under this section, or who knowingly files such a petition that is frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, except to the extent that a greater sentence is otherwise provided by any other provision of law, as the court deems necessary to deter such abuse of process.

“(j) MODEL POLICY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall draft a model policy to maximize the accessibility of Federal extreme risk protection orders.

“(2) CONTENTS.—In drafting the model policy under paragraph (1), the Director shall—

“(A) ensure that State, Tribal, and local law enforcement officers and members of the public without legal training are able to easily file petitions for Federal extreme risk protection orders;

“(B) prescribe outreach efforts by employees of the district courts of the United States to familiarize relevant law enforcement officers and the public with the procedures for filing petitions, either—

“(i) through direct outreach; or

“(ii) in coordination with—

“(I) relevant officials in the executive or legislative branch of the Federal Government; or

“(II) with relevant State, Tribal, and local officials;

“(C) prescribe policies for allowing the filing of petitions and prompt adjudication of petitions on weekends and outside of normal court hours;

“(D) prescribe policies for coordinating with law enforcement agencies to ensure the safe, timely, and effective service of Federal extreme risk protection orders and relinquishment of firearms, ammunition, and permits, as applicable; and

“(E) identify governmental and non-governmental resources and partners to help officials

of the district courts of the United States coordinate with civil society organizations to ensure the safe and effective implementation of this section.

“(k) REPORTING.—

“(1) INDIVIDUAL REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 court days after the date on which a court issues or dissolves a Federal extreme risk protection order under this section or a Federal extreme risk protection order expires without being renewed, the court shall notify—

“(i) the Attorney General;

“(ii) each relevant mental health agency in the State in which the order is issued; and

“(iii) State and local law enforcement officials in the jurisdiction in which the order is issued, including the national instant criminal background check system single point of contact for the State of residence of the respondent, where applicable.

“(B) FORMAT.—A court shall submit a notice under subparagraph (A) in an electronic format, in a manner prescribed by the Attorney General.

“(C) UPDATE OF DATABASES.—As soon as practicable and not later than 5 days after receiving a notice under subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall update the background check databases of the Attorney General to reflect the prohibitions articulated in the applicable Federal extreme risk protection order.

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2022, and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes, with respect to the preceding year—

“(A) the number of petitions for ex parte Federal orders filed, as well as the number of such orders issued and the number denied, disaggregated by—

“(i) the jurisdiction;

“(ii) whether the individual authorized under subsection (b) to petition for a Federal extreme risk protection order is a law enforcement officer, or a family or household member, and in the case of a family or household member, which of subparagraphs (A) through (G) of subsection (a)(6) describes the relationship; and

“(iii) the alleged danger posed by the Federal order respondent, including whether the danger involved a risk of suicide, unintentional injury, domestic violence, or other interpersonal violence;

“(B) the number of petitions for long-term Federal orders filed, as well as the number of such orders issued and the number denied, disaggregated by—

“(i) the jurisdiction;

“(ii) whether the individual authorized under subsection (b) to petition for a Federal extreme risk protection order is a law enforcement officer, or a family or household member, and in the case of a family or household member, which of subparagraphs (A) through (G) of subsection (a)(6) describes the relationship; and

“(iii) the alleged danger posed by the Federal order respondent, including whether the danger involved a risk of suicide, unintentional injury, domestic violence, or other interpersonal violence;

“(C) the number of petitions for renewals of long-term Federal orders filed, as well as the number of such orders issued and the number denied;

“(D) the number of cases in which a court has issued a penalty for false reporting or frivolous petitions;

“(E) demographic data of Federal order petitioners, including race, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender, age, disability, average annual income, and English language proficiency, if available;

“(F) demographic data of Federal order respondents, including race, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender, age, disability, average an-

nual income, and English language proficiency, if available; and

“(G) the total number of firearms removed pursuant to Federal extreme risk protection orders, and, if available, the number of firearms removed pursuant to each such order.

“(l) TRAINING FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

“(1) TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—The head of each Federal law enforcement agency shall require each Federal law enforcement officer employed by the agency to complete training in the safe, impartial, effective, and equitable use and administration of Federal extreme risk protection orders, including training to address—

“(A) bias based on race and racism, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, language proficiency, mental health condition, disability, and classism in the use and administration of Federal extreme risk protection orders;

“(B) the appropriate use of Federal extreme risk protection orders in cases of domestic violence, including the applicability of other policies and protocols to address domestic violence in situations that may also involve Federal extreme risk protection orders and the necessity of safety planning with the victim before law enforcement petitions for and executes a Federal extreme risk protection order, if applicable;

“(C) interacting with persons with mental, behavioral, or physical disabilities, or emotional distress, including de-escalation techniques and crisis intervention;

“(D) techniques for outreach to historically marginalized cultural communities and the development of linguistic proficiencies for law enforcement;

“(E) community relations; and

“(F) best practices for referring persons subject to Federal extreme risk protection orders and associated victims of violence to social service providers that may be available in the jurisdiction and appropriate for those individuals, including health care, mental health, substance abuse, and legal services, employment and vocational services, housing assistance, case management, and veterans and disability benefits.

“(2) TRAINING DEVELOPMENT.—Federal law enforcement agencies developing law enforcement training required under this section shall seek advice from domestic violence service providers (including culturally specific (as defined in section 4002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291)) providers), social service providers, suicide prevention advocates, violence intervention specialists, law enforcement agencies, mental health disability experts, and other community groups working to reduce suicides and violence, including domestic violence, within the State.

“(m) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or shall be construed to alter the requirements of subsections (d)(8) or (g)(8) of section 922, related to domestic violence protective orders.

“(n) PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt any State law or policy.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“932. Extreme risk protection orders.”.

(2) FUTURE.—Section 924(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) any attempt to violate a Federal extreme risk protection order issued under section 932.”.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL FIREARMS PROHIBITION.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (8)(B)(ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) is subject to a court order—

“(A) issued under section 932; or

“(B) that is an extreme risk protection order (as defined in section 4(a) of the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2022).”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (8)(C)(ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) is subject to a court order—

“(A) issued under section 932; or

“(B) that is an extreme risk protection order (as defined in section 4(a) of the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2022).”.

SEC. 4. EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a State or Indian Tribe—

(i) that enacts legislation described in subsection (c);

(ii) with respect to which the Attorney General determines that the legislation described in clause (i) complies with the requirements under subsection (c)(1); and

(iii) that certifies to the Attorney General that the State or Indian Tribe shall—

(I) use the grant for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2); and

(II) allocate not less than 25 percent and not more than 70 percent of the amount received under a grant under subsection (b) for the development and dissemination of training for law enforcement officers in accordance with subsection (b)(4); or

(B) a unit of local government or other public or private entity that—

(i) is located in a State or in the territory under the jurisdiction of an Indian Tribe that meets the requirements described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A); and

(ii) certifies to the Attorney General that the unit of local government or entity shall—

(I) use the grant for the purposes described in subsection (b)(2); and

(II) allocate not less than 25 percent and not more than 70 percent of the amount received under a grant under this section for the development and dissemination of training for law enforcement officers in accordance with subsection (b)(4).

(2) EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER.—The term “extreme risk protection order” means a written order or warrant, issued by a State or Tribal court or signed by a magistrate (or other comparable judicial officer), the primary purpose of which is to reduce the risk of firearm-related death or injury by doing 1 or more of the following:

(A) Prohibiting a named individual from having under the custody or control of the individual, owning, purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm.

(B) Having a firearm removed or requiring the surrender of firearms from a named individual.

(3) FIREARM.—The term “firearm” has the meaning given the term in section 921 of title 18, United States Code.

(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given the term “Indian tribe” in section 1709 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10389).

(5) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “law enforcement officer” means a public servant authorized by Federal, State, local, or Tribal law or by a Federal, State, local, or Tribal government agency to—

(A) engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of an offense; or

(B) supervise sentenced criminal offenders.

(6) **PETITIONER.**—The term “petitioner” means an individual authorized under State or Tribal law to petition for an extreme risk protection order.

(7) **RESPONDENT.**—The term “respondent” means an individual named in the petition for an extreme risk protection order or subject to an extreme risk protection order.

(8) **STATE.**—The term “State” means—

(A) a State;

(B) the District of Columbia;

(C) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(D) any other territory or possession of the United States.

(9) **UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “unit of local government” has the meaning given the term in section 901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251).

(b) **GRANT PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice shall establish a program under which, from amounts made available to carry out this section, the Director may make grants to eligible entities to assist in carrying out the provisions of the legislation described in subsection (c).

(2) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds awarded under this subsection may be used by an applicant to—

(A) enhance the capacity of law enforcement agencies and the courts of a State, unit of local government, or Indian Tribe by providing personnel, training, technical assistance, data collection, and other resources to carry out enacted legislation described in subsection (c);

(B) train judges, court personnel, health care and legal professionals, and law enforcement officers to more accurately identify individuals whose access to firearms poses a danger of causing harm to themselves or others by increasing the risk of firearms suicide or interpersonal violence;

(C) develop and implement law enforcement and court protocols, forms, and orders so that law enforcement agencies and the courts may carry out the provisions of the enacted legislation described in subsection (c) in a safe, equitable, and effective manner, including through the removal and storage of firearms pursuant to extreme risk protection orders under the enacted legislation; and

(D) raise public awareness and understanding of the enacted legislation described in subsection (c), including through subgrants to community-based organizations for the training of community members, so that extreme risk protection orders may be issued in appropriate situations to reduce the risk of firearms-related death and injury.

(3) **APPLICATION.**—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Attorney General an application at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(4) **TRAINING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A recipient of a grant under this subsection shall provide training to law enforcement officers, including officers of relevant Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, in the safe, impartial, effective, and equitable use and administration of extreme risk protection orders, including training to address—

(i) bias based on race and racism, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, language proficiency, mental health condition, disability, and classism in the use and administration of extreme risk protection orders;

(ii) the appropriate use of extreme risk protection orders in cases of domestic violence, including the applicability of other policies and protocols to address domestic violence in situations that may also involve extreme risk protection orders and the necessity of safety planning with the victim before a law enforcement officer petitions for and executes an extreme risk protection order, if applicable;

(iii) interacting with persons with mental, behavioral, or physical disabilities, or emotional distress, including de-escalation techniques and crisis intervention;

(iv) techniques for outreach to historically marginalized cultural communities and the development of linguistic proficiencies for law enforcement;

(v) community relations; and

(vi) best practices for referring persons subject to extreme risk protection orders and associated victims of violence to social service providers that may be available in the jurisdiction and appropriate for those individuals, including health care, mental health, substance abuse, and legal services, employment and vocational services, housing assistance, case management, and veterans and disability benefits.

(B) **CONSULTATION WITH EXPERTS.**—A recipient of a grant under this subsection, in developing law enforcement training required under subparagraph (A), shall seek advice from domestic violence service providers (including culturally specific (as defined in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291)) providers), social service providers, suicide prevention advocates, violence intervention specialists, law enforcement agencies, mental health disability experts, and other community groups working to reduce suicides and violence, including domestic violence, within the State or the territory under the jurisdiction of the Indian Tribe, as applicable, that enacted the legislation described in subsection (c) that enabled the grant recipient to be an eligible entity.

(5) **INCENTIVES.**—For each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027, the Attorney General shall give affirmative preference in awarding any discretionary grant awarded by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to a State or Indian Tribe that has enacted legislation described in subsection (c) or to a unit of local government or other public or private entity located in such a State or in the territory under the jurisdiction of such an Indian Tribe.

(6) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

(c) **ELIGIBILITY FOR EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Legislation described in this subsection is legislation that establishes requirements that are substantially similar to the following:

(A) **APPLICATION FOR EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER.**—A petitioner, including a law enforcement officer, may submit an application to a State or Tribal court, on a form designed by the court or a State or Tribal agency, that—

(i) describes the facts and circumstances justifying that an extreme risk protection order be issued against the named individual; and

(ii) is signed by the applicant, under oath.

(B) **NOTICE AND DUE PROCESS.**—The individual named in an application for an ex-

treme risk protection order as described in subparagraph (A) shall be given written notice of the application and an opportunity to be heard on the matter in accordance with this paragraph.

(C) **ISSUANCE OF EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDERS.**—

(i) **HEARING.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon receipt of an application described in subparagraph (A) or request of an individual named in such an application, the court shall order a hearing to be held within a reasonable time, and not later than 30 days after the date of the application or request.

(II) **DETERMINATION.**—If the court finds at the hearing ordered under subclause (I), by a preponderance of the evidence or according to a higher evidentiary standard established by the State or Indian Tribe, that the respondent poses a danger of causing harm to self or others by having access to a firearm, the court may issue an extreme risk protection order.

(ii) **DURATION OF EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER.**—An extreme risk protection order shall be in effect—

(I) until an order terminating or superseding the extreme risk protection order is issued; or

(II) for a set period of time.

(D) **EX PARTE EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDERS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon receipt of an application described in subparagraph (A), the court may issue an ex parte extreme risk protection order, if—

(I) the application for an extreme risk protection order alleges that the respondent poses a danger of causing harm to self or others by having access to a firearm; and

(II) the court finds there is reasonable cause to believe, or makes a finding according to a higher evidentiary standard established by the State or Indian Tribe, that the respondent poses a danger of causing harm to self or others by having access to a firearm.

(ii) **DURATION OF EX PARTE EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER.**—An ex parte extreme risk protection order shall remain in effect only until the hearing required under subparagraph (C)(i).

(E) **STORAGE OF REMOVED FIREARMS.**—

(i) **AVAILABILITY FOR RETURN.**—All firearms removed or surrendered pursuant to an extreme risk protection order shall only be available for return to the named individual when the individual has regained eligibility under Federal and State law, and, where applicable, Tribal law to possess firearms.

(ii) **CONSENT REQUIRED FOR DISPOSAL OR DESTRUCTION.**—Firearms owned by a named individual may not be disposed of or destroyed during the period of the extreme risk protection order without the consent of the named individual.

(F) **NOTIFICATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—

(I) **REQUIREMENT.**—A State or Tribal court that issues an extreme risk protection order shall notify the Attorney General or the comparable State or Tribal agency, as applicable, of the order as soon as practicable or within a designated period of time.

(II) **FORM AND MANNER.**—A State or Tribal court shall submit a notification under subclause (I) in an electronic format, in a manner prescribed by the Attorney General or the comparable State or Tribal agency.

(ii) **UPDATE OF DATABASES.**—As soon as practicable or within the time period designated by State or Tribal law after receiving a notification under clause (i), the Attorney General or the comparable State or Tribal agency shall ensure that the extreme risk protection order is reflected in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

(2) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—Legislation described in this subsection may—

(A) provide procedures for the termination of an extreme risk protection order;

(B) provide procedures for the renewal of an extreme risk protection order;

(C) establish burdens and standards of proof for issuance of orders described in paragraph (1) that are substantially similar to or higher than the burdens and standards of proof set forth in that paragraph;

(D) limit the individuals who may submit an application described in paragraph (1), provided that, at a minimum, law enforcement officers are authorized to do so; and

(E) include any other authorizations or requirements that the State or Tribal authorities determine appropriate.

(3) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which an eligible entity receives a grant under subsection (b), and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant period, the entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report that includes, with respect to the preceding year—

(A) the number of petitions for ex parte extreme risk protection orders filed, as well as the number of such orders issued and the number denied, disaggregated by—

(i) the jurisdiction;

(ii) the individual authorized under State or Tribal law to petition for an extreme risk protection order, including the relationship of the individual to the respondent; and

(iii) the alleged danger posed by the respondent, including whether the danger involved a risk of suicide, unintentional injury, domestic violence, or other interpersonal violence;

(B) the number of petitions for extreme risk protection orders filed, as well as the number of such orders issued and the number denied, disaggregated by—

(i) the jurisdiction;

(ii) the individual authorized under State or Tribal law to petition for an extreme risk protection order, including the relationship of the individual to the respondent; and

(iii) the alleged danger posed by the respondent, including whether the danger involved a risk of suicide, unintentional injury, domestic violence, or other interpersonal violence;

(C) the number of petitions for renewals of extreme risk protection orders filed, as well as the number of such orders issued and the number denied;

(D) the number of cases in which a court imposed a penalty for false reporting or frivolous petitions;

(E) demographic data of petitioners, including race, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender, age, disability, average annual income, and English language proficiency, if available;

(F) demographic data of respondents, including race, ethnicity, national origin, sex, gender, age, disability, average annual income, and English language proficiency, if available; and

(G) the total number of firearms removed pursuant to extreme risk protection orders, and, if available, the number of firearms removed pursuant to each such order.

SEC. 5. IDENTIFICATION RECORDS.

Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4)(A) subject to subparagraph (B), acquire, collect, classify, and preserve records from Federal, Tribal, and State courts and

other agencies identifying individuals subject to extreme risk protection orders, as defined in section 4(a) of the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2022; and

“(B) destroy each record acquired or collected under subparagraph (A) when the applicable extreme risk protection order expires or is terminated or dissolved; and”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “(a)(4)” and inserting “(a)(5)”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDERS IN NATIONAL CRIME INFORMATION DATABASES.—A Federal, Tribal, or State criminal justice agency or criminal or civil court may—

“(1) include extreme risk protection orders, as defined in section 4 of the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2022, and Federal extreme risk protection orders, as defined in section 932 of title 18, in national crime information databases, as that term is defined in subsection (f)(3) of this section; and

“(2) have access to information regarding extreme risk protection orders and Federal extreme risk protection orders through the national crime information databases.”.

SEC. 6. FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “extreme risk protection order”, “Indian Tribe”, and “State” have the meanings given those terms in section 4(a).

(b) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT REQUIRED.—Any extreme risk protection order issued under a State or Tribal law enacted in accordance with this Act shall be accorded the same full faith and credit by the court of another State or Indian Tribe (referred to in this subsection as the “enforcing State or Indian Tribe”) and enforced by the court and law enforcement personnel of the other State or Tribal government as if it were the order of the enforcing State or Indian Tribe.

(c) APPLICABILITY TO PROTECTION ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) shall apply to a protection order issued by a State or Tribal court if—

(A) the court has jurisdiction over the parties and matter under the law of the State or Indian Tribe; and

(B) reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard is given to the person against whom the order is sought sufficient to protect that person’s right to due process.

(2) EX PARTE PROTECTION ORDERS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), in the case of an ex parte protection order, notice and opportunity to be heard shall be provided within the time required by State or Tribal law, and in any event within a reasonable time after the order is issued, sufficient to protect the due process rights of the respondent.

(d) TRIBAL COURT JURISDICTION.—For purposes of this section, a court of an Indian Tribe shall have full civil jurisdiction to issue and enforce a protection order involving any person, including the authority to enforce any order through civil contempt proceedings, to exclude violators from Indian land, and to use other appropriate mechanisms, in matters arising anywhere in the Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code) of the Indian Tribe or otherwise within the authority of the Indian Tribe.

SEC. 7. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 3(1) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 40903(1)) is amended by striking “section 922(g)(8)” and inserting “paragraph (8) or (10) of section 922(g)”.

SEC. 8. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this Act, or an amendment made by

this Act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES). The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam 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. 2377.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, over the past several weeks, we have watched in horror as gun violence has touched communities across the country and dozens of people, young and old, have lost their lives. The details of each case may differ, each tragic in its own way, but there is one theme that comes up most often; someone deeply troubled, experiencing some sort of crisis, had easy access to firearms. And all too often, the warning signs were clear, but nothing was done to keep guns out of their hands before it was too late.

H.R. 2377, the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act, provides a sensible means by which someone who is exhibiting dangerous behavior can be prevented from possessing or purchasing firearms before tragedy strikes.

This legislation, introduced by Representative LUCY MCBATH, authorizes Federal courts to issue an extreme risk protection order, or ERPO, temporarily removing firearms from a person in crisis and preventing them from purchasing firearms. This only occurs after the court determines that there is evidence demonstrating that the person poses an imminent danger of injuring himself, herself, or others.

The bill also includes legislation by Representative SALUD CARBAJAL, which provides funding to States to enact ERPO statutes of their own.

We know that extreme risk laws save lives. We have witnessed their effectiveness in State after State, beginning in 2016, when California passed the first such law. Since then, 18 other States and the District of Columbia have enacted similar laws.

An analysis of the first 3 years of California’s extreme risk law found

that these orders were used for 58 mass shooting threats, including six in which a minor threatened to target a school.

These orders were also used in response to 82 threats of suicide, and they worked. No suicides occurred among individuals who were subject to the orders.

Federal courts have long been bastions of due process and, accordingly, this legislation includes strong due process provisions that strike the appropriate balance between protecting the rights of the gun owner and ensuring community safety. Every court that has reviewed laws similar to this bill has found that the procedural safeguards are sufficient.

And as then-Seventh Circuit Judge Amy Coney Barrett wrote, "History is consistent with common sense: It demonstrates that legislatures have the power to prohibit dangerous people from possessing guns."

Madam Speaker, the Constitution does not require us to wait until lives are lost.

As we address the scourge of gun violence, a blight that killed 45,000 Americans in 2020 alone, let us remember that there are no perfect solutions. We are painfully aware that we cannot do enough to save every life, and there is no one answer that will solve this problem.

But we do know that taking guns out of the hands of people who pose a danger to themselves or others would save countless lives. This legislation would take meaningful steps to prevent gun violence tragedies in our communities while, at the same time, protecting the due process of rights of those individuals in crisis.

I thank Representatives MCBATH and CARBAJAL for their leadership on this issue. I urge all Members to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. JORDAN for yielding.

You know, we have heard some revealing things this week. It was just a few moments ago our colleague from Tennessee, Mr. COHEN, lectured us that the Old Testament doesn't mention the word "guns" and so we shouldn't claim that this is a fundamental freedom. You know, as usual, he misunderstands the point of Scripture and the Constitution.

Here is the thing: As Americans, we respect and we protect the unalienable, God-given right to self-protection and to the protection of innocent lives around us.

President Biden said—among other outrageous things this week we have heard, President Biden said that he wanted to ban 9-millimeter handguns. That is one of the most widely owned handguns by law-abiding citizens in this country.

Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island, now infamously in our committee hearing, exclaimed, "Spare me the" B.S.—that is not what he said—"Spare me the" B.S. "about constitutional rights." That is pretty revealing.

Mr. JONES, in the same hearing, just a few moments later, he said that if Democrats don't get their way on their gun control wish list, that they will abolish the filibuster and pack the Supreme Court. They are saying the quiet parts out loud.

See, that wish list that they have includes taking away guns from Americans without the constitutionally required due process of law, which is exactly what this bill would do. It would allow the courts to take guns away from people without notice and without even the right to appear in the hearing to defend themselves in court.

Now, the other side is going to tell you, and you will hear in the argument here, hey, there is due process. Don't worry about it, they will say, because people subjected to this process, they can just go to court and they can petition to get their firearms back.

But I will let my colleagues in on something that every first-year law student learns: Due process after the fact is no due process at all.

Now, the other side is also going to argue here—get ready for it—they are going to claim that they have come up with a reasonable compromise by just making these gun confiscation orders temporary. They will say it is only going to last 14 days. They won't tell you that these orders can be renewed indefinitely.

My Democrat colleagues are going to tell you that this bill will save lives. But if you look at the objective studies, the comprehensive studies on this, you will find that the red flag laws in all these States have had no significant effect on the rates of murder, suicide, or the number of people killed in mass public shootings.

If this bill passes, people may have their information added to the national crime databases, even though they committed no crime. In what version of America do we think that is okay?

The Democrats claim Republicans don't care about gun violence. But while they may repeat this over and over, it doesn't make it any more true. If you look at the record, House Republicans have worked tirelessly to combat gun violence by enacting meaningful laws to put more resources into mental health, to provide training for guidance counselors, and fund grants for law enforcement.

The other side, meanwhile, is actively trying to defund police. And just last week, they voted against giving money to schools to enhance security. Democrats refused to work with us on legislation that would actually do something; that would actually reduce the rate of gun violence in this country.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. And instead, they are taking advantage of tragedies. That is what they are doing. They are taking advantage of tragedies to promote their agenda to destroy our constitutional rights, and it is shameful.

I will tell you this: When Republicans take back the majority next year, we will work to begin to address the root causes of the violence and the mayhem in our country. That day cannot come soon enough.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), the sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Federal Extremist Protection Order Act, a bill that would empower loved ones and law enforcement to help prevent mass shootings before they happen.

Every family in every community in our Nation deserves access to these lifesaving measures. No child, no parent deserves to live in fear of gun violence.

And we are paying for it. We are paying for this gun violence every single day. Day after day, hour after hour, we are paying for the weapons of war on our streets with the blood of our children in our schools.

We are paying for the unfettered access with mothers and fathers waiting in line for a DNA test, forced to find out if it is their child that is riddled with bullets and maimed beyond recognition; if it is their child whose blood now blankets the floor of the classroom where they should be learning math and science and English.

We are paying for this deadly gun culture with the lives of American people; with the lives of those that we in this body took an oath to protect.

The American people are absolutely exhausted. We cannot continue to be the only country in the world where we let gun violence happen again and again and again. An entire generation is growing up learning that the adults that they look up to cannot, or rather, choose not to protect them.

Now, we all agree that this status quo is unacceptable. We all understand that the murder of our children cannot continue. We need policies that will give our law enforcement the tools that they need, the tools they have asked for to help keep guns out of the hands of those who are a danger to themselves or to others.

How many more victims are we going to memorialize?

What rights do our children have as they grow in our lives and in our hearts?

Parents across the country, in every State, in every community, know the fear that accompanies the love that we have for our children. It is a primal fear, a helpless fear, a love so deep that

we worry and wonder every day where is my child? Are they safe? Are they going to make it home today?

Don't our parents have the right to send their kids off to school without the fear of them not coming home?

Don't our children have the right to live free from the trauma that only stepping over a friend covered in blood could ever bring?

How many more parents must receive the phone call that I did when I was told that my son was murdered; the phone call that confirms that fear that my child is dead and that I was unable to protect him; the phone call that leads you to cry out to God in your grief?

Was my child afraid? Did he feel pain as the bullets ripped through his skin? Did he know he was loved more than he could ever imagine?

We can do better than that. We must be better than this. We cannot be the only nation in the world where our children are torn apart on Tuesday and their deaths are gone from the news cycle by Wednesday.

And that is why, in the decade since my son was taken from me by a man with a gun, simply for playing loud music in his car, that I made a promise to Jordan and to my community, and to the American people, a promise that I would continue to fight this battle for the rest of my life, the fight to make sure that not one more parent is forced to join this ever-growing club, the club that no mother or no father ever wants to be a part of.

I promised that I would take all of the devotion as a mother that I have for my child, all the love that I poured out of my soul into my child, that I would do everything in my power to keep Jordan's community safe; yes, you, my community; that the time would come where we would be able to make a difference in the lives of our children and our children's children, and this is that time. This is that moment.

We are facing a challenge of our lifetime on the issue of our era.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an extra 30 seconds.

Mrs. MCBATH. This is that time. This is that moment. We are facing the challenge of our lifetime. This is the issue of our era, and today, we must vote with the majority of American people that agree with us.

We vote to provide law enforcement and family members the tools that they need to prevent these mass shootings. We vote to save lives. We vote to do what is right. We vote to stop the uniquely American horror that is ripping our families apart.

God bless us. And I ask God to cover us in doing the right thing.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

□ 0930

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative JORDAN for yielding time.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2377. I have five grandchildren. I would do anything—anything—to protect my five grandchildren, including, as a last resort, shooting someone if I had to, to protect the lives of my grandchildren.

Democrat bills that we have heard this week want to take away my right—my right—to protect my grandchildren. They want to take away the rights of law-abiding citizens to protect their own children and grandchildren and wives and brothers and sisters. This bill takes away due process from law-abiding citizens.

Can you imagine if you had a disgruntled ex or somebody who hates you because of your political views, and they go to a judge and say, "Oh, this person is dangerous"? That judge would take away their guns, lean on the side of conservatism and take away their guns, without that person even having knowledge that there was a court hearing that would take away their guns. This is wrong.

When Republicans were in the majority, we actually passed legislation that was signed into law that would have prevented mass shootings. These bills will not. We need to join together, Republicans and Democrats. I hope they can do it in the Senate and get something done that actually saves children's lives.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a June 7, 2022, Washington Post article titled "No, red-flag gun laws don't violate due process rights."

[From the Washington Post]

NO, RED-FLAG GUN LAWS DON'T VIOLATE DUE PROCESS RIGHTS

SUCH LAWS, ALSO KNOWN AS 'EXTREME-RISK PROTECTION ORDERS,' ARE POPULAR AND ARE EMBRACED BY SOME REPUBLICAN POLITICIANS. BUT SOME GUN-RIGHTS ACTIVISTS SAY THEY VIOLATE THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS.

(Perspective by Joseph Blocher and Jake Charles, June 7, 2022)

"Red flag" laws, which allow guns to be temporarily taken from people who pose a risk of harm to themselves or others, are one of the few gun-safety regulations that currently have bipartisan support. "I'm generally inclined to think some kind of red-flag law is a good idea," Sen. ROY BLUNT (R-Mo.) said last week, after the school shooting in Uvalde, Texas. Key senators have told reporters it's possible an agreement could be reached this week on legislation that would include a provision incentivizing more states to pass such laws.

There is strong popular support for red-flag laws—also known as extreme-risk laws—in both parties, and more than a dozen states have adopted them in the past few years alone (bringing the total to 19 plus the District of Columbia). Social science research suggests that they work, most strikingly in preventing gun suicides.

So what prevents their wider adoption, including at the federal level? Some gun-rights advocates and their allies in Congress say they violate the due process clauses of the

Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. "Depriving citizens of Life, Liberty, or Property, without Due Process, is a clear violation of our Constitution," Rep. THOMAS MASSIE (R-Ky.) tweeted last week. "Every member of Congress swears an oath to 'support and defend' the Constitution. Voting for, or introducing, Red Flag Laws is a blatant violation of that oath."

But such criticisms are off base. Politicians considering red-flag laws, whether in Congress or state legislatures, should do so based on an accurate understanding of what the Constitution requires. It indeed guarantees "due process of law" whenever the government seeks to deprive a person of "life, liberty, or property." But the basic design of existing extreme-risk laws is fully consistent with constitutional commands, as we showed in a recent law review article.

In the states where they exist, here's how red-flag laws work: A limited set of people—law enforcement officers, family or household members, and sometimes others—can petition a judge to issue an "extreme-risk protection order" (ERPO) requiring a person to temporarily surrender his or her firearms and refrain from acquiring new ones. Depending on the state, the burden of proof the petitioner must meet (to establish that the gun owner indeed presents a risk) varies from "probable cause" to "clear and convincing" evidence. If the petition is successful, the court can enter a short-term emergency ERPO, usually lasting two weeks or less. In many cases, that's all that is needed—the crisis can be averted. A longer-term ERPO can only be entered after a full hearing at which the petitioner again bears the burden of proof, usually at a higher threshold, and at which the gun owner can contest the order.

If there is a constitutional flaw in this basic structure, it has apparently escaped notice of the entire United States judiciary: Courts have unanimously rejected Second Amendment and due process challenges to ERPO laws, and for good reason.

Perhaps surprisingly, the Second Amendment has not been the focus of the constitutional complaints. That's because even ardent Second Amendment defenders like Justice Amy Coney Barrett recognize that "legislatures have the power to prohibit dangerous people from possessing guns"—as Barrett wrote in 2019 case, when she was a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Courts reviewing extreme-risk laws have upheld them on that very basis. In 2016, for example, a Connecticut appellate court relied on U.S. Supreme Court precedent in holding that Connecticut's statute "does not implicate the second amendment, as it does not restrict the right of lawabiding, responsible citizens to use arms in defense of their homes."

The crux of the political debate has therefore focused on due process—although due-process challenges to red-flag laws have fared no better. Nor should they have. A prime complaint about red-flag laws is that they allow an order to issue before the gun owner has an opportunity to contest the evidence, but the Supreme Court has long recognized that there are "extraordinary situations where some valid governmental interest is at stake that justifies postponing the hearing until after the event," as Justice John Marshall Harlan II wrote in a 1971 case. Examples include restraining orders filed by one domestic partner against another, civil commitments for mental illness and the temporary removal of children from parental custody in emergency situations (for instance, when there are credible allegations of abuse). In situations like these, delaying urgent action until after a full hearing can lead to catastrophic outcomes.

Given that the Constitution allows emergency action to temporarily remove a person's child before a full hearing, it's hard to argue that it prohibits emergency action to temporarily remove a person's guns. Quite simply, the Constitution does not require society to wait until the trigger is pulled.

Though they vary in their particulars, existing extreme-risk laws contain several important procedural safeguards that the Supreme Court has recognized help to forestall abuse and ensure due process. They impose the burden on the petitioner to convince an independent third party; they guarantee active judicial oversight and provide a prompt hearing focusing on the degree of risk; and many states provide specific criminal penalties for filing false or harassing extreme-risk petitions (in addition to existing punishments for perjury).

Understanding constitutional requirements is important not only for lawyers and judges, but for those debating gun regulation in public discourse. Time and again, arguments based on misunderstandings of the Constitution have been used to derail reasonable gun regulation. After Sandy Hook, for example, an overwhelming majority of Americans wanted to expand the existing system of background checks for gun sales. Of the minority opposed—some strongly so—the most common reason was that doing so would violate the Second Amendment, yet that position has no support in legal doctrine.

We should not once again make the mistake of blaming the Constitution for inaction on gun laws. The structure of extreme-risk laws is entirely consistent with not only the Second Amendment but also the constitutional guarantee of due process.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I want to excoriate as absolute nonsense, pernicious nonsense, what we just heard from Mr. JOHNSON, from Mrs. LESKO, and what I presume we will hear for the rest of the debate on this bill.

Red flag laws are in effect in 19 States and the District of Columbia. Every court that has considered them has found them constitutional. Every court has said that they meet the requirements of procedural due process—every single court.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for bringing his superior knowledge of our Constitution and the law of the land to bear in this important debate for the children.

Yesterday, as we had the debate on so many other pieces of legislation which passed with bipartisan support, we said it was of the children, by the children, and for the children. "Of them" because they are suffering. "By them" because they are testifying in the Congress of the United States, apparently to no avail to some in the Congress, but making an emotional appeal of the facts of their case to the American people, and again, all of it for the children.

The Protecting Our Kids Act, I thank the chairman for bringing that to the floor. The legislation passed yesterday. It has strong steps to save lives, whether it is raising the age to purchase weapons of war, outlawing bump stocks

and high-capacity magazines designed for mass murder, cracking down on gun trafficking and ghost guns, and strengthening safe storage requirements, to name just a few.

Today, the House builds on this progress by passing our Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act, another lifesaving measure aimed at preventing the next tragic shooting before it is too late.

Too often, what we know is that those who pose a risk of gun violence show early warning signs: a menacing message online, a troubled message to a loved one. Yet, in too many communities across the country, concerned family members, friends, and law enforcement have no legal pathway to get deadly weapons out of the hands of these troubled individuals.

Under the leadership of Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH, the House will pass a bill empowering family members and law enforcement to seek a Federal court order to temporarily remove access to a gun from individuals who pose a threat to themselves and to others.

Thanks to the leadership of Congressman SALUD CARBAJAL, this legislation will include incentives to encourage more States to adopt extreme risk protection order laws of their own. The incentives exist in many States, but not all.

Doing so will not only protect from mass shootings but also from the quiet daily massacre by suicide and gun crimes. These so-called red flag laws by some are saving lives in the 19 States and, as was mentioned, the District of Columbia, where they have been enacted. The statistics show that.

The American people are overwhelmingly for this lifesaving measure. Recent polling shows 8 in 10 Americans support it.

Madam Speaker, as you know, and you have experienced it in your State, gun violence in our Nation has reached a fever pitch in recent weeks. People keep saying again and again and again that we have gun violence. I would say it is not again and again and again; it is always. It is not one after another; it is ongoing, whether it is mass murders that are high profile or every night in cities and places across our country.

Sadly, too many Members think, in the wake of gun violence, a moment of silence is sufficient—a moment of silence. As Mr. HIGGINS said following the Buffalo massacre, we have a moment of silence, and then we must have action—and then we must have action.

Today, all Members have a chance to take action, to vote for another strong step, giving our communities a chance to prevent the next massacre. The next massacre could be a family tragedy, so it is personal as well as community protection.

Indeed, if you knew where and when the next gun incident would be, how could you oppose having the tools to possibly stop it? If you knew that children could possibly be exposed because of the action of someone practically a

child themselves, still a teenager, having access to a weapon of war, why wouldn't you want to take action to stop it?

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in a strong bipartisan "aye" vote for this legislation. In States across the country, this is not partisan at all. Let's hope that it will not be in the House of Representatives.

At the same time, we remain very prayerful and hopeful that the Senate will soon reach bipartisan agreement so that we will move a step closer to freeing our children from the horrors of gun violence, once and for all—our children, whether it is violence to them or violence to their parents and family members.

For the children, of the children, by the children, that is our mission. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, one of the most fundamental, God-given rights that we possess, which is uniquely protected in our American Constitution, is the right to keep and bear arms for self-defense and to ensure that we remain a free people.

We have seen under this administration, supported by the Democrat majority in this Congress, an unprecedented trampling on the basic rights of American citizens over the past 2 years. Our most precious freedoms to assemble together, to go where you want, to worship as you choose, to earn a living or operate your business, to keep your job or your employees, what you have to wear on your face, and whether or not you are required to receive a vaccine that you may not want or may not need all trampled upon by Democrats in power.

Democrats simply do not believe in the inalienable rights of American citizens to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They believe that your rights come from government, and they, therefore, have the right to take them away.

The guarantee provided by our Founders to ensure we remain free from foreign invasion and, yes, as our Founders clearly warned us, from an oppressive government like we see in Canada, Australia, and the Democrats' beloved Communist China is the constitutional right of law-abiding citizens to be armed as they choose.

Over and over, the Founders affirmed and reiterated that Congress has no power—no power—to limit the right of lawful citizens to arm themselves. H.R. 2377 would create a nationwide system of red flag laws, undermining the constitutional guarantee of due process, which is required before depriving any American of their Second Amendment right.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative MCBATH for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, 8 years ago, my own community of Isla Vista near UC Santa Barbara saw firsthand the horror and the trauma that a mass shooting brings. In 8 years since that attack, we have stood in solidarity with other communities reeling from the hundreds of mass shootings in our schools, our shopping malls, our houses of worship, and our Main Streets.

Madam Speaker, I share the outrage and frustration of the majority of Americans and many of my colleagues here in Congress that there are some in Congress who have kept us from doing our job to protect children by blocking commonsense gun safety measures.

I stand before you today as the author of a gun safety measure that has enjoyed bipartisan support, that has been implemented in Republican- and Democratic-led States alike, and that has been proven to reduce gun deaths and stop mass shootings before they happen. I am speaking about extreme risk protection orders or, as they are more commonly known, red flag laws.

These laws are simple. If an individual is showing signs that they may be a danger to themselves or others, a police officer or a family member can, through due process, go to a judge and request an extreme risk protection order, which temporarily bars that person from owning or purchasing a firearm. These laws are already on the books in 19 States and the District of Columbia, and in those places, they have saved lives.

Part of the reason these laws work is because warning signs of mass shootings are not as rare as you might think. In fact, a U.S. study of school violence found that the majority of incidents come with clear warning signs, which we have seen before in some of our most infamous school shootings: Columbine, Sandy Hook, Parkland, and even Uvalde.

That is why, in the wake of these tragedies, Republican- and Democratic-led States have approved red flag laws that have gone on to intervene in thousands of potentially violent attacks before they happen.

Florida residents, for example, have used ERPOs more than 8,000 times since they implemented their red flag law after the Parkland shooting. California implemented their red flag law after the UCSB Isla Vista attack in my community.

Police officers have used it to prevent numerous workplace attacks and other violent incidents. These red flag laws are also critical to reducing the largest form of gun deaths in our country, suicide by firearm.

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

□ 0945

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, as someone who lost one of my own siblings to suicide by a gun, I personally

am proud to stand in this Chamber today in her memory, Carmen, to see my bill come to a vote.

This measure is popular, bipartisan, and common sense. That may be why Republican Senators have introduced similar legislation in the past, to incentivize States to expand red flag laws and support States that already have them.

There is no bill that we can pass that would be the panacea to solve our violence overnight, but with this measure and those that we passed yesterday, we can make a major difference. We need to do this now.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, Alexis de Tocqueville said that the defining trait of socialism is "a profound opposition to personal liberty and scorn for individual reason, a complete contempt for the individual."

Socialists are hostile to our Bill of Rights specifically because it protects the individual against the State by guaranteeing our most fundamental rights and the means to defend them, and the guarantee that we can't be deprived of them except through due process of law.

You have the right to have your day in court, to face your accuser, to present evidence on your behalf, to contest the charges brought against you.

Now, if someone is adjudged to be dangerously mentally ill, of course they should not have access to firearms or to any other weapons. They shouldn't be on the street where they can do harm at all. They should be confined, during the course of their illness, so they can be treated and not endanger themselves or others.

We already have commitment procedures that address this in concert with our Constitution. In that process, you appear before a judge, you can know the charges, you can face your accuser, you can plead your case, and you can present evidence on your own behalf in open court.

But not under this bill. Under this bill, an anonymous accuser, including a jilted date or an ex-roommate, can trigger a secret proceeding that you don't even know is happening until the police show up at your door to strip you of your Second Amendment right to self-defense, and the burden then falls on you to try and restore it.

And it won't stop here. The left has already branded speech they disagree with as dangerous.

But they are right about one thing. This is an extreme risk bill. It is an extreme risk to our most fundamental individual rights as Americans.

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

Republican speakers obviously have more regard for their politics and for the National Rifle Association than they do for the lives of our children.

We see that every moment here, when they keep repeating the words that this is unconstitutional, when courts in 18 States and the District of Columbia have found them constitutional, and Supreme Court Justice Amy Coney Barrett, on the 7th Circuit, said: History is consistent with common sense. It demonstrates that legislatures have the power to prohibit dangerous people from possessing guns.

So I don't think we should hear lectures on Democrats don't care about due process. We do. We also care about children's lives.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act. Before the Emanuel church shooting, before the Uvalde, El Paso, and Parkland shootings and so many others, shooters showed warning signs or even flat out said what they were going to do.

Before many die by suicide by gun, they show warning signs that they may be a danger to themselves.

In these situations, there is often evidence that something terrible is going to happen. We know it, we can even articulate it, but we are often powerless to stop it.

This bill remedies this situation. This bill would help prevent individuals who pose an imminent threat to themselves or others from accessing firearms, by allowing law enforcement and family members to file a court petition in Federal court to temporarily—temporarily—block dangerous individuals' access to guns.

Despite the claim that this bill invades due process, this is absolutely false. It is a thinly veiled attempt to prevent any and all regulations of firearms in this country. As the chairman has said, it has been found constitutional. There is a hearing before the seizure with a judge, with witnesses, testimony under oath, affidavits. The judge makes a finding. It happens all the time in domestic violence cases.

These guns can only be taken away for a temporary period after a hearing with a judge, who determines on balance that it is necessary to do so for the safety of the gun owner or the community.

This bill is so common sense. It has historically been bipartisan. The last Republican President supported it, introduced by Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM in the Senate.

I thank Congresswoman MCBATH. Our Republican colleagues this morning have been talking about their passion for the Second Amendment, their devotion to the right to bear arms. If only for a moment they showed the same devotion, the same commitment to preserving the life of young people, the right to live a life free from gun violence, to go to a movie theater or church or synagogue and not worry

about their life and their liberty because they are gunned down by someone who shouldn't have a firearm.

This is absolutely the most common-sense proposal that will come before Congress on guns. Keep them out of the hands of people who are dangerous to themselves and others. For God's sake, vote for this bill.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, if House Democrats were so worried about violence, they wouldn't open the borders, open the prisons, and then disarm law-abiding Americans who want to protect themselves and protect their families.

Chairman NADLER says that Republicans shouldn't lecture about constitutional rights, but it was the last Democrat speaker, Mr. CICILLINE, who in the House Judiciary Committee said, Spare me the bullshit about constitutional rights. So pardon us for standing up for the Constitution and the very due process that ensures that we are able to have a civil, functioning society in this country.

Speaker PELOSI asks the question: Well, if you knew when the next act of violence would be, why wouldn't you want to stop it? What is this, the United States Congress, or the plot for the movie "Minority Report"?

The best you could ever hope to have in terms of warning is what we had in the Parkland case, where a neighbor saw Nikolas Cruz preparing for a school shooting, called the FBI, and because they were so focused on the bureaucracy, they didn't take action.

That is why I am against federalizing the regular police and it is why I am against federalizing the school police, because the more the FBI was involved, the more they botched the case, and maybe there are people dead who didn't need to be.

These red flag laws violate our Second Amendment rights, our Fifth Amendment rights, and when they are done at the national level, they violate our Tenth Amendment rights. It is crazy that we are considering legislation to bribe the States to take rights away from our fellow Americans, and it is nuts that Republicans in the Senate, the very Republicans who say they are the classic, liberty-minded conservatives, they are now working with Democrats on this very endeavor to Federalize the school police and to engage in this bribery for the sake of deprivation of rights.

Let me give you this warning, my friends: It is no victory, as Mr. CARBAJAL said, that in my beloved Florida we have used red flag laws 8,000 times. There weren't 8,000 school shooters we stopped, probably not even 8,000 criminals.

What we do see is that these red flag laws are used in divorce proceedings, they are used in every type of dispute and shouldn't be a cudgel that way. We will stand up for their rights. That is no bullshit; we will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to use profanity on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, since the massacre in Newtown, Connecticut, about 10 years ago, we have not enacted any substantive firearm restrictions to prevent children from being slaughtered in our schools.

In fact, not since the massacre of first graders and their educators at Sandy Hook, but in the 20 years since the shooting at Columbine, we have not enacted any new meaningful restrictions on firearms.

We have an obligation to protect our constituents, and we have a responsibility to keep the American people safe.

After each of these instances, we hear from our friends across the aisle that we must address mental health. I agree. But we must prevent those who are intent on harming themselves or others from having access to dangerous weapons and carrying out their intent.

That is why I support this thoughtful proposal balancing public safety and the individual's right to due process.

Let's just take the massacre in Uvalde. Should there have been a law in place in Texas, a red flag law, perhaps the gunman could have been stopped. There were plenty of warning signs, including the gunman with pictures of a cat he had killed and his frequent online threats to teen girls.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, I take the due process clause seriously. In this legislation, a court would need to make an individualized determination, looking at specific facts before issuing an order. A full hearing is required in 72 hours, where the party can have personal attendance and object.

This legislation is absolutely necessary, and I urge all my colleagues to support it. We have a moral obligation to act.

Yesterday, this body, with a bipartisan vote, adopted the Protecting Our Kids Act, which would make meaningful updates to our Nation's gun laws. We must go further, I believe, and reenact the assault weapons bans.

These bills would make a meaningful difference in gun violence in the United States and save American lives. God would not look kindly upon the use of weapons to kill his children, as happened in Uvalde, Texas.

Our votes are not political calculations; they are obligations. We have a duty to protect God's children.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MCCLAIN).

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Madam Speaker, I think what we need, again, is a little truth, transparency, and consistency.

I will share, as a mother of four, I represent the fact that you tell me that I don't care about children. In fact, when you have soft-on-crime policies, I need my Second Amendment right to protect my own children because the soft-on-crime policies don't help.

During these debates, on these unconstitutional—you know the thing we all took an oath to uphold—gun bills, the Democrats have been making the claim, well, if you can't buy alcohol or cigarettes, you shouldn't be able to buy an AR-15.

All right. Let's stick with that concept. Here is a concept: Apply it throughout every form. But let's talk about a couple of things that the Democrats feel you are mature enough to do under the age of 18. Because, once again, their standards clearly aren't consistent. What a concept, to be consistent.

Democrats believe that under the age of 18, you should be able to get an abortion. While you are at it, don't even talk to your parents about it.

Under the age of 18, Democrats think you should be able to change your sex without notifying parents.

At 18, you can vote.

At 18, you can join the military and lay your life on the line for this country.

And I bet they think that the 18-year-old Buffalo shooter is actually mature enough to be charged as an adult, right?

So, again, let's have some consistency in our standards.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, do we not hear the cries of the fourth grader in Uvalde who said, "All of my friends are dead"?

Would you like to do something about gun slaughter in this country? Then join us.

One commonsense way we can do this is by passing my friend and colleague, Congresswoman MCBATH's, Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act, red flag laws.

We know that in 46 percent of shootings, the attacker expressed interest in harming others. There was a cry for help, a warning. Someone knew that violence could erupt. Someone had the ability to intervene. We have a responsibility to intervene.

Representative MCBATH's bill would do just that, intervene when someone is a risk to themselves or others. We do not have to live this way. Fearful for our children at school, at movies, the grocery store, or the TLA on South Street in Philadelphia.

We do not have to live this way, and we don't want to: 79 percent of Americans support red flag laws and 67 percent of gun owners.

Stop sentencing our children to having to lament that all of their friends are dead.

□ 1000

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, next week will mark 5 years since the fateful morning on the baseball field where 136 rounds were fired in an attack on Republicans. Only by the grace of God were 20 or more of my Republican colleagues and staff not killed by a crazed terrorist wielding guns on that baseball field. So this is not a theoretical exercise for many of us on this side of the aisle.

I say this not to take away from the tragedies that any one of us has experienced, but to highlight the good people on both sides of this issue can bring our personal experiences to the debate and may see things differently, while both condemning violence and wanting to act.

When I reflect on that day, it is not about the weapon. It is about the person, the evil person that is on the other side of that weapon. It was guns that stopped that killer—two undercover Capitol police officers. They were only there because STEVE SCALISE was there. And he got hit. Otherwise, that terrorist could have easily assassinated 20 to 30 Members of Congress and staff.

Clearly, there are people I don't want to have a gun in their hands but we can't ignore the hate, the evil that is gripping too many in our country today. We have laws against murder. Yet, we see murder.

If my little daughter hits her big brother, I want to know why. I don't blame the stick in her hand. As a physician, common sense tells me that if we don't look at the events in someone's life that lead to the thoughts and the feelings that then lead to this horrific murderous behavior, then we are doing our society a grave injustice. And that is what is happening. We have seen this movie before.

Did these laws change the disturbing trends that we are seeing? Previous bans have made no difference. It has been proven. Many of our communities have gun laws and have even more homicides than ever.

We as Americans need to do some serious soul-searching about ourselves because something serious has changed in our society over the last several decades.

Is it the absence of God?

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

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, we had a public school in my district that was forced by the left and the courts to take down "thou shalt not kill" from in front of the schools.

Is it the breakdown of the family, the disruption of the community, the implosion of the village? Or is it the destruction of our mental health system, which, unfortunately, turned everyone onto the streets instead of reforming our institutions?

It could be all these things and many more, but until America is willing to take a long, hard look at ourselves and heal what truly ails us, I fear we are simply doomed to repeat what we have done in the past and we are doing here today.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), chairman of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and thank Congresswoman McBATH and Congressman CARBAJAL for the great work they have done to put this together.

Red flag laws are supported by a majority of Americans and nearly 70 percent of gun owners. Red flag laws provide an opportunity for an intervention if someone demonstrates that they are a danger to themselves or to others. California's red flag laws have been used 21 times to prevent mass shootings.

The bill we are considering today was originally authored by Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Republican, and is very similar to the Florida red flag bill that was signed by then-Governor RICK SCOTT, also a Republican, and today a U.S. Senator. Neither of those two have ever been accused of being antigun or anti-Constitution.

We know red flag laws save lives and we know the issues raised by the other side of the aisle are a stretch at best. If someone files a false complaint, they are subject to a \$5,000 fine and 5 years in jail. This bill will save lives, and I urge you to vote "yes."

The only real question is how much more bloodshed is needed to spur us to do the right thing and help us keep our kids and our communities safe.

Please vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, from the debate and from the whole premise of this red flag law proposal, you would think that there was no such way to deal with this problem in America. It has been pointed out that 19 States have red flag laws already, but there are 50 States that already have a way to have someone adjudicated minimally dangerous.

Every single State, the premise that we can identify somebody who might pose a risk to themselves or others is the whole premise why red flag laws might work. But that is the same premise that allows Baker Acts to work in every single State and Washington, D.C.

The difference is that the person charged, the person accused of being this mentally incompetent, mentally dangerous person, has the right to confront their accuser. And that is what they are trying to undo. It already exists in law. Everyone knows that we

cannot accept our children being murdered. We can't accept our communities being destroyed and gutted, not just by violence, by increasing violence, by increasing acts of despair; not just shootings, but suicides—and the number one cause of death for 18- to 45-year-olds—fatal overdoses.

There is something going on wrong. It is not the guns, it is the culture and the evildoer. When do we stop blaming the evildoer, the doer of evil deeds? And if you could identify who that doer of evil deeds might be, wouldn't you want to take them away from the weapons instead of taking the weapons away from them?

If you don't take the person away, they can get other guns. They might even get a car and drive through a parade.

Let's keep our communities safe. Let's keep our kids safe. Let's focus on the real problem and not just run the same play over and over again. The Democrats have a preconceived solution to every emergency, and it is shameful to watch this exploitation of violence to achieve a Democrat-long-standing objective to undermine our Second Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 2377, the Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act. Included in this legislation, is the Extreme Risk Protection Order Act, which I have been proud to co-lead for many years with my friend and colleague, Congressman CARBAJAL.

Madam Speaker, April 16, 2007, 15 years ago, 32 Virginia Tech students, in my home and Commonwealth, were killed by a young man who was well-known to the community to have paranoid schizophrenia. He had been hospitalized. He had been picked up by the police. He had been banned from classes. There was every reason in the world for him to be on the background checklist. Yet, he was able to buy the weapons legally that killed those 32 kids.

In 2014, I had a long conversation with a friend who was deeply depressed. He was having trouble getting out of bed, trouble finding a psychiatrist who would treat him. I made some calls to try to find somebody, and then didn't do anything but worry, and was stunned when he got out of bed to go buy a gun and kill himself.

To this day, I so regret that I did not call his wife, and we went together to the court to get him on the background checklist. We have all lost too many friends. We all are grief-struck by the massacre of children.

Red flag laws may not protect everyone, but it will save many lives and it is a start.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, do you ever wonder how many of our colleagues in the Democrat aisle receive

Bloomberg money to advocate for taking away Americans' Second Amendment rights? I do.

You hear about the NRA. You sure don't want to confess the Bloomberg donations that you receive as you emasculate America's rights. Yet, we hear about your polling. But you know what, 6 in 10 Americans, including almost half of Democrats, support armed officers and leaders at schools to protect their children. Democrats oppose that.

We hear about due process. Due process doesn't mean you have an ex-parte hearing by an undisclosed informant who comes in and says, Look, we think this person is a danger to themselves or others, when the undisclosed informant has a grudge or an axe to grind. That is why you have 8,000 of those in Florida.

Due process doesn't mean we take away your rights and then you get to petition to have those rights reinstated. No, this bill is designed specifically to get around the laws that are present in 50 States that do address due process and do address people who are a danger to themselves and society. This bill is ripe for abuse.

Some States have enacted similar laws. In Connecticut, for example, nearly a third of all ex-parte orders are overturned once a judge hears both sides of the story.

And why is that? You have already taken away their rights. But almost a third of them are overturned.

In a markup last week, there was some confusion as to what due process means. It does not mean that you can deprive an individual of their rights first and then later let them have a hearing to reinstate those rights. But that is what this bill does. Deprivation first, a hearing later.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. I rise today to address the indication that what we Democrats are doing is meaningless.

Meaningless to ban bump stocks. Well, tell that to the 60 people who were murdered at the Mandalay hotel where a gunman fired more than a thousand rounds in short order.

Meaningless to raise the age to 21 to purchase an assault weapon. Explain that the ghosts of the 10 people who were killed at Tops grocery store. Make it clear to those 19 babies who were murdered at an elementary school in Texas.

Meaningless? Tell that to the lives of those that have been lost. No, it is not meaningless.

Madam Speaker, I tell my dear friends that what we are doing right now is more than common sense. It is just good sense to prevent people from killing other people.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, well, we don't agree on much these days here in Congress but I know there is one thing we all agree on. We all agree that we really like guns. See, we are the special privileged elites. We are the ones in this Chamber being protected by guns while the American people don't have men and women with guns outside their homes. Of course, not at any gun-free school zone they are not protected, nor at work.

But here at Congress, the same Congress that is voting to send just millions and millions of dollars worth of guns to Ukraine so that they can defend themselves is the same Congress working as hard as possible to take away the Second Amendment rights from Americans. You see, our job here is to protect rights like due process and the Second Amendment rights of Americans, not strip them away.

Red flag gun laws violate Americans' due process rights and this is the type of thing that we shouldn't be passing in this Congress, especially while we enjoy the very privileged elite special protection of guns.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6½ minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has 11 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to make an urgent plea for action.

How can we listen to an 11-year-old girl talk about smearing herself with her own dead friend's blood so she doesn't get killed and think that the appropriate response is thoughts and prayers. It is unacceptable.

We have the power to make real change and end gun violence. Right now, the American people are calling on us to protect their kids, their family, and their community. I am not going to sit on the sidelines and neither should this legislative body. If not now, when? Every Member should support commonsense gun safety legislation. Not taking away your right to own a gun or your constitutional right, but use common sense, that, as my grandmother used to say, is not very common today.

Madam Speaker, the people of America are counting on us. Act now.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Madam Speaker, we have heard time and time again that the Democrats say this is not a violation of due process; not a violation of our constitutional rights. It most certainly is.

Remember the basics here. Someone doesn't like you. They file a complaint. There is a hearing within 24 hours, a hearing that you are not allowed to attend, you are not allowed to be there to face your accusers. The government

takes your gun or guns. Several days later there is a real hearing—well, a real hearing with a lower standard. The burden of proof for the government is not beyond a reasonable doubt to deny you your constitutional right. It is a clear and convincing standard. So a lower standard to take away your fundamental liberty when you didn't commit any crime. If that is not a violation of due process, I do not know what is.

□ 1015

Title I of this bill, it will all be administered by the Biden administration Department of Justice, the same Department of Justice that got a letter from a leftwing political organization and, 5 days later, sent a memorandum to every single U.S. attorney in this country saying this: Set up a dedicated line of threat communication on parents; use counterterrorism measures against moms and dads who had the nerve to show up at a school board meeting and speak up for their kid.

Then, 16 days after that memorandum went out, the FBI sends an email out and says: Put a threat tag, a designation, a label, on moms and dads who did show up at school board meetings who someone filed a complaint about on that snitch line, and investigate them. That same Biden administration Justice Department will be administering this law.

That is why we are so against this measure and why it is so darn dangerous. They can say all day long it doesn't violate due process; it most certainly does, and it is going to be administered by a Justice Department that has already proven they are willing to go after parents who speak up for their kids.

That is why this bill is so terrible, why Republican Senators are pushing this and, as Mr. GAETZ from Florida said, trying to bribe States to implement this when we have the history of the Biden Justice Department and know what this thing is going to look like and how it is going to violate due process. That is what is wrong with this legislation and why Republicans are so darn against this thing.

I hope they will come to their senses, stand up for the law-abiding American citizens and their fundamental liberties, and vote this thing down.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and let me personally on this floor—I have said it many times—offer my sympathy to LUCY MCBATH for the pain that she continues to live with for the loss of her son.

Let me say to my friends, your arguments could not be more absurd. Over these last 2 days, I have heard welfare

state; I am a person of faith as all who profess such, challenging whether or not we have faith; speaking about the absurdity of not understanding the Constitution; disrespecting the democratic system that we have; that there will be an outrageous attack on individuals with the red flag laws.

You are just simply wrong. My plea is to the American people because you can force people who masquerade as believing that it is a shame for children to die, but yet do nothing. This is the side of doing absolutely nothing but casting aspersions and challenging what is right.

Red flag laws are right. Why? Indiana passed it in 2005, and in years since, the State's firearms suicide rate has gone down 7.5 percent. They work. A little boy, 16 years old, in New York was getting ready to shoot up his students, had shotguns at home. An order was put forward, and he admitted that not having the guns in the home was helpful and the order helped him.

Is there no desire to do something in the name of those who died wrongly in Buffalo? Is there no desire?

Are you not in any way aware of Zaire, a mother's child trying to work in a job and was severely injured?

Are you not aware of Amerie, 10 years old, who died and bled out as she called 911?

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two lists of victims from the Uvalde school shooting and the Buffalo supermarket shooting.

THE 21 VICTIMS OF THE UVALDE SCHOOL SHOOTING

Makenna Lee Elrod, 10;
Layla Salazar, 11;
Maranda Mathis, 11;
Nevaeh Bravo, 10;
Jose Manuel Flores Jr., 10;
Xavier Lopez, 10;
Tess Marie Mata, 10;
Rojelio Torres, 10;
Eliahna "Ellie" Amyah Garcia, 9;
Eliahna A. Torres, 10;
Annabell Guadalupe Rodriguez, 10;
Jackie Cazares, 9;
Uziyah Garcia, 9;
Jayce Carmelo Luevanos, 10;
Maite Yuleana Rodriguez, 10;
Jailah Nicole Silguero, 10;
Irma Garcia, 48;
Eva Mireles, 44;
Amerie Jo Garza, 10;
Alexandria "Lexi" Aniyah Rubio, 10; and
Alithia Ramirez, 10.

THE 10 PEOPLE KILLED IN BUFFALO, NY

Roberta A. Drury of Buffalo, N.Y., age 32;
Margus D. Morrison of Buffalo, N.Y., age 52;
Andre Mackneil of Auburn, N.Y., age 53;
Aaron Salter of Lockport, N.Y., age 55;
Geraldine Talley of Buffalo, N.Y., age 62;
Celestine Chaney of Buffalo, N.Y., age 65;
Heyward Patterson of Buffalo, N.Y., age 67;
Katherine Massey of Buffalo, N.Y., age 72;
Pearl Young of Buffalo, N.Y., age 77; and
Ruth Whitfield of Buffalo, N.Y., age 86.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Are you not aware that 80 percent of people considering suicide give some sign of their plans, and nearly 80 percent of perpetrators of mass violence in public places make explicit threats?

Red flag laws are crucial to saving lives.

Yes, the FBI didn't act in Parkland, but a red flag law that was implemented by a Republican Governor could have been effective. There would have been another tool.

The Constitution, for some people, they can't seem to read it clearly. The Second Amendment says to create a militia, but Justice Scalia, who is idolized by the right, made it very clear that the Second Amendment right is not unlimited. It is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me say this: Do you want guns in the hands of dangerous people?

I don't want Republicans shot. That was a dangerous person.

Do you want guns in the hands of gang members? Do you want us to continue like all of these school shootings in the State of Texas?

Let us realize where your heart is and ensure that the mentally ill are not the persons that are the ones that are most dangerous, but it is dangerous people who need red flag laws.

Maybe we need to sit down in the name of John Lewis, who said: Where is your heart, and where is your soul?

We need to pass this red flag law and all of our gun safety laws, and the Senate should pass it as well.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2377, the "Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act of 2021," of which I am a cosponsor.

In recent weeks, we have mourned the loss of life resulting from an ever-increasing number of mass shootings that have shocked the conscience of our nation.

We have a duty to do all we can to prevent gun violence and end the bloodshed. Expanding the availability of extreme risk protection orders is one step we must take because access to firearms can be the difference between life or death—for one person or many.

These laws have proven to be effective, particularly in reducing suicides, which involve firearms more than 50 percent of the time.

We know that suicides are often times an impulsive action. Extreme risk protection orders can generate time and space between the impulse and someone's access to firearms.

Recognizing that up to 80 percent of people considering suicide give some sign of their plans and nearly 80 percent of perpetrators of mass violence in public places make explicit threats or behave in a manner indicative of their intent to carry out an attack, it is clear these orders can help save lives.

Yet under federal law, a person suffering from mental illness is generally not prohibited from purchasing or possessing a firearm unless certain statutory circumstances occur.

Similarly, a person who has committed a violent act towards others is generally not prohibited from accessing firearms under federal law unless they are the subject of a domestic violence restraining order, have been convicted of a felony, or have been convicted of a domestic violence misdemeanor.

In many instances of gun violence, family and friends noticed warning signs that their

loved ones were a significant risk of harm or injury to themselves or others.

For example, more than a month before the Parkland shooting, someone close to the shooter provided information to the FBI's tip line about his gun ownership, desire to kill people, erratic behavior, and disturbing social media posts, as well as the possibility he might commit a school shooting. But there was nothing to prohibit him from possessing firearms.

Extreme risk protection laws empower those close to people at risk of committing irreversible, hateful acts upon themselves or others to intervene before tragedy strikes.

Instead of focusing primarily on those who suffer from mental illness—the majority of whom are not violent—these laws focus on preventing access to firearms by people who exhibit dangerous behaviors.

While some states have enacted these laws, including Florida following the Parkland shooting, many have not. That is why we need H.R. 2377. Everyone deserves to be safe from gun violence.

This bill would provide nationwide access to extreme risk protection orders through federal courts, improve implementation of existing state extreme risk laws, and through grant funding, encourage more states to adopt such laws.

It would also ensure law enforcement is trained in the use of extreme risk protection orders, including crisis intervention and making referrals to social service providers.

When a concerned loved one can demonstrate that an individual presents a serious threat of injury to themselves or others, they should have an opportunity to request an order, allowing a judge to weigh the evidence and issue an order when appropriate.

This bill would also provide important due process protections including notice, an opportunity to be heard at a hearing within 72 hours after an order is issued if there is a request for a long-term extreme risk protection order, and a right to counsel.

If an order is dissolved or expires any firearms would have to be returned.

And the bill would establish a penalty for anyone who files a false or frivolous petition. I recently read that 44 percent of Republicans believe mass shootings are "something we have to accept as part of a free society," and I simply cannot and will not accept that.

We must never concede defeat to the epidemic of gun violence. Instead, we must continue to encourage and support the implementation of evidence-based solutions like extreme risk protection orders.

I would like to thank Representative LUCY MCBATH and SALUD CARBAJAL for their dedication to this issue and this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation that will make our communities safer, whether in our homes or on our streets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, the Fifth Amendment states: "Nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

It is the paradox of the American experience that so many who swear to

preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, the supreme law enshrining our fundamental rights, are so often predisposed to strip those rights, always with noble motive.

Weeks ago, the Biden Department of Homeland Security formed a Disinformation Governance Board to become the arbiter of right think, even since disbanded. Bad idea.

In 2020, State Governors ordered the healthy to stay out of their churches for fear of the virus. Do you remember?

In 1971, the Department of Justice obtained a TRO, a prior restraint, to abridge freedom of the press by forbidding The New York Times to continue publishing the Pentagon Papers. Lower courts approved that, too.

In February 1942, another progressive Democrat, FDR, issued an executive order to intern U.S. citizens and residents of Japanese descent. It was greatly popular; 60 percent of Americans polled supported sending their fellow American citizens to concentration camps. It was approved not just by lower courts but by the United States Supreme Court in *Korematsu*, 1944. It took until 2018 for it to be repudiated. Look again at what you justified.

The long-existing Baker Act provides due process. New York had a red flag law and did not detect the Buffalo shooter.

The fierce urgency of now meets the protections of fundamental rights in the United States Constitution, and they must be vindicated.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

The gentlewoman from Texas asked: Do we want guns in the hand of dangerous people? The answer to that question is, of course not. But the question, the only question that matters, is, who constitutes a dangerous person? Who gets to decide, and why? That is the important part here. That is what we are talking about when we talk about due process.

We have laws on the books in, I believe, every State in the Union, so-called Baker Act provisions to civilly commit persons who are a danger to themselves and others.

We have such a law in Texas, but we didn't use it. We didn't use it against a young man who wasn't in school, was harming defenseless animals, was talking about raping women, was clearly not well. We didn't use it.

There are more people killed in the United States by hands and knives than rifles. I don't want a crazy guy in my school with or without the ability to have a weapon.

We should actually be serious about committing people who have mental health problems. That would actually solve the problem.

Everything we are doing here today is a pretext. It is a pretext for tar-

geting, confiscating, and eliminating our ability to have weapons.

When people say things, it is a good idea to believe them.

President Biden: "... whether it is a 9-millimeter pistol or whether it is a rifle is ridiculous. I am continuing to push to eliminate the sale of those things."

Representative MONDAIRE JONES: "If the filibuster obstructs us, we will abolish it. If the Supreme Court objects, we will expand it. . . . We will do whatever it takes."

Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ: Ban semiautomatics.

House Democrats just yesterday tweeted: "Semiautomatic rifles are weapons of war."

Future Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson was applauding the New Zealand Prime Minister's commencement speech about New Zealand's banning semiautomatic rifles.

Representative Beto O'Rourke: "Hell, yes, we are going to take your AR-15."

Even Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the gentlewoman from Texas: "I have held an AR-15 in my hand. I wish I hadn't." She talks about a .50-caliber bullet, which isn't even true.

This is a pretext, and we should oppose this.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Everyone wants to stop mass public shooters, but we haven't previously punished people merely on the basis of a hunch, and we shouldn't start now.

Stopping future crimes doesn't work in the movies, and it doesn't work in real life. What can work is providing mental healthcare and counseling to those who need it.

If people truly pose a clear danger to themselves or others, they should be confined to a mental health facility. Simply denying them the legal right to buy a gun isn't a serious remedy.

Actually, it is already possible to take a dangerous person's guns away, but Democrats are completely ignoring involuntary commitment laws that are on the books in all 50 States, presently known as the Baker Act in Florida or the 5150 code in California. These laws are different than the ones that are proposed today in one very important aspect: They involve due process.

What is the difference? In the existing involuntary commitment laws, known as the Baker Act, there is a mental healthcare expert involved; there is no such thing in the red flag laws. There is the ability to challenge your accuser to have a day in court before your rights are deprived; there is no such opportunity in the red flag laws. You get an attorney appointed to you if you can't afford it; no such thing in the red flag laws in many of the States. There are predawn raids that endanger the lives, not just of the per-

son we are worried about but of the officers who are tasked with carrying out the raid.

Red flag laws could actually increase the rate of homicide and suicide. Simply talking to other people about your healthcare issues and your mental health could help you overcome it, but people will be reluctant to do that if red flag laws are in place.

Red flag laws have already created thousands of second-class citizens who no longer have the ability to purchase a firearm for defense in the States that have red flag laws. If this passes today, there will be millions of second-class citizens created in this country who have been deprived of due process and the Second Amendment.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a Texan, a father of three young girls who go to school, and a defender of constitutional rights. This is not just about doing something; this is about doing something that matters.

The horror of the school shootings is an unforgivable tragedy due to the evil we see in people.

There is room for bipartisan solutions. Unfortunately, Democrats don't want to make law; they want to make politics.

Republicans offered an alternative, a bill that would fund school resource officers and mental health counselors, close gaps in security, and strengthen active shooter preparations, with all the costs being offset by the unused COVID funds. Unfortunately, this has been blocked by House Democrats.

There is nothing more important than ensuring our children are safe. I know this because I take my children to school and drop them off and pick them up. But in no way are the recent tragedies justification for an infringement upon the rights of law-abiding Americans.

I won't support legislation that infringes upon those rights being stripped without due process. This is an emotional issue, but it is our job to step back and have an adult conversation.

□ 1030

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, to say I yield myself such time as I may consume is too short to recap these 2 days of the assault on the Second Amendment.

I will only say, in closing, that it might seem reasonable in this bill—these five or six or seven different bills cobbled together—it might seem reasonable that each of them makes sense.

I ask you, when we changed the Constitution to give an 18-year-old the right to vote, if we simply said today that we have changed our mind, we want to make it 21, don't worry about the Constitution. Wouldn't there be people saying that is ridiculous? Of course, they would.

If we said the First Amendment gives you a right that should not be abridged, and suddenly we say, but we are going to have prior restraint because you might do or say something wrong, we would say that is ridiculous.

Madam Speaker, today this affront on the Second Amendment is, in fact, ridiculous. Each piece may seem reasonable, but not in light of the significance of something enshrined in our Constitution, which is being systematically attacked by the other side.

Today, we are defending the Second Amendment in a way we have not had to in a generation. We stand here not because there aren't some elements that seem reasonable in this legislation, but because at the end of the day, our friends on the other side of the aisle who are not willing to support laws that are on the books being enforced and are not willing to stand behind the law enforcement community that would like to enforce those, they are affronting and trying to undo the Second Amendment without a constitutional change.

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

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

Madam Speaker, extreme risk laws save lives, it is that simple. Ultimately, that is what this debate should be about—saving lives. This legislation strikes a proper balance between protecting the due process rights of people in crisis and preventing tragedy by ensuring that those who pose an imminent danger to themselves or others do not have access to firearms.

Madam Speaker, this debate has been surreal. Every court that has considered the question has concluded that red flag laws afford proper due process and are constitutional. We already know that extreme risk laws work, but less than half the States have those laws in effect.

Madam Speaker, let us pass this legislation today, so we can bring access to this life-savings tool nationwide. We know it is not enough. We know we need all the provisions of the bill we passed yesterday, and we should bring back the assault weapons ban. But what we cannot do should not block us from doing what we can do. We can save thousands of lives annually, so let us begin.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. JORDAN. 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 224, nays 202, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—202

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

NOT VOTING—2

Fitzgerald	Hollingsworth
------------	---------------

□ 1111

Messrs. MURPHY of North Carolina and BAIRD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CICILLINE changed his 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

Barragán (Beyer)	Cárdenas	Frankel, Lois
Bass (Blunt)	(Correa)	(Wasserman)
Rochester)	Cooper (Correa)	Schultz)
Brooks	Crist	Garamendi
(Fleischmann)	(Wasserman)	(Beyer)
Brown (OH)	Schultz)	Gimenez (Waltz)
(Beatty)	Evans (Beyer)	Gomez (García (TX))

Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	McEachin (Beyer)	Strickland (Takano)
Guest (Fleischmann)	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Suozi (Beyer)
Johnson (SD) (LaHood)	Moulton (Neguse)	Swalwell (Correa)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Payne (Pallone)	Taylor (Fallon)
Khanna (Spanberger)	Price (NC) (Manning)	Torres (NY) (Blunt)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Ruiz (Correa)	Rochester (Van Drew)
Lamb (Blunt)	Rush (Jeffries)	(Reschenthaler)
Rochester)	Ryan (Beyer)	Vargas (Takano)
Leger Fernandez (Neguse)	Sánchez (Garcia (TX))	Walorski (Banks)
Loudermilk (Fleischmann)	Sewell (Beatty)	Waters (Garcia (TX))
	Sires (Pallone)	Wilson (FL) (Neguse)
	Spartz (Banks)	

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise to inquire of the House majority leader the schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend and the majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, the Republican whip, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed, as usual, until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Next week, the House will consider legislation to address inflation and help bring down costs for Americans. The House will consider the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act from the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Energy and Commerce to address food prices and help bring down the cost of fertilizer for farmers while providing more affordable options at the gas pump for Americans.

The House will also consider S. 3580, the Senate-passed companion to JOHN GARAMENDI's Ocean Shipping Reform Act, under suspension. We passed it previously, and it is in the Senate. However, this is a compromise with which Mr. GARAMENDI agrees. This legislation will address continued supply chain problems and ensure the fair and expeditious flow of goods in and out of our ports, helping lower costs for American consumers and bolstering our domestic agriculture products.

Additionally, Madam Speaker, the House will consider H.R. 2543, the Racial Equity, Inclusion, and Economic Justice Act, from Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS and the Financial Services Committee to promote racial equity and fair access to economic opportunity for those who are facing discrimination or bias. This will help families who are challenged in accessing financial services and housing at a time when every dollar is critical.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the House will also consider H.R. 2773, Representative DEBBIE DINGELL's bipartisan Recovering America's Wildlife Act.

The House will consider other bills, Madam Speaker, under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. Additional legislative items, of course, are possible.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I wanted to ask, specifically, there was some talk that we may today take up the Senate bill, the bill that passed over a month ago in the Senate, to give stronger protections to Supreme Court Justices and their families.

Of course, yesterday, something that angers a lot of us—Justice Kavanaugh, there was an arrest of a man that was at his house, attempting to murder Supreme Court Justice Kavanaugh. This is something we have expressed concern about for weeks, especially some of the language directed at Supreme Court Justices, people encouraging people to go to their houses.

There was a bill that had bipartisan support that passed the Senate over a month ago to give them stronger protections. We thought that may come up today. I don't hear it on the schedule. Can we get a vote on that bill when we come back early next week on the suspension calendar to get that bill sent to the President's desk to get that in motion quickly?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question. I think it is a very relevant question. I am hopeful that we can move that as early as possible.

I want to tell the gentleman the reason he thought that it might be moved this morning was because last night, I thought I had, after discussions with Senator CORNYN, a way forward that both the Senate and the House could agree on. Unfortunately, this morning, that appeared not to be the case.

We are trying to pursue that because we believe that it is a critical piece of legislation, as are the pieces of legislation we are considering.

I will tell the gentleman that the incident that occurred last night, of course, was covered, as the gentleman, I am sure knows, by the present security arrangements for Supreme Court Justices. The gentleman was taken into custody and apparently didn't get close to the house because of the security.

Nevertheless, we share the gentleman's concerns about the security for our Supreme Court Justices and, frankly, their families, their residences, as we are for the officers and clerks of the Supreme Court and their families and their employees.

So, the answer to your question is that is a priority item that I hope we can get done very early next week.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I hope that we can get that early in the

week put on the suspension calendar, in the form the Senate sent over where there is broad agreement on both sides of the aisle, and get that to the President's desk to get those stronger protections in place.

Finally, I would like to ask the gentleman, we have talked about this bill a number of times, H.R. 6858, which is a bill dealing with American energy independence, to open up more areas of our country to American energy production so that we don't have to be reliant on foreign countries, whether it is Russia, Venezuela, Iran or, now, the President is going to go to plead with Saudi to produce more energy when America has more energy that we could be producing that we can't because of current policies by President Biden.

This would open those up. It would allow us to lower gas prices. It would allow relief to families who are struggling because of these energy policies that are hurting our ability to produce in America and making us more dependent on countries that are cartels or monopolies, whether it is OPEC or other countries where they want they want a higher price. They want to limit production.

We want to open up American energy, and that is what that package of legislation would do.

Can we get that bill added to the calendar quickly, hopefully next week, so that we can help get relief to families who are trying to plan a family vacation and can't afford to pay \$4.50, \$5 a gallon or more for gasoline?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question. He has mentioned this before. I am talking to the committee whose jurisdiction this bill is in to consider what they want to do with it, and I am waiting to hear back from them.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, hopefully, we can get that addressed as well so that we can tackle some of these other problems: inflation, high gas prices, border issues that we are trying to bring legislation on.

If the gentleman has nothing else, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF MANUELITA GARCIA

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Manuelita Garcia.

Manuelita was a force to be reckoned with, a fierce advocate for justice, a true fighter for the community, and a longtime Little Village resident.

On Mother's Day, 2001, Manuelita launched Madres de la Villita to demand the construction of a promised high school in our neighborhood. I joined her and others as they initiated

a 19-day hunger strike to push the school board to fulfill their promise.

Her organizing led to greater support for educational equity and the eventual opening of the Little Village Lawndale High School.

Manuelita will be remembered for her devotion to the youth of La Villita. She knew that when we invest in youth, we invest in our future. Above all, she will be remembered for her commitment to fairness, justice, and equity.

Manuelita, thank you for your friendship. Rest in power, my friend.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER S. 4160, SUPREME COURT POLICE PARITY ACT

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I once again come to the floor to try to protect our Supreme Court.

Just yesterday, a man who wanted to kill Justice Kavanaugh was arrested outside the Justice's home. He was arrested with weapons on his person. Justice Kavanaugh has a wife and children. Yes, he does.

The Senate already passed a bill with agreement from 100 Senators to enhance the security protection for members of the Court and their families. Madam Speaker, it has sat here for a month—a month.

Yet, yesterday, House Democrats are leaving. Today, they want to leave for a long weekend. They gave tomorrow back.

I spoke to the majority leader this morning. I told him nobody on this side would object, a unanimous consent. He could run that bill on the floor right now and send it to the President so we could protect the Supreme Court.

How many times do they have to be threatened? How many people have to be arrested with a gun outside their homes? What would have happened had he not called 911? He didn't just have a gun. He had zip ties.

But somehow, you want to leave. This bill could be on the President's desk right now.

Now, think about this. This is coming from the same party whose White House press secretary said this, encouraged protests "outside of judges' homes." She even said that that was President Biden's position.

Let's not forget Majority Leader SCHUMER screaming on the steps of the Supreme Court. What did he say? Madam Speaker, I want you to listen to these words, and I want you to think about these words. What do you think the American public would think Schumer was telling them to do? He said: "You will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions."

Now, I don't know if that young man yesterday with that gun and zip ties that was at the home of Justice

Kavanaugh listened to this and that is why he went. I don't know, but I do know that is wrong. I do know we can change that. I do know we can protect them.

That bill has been sitting here for 1 month. I talked to the majority leader today. The only idea people have: Well, let's change it.

What does it mean if it is changed? It means it goes back to the Senate and waits longer.

Why? Why would we do that?

Every single Senator voted for it. And I promise you this: Every single Republican on this side would give unanimous consent to pass that, send it to the President, and protect the Supreme Court.

Enough is enough.

I know the Democrats want to defund the police. I know what they want to do across this country, but this is wrong. This is pure politics. And it has got to stop.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table S. 4160, the Supreme Court Police Parity Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I want it very clear, it is cleared on the House Republican side. There is not one Republican objecting, so the only place it is not being cleared is on the Democrats' side, and it is not moving. It has been sitting on the desk for a month, and that is wrong.

□ 1130

NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW

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

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, all government officials must be held accountable, especially those entrusted with the power to interpret our country's laws.

Repeated scandals and lax ethics requirements for Federal judges are eroding Americans' confidence in the impartiality of our courts.

When judges and Justices preside over cases that affect their individual stock portfolios or don't disclose their connections to special interests, they jeopardize the rule of law.

The American people should not have to question if cases are being decided fairly. We need stronger ethics rules to prevent these abuses of power from happening again.

I am backing legislation that will root out corruption, prevent conflicts of interest, and increase transparency in all three branches of the Federal Government.

To restore public trust in our institutions, we must hold government officials to the highest ethical standards. No one is above the law.

REMEMBERING SHERRA ANN EVERETT FERTITTA

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

Ms. LETLOW. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to pay tribute to the late Sherra Ann Everett Fertitta, a truly wonderful person and a dedicated mother, grandmother, educator, and friend, who was beloved by so many people across Ouachita Parish and northeast Louisiana.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the best way to describe the kind of person Sherra was is to use the words of her daughter, Tori Fertitta Mortensen. She said, "Her happiness was in seeing the happiness and good works of others."

Sherra was the kind of person who lifted you up every single time you saw her. On a personal level, she was always kind and encouraging, never forgetting to tell me that she was praying for me. It is her caring spirit and remarkable kindness that emerges as a common theme in the memories of her friends.

Sherra was a mom who was absolutely dedicated to her family. She was a teacher who believed that it is essential to pass along the love of learning to the next generation. She not only imparted her wisdom on others but also reminded them that "education is the best investment."

Sherra was a valued member of our community, who worked tirelessly to make it a better place. For instance, when she was working in the healthcare industry, she organized forums that would allow doctors and medical professionals to share information and connect with individuals who needed care and assistance.

She believed that being involved in the political process, helping elect good people to office, and being a strong advocate for your beliefs and values was essential to improving not just our community but our country.

She was a longtime leader for the Ouachita Parish Republican Women and served on the parish's Republican Executive Committee. She volunteered on numerous campaigns and even helped produce a local radio show.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on about all that Sherra Fertitta did for our community in Ouachita Parish, that is the kind of person she was.

We know that her true legacy lives on through her family, her friends, and the countless people whose lives she touched here on Earth. We will miss her immeasurably and the joy that Sherra Fertitta brought to our lives will never be forgotten.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF DAVID LEBLANC

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to David LeBlanc of Nottingham, New Hampshire, who passed away on this day 6 years ago.

A lifelong New Hampshire resident, David was born and raised in Manchester and worked in the line department at Public Service of New Hampshire for over 30 years.

He was an avid runner, whose legacy lives on through the Greater Manchester Running Club, which he founded with his wife, Cheryl, in 1980.

David honorably served the State and his country as a member of the New Hampshire Army National Guard. Today, he will be reinterred at the New Hampshire State Veterans Cemetery, something that is only possible because we changed the law this year.

I was proud to sponsor this legislation that ensures all of our veterans, including members of the National Guard and Reserves, can be laid to rest in State veterans cemeteries.

The National Guard and Reserves are a critical component of our military and sacrifice so much to keep us safe.

As we honor the memory of David LeBlanc, let us honor the service of all of our veterans and ensure they are not forgotten.

PRIME-TIME TELEVISION SOAP OPERA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, tonight starts the latest development in this political circus otherwise known as the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol. In prime time.

Instead of working to combat issues facing Americans, such as skyrocketing inflation, decreases in real wages, gas prices barreling towards \$7 a gallon or \$8—if you are a lucky Californian—or the invasion of our southern border, House Democrats are continuing their witch hunt against former President Trump, who seems to still be living rent-free inside their heads.

This time, in a certain boost to their own vanity, the committee has hired former ABC News president, James Goldston, to produce it.

They aren't interested in the truth. They aren't interested in justice; not even the intel that was available ahead of the possible Capitol break-in that they knew about.

The committee is putting on a spectacle, a Hollywood produced, prime-time television soap opera to distract viewers from the real policy-made disasters.

How out of touch are they with the American people? Do you think the young mother desperately trying to find formula for her newborn cares about this hearing?

Do you think the farmer who can't plant this year due to the water shortage, the water being taken away, or the trucker who can't use his equipment because diesel is over \$7 or \$8 cares about this hearing?

Even liberal San Francisco recalled their radical DA because he stopped caring about the people and opened up the city to a crime wave they haven't seen in decades.

People want answers and change, and it isn't about this January 6 deal.

INVESTING IN OUR WATER RESOURCES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, fresh water is life. I rise today to applaud House passage of the 2022 Water Resources Development Act.

As chair of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies, one of my top priorities is advancing solutions and funding to meet the critical, new, freshwater challenges to every State and community in America.

To grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and protect and conserve our precious environmental resources, we must invest in freshwater systems and in our ports, harbors, and waterways. We must strengthen communities and ensure Federal agencies, like the Army Corps of Engineers, are prepared for the challenges of today and tomorrow.

As a representative of the agricultural and industrial heartland of America, our Great Lakes region is home to those who make, build, and grow America. The water resources bill will unleash their full potential, meeting new challenges to our ecosystem.

I look forward to working with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and our local partners to deliver progress for the American people in every nook and cranny of our beloved homeland.

JUNE IS NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National Dairy Month.

As Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee, I am proud to be a descendant of a long line of dairy farmers. In fact, Pennsylvania is one of the largest milk-producing States in the Nation. We are home to more than 474,000 cows.

National Dairy Month began as National Milk Month in 1937. Now, it has

developed into an annual tradition that celebrates the contributions the dairy industry has made to the world. From calcium to potassium, dairy products like milk contain 13 essential nutrients, which may help to better manage your weight, reduce your risk for high blood pressure, osteoporosis, and certain cancers.

Yet, for too long, dairy products like milk have been unfairly demonized. Not only does it hurt our dairy industry, but it has also resulted in the loss of nearly an entire generation of milk drinkers. Kids have been cheated out of the nutrition that they need.

Madam Speaker, whether it is protein to help build and repair the muscle tissue of active bodies or vitamin A to help maintain healthy skin, dairy products are a natural nutrient powerhouse. Those are just a few reasons we should celebrate dairy, not just in June but every day all year long.

Happy National Dairy Month.

AMERICA IS BEYOND THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS

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

Mr. KAHELE. Madam Speaker, today I urge the United States Senate to pass the Protecting Our Kids Act. The Uvalde shooting in Texas is one of many mass school shootings that will remain a forever stain on our country. We find ourselves here again, in the wake of another elementary school massacre, expressing condolences, sympathy, and outrage.

As a parent to two elementary school-aged children, when my wife and I take our daughters to school, we expect them to run to our car, with smiles on their faces at the end of every fun-filled school day.

Once more, the House took action this week and voted to move this forward. We worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass the most basic measures to keep our families safe from gun violence. This commonsense bill will save lives. It makes crucial changes, raising the age for buying an assault rifle to 21, working toward safe gun storage, and reducing the unregulated trafficking of guns.

We are many school shootings past thoughts and prayers. Sandy Hook, Parkland, Columbine. We need action now. Time and time again, this Nation has failed to act.

We must pass comprehensive gun violence prevention legislation to protect my children, to protect your children, to protect America's children. The American people are demanding for us to act. It is time to act now.

ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, from Oxford, Michigan, to Uvalde, Texas,

Americans have seen more than 240 mass shootings in just 158 days. In the past week, a pregnant woman was shot at a picnic in Saginaw, Michigan, and a young boy was shot in Flint.

It does not have to be this way.

America is the only developed country in the world where this type of gun violence happens every single day.

And that is why I support these commonsense efforts to expand red flag laws; to raise the purchasing age for some semiautomatic weapons to 21 years of age; to crack down on gun trafficking and straw purchases; to address ghost guns, untraceable guns without serial numbers that can be bought and assembled at home; to restrict high-capacity magazines; and to ban bump stocks, devices that turn semiautomatic rifles into automatic weapons, into a machine gun.

I wrote this legislation back in 2017 after a mass shooter in Las Vegas was able to fire over 1,000 rounds in just mere minutes, killing 60 people.

While no single law will stop every tragedy, we can do what we can, and that is why I support this important legislation. I am glad the House passed it. The Senate should take it up now.

□ 1145

CHILDREN KILLED BY GUN VIOLENCE THIS YEAR

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

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, I will take a moment after the shootings this week just to read the names of the children under 10 years old in America who have been killed by guns so far this year.

Aiden, age 8.
Alice, a newborn.
Alyssa, age 6.
Amare, age 10.
Andres, age 9.
Antonio, who went by the nickname "Espn," age 7.
Arbrie, age 8.
Ariah, age 7.
Arlene, age 9.
Asa, age 8.
Ashton, age 2.
Autumn, age 3.
Avery, 3.
Bella, 4, and her sister, Brixx, was a newborn.
Bridger, age 10.
Bryson, 3.
Caleb, 5.
Cayden, 10.
Charlie, 10.
Charlotte, 9.
Charvez, 2.
Chloe, 7.
Clesslynn, 2.

Madam Speaker, I realize I am being gavelled out there, but there are 600 names on this list. I can't read these in 1 minute.

Are we going to act, or are we going to throw up useless thoughts and prayers? It is time to act.

GUN LAWS

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, America has been through a tough time the last few weeks due to serious incidents that happened in Buffalo and in Texas. But last week, I was down at the Mexican border, and I talked to some Border Patrol guys, who, because we were Congressmen, brought up what happens when we make it as difficult as possible for law-abiding people to own guns.

Right now, if you compare Mexico and the United States, Mexico has—per capita—about five times as many murders as they do in the U.S. Not 5 percent more, not 50 percent more, five times as many. I am sure the Mexican elected officials who passed those laws making it so difficult to get a gun thought they were going to have a peaceful paradise down there.

Right now, many people are running all over each other to say: Let's pass law. Let's pass this law. Let's take a look and see what happened in Mexico and whether the sole answer is more laws.

Meanwhile, I have a bill making it more difficult to bring guns into schools, and right now, that bill is not moving. I think that would have a good impact.

RECOGNIZING BETTY REID SOSKIN

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend, Betty Reid Soskin, as she finally enters retirement from the National Park Service at age 100. Betty has had too many jobs and too many accomplishments and too many compliments for just 1 minute, so I will share a few of the highlights of this remarkable woman's life.

During World War II, Betty was a file clerk for the Boilermakers Union A-36 in Richmond, California, an all-Black union auxiliary.

In 2004, she became a park ranger with the National Park Service assigned to the Rosie the Riveter Park in Richmond, California. In this role, Betty shared her story as a young Black woman working during the war and long held the honorable distinction of being the Nation's oldest National Park Ranger.

Americans came from all over the country to listen to Betty's voice. Betty has been recognized over the years for her advocacy and her commitment to social justice, including by President Obama as Glamour magazine's Woman of the Year, and recently, had a local middle school named after her.

Betty is an important part of our community and our country, and I am proud to call her a friend and a con-

stituent. Her leadership and passionate spirit are an inspiration to all of us, all who have been fortunate enough to know her and for all Americans who know of her.

Congratulations, Betty, and thank you for a wonderful life of service to our community and to our country.

COMPREHENSIVE GUN REFORM

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, this week, House Democrats have led the effort to pass comprehensive gun violence prevention legislation to address this epidemic here in America. We will also ensure that the American people know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth with respect to the violent insurrection and attack on our Capitol to protect the integrity of our democracy.

At the same time, we continue to fight for good-paying jobs, to lower costs and ensure an economy that works for everyday Americans. We believe in a country where if you work hard and play by the rules, you should be able to provide a comfortable living for yourself and for your family, educate your children, purchase a home, and retire with grace and dignity. That is the great American Dream that we are fighting to preserve for the people.

SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), my friend.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my good friend, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about a major problem facing our communities, and that is human violence. I have four children and four beautiful grandchildren who are school-aged.

Madam Speaker, I have to tell you, when I turned on the television set and saw what was going on in Uvalde, Texas, my heart sank. I saw my grandchildren in the faces of those children that I saw fleeing from that horrible violence that was being conducted that afternoon. It is too often that we turn on our TV sets and see images of schools locked down and grieving communities. Unfortunately, as I mentioned, we saw that unfold in Uvalde, Texas. Yet, every time tragedy strikes, we hear the same conversation, calls for bans on firearms, universal background checks, and red flag laws. That is how we spent the last two days in this Chamber, talking about partisan bills that are, number one, redundant—a lot of these laws already exist—or number two, they are laws that will infringe on the rights of law-abiding

American citizens. Ultimately, they won't fix the problem.

Madam Speaker, the problem is not guns. It is not gun violence. The problem is human violence. When I was sheriff, I used to explain to my community occasionally, when gun violence—as they would call it—would erupt, and they would ask me to talk about it.

Madam Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, Mr. GOHMERT, I would always make the point to them that I could take that weapon off my hip, put it on that podium, and it would never, ever become violent. Now, some human may come along and pick it up and use it violently, but that is a human violence problem. It is not a gun violence problem.

I carried a gun for 41 years. It never became violent. Yet, we see it over and over again. Humans are the cause of this violence. It is a cause of the grief that we are seeing today and feeling in Uvalde and Buffalo and so many other cities across America.

We see it over and over again. A tragedy happens, a gunman is identified, and what do we learn? Then we learn that they showed all sorts of dangerous behavior and telltale signs of violence long before becoming a mass shooter, a murderer, killing animals, making threats, threatening words, self-harm, cutting themselves—the list goes on and on; mental health issues that should have been addressed long before they became an active shooter.

Madam Speaker, but people don't want to talk about that in the wake of a tragedy. The fact is, we already have the tools to deal with these individuals once they are identified. We have the tools to stop these horrific events before they happen. One of the things, as sheriff, I used to tell my officers all the time is I don't want to be the best first responder to a mass casualty event. I want to prevent it before it occurs.

Madam Speaker, I saw firsthand, countless times, when people were a danger, we stopped them before they could hurt others. We put them in jail. We arrested them for making threats. We identified them and we identified the threats that they were making, and we stopped them from acting on those threats.

The challenge here, we must focus on identifying those who are a human threat to themselves and others and then intervene. Too many times after all of these events, we hear that conversation: Oh, I knew this guy. I am not surprised.

Those are the conversations that we hear afterwards. We must identify those suffering from severe mental illness and formally adjudicate them so they cannot buy a firearm. That law already exists. We need to start adjudicating those who are mentally ill and a danger.

And let me say this: Everyone that has a mental illness is not a danger. Many people suffer mental illness and are not a danger. But those that are, we need to adjudicate them as such so

that they can't go down and buy a firearm. Those laws are already on the books, but our community must do a better job of identifying those who need help and then get them the services and treatment that they need and deserve.

We could do this while also upholding basic due process rights. Our whole judicial process system is based on the assumption that people are innocent until proven guilty. But the ex-parte order issued through these red flag laws throws these fundamental rights out the window.

Red flag laws take away a person's Second Amendment rights and a lower evidentiary standard without the opportunity to even defend themselves in court. Ex-parte is almost a secretive process. It is going on without the accused's knowledge. And we see how well the ex-parte process worked in the FISA courts, didn't we?

The reason our judicial system works is because it is adversarial. We have people on both sides of the issue who are fighting it out in court, discussing the facts. Ex-parte, you hear one side of the story. That is all. And they want to use that to take away your Second Amendment rights. Then once deprived of those rights, now we have to prove that we are innocent.

This is backwards and ineffective at solving our violence problem. Before we quickly jump to pass bad legislation—like we just passed this afternoon—let's do a better job of enforcing the laws that are already on our books.

Before we rehash the same talking points and debate partisan messaging bills, let's work together on the areas where we need change. Let's work together to bolster our mental health system so we can better identify people suffering from mental illness and adjudicate them if they are a danger and provide them the treatment they need and deserve.

□ 1200

Let's work together to strengthen penalties for those who steal and traffic in firearms. Let's work together to secure our schools and make sure that our kids have a safe place to learn.

The STOP School Violence Act of 2018, which was signed into law by President Trump, when we drafted the language for that bill, the first concern that I had was identification of those who are a threat, and that is the first part of that law.

The second part of that law now is CPTED, crime prevention through environmental design, how we can stop those who may be coming to our schools to commit violence.

Let's work together to identify the signs of dangerous behavior and prevent these acts of violence before they even happen.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I know my friend mentioned he had been a sheriff. He has great expertise in knowing what he is talking about, and I appreciate his insights as a lawman.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure and honor to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), ambassador from Texas Tech University, where their slogan is "Guns Up," not because they are violent, but I have always taken it to mean they were ready to preserve and protect if the need arose.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I have never been more proud to be a Red Raider than after that introduction, I can tell you that.

I thank the gentleman, my fellow freedom-loving Texan, Representative GOHMERT, for yielding me the time. We will miss Representative GOHMERT in this Chamber and the fight that he brought every day for the people in this people's House.

I will lend my thoughts and sentiments on this issue of violence. As my colleague from Florida mentioned, human violence, sometimes perpetrated with guns, is a human problem, a problem of the soul, a problem of society, the degradation of our culture and our families. These are issues far deeper than legislation can reach, I can assure you.

I understand, because I am human, that we want to do something and that while that may be a human response, as lawmakers, we should ask the question not can we do something symbolic, can we do something to make the American people feel good, because that is not going to save a single elementary school child. We have to ask the question: What can we do that will actually work, and what can we do that will also preserve the rights of our citizens to protect themselves?

I think we often forget and fail to start this conversation with the genesis and the fundamental rationale for the Second Amendment. Our Founders knew good and well the abuses, the corruption, and the tyrannical force from a coercive central government. They wanted to make sure that not only could we preserve our happiness and our life and liberty from the crazy and the criminal; they wanted to make sure that we would have a last check on tyranny with an armed citizenry.

Folks, the Second Amendment is there, and we have preserved this experiment in liberty and democracy for 240-plus years, even though, in the 20th century alone, tens of millions of people have been slaughtered by their own government. We have preserved this great beacon of liberty, this shining city on a hill, because of that founding principle that the Second Amendment is the citizen's last check on an abusive government.

The Declaration of Independence says it best. It talks about the mission of a government that has the consent of the people to protect and secure the liberties of those people, and whenever any form of government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it. But it goes further. It says when there is a

long train of abuses and usurpation, reducing the society to absolute despotism, it is the right and even the duty of the people to throw off that government.

Folks, that is the context to the Second Amendment. It is not just to give east Texans and west Texans a hunting license. And I think it is critical.

As we grieve with our brothers and sisters in Uvalde, and it is heart-breaking and unthinkable to see that tragedy play out and to see these families suffer, but I think it is incumbent upon mature lawmakers and leaders of the greatest and freest country in the world to take a deep breath and ask the question: Will these things that we are talking about with respect to gun control actually do anything to stop these crazy, murderous people from committing their crimes?

We need to let Uvalde grieve. We need to let the final report come out. We all need to be more vigilant.

Quite frankly, when we talk about 18- to 21-year-olds and extreme risk orders and all the litany of things that are being debated in this Chamber, we ought to let the States like Texas, along with their communities, figure out how to solve these problems and secure their schools and communities.

The Federal Government's mission at its core is to secure the liberties of the people and provide for a common defense. Let Texas figure this out.

My goodness, the very gun control laws that were passed out of this Chamber have been in place in cities and States with the highest gun-related crimes.

No more feel-good measures, no more infringing measures. Let's pray for Uvalde. Let's let Texas solve those problems. Let's protect the God-given, constitutionally protected rights of every American to defend themselves against the criminal and, God forbid, a coercive government.

God bless America, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the wise observations of my friend from Texas. I couldn't have asked for a better lead-in to the thoughts that I have on this very issue. Mr. ARRINGTON had some great insights.

I have an article here from, of all things, ABC News. Above the name of the author, Bill Hutchinson, is a quote from a police official saying: "It is worse than a war zone around here lately."

The article says: "At least 12 major U.S. cities have broken annual homicide records in 2021—and there is still 3 weeks to go in the year." This is from December 8, 2021. This article became more relevant because of the horrors that occurred in Uvalde.

Another quote, from Philadelphia Mayor Jim Kenney: "It is terrible to every morning get up and have to go look at the numbers and then look at the news and see the stories. It is just crazy. It is just crazy, and this needs to

stop." He said that after the city surpassed its annual homicide record of 500, which had stood since 1990.

"Philadelphia, a city of roughly 1.5 million people, has had more homicides this year"—this is 2021—"521 as of December 6) than the Nation's two largest cities, New York (443 as of December 5) and Los Angeles (352 as of November 27). That is an increase of 13 percent from 2020, a year that nearly broke the 1990 record."

The article goes on and talks about all these shootings in our major cities. In fact, these aren't considered mass shootings. They don't meet that definition as commonly used.

From worldpopulationreview.com, the top 10 cities in the United States with the highest murder rates—and that is murders per 100,000 people—number one is St. Louis; number two, Baltimore; number three, New Orleans; number four, Detroit; number five, Cleveland; number six, Las Vegas; number seven, Kansas City; number eight, Memphis; number nine, Newark; and number 10, Chicago.

Now, all of those cities have Democrat mayors. Las Vegas has an independent who was a Democrat until 2009 when he announced now being an Independent.

We also, in 2021, had 16 cities hit record-high homicide rates. Again, rates normally are calculated in murders per 100,000 people. Rochester, New York, had 80. Philadelphia had 524. Louisville, Kentucky, had 179. Baton Rouge had 115. That was an unofficial number but, apparently, accurate or close to accurate. Austin had 88. Indianapolis had 258. St. Paul had 35. Portland, Oregon, had 84. Albuquerque had 107. Tucson had 92. Columbus had 179. Jackson, Mississippi, had 129. Atlanta, Georgia, had 150. New Haven, Connecticut, had 25, which is a tremendous number for a small city. Macon, Georgia, had 52. Milwaukee had 190.

Additional cities with high homicide rates, naturally, Chicago had 797 homicides in 1 year, yet Mayor Lightfoot, prominent Democrat that she is, doesn't want to get to the root causes of that.

□ 1215

Black lives matter. There is absolutely an inordinate number of Black lives that are taken in these Democrat-controlled cities.

New York, New York had 481. It is just tragic what has gone on. So what is different? We have had guns in America. In fact, not only have we had them from our founding, if it were not for guns in America we would not have had a founding, starting perhaps with Lexington Green.

People in America had guns and they defended themselves and they defended their liberty. That is how we came to have what I believe is the greatest country in the history of the world. I know there are a lot of schools that are teaching how terrible this country is, but I hear over and over from people

that come here to the United States from other countries, and they say: You have got to protect your freedom because if you lose your liberty, your freedom here in America, there will be nowhere else in the world anyone can go to be free.

Historically, countries don't go fight for other people's freedom, yet, this country has. We fought the bloodiest war with the biggest loss of life here on our own soil for the freedom of people who were slaves. Yes, I know States' rights were a big part, but let's face it, slavery was at the bottom of it all.

Countries don't do that. This one did. You even had the Founders do something that Founders don't do historically. They condemned themselves in their own founding documents by saying all men are created equal, they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights.

Thomas Jefferson himself put the grievance in the declaration. There was disagreement on it. Here he was a slave owner, yet, the most offensive, longest paragraph of the grievances was because King George had allowed slavery to ever start. The problem, or the wrong, that was being done through that institution, it was wrong. Yes, I know it has always been here on Earth.

As I understand, there may be 40 million or more people in slavery right now today in our modern world, but it doesn't make it right anywhere and it needs to stop. This country had people who were Founders that condemned themselves by putting that language in there because they knew what was right.

This is an unusual country. I know Solomon's Israel was an absolutely amazing place, supposedly the wisest man to ever live. Of course, he had so many wives and that creates problems. More opportunities. More liberty here than anywhere. Yet, we have spent the week hearing over and over about the need for gun control.

The first time I was asked if I supported gun control years ago, I said: Well, of course I do. We were taught in the Army that the most effective gun control back then was—I believe there were eight steady hold factors—which was the best way to control your gun while firing—the steady hold factors were taught.

They don't teach that in the Army anymore, as I understand it. Kids have grown up around guns in America and we didn't have mass shootings. There is something going on here. I know I was condemned roundly this week, yesterday, talking about—we had friends across the aisle who made clear they didn't want to hear any more about prayer. They wanted to do something. They didn't seem to care if it was wrong. They wanted to do something.

Well, John Lott, Jr., had this article on May 26 in Newsweek. I am just touching on certain parts.

He said: "Just as with so many of these attackers"—talking about the shooter in Uvalde—"the man who attacked Robb Elementary School picked

a place where people were banned from carrying concealed handguns. For example, the perpetrator of the Buffalo shooting from a couple of weeks ago wrote in his manifesto: 'Areas where carrying with a concealed weapon 'are outlawed or prohibited may be good areas of attack.' "

He put that in the manifesto in case people just were too dense to understand that it draws shooters if they know they have got soft targets.

John Lott says: "Teachers and staff can carry concealed handguns in about 30 percent of Texas school districts, so we don't need to guess how the policy would work. Nineteen other States also allow concealed carry in schools. Since the year 2000, there has yet to be a single case of someone being wounded or killed from a shooting, let alone a mass public shooting, between 6 a.m. and midnight at a school that lets teachers carry guns.

"While there have not been any problems with armed teachers, the number of people killed at schools without concealed carry has increased significantly over the course of the last decade.

"Biden's speech Tuesday night contained one misleading or false statement after another. Instead of trying to bring the country together, it politicized the attack. When mentioning the Sandy Hook, Parkland, Santa Fe, and Oxford school shootings, Biden claimed that there were 900 instances of gunfire at schools over the last 10 years. But someone committing suicide in a car parking lot at 2 a.m., two gangs fighting over drug turf in a parking lot after school hours, and an accidental discharge in a firearms training class are not remotely similar to the sort of shooting that happened Tuesday. Even including lone suicides, accidental discharges, including those by police, and gang fights, the number—as compiled by my organization, the Crime Prevention Research Center, is about half of what Biden claims it is: 470.

"Since 1998, there have been a total of nine attacks similar to the Robb Elementary School shooting. Nine is nine too many. But once you adjust for population, there are many other countries, from Germany to Russia to Finland, that have comparable rates of school shootings.

"Biden says that we need common-sense gun laws, but what he proposes simply will not help. He doesn't seem to realize that over 92 percent of violent crime in America has nothing to do with guns. Focusing on so-called 'assault weapons' is not only not going to stop mass public shootings, but it won't make a difference in reducing murders at large.

Madam Speaker, one murder is too many.

"Only a small share of murders are committed with rifles, let alone 'assault rifles,' and that share has grown even smaller over time. The percentage of firearm murders committed with rifles was 4.8 percent prior to the Federal

'assault weapons' ban that took effect in September 1994.

"When the ban was in effect, from 1995 to 2004, the figure stood at 4.9 percent." Up a tenth of a percent with the so-called assault weapons ban in effect. "And since 2004, it's been even lower. Based on these numbers, it's hard to argue that the ban did anything at all.

"When we passed the assault weapons ban, mass shootings went down. When the law expired, mass shootings tripled," Biden claimed. In fact, there was no drop in the number of attacks with 'assault weapons,' and virtually no change in total mass shootings, during the 1994 to 2004 ban."

We know from the rules of the House—I can't say anybody lied, including the President, but whoever is putting those words in his teleprompter sure was because that just didn't happen, it misrepresented the truth—I am sure not intentionally.

"Biden asked Americans why people need 'assault weapons' to hunt deer. But, in reality, many so-called 'assault weapons' are nothing more than small-game hunting rifles. The AR-15 platform has just been made to cosmetically resemble a military-grade weapon."

For people that know weapons, it fires a .223 round. It is just 3/1000ths bigger around than a .22.

We were taught in military science—and I had an Army scholarship at Texas A&M—that Vietnam had gone to the M-16, now the M-4, same basic gun. It fires the same size round—or in the metric system, 556. We were taught that, gee, it is a higher speed, but the rounds are lighter weight, therefore, our military can carry more of them. We were also taught it certainly is not more lethal than what was being used before with the 7.62 round.

John Lott says, "The Uvalde tragedy will inevitably lead to a push for so-called 'red flag' laws or extreme risk protection orders. You would never know this from the media coverage, but the Federal Government and every State already have laws on the books that deal with people who are a danger to themselves or to others. These laws are commonly known as 'Baker Act' statutes, though they go by different names in different States. They typically allow police, doctors, and family members to have someone held for a mental health examination based upon a simple reasonableness test—effectively amounting to an educated guess."

Further down: "When faced with legal bills that can easily amount to \$10,000 for a hearing, few people find that it makes sense to fight 'red flag' laws just to keep their guns. Judges will thus initially confiscate a person's gun on the basis of a written complaint and 'reasonable suspicion.' When hearings take place weeks later, courts overturn a third of the initial orders. But since few defendants have legal representation, the actual error rate is undoubtedly much higher.

"When people pose a clear danger to themselves or to others, they should be confined to a mental health facility. If someone is really suicidal, simply taking away his gun won't solve the problem anyway. If anything, 'red flag' laws harm people who need genuine help; absent such laws, a person contemplating suicide might speak to a friend or family member and be dissuaded from that tragic course of action.

"It is well past time that we address these mass public shootings. But let's come up with proposals that matter—starting with eliminating 'gun-free zones'."

□ 1230

It also is worth noting, although some say assault weapon bans would reduce mass shootings and they think an assault weapon would be an automatic weapon—you hear that over and over, Madam Speaker. Actually, automatic weapons are already illegal and unavailable to the general public. Assault weapons are only available to the military. Though you have people who are vying for gigs on CNN or MSNBC who may say otherwise, but people who actually are not don't have an ulterior motive. They know an AR-15 is most often used as a defensive weapon.

I have heard why more people like an AR-15 with such a small round as a defensive weapon at home is people who don't fire weapons often end up twitching before the gun is fired which is extremely harmful to the accuracy. The AR-15, because the round is so small, it doesn't have much of a kick at all, and so people who are not used to using guns actually can be more accurate and find it more helpful.

We have people here saying that you shouldn't have more than five rounds. Yet, if you have multiple people coming into your home threatening your family, Madam Speaker, and they will each have guns most likely, then you need that.

Of course, I had a guy last time, some years back, when there was talk by Democrats about eliminating or making illegal multiple rounds in a magazine, and I had a guy over in the Rayburn Building who told me, I know you all are looking at banning multiple rounds in magazines. I am from Georgia. We don't want that because we find that, generally speaking, it takes over 50 rounds to bring down a drone.

I thought he was kidding, but he didn't smile. So that was news to me. That is the only time I have heard that request for multiple rounds in a magazine.

But the "Updated Assessment of the Federal Assault Weapons Ban: Impacts on Gun Markets and Gun Violence, 1994 to 2003," the Department of Justice concluded this: "Should it be renewed, the ban's effects on gun violence are likely to be small at best and perhaps too small for reliable measurement. Assault weapons were rarely used in gun crimes even before the ban."

According to recent data from the FBI between 2015 and 2019, you were twice as likely to be killed by hands or feet than you are to be killed by a rifle.

That is really amazing and shocking.

Our society, if you go back to a Supreme Court case in the late 1800s, they reviewed pages and pages of evidence and said that they didn't think there was any question that the United States was a Christian nation—not that everybody in the United States was a Christian, of course not, never has been. But that Christian and Judeo-Christian principles had a major effect on our founding and on the country up through those times.

I would agree with President Obama when he said we are not a Christian nation. I think the Supreme Court was right back in the late 1800s, and I think President Obama was right when he said that we are not now.

So what is the answer?

What is amazing to me is we have people deeply concerned—and I have friends across the aisle. I know their heart, and I know how desperately concerned they are about these shootings, and they want to stop them.

But if you look at the data, Madam Speaker, and you look at the cold, hard facts, the number one State in the Nation for gun control laws is California.

This article is from AWR Hawkins from June 5, 2022:

“An FBI report on active shooter incidents in 2021 shows that California was the number one State for such incidents, with six incidents total.

California is also number one for gun law strength, the Mike Bloomberg-affiliated Everytown for Gun Safety noted.

According to the FBI, there were 61 ‘active shooter incidents’ across the country in 2021 and 12 of the incidents met the definition of mass killing’.”

Madam Speaker, California—where our Speaker is from—led the Nation with six of those 12 active shooter incidents:

California has universal background checks, an assault weapons ban, a high-capacity magazine ban, a 10-day waiting period on gun purchases, they have got the red flag laws, gun registration requirements, good cause requirements for concealed carry, a ban on carrying a gun on a college campus for self-defense, a ban on K-12 teachers being armed on campus, a background check requirement for ammunition purchases, and a limit on the number of guns a law-abiding citizen can purchase in a given month, among other controls.

Additionally, ammunition purchases are only allowed if made through a State-approved vendor.

Yet, as a friend mentioned at the beginning of our hour here, Madam Speaker, you have got more shootings in Mexico.

As this article from “American Wire” by Melissa Fine indicates that: “According to the National Shooting Sports Foundation, retailer surveys revealed a 58 percent increase in gun sales to African Americans, a 49 percent increase among Hispanic Ameri-

cans, and firearm sales to Asian Americans jumped by 43 percent.”

According to this article there is a guy named Juan Ramireo, who immigrated from Mexico as a teenager, said: “As a Mexican immigrant, I feel that people are waking up.”

Ramireo, who legally immigrated to the United States when he was 13, said, The Second Amendment is a large reason why people feel safer here in the U.S. and in their homes at night. He said that as a kid—of course, living in Mexico—he knew what it was like to feel helpless. Nobody wants that feeling.

He said, “I saw my mom and grandmother go through several struggles and feelings of fear in our small Mexican town. It was difficult. But after moving here to the U.S., it's a new world. I go to bed with no worry about defending myself and my family.”

That is because he and his family have guns.

So what makes a difference?

We heard in our hearing in the Judiciary Committee from some Democrats that they didn't want to attribute any effect to social media. They didn't want us to attribute any effect to violent video games or to Hollywood or to mental illness or to godlessness or to fatherlessness or to drug use.

Yet we need to talk about these things. We really need to talk about these things.

We were told that they didn't want to hear anything more about prayers. And I know some media has made a big deal of that. But the fact is before prayers were eliminated in schools we didn't have the kind of mass shootings we do today.

I read a quote from a man named A.A. Hodge who was the principal of the Princeton Seminary and a professor of systematic theology back before the turn of the century of 1900. In fact, it was a few months before his death in 1886. Jim Garlow had quoted Reverend Hodge.

He warned a few months before his death, “I am as sure as I am of the fact of Christ's reign that a comprehensive and centralized system of national education, separated from religion, as is now commonly proposed, will prove the most appalling enginery for the propagation of anti-Christian and atheistic unbelief, and of anti-social nihilistic ethics, individual, social and political, which this sin-rent world has ever seen.”

George Orwell commented, “Sometimes the first duty of intelligent men is the restatement of the obvious.” He said, “The further a society drifts from the truth, the more it will hate those who speak it.”

I am getting a lot of hate.

“The most effective way to destroy people is to deny and obliterate their own understanding of their history.”

We are getting a lot of that in this country: eliminate our history, lie about our history, and tear down our history and our statues.

When the truth is you learn from good history and you learn from bad history, Madam Speaker, and if you don't get all of it or you get inaccurate history, you don't learn anything accurate.

Orwell said, “Free speech is my right to say what you don't want to hear.”

He said, “In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act.”

But as he talked about history and the ministry of truth that rewrote history every day like a disinformation board, he said, “The past was erased, the erasure forgotten, and the lie became the truth.”

We have seen a lot of that and not from Republicans.

Orwell said, “So much of left-wing thought is a kind of playing with fire by people who don't even know that fire is hot.”

He said, “Threats to freedom of speech, writing and action, though often trivial in isolation, are cumulative in their effect and, unless checked, lead to a general disrespect for the rights of the citizen.”

He said, “Whoever controls the image and information of the past determines what and how future generations will think; whoever controls the information and images of the present determines how those same people will view the past.

“He who controls the past commands the future. He who commands the future conquers the past.”

Orwell defined journalism as “printing what someone else does not want printed. Everything else is public relations.”

□ 1245

We have got a lot of public relations in this town.

From the Gulag Archipelago, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn had an interesting quote. He said, “Remember Lenin's words: ‘An oppressed class which did not aspire to possess arms and learn how to handle them would deserve only to be treated as slaves.’”

That is Lenin. And the system he created in the Soviet Union resulted in the second most murders by a government in the history of the world, second only to Mao Tse Tung in China.

Whitaker Chambers—I waited too many years to read his book, Witness. But he says—because he did a lot of analysis. He was an atheist. He had had a troubled family life and loved the idea of communism; but eventually saw what communism really was and decided he didn't want any of it; eventually became a Christian.

But he said: “. . . the moment man indulged his freedom to the point where he was also free from God, it led him into tragedy, evil and often the exact opposite of what he had intended. In human terms, there was no solution for the problem of evil.”

He said: “. . . the crisis of the Western world exists to the degree it is indifferent to God. It exists to the degree

in which the Western world actually shares communism's materialist vision, is so dazzled by the logic of the materialist interpretation of history, politics, and economics, that it fails to grasp that, for it, the only possible answer to the Communist challenge is to choose either faith in God or faith in man."

Well, what Lenin had to say about that issue, he said, "Every religious idea of God, even flirting with the idea of God, is unutterable vileliness." And that came after Dostoyevsky analyzed what this crazy guy named Marx had to say. And Dostoyevsky took great issue with it. And at one point, he said: "The problem"—Dostoyevsky—"The problem of communism is not an economic problem." Of course, some of us know it is an economic problem. But his point is it is not the biggest problem.

He said, "The problem of communism is the problem of atheism."

And back during the summer I was an exchange student to the real Soviet Union in the seventies, it was nauseating to walk into a church, and where you would have seen a gorgeous stained glass window of Jesus—I remember one came in, and I have seen a picture depicting Jesus surrounded by the children where he—the quote was: "Suffer the little children to come unto me," except it was Lenin sitting there with the children around him. They had destroyed the stained glass window of Jesus and had Lenin; which goes back to what Dostoyevsky had to say, the problem of communism, socialism, progressivism, the big problem is ultimately government has got to be God; and that doesn't work out well.

Natan Sharansky, an amazing man, he said: "A lack of moral clarity . . . is why people living in free societies cannot distinguish between religious fundamentalists in democratic states and religious terrorists in fundamentalist states. That is why people living in free societies can come to see their fellow citizens as their enemy and foreign dictators as their friends." A lack of moral clarity. And that is not being taught in too many of our schools.

Ronald Reagan told the Alabama Legislature in 1982: "To those who cite the First Amendment as reason for excluding God from more and more of our institutions and everyday life, may I just say: The First Amendment of the Constitution was not written to protect the people of this country from religious values; it was written to protect religious values from government tyranny."

John Adams said, "The general principles on which the Fathers achieved independence were the general principles of Christianity." He wrote this to Thomas Jefferson toward the end of his life.

Adams said, "I will avow, that I then believed, and now believe, that those general principles of Christianity are as eternal and immutable, as the existence and attributes of God."

And I have gotten mail before saying, How dare you bring these things up on

the House floor? Because people are not taught our history. The fact is, the Bible has been quoted more times—many, many times more than any other book throughout our history, but it is quoted less and less these days. We have got our work cut out for us.

But it appears the Supreme Court is starting to understand, for them to become oligarchs, monarchs, and rule from Mt. Olympus across the street here, is not the best way to decide things better left for the legislature, after a great debate. And that is what we need to do.

And we really need to look at what is different now than when we didn't have mass shootings like we do now. And I think we will come to the things that Natan Sharansky, Whitaker Chambers, Dostoyevsky, John Adams, Ronald Reagan, and so many of our founders understood.

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

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate you and the staff's patience as I am racing up the elevator.

We are going to do something that is new to me today. And please wave at me if I start machine gun speaking.

And I have gotten teased about it a bit, so this week, I got to become the ranking member for the Republicans, that is sort of the senior Republican over Social Security in the Ways and Means Committee. And it is an area I have had a fascination with since I got here because, you know, it is \$1 trillion a year, and it is running out of money.

So, the last few times I have come behind these microphones, I have turned to my brothers and sisters on the left and begged them to stop doing what they are doing because we have showed board after board after board after board of how many people they are hurting, the working poor, the poor, the working middle class. It is just being destroyed by Democrat policies.

And I appreciate the virtue signaling. I understand maybe for many of them they didn't understand the most basic economics of what inflation was going to do and crushing people.

But now, all of a sudden, I have the responsibility—I take this really seriously. How do you save Medicare? How do you save Social Security?

And it is not a game, and it is not just little adjustments here. You talk to groups, even fellow Members, and they somehow think a little adjustment here, waste and fraud. A little adjustment here. We are talking trillions.

Remember, our best math right now is functionally, over the next 30 years, just Social Security and just Medicare,

when you add them together, and then the financing costs, are close to \$120 trillion short. So functionally, every dime of future debt is the shortfall of Medicare and Social Security.

It is demographics. We got old. At the end of this decade, 22 percent of us are 65 and older. A country like Japan, it is 30 percent. Japan has dramatically higher savings rates.

At the end of this decade, 22 percent of our neighbors will be 65 or older. And we functionally have nothing set aside for that.

Medicare is moving to being 100 percent general fund. The Medicare trust fund, the part A, the hospital portion, we got a good number a couple of days ago, so now it is gone in about 5 years. And we have no idea how we replace that because the model right now, as it is written in statute, is hey, just stop paying doctors and hospitals. That is going to work really well, isn't it?

And we will see here, the actuarial report for Social Security got extended out a bit. But functionally, in a decade, our parents, our grandma and grandpa, the model is at this moment, 27 percent cut. And that isn't the true story. It is much, much, much darker.

And I am going to do my very best here. And look, I have got to be honest; I am only partially through starting to dig through the numbers that Keith handed me, and we are trying to understand the Medicare actuaries and the Social Security actuaries. They just published their report, but it is based on data that may be as much as a year out of date. They have missed much of the inflation cycle so—one of the benchmarks was February this year. Well, think about what has happened to inflation since then.

And I am going to do my best right now to present the cruelty, just the cruelty of what the left has done to the poor, but particularly to the elderly poor.

And once again, I will give them credit. I don't think it was meant, but there is a misunderstanding here of what inflation does, because it is not just today. It is not just this year.

We are trying to build a model here of how many of our brothers and sisters who are older at the end of this decade are going to be living in poverty because of what this place did this last year.

So my best model right now is about 22 percent of our brothers and sisters who are 65 and over are living in poverty today. And it is a back of the napkin math, and I may be wrong. God, I hope I am wrong.

But if inflation stays substantially above the mean for a few more years, it is going to be a third of our retirees who are going to be living in poverty. This is what they did.

And so, in past weeks I have come behind the mike and said, here are ideas to knock down inflation. If inflation is too many dollars chasing too few goods, let's make more goods.

□ 1300

Right now, it is the passive approach. We had Janet Yellen in front of the Ways and Means Committee yesterday, and it is basically: Well, we are going to let the Federal Reserve jack up interest rates, put a bunch of people out of work. We are just going to raise the misery, but it is their problem. It has nothing to do with the crappy economic policies that have been pushed through this body.

How about some things the left and the right could agree upon? Instead of just spending trillions and trillions of dollars, how about incentives and mechanisms to create productivity because when you make more stuff, that is the most elegant way to knock down inflation. Of course, that would mean for our brothers and sisters on the Democrat side to accept something called supply-side economics.

First, we need a little bit of a reference here. These numbers are almost 2 years out of date because we haven't gotten a CBO updated number yet, which I believe should have already happened. Projected 2051, so that is basically 29 years from now.

Outlays as a percentage of GDP—this is policy. This should be driving every bit of policy around here. We chase shiny objects all day long, but we are basically saying, hey, Social Security and Medicare, the dedicated revenues, the revenues we expect to be getting in over that 29 years are going to be about 6 percent of GDP. Outlays will almost be 21 percent of GDP. The rest of the budget, revenues actually exceed outlays.

Once again, we have to get this through our heads. Medicare, Social Security, the baseline from a couple of years ago was \$112 trillion. My math says it is about \$120 trillion of borrowing. The rest of the budget is in balance.

Why isn't this what we talk about every single day? Don't we care about the 22 percent of our brothers and sisters who are going to be 65 or older by the end of this decade? Do we have not a moral, an ethical, an economic obligation to fix a system that is collapsing and has been collapsing for years?

You have all heard the saying that it is the third rail. I have been teased by some of my colleagues here. "Schweikert, you are an idiot," which may be absolutely true. "Your willingness to take on Social Security, have you decided to end your political career?"

You can't get in front of microphones and tell people the truth about the math. They don't want to hear that. They have been lied to for decades, and they believe the lies because the lies are comfortable. You can't show them the slides of what is actually about to happen.

Yet, how do you fix something unless you admit there is a problem? This place is like an alcoholic who is unwilling to take that first step at their 12-

step meeting, admit they have a problem. If this board doesn't tell you the problem, I don't know what will.

This board is 2 years old. Once again, I don't have an updated number from CBO. This shows \$112 trillion of borrowing solely from Social Security and Medicare. Obviously, Medicare is functionally three-quarters of the problem. Social Security is a quarter of the problem. But that is \$112 trillion, 2-year-old number, my current number, \$120 trillion of borrowing in today's dollars, so inflation baseline dollars. The inflation that has exploded in the last year because of Democrat fiscal policies makes these numbers much uglier.

Just as a reference to understand why I am so concerned and why I am mad this place isn't on fire with almost a level of panic over these numbers, when you see this scale of debt, in a couple of decades, if the mean borrowing cost is 2 points higher, in about 20, 25 years, every dime of tax revenues, tax receipts, every dime is just the interest cost.

Do you get that? Do you realize the level of fragility we have given to this country? Do you care about people, care about kids? Do you care about seniors? Then this should be the fixation because this is real math. Unless somehow the Democrats have come up with a way to repeal the laws of mathematics, this is what we are up against.

Yes, you will be booed when you get up in front of an audience and say: "Hey, do you realize with Social Security, in about a decade, you will get about a 27 percent cut? That is not even calculating the dramatic increase in your Medicare portion of your premiums that for many seniors will eat up every dime of their Social Security check."

This is real. It is the biggest thing going on in our country at this moment, but it is like a slow-moving avalanche coming at us. It is going to wipe us out, but it is not here yet, so let's worry about something else.

Just to emphasize a little bit, Medicare faces a \$78 trillion cash shortfall over the next—and this is now 29 years, and the number is worse now. Once again, I just haven't gotten an update because these are '21 numbers. We should already be starting to project the '22 and '23 numbers. But do you see that?

We have about \$20 trillion coming in in payroll taxes and almost \$98 trillion in projected expenditures, and this is before the inflation cycle. Medical inflation, baseline inflation, is going to drive these numbers up dramatically.

Maybe this is too much of a current snapshot, but you are starting to see it. Everyone just got—if you are on Medicare, you just saw it, or you just got it. Functionally, your healthcare costs just bounced up for part B \$250 a person, \$500 a couple. The dirty number is that that is not even close to what is coming. That is what you just got. You are going, whoa, it went up \$500. But

functionally, 2 years from now, we may get as much as an 8 percent COLA because, remember, the COLA adjustment on Social Security is about 24 months behind. It takes that long to get the calculations.

A community like mine—I represent the Phoenix-Scottsdale area—has the highest inflation in the Nation. My area is over 11 percent inflation. But they will do a national mean, which will probably be closer to 8-something, and you are not going to get that for a couple of years. You are going to get 3-plus, 3½-plus this year. You are going to get to live poorer, substantially poorer, for the next couple of years, and the COLA is not going to keep up.

The basket that is used to calculate doesn't keep up, and it has already begun. The eating up of how you survive in retirement has already begun. The money is disappearing. We are working on this. This is a work in progress.

This is a dangerous speech for me to be giving because I am going to anger a number of people who don't want to know the truth. I am going to anger a bunch of my brother and sister Members here who are terrified their voters find out.

The fact of the matter is, I will be back in a couple of weeks revising these numbers, but this is from some of the best literature we found when I found out I was going to be taking on the responsibility over Social Security.

What this board is basically saying is this is your cost. If you are 65 years old today, and you are stepping into retirement, we expect your out-of-pocket to have gone up about \$85,000. It is an assumption that healthcare inflation remains at 1.5 percent over the Consumer Price Index for 2 years. This is the change you get if it is 2 years.

The problem is my Joint Economic Committee is saying the structure of inflation may be with us for a decade. Now, it may not be running at like my neighborhood, 11 percent, or your neighborhood, probably 8 percent, for another 7 to 10 years, but it is going to be higher than normal. We are having to rebuild all of our models.

What does this mean, though, if it is just for 2 years? If you are 45 years old, the change in your cost when you hit retirement that you are going to have to be contributing to the healthcare portion—so you get your Social Security check, the portion that is put off for the healthcare, for Medicare. You are 45 years old; just these 2 years of the above inflation. It is a quarter million dollars, and that is out of your pocket.

We keep talking about, well, here are your fuel prices today. Fine. Be outraged about that. You should be. But understand the cascade effect, that we are going to drive so many people into poverty through the rest of this decade and at the end of this decade, and this place is silent.

We are just silent on the damage we are doing to people's survival because

the shiny object is what is at the gas pump right now. You should be enraged. The economic devastation, the misery the left has foisted on this country—and I am sorry. I am being a bit of a jerk, but they did it, and they were warned.

They were warned by my kind. Well, they were warned by my kind, but they were warned by their own economists. Yes, they have about a dozen economists that said, go ahead and spend the trillions. It won't make a difference. Please stop listening to them.

But you did have a number of your leftist economists who said: Don't do this. You are going to hurt people. But it buys us votes, and they did it. Congratulations.

This is your future, and this is only if the increased inflation lasts for 2 years. What if my model is correct, and it lasts throughout the decade?

This isn't my math. This is some literature we are finding out there. We haven't had time to break it down and do our best vetting, but these all came from big boy researchers, well respected. This is a little hard to get our heads around, but we are going to do our best here.

Short-term healthcare inflation can have devastating retirement consequences. What they are saying is with the spike today in healthcare costs, you turn 65, you start getting your Medicare, you start getting your Social Security, the change in cost you have for the next 20 years is in these numbers.

They are basically trying to say, what happens if you are 65, you have 1 year of the current medical inflation, and this is underestimating it. The latest number I had as of this week was in the high 16s for healthcare inflation. This one is 15.8.

But just the increase in your healthcare cash; this isn't your Medicare payment. This is cash coming out of your Social Security check, out of your bank account. So, you are 65. It is going to be an additional \$72,000.

But if you are 45 today, and this increased inflation is only for 2 years, it is \$434,000 of additional spending you need to be prepared for in your retirement. This is the math.

Just a little bit of healthcare inflation today. So if the baseline is 8.3—that is my prediction for tomorrow's May number. We will see how accurate I am. Healthcare is almost double the baseline inflation.

If it ran at that for 2 years and then went back to the mean, and you are 45 years old today, so you retire 20 some years from now, the change in the baseline of your future cost is now approaching a half million dollars. Well, in this case, \$434,000. Let's be a little more accurate.

Is anyone here talking about this? How many people, with the savings you have right now, with just trying to survive buying that tank of gas today, are going to be able to save enough money for future expenses? That Social Secu-

rity check you have basically disappears, shrinks away, because you are now having to deal with the inflationary costs.

That is why my back of the napkin math or back of the envelope math, if I can use the colloquialism, is starting to say, oh, my God, I hope my math is wrong. But where this is going right now, I think we are heading toward about a third of our retirees being in poverty in a decade.

Remember, Social Security was an antipoverty program. But, once again, crappy public policy here by the left, and this is the decades and decades of future misery they brought to us. Does anyone on the other side own a calculator or actually showed up at their economics class?

□ 1315

Social Security income functionally gets erased by rising healthcare costs. Now, this is what brought me to do this on the floor. This last weekend, I had inklings I was going to get the responsibility over Social Security for the Republicans, and so I don't sleep well. The only way I fall asleep often is I sit up and read, and I try to read stuff that is actually important to this job.

I came across this article that didn't have good math in it, but it was functionally alluding that the healthcare inflation—and this is beyond just all the other inflation of just trying to buy food and pay for your rent and everything else, just healthcare inflation—was going to destroy, was going to consume many, many, many seniors' entire Social Security check.

I don't get credit for this. My staff actually found this. But let's actually go back to our 45-year-old, this bottom line. This is for a couple—because they found this on someone else's literature, so I can't take credit for the math. A couple, they are going to get about \$1.153 million, \$1,153,000 in Social Security benefits when that 45-year-old couple basically enters their Social Security benefits.

Okay. But with the inflation that has been built in—and this is, I think, only a couple years of inflation, but the calculation over 20 years, with the change of inflation, so they are going to get \$1,153,000 of Social Security benefits, but they are going to spend functionally out of their pocket \$1,543,000 in healthcare costs, and that is with Medicare.

Does anyone see a problem?

So you start looking at the lifetime retirement healthcare costs when it is 1.8. Based on cost projection, two years of inflation cost projection, functionally their healthcare costs in this model are 156 percent. So every dime of their Social Security check, plus another 56 percent that they are going to have to find other resources to pay for, just to cover their healthcare because of inflation.

The couple that turns 65 today—or actually a month or so ago when this calculation was done. Remember, this

calculation under calculates inflation. This was done almost back in February with those numbers, and inflation turned out to be much worse. That couple, as a mean across the country, is going to get about \$968,000 in Social Security benefits over what we calculate as the average mortality numbers lifetime. Seventy-one percent of their Social Security income is going to healthcare costs driven by, substantially driven by this increase in inflation.

So if anyone is listening right now, God, I hope I am wrong. Start saving every dime you can because this government's Democrat policies from this last 2 years have absolutely screwed you over. We are going to spend the rest of the decade fixing the damage that was done in the last 15 months. The math is the math.

If I am being hyperbolic, I am doing it because it is important. I don't want to live in a country where a third of my seniors are in poverty because of a decision they made a year ago.

This is the actuarial report on Social Security and Medicare when the trust funds are gone, and there is a problem with their math, and that is it was done on February's baseline. Inflation is dramatically higher than what we thought the February baseline was. Now, the economists are saying it is going to last much longer, meaning these dates are going to erode.

But functionally, you are 66 months, according to the actuary report, and Medicare part A, the hospital portion, is gone. So functionally, you go into your hospital, and your doctor doesn't get paid to see you. How is that going to work out? Seriously, who is going to pay?

The new number is about 150 months for Social Security. I think that is wildly optimistic in this inflationary time. But the baseline model, how are you going to do it? Do you plan to live for another 10 years? Okay. Whether in those 10 years you are on Social Security or you are heading into retirement, are you prepared to have not 25, but 27 percent of your Social Security check disappear? At the same time, I am showing you charts saying, hey, you are 65 today. Because of medical inflation—if it lasts where we are at, 2 years—76 percent of your Social Security money is going to healthcare costs, and we are also then going to reach over and reduce your Social Security check by 27 percent.

Does anyone else see a problem coming?

This place doesn't own a calculator, and yet as I used to get teased when I was a child, the math always wins. But this place will avoid the math because it is hard. It is the sort of thing that gets you unelected. It is the sort of thing that makes your voters mad.

It is your absolute moral obligation to fix these programs without lying.

In a future presentation, I am going to come back here, and I am going to

also overlay the private pension systems, the multi-employer pension systems, all the other shortfalls, and if any Member here uses the words “retirement security” and isn’t bathing in fixing these numbers, they should be ashamed of themselves.

Madam Speaker, I apologize for the amount of caffeine I have had today, but I am not here to be hyperbolic. I am here to beg of this place to stop chasing the daily shiny object that may get us some press, get us a few minutes on cable television. This is the hard work we are elected to fix, and it is also our moral obligation to save the future.

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

REALITY TV PROGRAMMING TONIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, reality TV. I think most of us are familiar with reality TV. You are going to see some of that tonight. Now, when reality TV first started, people watched that, they were enthusiastic about it, maybe a little intoxicated at times.

I don’t know how many shows you had to watch. I don’t know how many iterations you had to watch, Madam Speaker, before you figured out, well, this really isn’t reality. This isn’t even real, right? The drama was contrived, the relationships made up. I suppose it was all to make you feel better about your own life, watching the crazy, unhinged existence of these aberrant things on TV.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are going to see some more reality TV tonight, on this January 6th alleged committee. I call it an alleged committee because it is not really a committee. There is no minority. There is no minority on the committee. I know because I am in the minority. When you have a committee basis, you have the majority, they pick their members, and the minority picks their members. But when the majority picks members for the minority, they are the majority. It is all one side. What you are going to hear is a one-sided tale.

Madam Speaker, this is not a court of law, but it is kind of like trying to be one in front of the public, trying to act like it is a court of law for the public to decide. It is a show trial. This is a Soviet-style show trial.

Unfortunately, there are huge things happening in people’s lives right now. They are paying the highest prices they have ever paid to drive back and forth to work or to daycare or to get their kids to school or if they can even afford a vacation. If you have got a small child, you are worrying every day, am I going to be able to get formula to feed my child? Of course, we have got this border crisis, cost of liv-

ing, supply chain, all that stuff, and we are spending millions of dollars.

This should actually be a campaign contribution to my friends on the left. The FEC should make them file a report. Millions and millions of taxpayer dollars for a show trial, a Soviet-style charade.

How do we know? We know so many ways. We know in so many ways. Like I said, we are going to get one side of a story. The outcome has already been determined, Madam Speaker, by the people on this so-called committee. They issued subpoenas. But they didn’t tell the people they issued the subpoenas to; they told the press. Does that sound like how things normally go in a court of law where due process is happening?

But this isn’t a court of law. You are just supposed to believe it is one. You are also supposed to believe there is due process. But there isn’t. You are supposed to believe that this is seeking the truth, that this is seeking some kind of justice, that this is a fact-finding mission for which the legislature will then promulgate laws to make sure that mistakes made in the past never happen again.

Ladies and gentlemen, it couldn’t be further from the truth.

How do I know? How do you know? Because these folks have hired the producer from ABC for this prime time show. We could be having this alleged hearing right now. I am here right now. My colleagues are here right now. Madam Speaker, you are in the chair right now, but this is being delayed until prime time with a TV producer, because it is a show. That is all it is.

These are the same folks that if you want to call it evidence, they took somebody’s text message, and they changed it to say what they wanted it to say. If it is evidence, they just tampered with evidence.

Madam Speaker, this is an abomination. This is an outrage. This is an affront to our American Republic and to the order and the rule of law and to justice.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my good friend, for some comments about what is going to happen, what you are going to see tonight.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to take a few minutes.

The first point I will talk about, the most fundamental aspect that this needs to be contextualized with is that the Democrats have basically corrupted every institution in America, not the least of which is this institution, not the least of which are the committees and the roles of committees.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said this is a show trial. He is exactly right. This is designed for television. It is not designed to find truth. It is not designed to say, let’s come up with a legitimate legislative purpose, which is what the Supreme Court says you have to have if you are going to have a sub-

poena in the first place. You have to have a legitimate purpose. They don’t have any.

So these are the same folks that sit on this committee, that are running this committee. Don’t forget, they ran the two sham impeachments. The last sham impeachment was such a debacle, such an embarrassment to our institutions and the Constitution that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court said, I am not going to show up.

So who do we have and what do we see? Well, they are not going to talk about tonight that four witnesses—four witnesses have testified under oath that 4 days before January 6, President Trump authorized up to 20,000 National Guard troops. Why won’t they present that? Because it is indicia of what we would call in law the mens rea or culpability, your state of mind. And the state of mind said, we have to protect the Capitol.

□ 1330

What that means is there is no intention to incite. There is no intention to cause harm. But you are not going to hear about that, even though that has been testified to four different times.

The FBI has indicated pretty clearly that there was no collusion by President Trump to incite a riot on January 6. In fact, no collusion by President Trump or by any Member of Congress.

In fact, FBI Director, Christopher Wray, testified in the Committee on the Judiciary that he could not call what happened there an insurrection. But that is not what you are going to hear from the Democrats because they love that term, because they are all about hyperbole.

How about our former colleague, Denver Riggleman, a former Republican working for this committee? What did he say? Just the other day, he said: “There is no smoking gun indicating that President Trump planned for the U.S. Capitol to be overrun by his supporters.” But you are not going to hear that because this is—as they have accidentally said a couple of times—not about finding the truth but about narrative-building, and distracting the American public from the disaster that the Biden administration, Speaker PELOSI and her Democrats in the House, CHUCK SCHUMER and his Democrats in the Senate, has perpetrated, has foisted upon the American people.

So you know what the Democrats want? They don’t want us talking about: It costs me 85, 90 bucks to fill up my car with gas.

They don’t want you talking about that.

They don’t want you talking about: Hey, the size of that pack of tortillas that I just bought last week before it came out, they used to look like the regular corn tortillas. Now they look like mini tortillas. Same price, the same packaging.

They don’t want you talking about that.

They don't want you talking about: Hey, kids, we are not going to be able to go on vacation this year.

They don't want you talking about any of that because that is what Americans are talking about.

They don't want you talking about the border. They don't want you talking about that.

When I was down to the border twice last week—two different borders, three different sectors—everywhere I walked, there were people coming up. You know what these folks told me? They said, “We love Joe Biden.” In fact, in Mexico he has got a 52 percent approval rating, while he is only 32 percent in the United States.

They want us to not talk about that stuff. They want to distract us. But the bad news for them is this: The reason you have to bring in an ABC producer is because your show stinks and that committee reeks, and no amount of production is going to give Liz Cheney charisma. Sorry to say. No amount of it is going to change and take that apart.

I know that there are others who want to talk about this but I just have to ask four or five things, if I can, Mr. PERRY.

Mr. PERRY. Absolutely.

Mr. BIGGS. Why is NANCY PELOSI off limits? Why isn't she testifying before that committee?

Oh my goodness, we can't ask her what happened. We can't ask her what she knew, what she didn't know.

We can't ask her why she didn't approve and encourage Mayor Bowser to accept the authorized and offered 20,000 National Guard troops.

Why has the committee not released 14,000 hours of video of January 6? Why is that missing?

Why has the committee selectively, without appropriate context, leaked documents or testimony?

Why did ADAM SCHIFF come out here and put up a poster and later have to admit that, yeah, he had doctored the poster?

Because they are lying. They altered evidence, as Mr. PERRY said.

I will just close with this: Committee member, JAMIE RASKIN, he loves to say that anybody who questions an electoral outcome of 2020 is telling the big lie.

Of course, he questioned the 2016 election outcome. Was that the big lie? Hillary Clinton questioned that.

Joe Biden has already said the 2022 midterms are going to be illegitimate. Why? Because he is going to get his butt kicked, that is why.

I will tell you something. JAMIE RASKIN selectively edited video he used in the second Trump impeachment just a few days before the President was going to be vacating the Oval Office. If anyone is persisting in telling a big lie, it is members of the J6 Committee.

That is why they have to bring in a producer. That is why they deleted the tweet from their star witness from tonight. And what did he say back then?

He said the Proud Boys were organizing together.

How many police were there at 11:22 on the steps of the Capitol? I Count 1.

This is a deliberate act. And he wasn't talking about the people who came in. He said someone in authority left the door open and the mob walked in. That is their witness tonight. They deleted that text.

This is an illegitimate committee. You are going to see illegitimacy on display meant to deceive the American people. That is what happens in former Soviet Union. That is what happens in Venezuela. That is what happens whenever tyrants and authoritarians get a little bit of power or think they have any.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS).

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, Representatives PERRY and BIGGS speaking the truth here today.

Madam Speaker, listen to these words: “Sense of desperation and disappointment may lead to more of an incentive to become violent. Congress itself is the target. There has been a worrisome call for protestors to come to these events armed, and there is a possibility that protestors may be inclined to become violent. Propensity to attract white supremacists, militia members, and others who actively promote violence may lead to a significantly dangerous situation for law enforcement and the general public alike.”

These words are taken directly from the intelligence assessment on January 3. So why didn't they request the National Guard? Why were the Capitol Police so ill-prepared?

A couple of months ago, I had the opportunity to question then-D.C. National Guard Commander, General Walker. Now he is the House Sergeant at Arms.

I asked General Walker, I said, “General, if the National Guard would have been on our Nation's Capitol on January 4 as the intelligence called for, would January 6 have ever happened?” And he said no.

And I agree, General, I agree.

Capitol Police leadership had the intelligence days and weeks in advance and did nothing with it. They let it happen, folks. The Capitol Police leadership team failed, and this sham committee continues to give them a pass.

These hearings are clearly not about finding the truth. They are a sad attempt to put the blame on Donald Trump. This committee—make no mistake—this committee doesn't want to see Donald Trump as the Republican nominee in 2024 because they can't beat him.

Never in the history of Congress has the majority party used their power to smear, destroy, and intimidate the minority party ahead of an election so brazenly on a public stage. They know

they can't win elections fairly, so they will use every dirty trick in the book and try to cheat their way to a win. But the American people know better. They can see through this political theater and their voices will be heard at the polls in November of this year and in 2024.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. He is absolutely right.

Look, I don't think it is a mystery that many of us on this side of the aisle have no love for the FBI Director. It would be my choice to remove him immediately and get somebody effective that would do the job and restore the dignity of the FBI. But that having been said, he said there was no insurrection. He said there was no collusion.

And as you already probably know—or maybe you don't—you won't find out tonight—the President of the United States at that time ordered 20,000 troops to be authorized to come to protect the Capitol days in advance.

And as I said the day after, on January 7, I asked: What did the Speaker know and when did she know it? But we are not going to find that out, Madam Speaker. We are never going to know watching this show trial. This is something from a Third World country, where we use the instruments of Federal power to prevail upon and against our political adversary. That is what is happening right now.

What did the Speaker know and when did she know it? And what about the 20,000 troops that were authorized by the President of the United States in advance but never asked for by the Speaker of the House—and as a matter of fact, declined by the Mayor of Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, this is not the Mayor's city. This is not the Mayor's capital of the United States. This is the American people's capital. She has a duty and she failed in that duty. And now this sham organization called a committee here, where the Vice President is also the ranking member—not chosen by the minority. They just made it up. They could have chosen anybody off the street and said, that is who the ranking member is. And that is what they did because the verdict is already in for them.

They already know. They already know what the outcome is for them. There is no due process here. There is no fairness here. There is no other side of the story here. There is just a prosecution where you stand there with your mouth taped shut. You can't call any witnesses. You can't have your attorney. Then they would like to convict people and send them away forever and never be heard from again. And that is what this is; the silencing of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I really appreciate him bringing up these very important details

that I highly doubt we will hear anything about from the January 6 Committee.

You know, there are some very interesting facts that came out today, as a matter of fact. Reporting on the failure of this Chamber, this Capitol to be secured.

And I will tell you something. On January 6, I was a brand new Member of Congress.

Mr. PERRY. How many days had you been here, Representative GREENE?

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. January 3 was my first day on the job.

Mr. PERRY. So you had been here three days.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. That is right. Three days.

And I looked at the Capitol and thought this was the most secure building that I could possibly be in, at least in this city, possibly in the country, because it is our Nation's Capitol. And tragically, we found out that it was not. I was shocked by that.

What amazes me is the overwhelming amount of evidence that the National Guard was requested to be here and it was continuously turned down. And the biggest shocker to me is that there were three people that turned it down. It was CHUCK SCHUMER in the Senate, NANCY PELOSI in the House, and Mayor Muriel Bowser.

Mr. PERRY. If I could interject for just a moment, who is in charge of security here in the House of Representatives?

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. The Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. PERRY. Employed by?

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. NANCY PELOSI.

Mr. PERRY. Right. The Speaker.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. The Speaker of the House is the one in charge of the House Sergeant at Arms.

And the House Sergeant at Arms and the Senate Sergeant at Arms turned down the request for the National Guard to keep all of us safe from the threats that they knew existed.

Mr. PERRY. Are we going to find out if they got ordered to do that by the Speaker or by the leader in the Senate? Are we going to find that out tonight?

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. No, we will not hear that from the January 6 Committee that spent millions of taxpayer dollars supposedly investigating January 6. I highly doubt we will hear that. But I want you to know that when we take back the majority, these will be the investigations that we take on.

Now, I want you to know some other things that really bother me. As we have spoken about the failure and absolutely purposeful refusal to protect this Capitol by NANCY PELOSI, the Speaker of the House, CHUCK SCHUMER, and Mayor Muriel Bowser, these are the failures. They did it on purpose.

There are other things I don't think we will hear about tonight, and I remind everyone.

Number one, we still do not know who the pipe bomber is. Who is the per-

son? There are videos everywhere. It is all over the FBI website but we don't hear that coming out consistently from the January 6 Committee.

You know what else we don't hear enough about? We do not understand what is happening to the over 800 people who have been arrested and charged for the events on January 6. We don't know what is happening to them, and there are dozens of them right here in this city wasting away in the D.C. jail, being treated like political prisoners of war.

And you know what? This is before they have been convicted of anything. They are there pretrial. And no one cares about them. No one on this January 6 Committee dares to ask a question, what is happening to these people and why their due process rights are being so flagrantly and horrifically violated, pretrial. Pretrial, they are sitting in that jail.

Do you know they have begged to go to Guantanamo Bay because they think terrorists are treated better than they are treated here? But no one cares about them.

□ 1345

These people have been arrested and charged, and they are wasting away in jail.

Do you want to know something else that we are probably not going to hear about? What about the fact that there is a man named Ray Epps? Do you know who is not in the D.C. jail? Ray Epps. Ray Epps is not in the D.C. jail, and I know because I went in the D.C. jail. I did not see him there. He also is on video over and over again telling people to go in the Capitol.

Mr. PERRY. I am sure we will hear about Ray Epps this evening.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. I don't think we are going to hear about Ray Epps. I don't think so. I don't think he is on the witness list.

Do you know who else we probably won't hear about? The man on the scaffolding, the so-called scaffolding commander that told the crowd, told them, sent them, gave them orders to go in the Capitol. Storm the Capitol.

I haven't heard about him being questioned, have you?

Mr. PERRY. No, I have not.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. No. Do you want to know something else? Here is a woman we don't hear anything about, a woman named Rosanne Boyland, who was trampled in the tunnel, trampled to death. We never hear anything about this woman. She died in the tunnel of this Capitol, and I saw the video myself when I was in the D.C. jail, from one of the people being held there pretrial, by the way, of her body being drug across the floor, and then it was taken somewhere else.

Do you know what happened when they were dragging her body away? They pulled her away from someone that was giving her CPR. She was pulled away from lifesaving CPR. Why did that happen? Are we going to hear

about that from the committee tonight? I doubt it. They don't care about Rosanne Boyland.

Here is my major issue. We are representatives of the people of the United States of America, and all I hear from everyone in this body is all they care about is themselves. The American people are suffering from so many things happening from the decisions of this body, but the people in this body and the people in that committee don't care about Rosanne Boyland from Georgia, by the way. They don't care about her family. They don't care about justice for them. They don't care about anything else but, oh, what happened to us on January 6.

Well, what happened to the American cities in 2020 that were burned and looted and destroyed because of BLM violence? Nothing. All that money raised on ActBlue for BLM? It went in their pockets. No one paid to rebuild those communities. Not at all.

You know who else we probably won't hear about is Michael Byrd, who shot and killed Ashli Babbitt right out there. We don't hear about his reckless record of guns, which is all we have talked about all week in here. We aren't hearing about that. Why aren't we hearing about that record? Why? Why isn't he standing trial? He is not. He just gets to get away with it. It is on video; I bet you we won't see this video, but I have seen it. It is out there.

Did you know Ashli Babbitt was trying to stop people from breaking in? That is on video. I have watched it over and over. She was trying to stop people from breaking in, and then she was shot and killed.

Yes, a lot happened on January 6. Do you know what else—and the American taxpayers pay for this—there are surveillance cameras all over this building. If we really want to know the truth about January 6, it is real easy. All we have to do is release the video footage, and everyone can see for themselves what exactly happened. I think the American people deserve that while they have to watch and go through this big cinematic production tonight and carrying on for weeks and weeks and weeks. And the American people pay for it, by the way. The American people deserve to see all the video surveillance, not just the little cut and pasted pieces that the January 6th Committee is going to show tonight.

Most of all, I want to finish with this: There is something terrible happening in this process, and it is called defamation of character. The 45th President of the United States' character is being defamed and all of his staff and his family and all Republicans. Everyone's reputation is being defamed as lies are being told about all of us and President Trump just for politics, and it makes me sick. It absolutely disgusts me.

If we are supposed to represent the American people, and we are supposed to do a good job and uphold this place

with honor and keep its reputation good for the people we serve, then we should be truthful. But what is about to happen tonight is not going to be truthful. It is going to be a political narrative, and it is all for politics. It is sickening.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. Like I said, if you have ever seen reality TV, you know in just a couple episodes it is not really reality.

Now, I don't know how many of these you will go through this evening, and we just have a couple of minutes remaining, but I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my good friend, to conclude with some of his thoughts before we wrap up here this afternoon.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, as I watch what this January 6th Committee has done, as it unfolds, and the constant attack of President Trump, here is what I find interesting: It wasn't too very long ago that CHUCK SCHUMER stood with a rabble attacking the United States Supreme Court. CHUCK SCHUMER said: We are going to come up on you like, Justices Kavanaugh and Gorsuch, like a whirlwind. You will know.

He made threatening comments. And guess what? Last night, there was an assassination attempt. A gentleman has been arrested for attempted murder of Justice Kavanaugh. Not a peep from the President, not a peep from NANCY PELOSI, not a peep from anybody here.

You had a President who said let's march peacefully up to the Capitol. Let's let them know you are here. Let's fight for our rights. Somehow, that is incitement.

That is not incitement, but this committee that is there, they don't care about the truth. They don't care about equity. I don't even like saying that term, "equity." How about equality before the law? They never are concerned with due process or equality before the law. That is a political, sham, narrative-building exercise to divert the attention of the American people away from the disastrous Biden policies.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. In the remaining 40 seconds I have, I will close by saying every day Americans wake up and they think it can't get any worse, yet somehow every day there is something new that actually makes it worse. Tonight is going to be no different. We are going to push the envelope to places we have never gone, a show trial right here in the Halls of Congress as a Supreme Court Justice is under threat.

This is literally like a Third World country, and we have leaders in this government calling for Justice Kavanaugh—"You have released the whirlwind." That is what was said. Do not let this stand.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4591. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress periodic reports on the costs, performance metrics, and outcomes of the Department of Veterans Affairs Electronic Health Record Modernization program.

Kevin F. McCumber, Deputy Clerk of the House, further reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 735. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 502 East Cotati Avenue in Cotati, California, as the "Arturo L. Ibleto Post Office Building".

H.R. 767. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the "Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building".

H.R. 1170. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 League in Irvine, California, as the "Tuskegee Airman Lieutenant Colonel Robert J. Friend Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 1444. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 132 North Loudoun Street, Suite 1 in Winchester, Virginia, as the "Patsy Cline Post Office".

H.R. 2324. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2800 South Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "D. Edwina Stephens Post Office".

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3823.—An act to amend title 11, United States Code, to modify the eligibility requirements for a debtor under chapter 13, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 13, 2022, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4324. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule—Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2021-0946 FRL-9334.1-02-OLEM] received May 10, 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-4325. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Air Plan Approval; New Hampshire; Env-A 800 Testing and Monitoring Procedures, Env-A 619.03 PSD Program Requirements, and Env-A 1200 VOC RACT [EPA-R01-OAR-2021-0785; FRL-9591-02-R1] received May 10, 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-4326. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Trans-anethole; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0900; FRL-9763-01-OCSP] received May 10, 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-4327. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cell Walls of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0545; FRL-9761-01-OCSP] received May 10, 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-4328. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hydrolyzed Vegetable Proteins from Soy; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0204; FRL-9556-01-OCSP] received May 10, 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia: Committee on Agriculture. Supplemental report on H.R. 7606. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture (Rept. 117-357 Pt. 2).

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2773. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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 Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CRIST, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SOTO, Mr.

O'HALLERAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 7993. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide equal treatment of LGBTQ older individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 7994. A bill to expand and improve the advisory panel on community support for military families with special needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 7995. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt qualifying physicians from prior authorization requirements under Medicare Advantage plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7996. A bill to require congressional authorization for the drawdown and sale of petroleum products in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself, Mr. SOTO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CRIST, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BACON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 7997. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a floor in Medicare Advantage benchmark rates for regions with low Medicare fee-for-service penetration and to make the Medicare Savings Program available in all jurisdictions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HERN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ROSE, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. LATURNER, and Mr. MEUSER):

H.R. 7998. A bill to amend the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 to impose additional sanctions relating to human rights abuses in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 7999. A bill to prohibit the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and the construction or modification of facilities in the United States to house de-

tainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. HERN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. COMER, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 8000. A bill to provide incentives for States to recover fraudulently paid Federal and State unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BANKS, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. HERN, Mr. LONG, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 8001. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to ensure the United States currency market does not support egregious human rights violations; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8002. A bill to establish the Inter-Agency Task Force on Energy Independence to examine whether the Russian Federation funded activities of nongovernmental organizations in Western countries which limited the ability of those countries to achieve energy independence and made them more reliant on energy exported from Russia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK (for herself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 8003. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permanently authorize the use of certain funds to improve flexibility in the provision of assistance to homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MAST, Mr. GUEST, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 8004. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to restore and standardize work requirements for able-bodied adults enrolled in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 8005. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 8006. A bill to prohibit the mass cancellation of student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 8007. A bill to prevent price gouging at the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 8008. A bill to allow States and local educational agencies to use any remaining COVID-19 elementary and secondary school emergency relief funds for school security measures; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Ms. MACE, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 8009. A bill to improve school safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUSHON, Mr. DUNN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 8010. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to act upon pending submissions for new infant formula, to increase regulatory flexibility in the event of an infant formula shortage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H.R. 8011. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to revise the terminology used to prohibit discrimination against people with disabilities serving in the Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 8012. A bill to address the importance of foreign affairs training to national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):

H.R. 8013. A bill to establish the Committee on Large-Scale Carbon Management in the Department of Energy and a Federal Carbon Removal Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATURNER (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MAST, Mr. GUEST, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 8014. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to implement a minimum work requirement for able-bodied adults enrolled in State Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT, Mr. ROCHESTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mrs.

CHEFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DEAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TITUS, Ms. TLAIIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 8015. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to establish a program to make grants to States to provide enhanced pay for election workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 8016. A bill to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. CLINE):

H.R. 8017. A bill to make certain improvements to the workforce of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 8018. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a grant program to assist with the purchase, installation, and maintenance of point-of-entry and point-of-use drinking water quality improvement products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 8019. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants for career support for skilled internationally educated health professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 8020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for investment advisory expenses of certain funeral and cemetery trusts during suspension of miscellaneous itemized deductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 8021. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to reduce barriers to immigrants becoming nurses or allied health professionals in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 8022. A bill to address barriers immigrants and refugees face to entering the health care workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 8023. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to establish special pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces assigned to cold weather operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. PFLUGER, and Mr. PHILLIPS):

H.R. 8024. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to prohibit the distribution of Federal funds to certain entities related to the People's Republic of China for certain public works projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution recognizing the historic significance of the 70th anniversary of the founding of the United States Army Special Forces and honoring the "Father of the Special Forces", Colonel Aaron Bank (United States Army, retired) of Mission Viejo, California, for his role in establishing the Army Special Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 1162. A resolution expressing support for a whole child approach to education and recognizing the role of parents, educators, and community members in providing a whole child approach to education for each student; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEYER:

H. Res. 1163. A resolution expressing the need for protecting and conserving at least 50 percent of the lands and oceans in the United States and encouraging diplomatic efforts to achieve this goal worldwide; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CAREY, and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H. Res. 1164. A resolution condemning Charles "Chuck" Schumer, Senator of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. DEAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 1165. A resolution declaring gun violence a public health crisis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas (for himself, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WILLIAMS of

Texas, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. PFLUGER, and Mr. FALLON):

H. Res. 1166. A resolution condemning the horrific attack in Uvalde, Texas, and expressing support and prayers for all those impacted by that tragedy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MOONEY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mr. MANN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. CLINE, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. BUDD, Mr. ROSE, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. KELLER, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ROY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GUEST, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LATURNER, and Ms. FOX):

H. Res. 1167. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1011) to implement equal protection under the 14th article of amendment to the Constitution for the right to life of each born and preborn human person; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. PLASKETT (for herself, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H. Res. 1168. A resolution reaffirming the economic partnership between the United States and the Caribbean nations and recognizing the need to strengthen trade and investment between the United States and the Caribbean nations, our "Third Border"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H. Res. 1169. A resolution requesting the President to transmit certain information to the House of Representatives relating to the proposed waiver of intellectual property commitments under the World Trade Organization Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 7993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 7994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 7995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 7997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; [. . .]—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 7998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 7999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 8000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 8001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 8002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK:

H.R. 8003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 8004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

[The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 8005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and

proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H.R. 8006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 8007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 14, and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 8008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 8009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 8010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 8011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to make laws that are necessary and proper to carry out its enumerated powers.

By Mr. KIM of New Jersey:

H.R. 8012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

[Page H1148]

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 8013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII: [The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LATURNER:

H.R. 8014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 which provides Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 8015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 8016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 8017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 8018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 8019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 8020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 8021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 8022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 8023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 8024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 82: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 130: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 194: Mr. BENTZ.

H.R. 475: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 623: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 645: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 647: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 750: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 911: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1011: Ms. FOX.

H.R. 1179: Ms. SEWELL and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1304: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1381: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 1476: Ms. MANNING.

H.R. 1518: Mr. BENTZ and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1567: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1579: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1587: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 1604: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1607: Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1639: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1642: Mr. OBERNOLTE and Mr. BENTZ.

H.R. 1755: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1946: Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 1956: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2050: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. STEIL.

H.R. 2166: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2187: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 2198: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 2255: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2447: Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 2638: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2773: Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. BUDD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 3135: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 3173: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 3183: Mr. McEACHIN and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 3215: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 3259: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 3295: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 3440: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3452: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3541: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3558: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 3646: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 3671: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3816: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3829: Mr. FITZGERALD.

H.R. 3897: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.

H.R. 3946: Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 3952: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana.

H.R. 4022: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 4136: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4193: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 4268: Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 4436: Mr. SAN NICOLAS and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 4450: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 4766: Mr. McEACHIN.

H.R. 4780: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LIEU, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 4885: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 5008: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5056: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 5064: Ms. SALAZAR and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 5338: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 5407: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 5508: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 5678: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 6020: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 6181: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 6232: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.

H.R. 6381: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 6415: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 6448: Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 6532: Mrs. HAYES and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 6570: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 6681: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 6712: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 6768: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 6815: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 6860: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 6921: Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 6934: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 6940: Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 7030: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 7109: Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 7116: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 7181: Mrs. SPARTZ.

H.R. 7194: Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 7249: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 7255: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 7260: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 7290: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 7301: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 7361: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 7465: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 7477: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 7482: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 7486: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 7563: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 7598: Mrs. TRAHAN and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 7612: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 7644: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 7693: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 7705: Mr. PFLUGER.

H.R. 7769: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 7792: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 7799: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 7801: Ms. BONAMICI and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 7814: Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. MENG, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 7847: Ms. PORTER and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 7851: Mr. CLYDE.

H.R. 7861: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 7877: Ms. DEAN, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 7884: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 7890: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 7892: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. ELLZEY, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Ms. HERRELL, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 7896: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 7901: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 7902: Mr. BABIN, Mr. GARCIA of California, and Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 7909: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 7912: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 7931: Mr. ROSENDALE.

H.R. 7945: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 7963: Ms. MACE.

H.R. 7966: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. AMODEI, and Ms. MACE.

H.R. 7973: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 7991: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 7992: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.J. Res. 53: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Ms. CRAIG.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. SOTO.

H.J. Res. 87: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MOONEY, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H. Res. 366: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H. Res. 551: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 722: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 777: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 791: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 939: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H. Res. 986: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 1036: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H. Res. 1077: Mr. BABIN.

H. Res. 1088: Mr. MOONEY.

H. Res. 1131: Mr. POSEY and Mr. BROOKS.

H. Res. 1148: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS and Mr. CAREY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

PT-120. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, relative to Resolution No. 100-22, urging the Biden Administration to expedite the processing of all eligible Special Immigrant Juvenile visas and to ensure the provision of employment documents for all abused, neglected, or abandoned children and youth; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 13 by Mr. BANKS on H.R. 426: Mrs. Rodgers of Washington, Mr. Fallon, Mr. Joyce of Ohio, and Mr. Steil.

Petition 14 by Mr. MAST on House Resolution 1039: Mr. Rutherford.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 9, 2022

No. 99

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You stretch out the starry curtain of the Heavens. May Your Name be kept holy. As our law-makers depend on Your guidance, keep their feet on the path You have chosen. Lord, inspire them to make a commitment to always do what is right as You give them the wisdom to discern it. Open Your hands to bless their work, supplying their needs out of the bounty of Your celestial riches. Mighty God, may Your glory continue forever.

Lord, thank You for the commitment and competence of the great spring 2022 Senate page class. Bless them as they prepare to leave us tomorrow.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

HONORING OUR PROMISE TO ADDRESS COMPREHENSIVE TOXICS ACT OF 2021—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3967, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3967), to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Tester/Moran amendment No. 5051, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 5065 (to amendment No. 5051), to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this year we have already seen more mass shootings in America than we have had days in the year—more than one a day on average. The prevalence of guns, their ease of access, and the hateful motivations of mass shooters have all mixed into a toxic brew that is tearing America apart. People are asking,

what is going on, and why can't Congress protect us?

Yesterday, our House colleagues heard from those affected most: the parents of a young girl murdered in Uvalde, a student who played dead by covering herself in her friend's blood, and the mom of a Buffalo survivor who painted the gruesome picture of the bullet holes on her son's neck, back, and leg.

These were harrowing, gut-wrenching testimonies. That Congress has not acted in decades in response to these acts of violence is shameful. It used to be different. About 30 years ago, I was the author of the Brady bill and worked with Republicans and law enforcement to get strong gun safety laws passed. That was a different era. But the lesson from back then remains clear today: The right laws can make a real difference in reducing gun deaths. Because those laws were on the books, it is very likely that tens of thousands of people are alive and healthy who would not have been.

Right now, the Senate is trying to break that streak of inaction—the 30-year streak of inaction since we were able to pass Brady and the assault weapons ban—by working toward meaningful legislation on gun violence.

Yesterday, a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans met again to continue working toward a bipartisan compromise. This morning, my colleague Senator MURPHY reported that the group is making good progress, and they hope to get something real done very soon. As soon as the bipartisan group comes to agreement, I want to bring a measure to the floor for a vote as quickly as possible.

The overwhelming consensus of our caucus, of gun safety advocates, and of the American people is that getting something real done on gun violence is worth pursuing, even if we cannot get everything that we know we need.

The work of curing our Nation of mass shootings will continue well after

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2875

this debate concludes. But at this moment, we have a moral obligation to try for real progress because taking tangible steps to reduce gun violence is critically important.

Americans are sick and tired of going through the same grieving cycle over and over again, only for Congress to do nothing. They are enraged that even after shootings in Sandy Hook, Parkland, San Bernardino, El Paso, Boulder, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, and so many others, that nothing—nothing—has changed.

We hope this time around something will change at last. I hope that very soon we can see a deal come together. I encourage my colleagues to keep their talks going so we can act on it very quickly.

JANUARY 6 HEARINGS

Madam President, on the January 6 hearings, tonight, the Nation will tune in to the House Select Committee on January 6 as they begin their first public hearings on the Capitol insurrection. Tonight's hearings will be a watershed moment in the fight to protect our democracy from the Big Lie of the hard right.

The committee will lay bare the truth that the American people must know; first, that there was tremendous violence. There are still many out there who say there wasn't violence. There was. The pictures show it. The eyewitnesses testify to it.

And the committee will lay bare the truth that the American people must know; that Donald Trump was at the heart of a coordinated effort to overturn the 2020 elections, to overturn our constitutional order, and inflict permanent damage upon our democracy. It will be essential viewing.

But in one of the most cowardly journalistic decisions in modern memory, FOX News—one of the biggest amplifiers of the Big Lie about January 6, about Donald Trump, and about the election—will not broadcast tonight's hearing.

FOX News's decision not to air the biggest hearing in modern history should end any debate that they are not a real news organization. FOX News is rapidly becoming a propaganda machine of the hard right, and it is as plain as day that they are scared of their viewers learning the truth about January 6.

FOX News's decision not to air the January 6 hearings is dangerous, cowardly, and shameful, given that they have spent more than a year spreading the Big Lie and misinforming their viewers.

Instead of telling the truth, they have isolated their viewers in an alternative reality of conspiracy theories that is immensely damaging to our democracy. Even the so-called liberal media which FOX News regularly attacks tries to tell both sides.

FOX News is afraid of telling both sides because they are afraid of the truth, and they are afraid their viewers may learn that FOX News has lied to them.

I urge FOX News to change course very soon. The press has an obligation—always has had that obligation—not to hide the truth from the American people, no matter how painful or inconvenient.

And as a nation, we have a duty to never forget what happened on January 6. The direct assault on our democracy and the dangers of that day, sadly, remain still with us.

HONORING OUR PACT ACT OF 2021

Madam President, now, on the PACT Act, a happier note, today, the Senate will continue consideration of the most important veteran healthcare expansion in decades, the PACT Act, authored by my colleagues Senators TESTER and MORAN—bipartisan.

We want to get this bill done as soon as we can. We can't have dilatory or destructive amendments to this bill because it is too important for our veterans' well-being to delay or destroy it.

For years, I have worked extensively with veterans, veterans service organizations, and advocates, including Jon Stewart and John Deal, who all say that the VA rules must be changed to ensure sick veterans get the care they need.

They volunteered, went off to war, and were exposed to toxins. That is a cost of war, and the American people cannot let them down.

The bill, which could benefit 3.5 million veterans who have been exposed to toxic chemicals in the line of duty, represents that change. For the sake of our veterans, there is no reason—no reason—not to pass this bill A-S-A-P, and I hope that is precisely what we can do.

SHIPPING

Madam President, on shipping, next week, the House is to vote on a much needed bill, passed unanimously by the Senate in April, to lower costs and relieve supply chains by reforming unfair shipping practices that hurt exporters and consumers alike.

Rising costs are top of the mind right now for the American people, and one of the more flummoxing causes of inflation is the crushing backlog that we are seeing at our ports. We have all seen the pictures of scores of ships lining up in ports, from Los Angeles to Savannah, to Seattle, to my home port of New York and New Jersey.

These backlogs have created serious price hikes. According to one study from earlier this year, the price to transport a container from China to the west coast of the United States costs 12 times—12 times—as much as it did 2 years ago, and the American consumer is paying the price. And it hurts both ways when shipping costs go up: It affects exports that we send overseas and imports that come back. It is a double whammy, whacking the American people's pocketbooks and wallets. At the end of the day, the American consumer ends up paying the higher price.

So I am very glad that the House will finally act on the Senate-passed ship-

ping bill next week. The shipping reform bill will help us lower costs. It will clear our ports, relieve our supply chains, and American families will feel the benefit.

I want to thank my colleagues Senators KLOBUCHAR and THUNE, the authors of the legislation, as well as the fine work of Senator CANTWELL, for leading this legislation earlier this year out of committee, onto the floor, and passing here in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, 2 years ago, the Senate Democratic leader stood on the steps of the Supreme Court and threatened two Justices by name. "You will pay the price," he shouted. "You won't know what hit you." A month ago, after the precedent-breaking leak of a draft opinion, top Democrats intensified the reckless talk. Hillary Clinton said the Court was poised to "kill and subjugate women." Leader SCHUMER and Speaker PELOSI said the Court would be "ripp[ing] up the Constitution." Some of the most powerful people in the country pushing total hysteria over the possibility that Justices may—may—overturn a decision that even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said was badly reasoned.

Far-left activists publicized Justices' private addresses and encouraged angry people to flock to their homes. President Biden and his White House were asked to condemn these intimidation tactics, and they refused. I wrote to Attorney General Garland about a month ago, asking why he wasn't enforcing the laws on the books already against judicial intimidation.

Look, everybody saw where this climate might lead. So, yesterday morning, U.S. marshals arrested a deranged person who traveled to Washington from California in order to assassinate a Supreme Court Justice at his house. He has reportedly been charged with attempted murder. The FBI says the would-be assassin was armed and equipped for a break-in. He told authorities that he was trying to think about how to give his life a purpose. Apparently, it was only when he came across the Justice's address posted online that it occurred to him to attempt a murder-suicide. He explained that his problem with this Justice was ideological, citing abortion and the Second Amendment.

While this would-be assassin was making his plan and traveling across

the country, House Democrats have spent weeks—weeks—blocking bipartisan legislation to strengthen security for the Justices and their families.

This bipartisan bill passed the Senate unanimously in early May. Chairman DURBIN is a strong supporter. But inexplicably—inexplicably—this urgent and uncontroversial bill has been sitting on Speaker PELOSI's desk ever since. The same House Democrats whose irresponsible rhetoric has contributed to this dangerous climate are themselves blocking added security for the Justices and their spouses and their children. Even last night—last night—even after this arrest was made, even after a leftwing group published an ominous social media post concerning a school that a Justice's children attend, when Leader MCCARTHY asked consent to pass the uncontroversial bill, House Democrats objected to it.

Meanwhile, the Biden Department of Justice, under Attorney General Garland, continues to flatly ignore section 1507 of the Criminal Code, which would appear to make it a Federal crime to protest at the homes of Federal judges to influence them over a pending case. That is the law right now.

So this has been a shameful and disturbing two-step from Washington Democrats. First they use reckless rhetoric that helps fuel the dangerous climate, and then they refuse to do their jobs and address the problem. The same far left that has spent years trying to improperly pressure the Court is now aiding and abetting this illegal intimidation campaign through total inaction.

So why won't President Biden call on his supporters to leave the Justices alone?

President Biden, call on your supporters to leave the Justices alone.

Why won't the Attorney General of the United States enforce existing law? Why won't the Speaker stop blocking a bipartisan security bill that passed the Senate unanimously?

So it is hard to avoid concluding that perhaps some Democrats may want this dangerous climate hanging over the Justices' heads as they finish up this term—a disgraceful—disgraceful—dereliction of duty. This is antithetical to the rule of law. The Speaker of the House and the Attorney General must honor their oaths to the Constitution and do their jobs.

I understand Democrats want to stage a big spectacle this week about what they claim is their opposition to political violence, but in reality, they are going out of their way to block concrete steps to prevent political violence.

FOREIGN POLICY

Madam President, now on an entirely separate matter, 1 year ago yesterday, the Biden administration announced its withdrawal from Afghanistan had reached a halfway point.

Analysis after analysis has confirmed what was clear to many of us in real

time: The President's shoddy plans for a reckless pullout were doomed to disaster from the start.

Back in February, an Army investigation found that in the run-up to President Biden's botched retreat, his senior national security and diplomatic advisers were "not seriously planning for an evacuation" and not paying attention to "what was happening on the ground." That is an Army investigation of the withdrawal.

Last month, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction blasted the administration's bad judgment before Congress. He explained that removing U.S. military and contractor support to our Afghan partners was "the single most important factor" in the collapse—the collapse—of Afghanistan's resistance to the Taliban.

It is not just that this giant policy failure should have been foreseeable to the Biden administration; it was, in fact, foreseen. Experts spent months warning that the President's policies would create chaos. I spent months saying the very same thing.

Now many of the worst predictions about the aftermath are coming true before our eyes. Our country and our partners are facing needlessly heightened risk from terrorists because of how the Biden administration botched Afghanistan. Yet the administration is still in denial.

In a letter to Congress just yesterday, the Commander in Chief claimed the United States "remains postured to address threats" to both our homeland and our interests "that may arise from inside Afghanistan." But the reality is that Pentagon leaders have been clear about the dramatic ways the withdrawal has limited our ability to identify, to target, and to strike terrorists in Afghanistan.

The former commander of U.S. Central Command says that forcing U.S. air assets to travel longer distances to reach Afghan airspace means severely limiting the time they can spend actually performing counterterrorism missions—just as we predicted.

A brandnew report from the lead inspector general for our ongoing counterterrorism operations further confirms that the Biden administration's mistakes have put us way, way behind the curve. Without human intelligence or bases in the country, the United States is already suffering from less insight into emerging terror threats. Our sources are drying up just as we predicted.

We haven't conducted a single strike against a military target in Afghanistan since the last military personnel left Kabul, and that isn't because there aren't any terrorists there. As the IG report confirms, it is because of "logistical challenges and limited intelligence."

The Taliban-Haqqani government in Kabul is not just a state sponsor of terrorism, it is literally a government made up of terrorists and kidnappers with deep ties to Al Qaeda.

Even as the Biden team continues to pretend that over-the-horizon operations are not inadequate in Afghanistan, they are implicitly acknowledging that same insufficiency in other theaters. Last month, President Biden redeployed U.S. troops to Somalia, reestablishing a limited but real presence intended to help local partners prevent their country from becoming a terrorist haven. So President Biden's own actions in Somalia give rise to the false claims in Afghanistan. In point of fact, the longest term vision about counterterrorism this White House has managed to lay out is their obsession—obsession—with someday shutting down the Guantanamo Bay detention center entirely.

I have yet to hear any coherent plans for what the Biden administration intends to do with the dangerous killers currently held there. Will they continue to rely on third countries to detain terrorists? That is the strategy that made possible the Taliban's massive jailbreak of thousands of hardened terrorists from Bagram after this administration fled Afghanistan.

Does the administration intend to send terrorists to Syria to be held indefinitely by a nongovernmental entity like the Syrian Defense Forces? In that case, how long is the Biden administration prepared to remain in Syria to make sure that ISIS, Hezbollah, or the Assad regime can't facilitate another giant jailbreak?

The American people and our coalition partners deserve a clear, coherent counterterrorism strategy that leaves our homeland safer and our partnerships stronger.

The Biden administration is providing, unfortunately, exactly the opposite.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, before I begin, I would like to express my dismay at House Democrats' decision last night to block legislation to provide enhanced security for Supreme Court Justices and their families.

Due to the unprecedented leak of an early draft of the Supreme Court's Dobbs decision and the resulting hysteria from members of the pro-abortion left, the Supreme Court asked Congress for additional authorities to protect Justices' families. This happened 4 weeks ago. And yesterday's arrest of an armed man near Justice Kavanaugh's home—a man who told police that he intended to kill a Supreme Court Justice and has been charged with attempted murder—made clear just how needed that protection is.

The Supreme Court security legislation in question passed the Senate unanimously 4 weeks ago but has faced inexplicable delays in the House of Representatives.

This should not be a partisan issue. The Senate Democratic Whip said just yesterday that the House should pass this legislation.

And I really thought that yesterday's arrest of an individual bent on assassinating a Supreme Court Justice would have forced House Democrats to abandon political gains and provide this urgently needed protection.

There is no excuse for further delay. One press report suggests that Democrats may be rethinking their opposition. I hope that is true. House Democrats should abandon the political games today and pass this legislation.

STUDENT LOANS

Madam President, recent reporting suggests that President Biden may be contemplating forgiving \$10,000 in Federal student loan debt per borrower. That is a bad idea for many reasons. It is difficult really to know where to start, but let me begin by pointing out the obvious: that forgiving \$10,000 in Federal student loan debt will do absolutely nothing to address the underlying problem and, in fact, would likely make things much worse.

The price of higher education has risen stratospherically in recent decades. The cost of 1 year of attendance at some colleges—just 1 year—is more than many Americans' yearly salaries. And that is a problem. But forgiving \$10,000 of student loan debt would do absolutely nothing to fix the problem of soaring tuition costs. As I said, it would very likely make things worse.

What incentive would colleges have to rein in costs if they could be confident that part of their students' bill would eventually be picked up by the Federal Government; because, of course, no one should be deceived into thinking that student loan forgiveness would be a one-time thing?

One estimate suggests that the student loan burden in this country would return to its current amount within 4 years—4 years—of \$10,000 in debt being forgiven, and calls to forgive more debt would undoubtedly come much sooner.

Future graduates are very likely to want the same deal that would be offered to graduates today—the wiping away of \$10,000 in debt—which brings us to another problem: some students opting to take on unrealistic levels of debt to finance their educations.

How much greater is that problem going to be if students think that the Government is likely to step in and forgive some of the debt that they have agreed to repay? It is very easy to imagine a student feeling free to take on more debt than he or she otherwise would, believing that the Government is likely to reduce the resulting debt burden.

Another massive problem with President Biden's plan is, of course, its complete unfairness. Under President

Biden's plan, an individual who just finished paying his or her student loans after years of work would not receive a penny. Meanwhile, a student who graduated a month ago and hasn't yet paid a dime on his or her loans could see a substantial part of his or her debt wiped away.

The President's plan is also incredibly unfair to the tens of millions of Americans without any student loan debt who would be asked to subsidize a student loan debt of a small percentage of Americans. Somewhere around two-thirds of millennials have no student debt, either because they didn't attend college or didn't take out any loans to attend college. The president's plan is unfair to those who avoided loans by working their way through school or choosing a lower-cost college option. It is unfair to parents who worked for years to ensure that they could finance their kids' education. And it is unfair to those who chose not to attend a traditional 4-year college and, instead, trained in one of the many essential trades we depend on, from plumbing to air conditioning to broadband installation, at a significantly lower-cost community college or technical school.

Another problem with the President's plan is what it would teach about the sanctity of contracts. While it may, at times, be ill-advised, students freely enter into the agreements when they take out a loan. Should we really be teaching that agreements and contracts mean nothing, that people can incur debt and then not have to pay it off?

Another important point to make here is that the average debt for undergraduate education in this country is not as crippling as it might be portrayed. Now, there is no question that there are students out there who were encouraged to take on unrealistic levels of debt and are currently struggling with huge debt burdens made up of private as well as Federal loans, but the average debt, the average debt for an undergraduate education is somewhere around \$29,000. That is not chump change, for sure, but it is also not an unmanageable level of debt for the average college graduate—especially with the availability of extended repayment plans and income-driven repayment programs.

Average student loan debt rises substantially for those with advanced degrees, and there are certainly those who take on far too much debt for graduate education, but it is also important to know that those with advanced degrees have higher—and in some cases much higher—earning potential.

Doctors, for example, take on medical debt north of \$190,000 on average, but once they have completed their education and training they can expect to make a robust—sometimes a very robust—six figures per year, making repaying debt of that size a very feasible proposition.

There is no question that the cost of higher education is out of control and

that students sometimes take on unrealistic levels of debt to pay for it. But forgiving student loan debt is not the answer for the reasons I have mentioned, among others. Instead, we should be exploring ways to drive down education costs.

We should be also highlighting affordable education options like our Nation's community colleges and technical schools. These institutions, like the outstanding tech schools we have in South Dakota, provide students with associate's degrees, certificates, apprenticeships, opportunities to learn a trade, and more.

There are also things we can do to help students pay off loans without forcing taxpayers to shoulder the burden. In December of 2020, Congress passed a 5-year version of legislation that I introduced with Senator WARNER to allow employers to help employees repay their loans. Our Employer Participation in Repayment Act amends the Educational Assistance Program to permit employers to make tax-free payments on their employees' student loans. It is a win for employees, who get help paying off their student loans. And it is a win for employers who have a new option for attracting and retaining talented workers.

Our bill isn't a cure-all, but it will certainly help ease the pain of paying back student loans for a number of Americans. I am pleased that it was enacted into law for a 5-year period, and I hope at some point Congress will act to make it permanent.

Another big thing we can do, of course, is to make sure that graduates have access to good-paying jobs. This is key to enabling people to pay off their debt, and we should resolve to build on the economic progress that we had made prepandemic and focus on policies that will allow our economy to thrive.

Republicans are not alone in thinking that forgiving \$10,000 in student loan debt is fraught with problems. As one Democrat Senator said:

An across-the-board cancellation of college debt does nothing to address the absurd cost of college or fix our broken student loan program. It offers nothing to Americans who paid off their college debts or those who chose a lower-priced college to go to as a way of avoiding going into debt or taking on debt. . . . [R]eally importantly, it ignores the majority of Americans who never went to college, some of whom have debts just as staggering. . . .

That is from one of our Democrat colleagues here in the Senate.

The New York Times editorial board, not exactly known for toeing the Republican line, noted:

Canceling this debt, even in the limited amounts the White House is considering, would set a bad precedent and do nothing to change the fact that future students will graduate with yet more debt—along with the blind hope of another, future amnesty. Such a move is legally dubious, economically unsound, politically fraught and educationally problematic.

That was from the New York Times editorial board.

With inflation near a 40-year high, with the President's approval rating hitting a new low, and with Democrats' prospects for November looking less rosy, it is not exactly surprising that the President would look toward student loan forgiveness as a way of distracting voters or that some Democrats are reportedly pushing for student loan forgiveness as a way to boost their chances in November; but I very much hope that the President will decide that temporary political gain is not a good reason to put American taxpayers on the hook for billions of dollars in student loan debt that is not their own.

As the New York Times noted, the President's plan is "legally dubious, economically unsound, politically fraught, and educationally problematic."

I strongly, strongly encourage the President to abandon a plan that even the Democratic Speaker of the House has suggested he doesn't have the authority to implement.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

MR. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at 11:45 a.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 856, the nomination of Robert Steven Huie, as provided under the previous order, and that, following the vote, the Senate resume legislative session.

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

JANUARY 6 HEARINGS

MR. DURBIN. Mr. President, this evening, the Select Committee to investigate the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol will hold its first public hearing.

For more than 10 months, the January 6 Select Committee has labored diligently to discover and document the truth about the day we nearly lost our democracy. This evening, the committee will begin to lay out publicly, for the first time, the coordinated plan in place to overturn the results of the 2020 Presidential election and prevent the peaceful transition of power to a new administration in America. Those are incredible words that I have just spoken, but they reflect the reality of January 6, 2021.

Among the witnesses will be Capitol Police Officer Caroline Edwards, one of the more than 140 Capitol and Metropolitan police officers who was injured when the mob attacked the Capitol.

To Officer Edwards and all of the police officers who defended American democracy that day and who continue to

protect this Capitol every day, we owe more than our thanks.

January 6 revealed to the world how fragile democracy can be, even in America. Keeping our democracy requires vigilance and truth. Often, it requires sacrifice, and there must be a willingness to accept that truth. It is regrettable—no, it is shameful—that our Republican colleagues in the Senate filibustered the creation of an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate what happened on January 6.

I recall that moment, and I am sure the Presiding Officer does as well. It was slightly after 2 o'clock, just a few minutes after 2 o'clock. Vice President Pence was presiding over the U.S. Senate as we went through the orderly, constitutional process of counting the electoral votes. I looked up from my chair to see the Secret Service come in and physically remove—quickly remove—the Vice President from that chair. The events that unfolded in the next few minutes were hard to imagine could ever occur in the United States of America. We were told to sit safely in our chairs, in that this was a secure Chamber, and be prepared for other staffers from around the Capitol to join us. Not 10 minutes later, a member of the Capitol Police stood before us and said: As quickly as possible, evacuate this Chamber.

It is hard to imagine this in the United States of America. We have seen the videos. We know what happened. There is no doubt as to what happened that day and what an impression it must have left on the rest of the world. What would we think, at this moment in time, if a mob with battering rams beat down the doors of Parliament and entered the House of Commons and the House of Lords? Would we not say on this side of the ocean, my God, what has happened to the United Kingdom? Can this government survive? Can that country survive? The same questions were being asked about America because of that insurrectionist mob on January 6.

The proposal was made—and it was a legitimate, thoughtful, good-faith proposal—to establish a bipartisan commission to get to the bottom of it—who was behind it?—and to ask the hard questions. What role did President Donald Trump play in what unfolded after his rally on January 6, 2021? Some people don't even want to raise the question, let alone hear the answer.

History demands the truth, unless we have reached the point that we saw in the times of the Soviet Union when they refused to print in their daily newspapers plane crashes. It was bad news, and they didn't want to peddle any bad news in the official partisan organ, *Izvestia*. No. That was the reality of the Soviet Union—deny the truth, rewrite history. We see the same thing occurring today, but the American people are going to learn the truth.

All three major broadcast networks and all but one cable news network will

carry this evening's hearing live. What cable news network might not require the broadcast of this? I am going to guess FOX News, and I am right. Think about that for a second. Clearly, to FOX News, which profits off the Big Lie of Donald Trump, it matters more to continue that relationship than to tell the truth to their viewers.

The members of the Select Committee have undertaken their duty with uncommon courage, and I want to single out, in particular, Congressman ADAM KINZINGER from the State of Illinois. We are not close friends, but we have worked on a few things together. I have the highest regard and admiration for the courage that he has shown throughout this travail; and the fact that he would volunteer, against the wishes of the Republican House leadership, to make this committee bipartisan is a tribute to his citizenship and to his commitment to this Nation.

The same thing, of course, is true for Representative LIZ CHENEY. She has a lot at stake. Representative KINZINGER has announced his retirement. She continues to represent Wyoming, and I hope she will for many years to come. I may disagree with her on virtually every other issue, but I have respect for her courage in serving on this bipartisan committee.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

MR. President, on another topic, it is no secret that the Federal Bureau of Prisons has been plagued by misconduct. One investigation after another has revealed a culture of abuse, mismanagement, corruption, torture, and death that reaches all the way to the top.

One of the most troubling investigations was published last week by National Public Radio and the Marshall Project. The title of the report reads: "How the Newest Federal Prison Became One of the Deadliest"—the facility in question I know well: U.S. Penitentiary Thomson. It is located in my home State of Illinois. In fact, it is a facility that I officially and originally encouraged the Federal Government to purchase in order to reduce overcrowding in high security prisons. The opening of U.S. Penitentiary Thomson was supposed to improve safety within the Bureau of Prisons, but the reality, sadly, has been the exact opposite.

According to this report, seven inmates at U.S. Penitentiary Thomson have died in just 2 years. Five of them were reportedly murdered by other inmates; two died by suicide. And those deaths are just a snapshot of the grim reality of this facility—the deadly, grim reality. The investigation paints a picture of rampant abuse by prison staff. This alleged abuse includes the excessive use of two kinds of painful restraints—ambulatory restraints and four-point restraints. The "four" refers to each of a person's limbs, which, under this technique, are chained to a concrete bed, rendering the individual immobile.

This is an American penitentiary. The Bureau of Prisons' protocol says

that these restraints should be used sparingly and only to momentarily—momentarily—restrain an inmate who presents an active danger to himself or others.

According to this report, some guards at U.S. Penitentiary Thomson have, apparently, made a habit of regularly using these restraints on inmates—not momentarily but regularly. In some cases, inmates have reportedly been left chained for hours and days.

A lawyer who has spoken with U.S. Penitentiary Thomson inmates said:

[The inmates] are denied food. They are denied water. Many of them report being left in their own waste. It's really akin to a torture chamber.

This is an American prison in my State.

The use of restraints and shackles has become so common, inmates have coined a term to describe the scars they leave on their arms and legs. It is known as the "Thomson tattoo."

The report also alleges that the staff at U.S. Penitentiary Thomson have gained a reputation for stoking tensions between cellmates. Make no mistake, this is a special management unit. These are inmates who can be very dangerous, and I understand that. I understood it when the penitentiary was opened.

One example that was highlighted in this report is indicative of the challenge. It was the murder of Matthew Phillips, a U.S. Penitentiary Thomson inmate who died in 2020. Mr. Phillips was a Jewish man with a visible Star of David tattoo. The corrections officers at U.S. Penitentiary Thomson reportedly locked Mr. Phillips in a recreation cage with two known White supremacists. These inmates beat Mr. Phillips until he was unconscious, and he died from his injuries 3 days later. Both men have since been indicted by the Justice Department on murder and hate crime charges.

Following the publication of this shocking report, I joined Senator DUCKWORTH, my colleague from Illinois, and Illinois Congresswoman CHERI BUSTOS, sending a letter to the Justice Department's Inspector General Michael Horowitz. In it, we urged him to launch a full-scale, immediate investigation into the failures at Thomson prison.

I spoke with General Horowitz yesterday. He confirmed that his office is investigating the deaths at Thomson, along with many other abuses in the Bureau of Prisons.

But this report about U.S. Penitentiary Thomson is only the most recent look into the house of horrors that is the Bureau of Prisons, the Federal Bureau of Prisons. We already have ample evidence of a pattern of neglect and abuse that has been embedded in their bureaucracy.

Consider, for instance, the Bureau's overuse of restricted housing—the practice of separating inmates from the general prison population, isolating them alone or with one other person

for 24 hours at a time. The practice can cause severe mental anguish for inmates and can severely harm the prospects for ever reentering society.

Much like the use of four-point restraints, restricted housing should, as the Justice Department noted in 2016, "be used rarely, applied fairly, and subjected to reasonable constraints." That is the standard, the published standard, of the Bureau of Prisons.

During the Obama administration, I held two hearings, which are still fresh on my mind they were so gripping, on the issue of solitary confinement. Following those hearings, the Justice Department took steps to reduce and reform the Bureau of Prisons' use of restricted housing. We started to make real progress.

Unfortunately, the progress was erased during the Trump administration. And since the former President left office, the Biden Department of Justice has had plenty of time to change course and leadership. And I have urged them to do so.

A year and a half into this administration, nearly 8 percent of BOP inmates are still being held in restricted housing. That is the same level it was under President Trump. That is just plain unacceptable. The continued overuse of restricted housing and the alleged abuses at Thomson are among the many instances of misconduct and mismanagement that have occurred under the failed leadership of Bureau of Prisons' Director Michael Carvajal.

In light of those earlier reports detailing similar failures, I called for Mr. Carvajal's resignation last November. So it was welcome news when, about 6 weeks after I asked for his resignation, he announced it. Mr. Carvajal said he was going to resign.

But that was January. Now we are in June, and the Justice Department has shown little progress or urgency in naming Carvajal's replacement. As a result, he is still running and mismanaging the Bureau of Prisons.

This recent investigation at Thomson makes it clear there are no excuses for further delay. So today I am calling on President Biden, Attorney General Garland, and Deputy Attorney General Monaco to do one of two things; either name a new reform-minded Director to replace Carvajal immediately or appoint an Acting Director until a permanent selection is made. This cannot wait. We need to act before another inmate dies in the custody and care of this Federal Government.

In the coming weeks, the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, will be holding a hearing on the Bureau of Prisons. We will examine these allegations of abuse at Thomson and other facilities. We need answers from the Biden administration on the failure to reduce the use of restricted housing, and we will discuss what BOP must do to address the staffing crisis that has contributed to this disastrous situation.

The crisis demands the attention of the highest ranking officials within the

Department of Justice. It has been long overdue. It is time for us to have competent, principled leadership at the Bureau of Prisons.

I am not condemning every person who works at that Agency, for sure. I have met many of them and respect them. But those who are guilty of this misconduct need to be held accountable, and new leadership is imperative.

It has been a long time since we have had that kind of competent, principled leadership. I believe that Attorney General Garland and Deputy Attorney General Monaco will choose the right leader to clear out the bureaucratic rot and improve with significant reforms. But we need to act quickly. Lives are at stake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last couple of weeks, many of us have spent a lot of time thinking about the horrific shootings in Uvalde, Philadelphia, Buffalo, and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, these are familiar scenes that we have seen before, and we would like to try to find a way to reduce the likelihood of their reoccurrence in the future if there is anything we can do here in the Senate to make that possible. So I have been working particularly with Senator MURPHY, who was my partner on the Fix NICS bill that we passed in 2018.

Senator MURPHY comes from a blue State, Connecticut; I come from a red State, Texas. Yet, in that example, we were able to take the horrible events of Sutherland Springs, where innocent parishioners were gunned down at a small Baptist church outside of San Antonio, and take out of that tragedy something good, which is a bill we call Fix NICS, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Since that was signed into law, 11½ million new records have been uploaded into the background check system, and I believe that has saved lives.

You will recall, in that case, the shooter was a veteran of the U.S. Air Force, but, unfortunately, he had a troubled history: felony convictions, domestic violence, mental health adjudications. None of that was in the background check system. It should have been, and it would have disqualified him had it been known. But he did what so often happens; he lied, and then he bought—the lie and buy—and tragedy ensued. We were all sickened by these shootings, and we are hyperaware of the public interest.

The most common refrain I hear is: Do something. Do something. Unfortunately, it gets a little less specific after that what exactly should be done, and that is where the hard work begins.

But, as before, I am optimistic that we can find something that protects the rights of law-abiding citizens under our Constitution, under the Second Amendment, who, I believe, are not a

threat to public safety, and focus on people with criminal records, people with mental health challenges, like young Salvador Ramos in Uvalde, TX; like Adam Lanza at Sandy Hook.

The profile is pretty well established—young, alienated, disaffected, mentally challenged boys who lack access to treatment which will help them manage their mental illness and who descend into a pit of despair, ultimately resulting in their desire not only to harm themselves but to take other people with them. That profile is well established in the scientific literature. And the New York Times did an excellent piece a couple of weeks ago on that profile. So I think that gives us a little bit of a roadmap for the sorts of things we might do to deal with that.

What makes this more challenging than, for example, the Fix NICS bill after Sutherland Springs is that was a singular point of failure. Here, we see multiple points of failure, and I think we need to address as many as we can.

So as I mentioned, the mental health issue looms large. We know that during the 2 years, where many students were isolated at home, trying to keep up with their studies virtually, many of them have languished, many of them have fallen behind. And because they have been isolated from their peers at a time when their social development is the most important, many of them have fallen into despair, exacerbating underlying problems that they may have in the first place. So trying to figure out how to support our schools and our communities with resources needed to address the mental and emotional health of people who are struggling, particularly young students, that seems like an obvious area that we can work on together.

Obviously, school security is important. The initial reports in Uvalde were that the door was propped open that Salvador Ramos entered. Later, we found out that, no, it wasn't propped open, but the lock didn't work. He just walked right in.

There are a lot of studies and best practices when it comes to what is necessary to secure our schools. If we can secure our airports post-9/11, we can secure our schools to make sure that people who should come in and out of those schools can do so relatively easily but that outsiders cannot and particularly those who are a threat to the safety of those students.

I think all of us want to try to find ways to reduce the likelihood of something like this happening again, and school districts across the country are eager to get our help and guidance to harden their infrastructure to provide for the personnel, resource officers—that is the local police officer on the school campus. Those are things that I think would diminish the likelihood of another Uvalde.

Mental health and school safety seem to me as kind of no-brainers, in a sense, where I don't think there is a lot

of division between that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle.

But we are also looking at ways to keep guns out of the hands of people who already, by law, are prohibited from having them. I am not talking necessarily about expanding the background check system; I want to make sure the background check system works.

What makes this challenging is Salvador Ramos showed up after his 18th birthday as if he were born yesterday. For purposes of the background check system, there was no insight into his many mental health challenges or terroristic threats of fellow students, potentially drug use, and other things that if he were an adult, he could not pass a background check. But because of the fact that juvenile records are typically sealed and are not part of the NICS review, the merchant who sold him the firearms he used didn't know anything about his track record.

But we know how, as I said earlier, that he fits a familiar profile. He shot his own grandmother because she wanted him to go back to school after being out of school for the last 2 years. He engaged in self-mutilation, self-cutting, tortured animals, made threats against his fellow students, threatened sexual assault against his fellow female students, and made threats that he would, in fact, do what he ultimately did online. He was a ticking timebomb.

So if there is some way for us to look back into the sorts of records that would disqualify an adult if they had occurred post-18—because they would have been public records available to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System—if there is a way to look back and identify people like Salvador Ramos, who, by virtue of his mental health and other problems, we would know he should not be able to purchase a firearm legally.

A couple of States—I think it is South Carolina and Virginia—voluntarily upload mental health adjudications for 17-year-olds. We can't compel other States to do that, but we can sure provide—we can facilitate other States doing so and incentivize their populating the NICS background check system with this necessary information for juveniles, who ultimately will end up—they will turn of age and be able to buy a firearm, and we need to know ahead of time, for purposes of the background check system, what those records look like.

So there are a number of things that we could do. One suggestion is, for example, to take a look at the background check process itself for 18- to 21-year-olds in particular since that is the population we are focusing on based on this profile.

Under current law, if you go in and buy a firearm and you have a clean record, you can pass your background check pretty quickly. In 90 percent of cases, that is actually what happens. The average processing time is 2 min-

utes. In most cases, the system returns a binary result: You either pass or you don't pass, you fail. When you fail, that means you can't purchase a firearm.

Now, the Congress, the Senate—in particular, Senator COONS from Delaware and I sponsored a bill that would notify local police when somebody goes in to take a background check and fails because they don't qualify. Many times, the local law enforcement knows more about these people and would be interested to know that they tried to illegally purchase a firearm and were denied.

But in about 10 percent of the gun purchases, the background check is not resolved immediately. The system returns a yellow light, which means additional review is required. For example, if you have a common name like John Smith, the search may pull records for somebody else, for the wrong person with the same name who is prohibited from purchasing a gun. It could also be caused by incomplete criminal history—for example, if somebody is convicted of assault but on further examination, you find out it was domestic violence, which is a prohibited category. You would also learn whether it was a felony or a misdemeanor.

In those cases, the FBI, under current law, already has 3 days in which to complete the background check. The problem is, under current law, there are no finish—the seller still sells the gun, and we have an incomplete record.

Dylann Roof, I believe, was the name of the shooter at the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, SC. As it turned out, he had a misdemeanor drug offense that was not uploaded into the background check system.

Now, it is a disqualifying condition if you are addicted to or a frequent user of illegal drugs, but because the background check system did not allow enough time to include that information—maybe, just maybe, he would have been denied the purchase of the firearms that he ultimately used to kill those innocent people that day.

So what we are looking at is the possibility of—in those cases where there is what I will call a yellow flag or an indication that further review is necessary—an extended period of time, for this class of purchasers between 18 and 21, for the background check system to complete their review.

Well, I have said it before, and I will say it again: I don't believe law-abiding, mentally well gun owners are going to commit mass shootings or are a threat to public safety. I know within the Senate, we have a number of people who are sportsmen; who enjoy target shooting, let's say; who believe that they need to exercise their Second Amendment rights in order to protect their family and their homes. They are not a threat. So blanket limitations or prohibitions on those law-abiding citizens who are not a threat to public safety and never will be, to me, strikes as overreach.

We are not talking about a discretionary right; we are talking about a

constitutional right. But I do believe that the Second Amendment and sound public policy are not mutually exclusive here, and that is the needle we are trying to thread here. So adding juvenile records to the NICS system is a commonsense way to ensure we have a complete picture of the buyer's history.

Then, of course, there is the scandal of our mental health delivery system in the United States today. Back in the sixties, when people who had mental health challenges were institutionalized, we finally figured out that that didn't work very well; it was inhumane. The theory was that there would be created some safety net in communities across the country where people could turn; where the police, if they answered a 9-1-1 call and they realized that this isn't a criminal, that this is somebody going through a mental health crisis—where the police could take people where they could actually get help, get treated, get counseling, and get better. That doesn't exist today in many communities—in the major cities perhaps, even in suburban areas, but Uvalde, TX, population 15,000, not so much.

So we are looking at ways to expand the community-based mental health system. Senator STABENOW and Senator BLUNT have a great proposal that would extend the current eight-State pilot program nationwide. Now, is that solely related to what happened at Uvalde or what happened in Buffalo or what happened in Philadelphia? No, but it would address the larger underlying challenge of more and more Americans falling through the cracks.

While we know most people in a mental health crisis are not going to commit acts of violence, we also know that 60 percent of the gun-related deaths are suicides. And as it occurred to me like a light went off in my head, Salvador Ramos, Adam Lanza, and others of this profile of young men, in addition to the multiple homicides they commit, they commit suicide. They know they are not going to make it out alive.

So addressing this mental health crisis that affects our country and particularly where we fail these young men who feel like they have nowhere else to turn, who become increasingly isolated, become increasingly desensitized to the idea of taking someone's life because they are sitting in their room playing video games, killing people virtually all the time, and then, in their bizarre fantasies, decide to extend those fantasies to taking not only their own life but the lives of other innocent people.

So this is challenging, Mr. President, and there is no doubt about it, but we can do this. We can do this. Sometimes politics is called the art of the possible, and I think this is possible. Is it going to be perfect? Are we going to not have to revisit some other scenario where people have fallen through the cracks or where vulnerabilities are exposed? No, we can't be sure that this is one

and done. But I do believe there is a sense of urgency, not only here in the Congress but in the White House and across the country. We have all heard from our constituents, who are in anguish over what has happened in Uvalde and elsewhere. The cry is to do something. Like I said, that is not very specific. And I understand, but it is up to us to try to find what is the right set of policies that would respect the rights of law-abiding citizens under the Constitution but at the same time address what we know is a huge mental health crisis in this country and make sure that the systems that are in place work, like the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

We need to populate that system with the relevant information that would disqualify somebody, if they were an adult, if it occurred while they were a juvenile. There are ways we can do that. We can incentivize that. We can take a look back in some cases. We can allow the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, in those limited cases where they need to do further review, to see that the information is complete.

We can figure this out, and I think, on a bipartisan basis, there is a will to do so. Around here, if there is a will, there is a way, and I believe we do have the will and we will find a way.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, secondly, I would ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak even though it may go a moment or two longer and that the vote be delayed to allow me to complete my remarks.

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

HONORING OUR PACT ACT OF 2021

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I want to speak this morning really to America's veterans and provide an update on our work to get our toxic exposure legislation across the finish line.

The Senate is in the midst of considering the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring Our PACT Act. This is historic. It is bipartisan.

I hope that we can keep it becoming, when something is bipartisan, that it is historic because we ought to be able to solve these problems for veterans and really for Americans in a way that brings us together and not pulls us apart, and this is an effort to show that that can be done. This legislation will deliver on a promise we made as a country to take care of our service men and women, both when they deploy and when they come home.

The Heath Robinson Act will provide access to healthcare and benefits for millions of veterans who are sick from

illnesses connected with toxic exposures.

When we send our warfighters into harm's way, it is with the understanding that we will have their back. When they come home bearing physical, mental, or invisible wounds of war, we care for those wounds. Toxic wounds should not be treated differently.

John Buckley, a retired U.S. Army colonel from Andover, KS, told me:

Our Soldiers were put into dangerous situations in Iraq and Afghanistan. And many who suffered from their wounds or made the ultimate sacrifice have been cared for by our nation. Unfortunately, many too have been overlooked and ignored. Especially those who are suffering from injuries after having recurring and prolonged exposure to toxic fumes, burn pits and other environmental hazards.

This legislation is designed to address what the retired colonel told me.

Another Army colonel, this one from Leavenworth, KS, Pat Proctor, who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, shared that many of the men and women he served with are facing health challenges from being exposed to toxins while deployed. He said:

There is no telling—[there is no telling]—how many of us will be impacted as we get older.

I know many of our veterans live with the lingering fear, will the toxic exposures from their service catch up with them and leave them with a debilitating disease? And if that happens, will the VA be there? Will Americans be there for them with the healthcare and benefits they need?

William Turner, the former deputy commander general of support for Kansas's own Fort Riley First Infantry Division, told me:

Our Veterans have served in multiple locations where they have been exposed to a number of toxins that have resulted in them developing serious illnesses, and they often struggle to gain access to health care and benefits that help alleviate some of the pain and suffering they are experiencing.

Sometimes we think these issues are something people in Washington, DC, are talking about, but what we are trying to address is the real circumstances of real Americans who have served our Nation and who are deserving of our attention.

The former deputy commanding general went on to say—to note this:

It is absolutely imperative that we pass this bill to guarantee exposed veterans receive permanent access to health care.

Moving legislation through Congress can be a slow and frustrating process. However, this week, when the Senate began debate on our bill, I was encouraged by the resounding show of confidence. This bill—to move forward on this bill, that vote was 86 Senators in favor.

We are now focused on an amendment process and will continue working as quickly as the Senate will allow to get this bill to the House and back on its way to the President's desk.

Whether Democrat or Republican, every Member of this Chamber represents veterans at home, and I firmly

believe that every Member in this Chamber cares about those veterans. Issues related to veterans often have a way of bringing us together to find consensus, and that is what we have been attempting to do and we will continue to do as we sort out what amendments could be considered.

We were able to deliver veterans choice through the MISSION Act, landmark mental health legislation through the John Scott Hannon Mental Health Improvement Act, and I believe we can do that again on this legislation to deliver care and benefits to all generations of toxic-exposed veterans.

This country is good at recognizing the physical wounds of war, and we are getting better at recognizing the mental wounds of war, but no longer can we ignore the wounds of war from toxic exposure—the wounds, like Agent Orange before it, that may not arrive until years later.

Throughout the remaining procedural votes on the Heath Robinson Act, I urge my colleagues with remaining questions or concerns to reach out so we can all, together, deliver on this promise to those who have borne the battle. I look forward to working with my colleagues to see that this bill crosses the finish line soon.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robert Steven Huie, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

VOTE ON HUIE NOMINATION

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Bennet	Brown	Carper
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Casey

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

Burr	Cramer	Sanders
------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Maryland.

LGBTQI+ PRIDE MONTH 2022

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this June marks 53 years since the attack on the Stonewall Inn and 52 years since the first pride parade was held in New York City. The Stonewall riots are widely recognized as the catalyst for the resurgence of the fight for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex—LGBTQI+—rights, and they were the first in a series of landmark events that would define the LGBTQ experience of the late 20th century.

From the UpStairs Lounge arson attack to the devastating AIDS crisis, the community persevered through many harrowing ordeals. During this month, we recognize not only the struggles of the LGBTQ community but the triumphs, both big and small.

Not nearly as well known, the UpStairs Lounge arson attack took place nearly 4 years after the Stonewall riots, on June 24, 1973. Patrons of the New Orleans bar, which primarily served as a safe meeting space for blue-collar gay men, noticed a fire in the front stairwell just before 8 p.m. The fire spread rapidly, forcing patrons to flee to the rooftop and out the barred windows to escape. Unfortunately, this was not enough. Twenty-eight people lost their lives in the blaze, and four more succumbed to their injuries in the following days. This horrendous act would go on to become the deadliest at-

tack on the LGBTQ community until the Pulse nightclub shooting in 2016, which claimed the lives of 49 individuals. Both of these attacks took place during Pride Month, a month that celebrates love, acceptance, and community.

The celebration of Pride Month also allows members of the LGBTQ community to reassert their rights to openly be their true selves and say: "We are here. We are not going away." This message is especially important now, as the Supreme Court prepares to vote on potentially overriding *Roe v. Wade*, the decision that protects an individual's right to privacy and control over their own bodies. Justice Samuel Alito's reasoning in this argument, though not final, threatens an entire line of rights that the Court has inferred from the text of the Constitution over decades, including foundational protections for the LGBTQ people such as marriage equality, established in the 2015 *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision.

I am an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, S. 393, which would safeguard and protect equal rights for the LGBTQ individuals in areas including public accommodations and facilities, education, Federal funding, employment, housing, credit, and the jury system. I am also the lead sponsor of the resolution to eliminate the deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, which would strengthen the constitutional foundation for pro-LGBTQ legislation like the Equality Act.

I strongly oppose action by the Supreme Court to take away the rights of Americans by overturning *Roe* or *Obergefell* or other cases like *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which guarantees the rights of families to have access to contraception and family planning.

While I am proud that Maryland has, at the State level, protections in place to preserve the sanctity of same-sex marriage should these rights come under threat at a Federal level, such fundamental rights must be respected at the national level. As many have pointed out, Supreme Court decisions to overturn precedent have historically expanded individual rights, not taken them away.

LGBTQ Pride Month is an integral part of our community here in Maryland. Parades and celebrations are taking place all across the State, from Salisbury to Cumberland. As an ally, I am committed to uplifting and supporting the LGBTQ voices. In particular, we must make a special effort to protect transgender children and their parents and safeguard their access to healthcare and social services during these challenging times.

As extremism grows louder in many States, we must stand united and firm in the face of injustice and continue to proclaim that love has been and always will be love.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Samuel R. Bagenstos, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services.

VOTE ON BAGENSTOS NOMINATION

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

Mr. DURBIN. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—43

Barrasso	Fischer	Marshall
Blackburn	Graham	McConnell
Boozman	Grassley	Moran
Braun	Hagerty	Murkowski
Capito	Hawley	Paul
Cassidy	Hoehn	Risch
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cornyn	Inhofe	Rounds
Cotton	Johnson	Rubio
Crapo	Kennedy	Sasse
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Daines	Lee	
Ernst	Lummis	

Scott (SC)
Shelby

Sullivan
Thune

Tillis
Young

NOT VOTING—8

Blunt
Booker
Burr

Cramer
Portman
Toomey

Tuberville
Wicker

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

RECOGNIZING WGN RADIO

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Chicago's very own WGN Radio for reaching its milestone 100th birthday this year.

In a century's time, WGN has reported on so much of our Nation's history. The station is synonymous with Chicago's vibrant sports history and has defined time and again what it means to have a vision and work to see it through.

WGN, which stands for "World's Greatest Newspaper" and pays homage to the Chicago's Tribune's 20th century slogan, comes from humble beginnings.

Starting with a single staff member in 1922, WGN went on to cover some of the past century's defining moments and solidify a legacy of storytelling and determination.

In 1942, it was WGN who interrupted their broadcast of a Bears game to report for the next 257 hours and 35 minutes on the attack on Pearl Harbor.

On 9/11, WGN was there, focusing on Chicago's reaction to the events on that tragic September morning.

As an Illinoian, I am proud that WGN has consistently shown up during some of our country's darkest days. But they have been with us through many of our brightest moments too.

WGN went from broadcasting its very first sports game—a match between the Cubs and White Sox—go Cubs—in 1924, to Wayne Larrivee, Dick Butkus, and Jim Hart broadcasting the Chicago Bears' legendary Super Bowl XX win to 2010's triumphant cries as the station's broadcasters described Patrick Kane scoring the winning goal in overtime, earning the Chicago Blackhawks the Stanley Cup for the first time in 50 years.

WGN has not just been telling our stories for the last 100 years, but they have become a vital member of our community.

Judy Markey and Kathy O'Malley's beloved afternoon talk show, and making Mary Sandberg Boyle the station's first woman general manager in 2019, or bringing the voices like Orion Samuelson and Bob Collins to our days—WGN is embedded in the hearts of so many Chicagoans.

WGN's legacy isn't just about radio. It is about community. It is about

being proud of where you have come from and where you are going.

So here is to 100 more years of WGN, and many more to come.

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

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

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Thursday, and I normally come down on the Senate floor to give the "Alaskan of the Week" speech. And, unfortunately, I am not going to do that today.

Actually, last week, I named two Alaskans of the week. We kind of had a two-for-one last week. Just as a little wrap-up for that, it was quite a remarkable thing that took place just last week in Alaska on Memorial Day.

My two Alaskans of the week, a 92-year-old artist working with a detective, both Alaska Natives, both from the community of Unalaska out on the Aleutian Islands chain, worked together. Actually, Gertrude Svarny worked for decades to right a wrong and get a military burial on Memorial Day for a young man and also an Alaska Native from Unalaska who died fighting in World War II and was never recognized, no gravestone, no tombstone, nothing—for decades. And we had an amazing ceremony thanks to these two amazing Alaskans—Gertrude Svarny, as I mentioned, and Mike Livingston. And the memory of this young Alaska Native soldier, Private George Fox, was now finally recognized.

That was in a Memorial Day ceremony last week. I was trying to get there. Unfortunately, they sometimes get a lot of bad weather out there. I flew halfway out to the Aleutian Islands, and we had horrible weather. We couldn't land.

But the ceremony happened. So there were two Alaskans of the week 2 weeks ago that I just wanted to highlight again. It was an incredibly moving ceremony.

So I figured that was two for one. So, unfortunately, I am not going to do an "Alaskan of the Week" today. I know we like to end the week on a high note.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. President, I am going to talk about a mystery that has really been, certainly, flummoxing me and, I think, so many people in our Federal Government on a matter that especially impacts millions and millions of Americans suffering from high energy prices. It is a mystery for the American people.

And, you know, our Federal Government can sometimes be so opaque that you often don't know who is up to what in this Big Government of ours, particularly when people are trying to do

things that are so obviously harmful to the American people. So I am going to talk a little bit about this mystery because I think we finally solved it. There is a culprit who is usually the culprit in a lot of bad things happening in our Federal Government, and I am going to talk about that.

So here is a little bit of background on the mystery. We passed a bipartisan infrastructure bill in November. Now, I voted for it. Some of my colleagues didn't. I voted for it primarily because I come from a resource-rich, infrastructure-poor State.

Alaska has resources—oil, gas, minerals, renewables—that can help our State and can help the country and, really, help the world, but we have very little infrastructure.

Think about this. My State is 120 times bigger than Connecticut, and we have less road miles than Connecticut. And I know we have less road miles than Maryland.

So, we need infrastructure. So Senator MURKOWSKI, Congressman YOUNG, and I participated, certainly in our own ways, on getting this infrastructure bill written and then over the goal line in terms of votes.

Overall, I thought it was a positive bill. It wasn't perfect, but especially with the focus on roads, bridges, ports, harbors, and broadband—and there is actually a provision in there for Federal loan guarantees on a huge Alaska gas project—an LNG project. So in my view, this bill was a win-win-win for jobs, infrastructure, and energy infrastructure to help bring down energy prices, and, of course, on the environment.

I like to show this chart a lot. It has gotten a lot of attention. Some of our national media folks have seen it, and they say: Gee, that can't be true. Let's PolitiFact or fact-check Senator SULLIVAN's emissions chart. So they have, and they have come back and said: Hey, gosh, he is actually right.

It shows annual emissions from the major economies in the world since 2005 to present. Who is the leader in reducing emissions? Who is the leader? We are. America is—actually, by far; not even close—with almost a 15-percent emission reduction since 2005.

Who is the main culprit of spewing emissions out into the global atmosphere? Well, you guessed it—our good friends, the Chinese communists—China, India, Iran, and Russia.

So we are the leader on this. I had the opportunity during a confirmation hearing recently for one of the Biden administration's EPA nominees in charge of air quality. I showed him this chart. He didn't seem to know a lot about the chart, but he seemed like a good guy. I asked: Hey, why do you think this happened? He kind of trotted out initially the EPA regs. Wrong answer. This is because of the revolution in the production of American gas. That is a fact, OK? You can check it all you want.

So you would think that infrastructure, part of the infrastructure bill

that can help us actually produce more energy with more energy infrastructure, that everybody would be for it—helps the environment, global emissions, certainly helps workers, and helps build out infrastructure, which we sorely need.

As I mentioned, Mr. President, big supporters of the infrastructure bill were all the trade unions in Alaska and America because they know they are going to get the jobs from the build-out of this infrastructure bill.

Now, one of the things the bill had that I thought was actually really important—it was something I worked on in the Environment and Public Works Committee—were provisions to streamline our Federal permitting system to be able to get infrastructure projects deployed and built. That was a big element of this bill—not as much as I wanted, but certainly a good start.

This has been an issue I have been working on since my time here in the Senate. It is a bipartisan issue, as the Presiding Officer knows. When you talk to mayors and Governors in America anywhere—it doesn't matter what party they are—they want the ability to have the Federal Government permit infrastructure projects so we can move them out. That is not controversial.

And here is the thing. As a country, we used to be really good at building stuff—building stuff on time, building stuff that is impressive. Just to give you a few examples—I think a lot of people know this—but our country used to be the envy of the world building great projects responsibly, efficiently, and on time. The Pentagon was built in 16 months. The Empire State Building was built in 1 year 45 days. With the 1,500-mile Alaska-Canadian Highway—what we call the ALCAN Highway, connecting the lower 48 all the way through Canada up into Alaska, 1,500 miles—it took 8 months to do that. So we know how to do this as a country.

Let's fast-forward to today. A new U.S. highway construction project, to build a highway, usually takes 9 to 19 years. That is according to the GAO. Let me just give you a couple of examples of those.

The Gross Reservoir in Colorado, which is going to offer clean water to the people of Colorado, has taken two decades of planning and permitting. To expand the Gross Reservoir northwest of Denver has taken two decades—20 years—to get this important project in Colorado permitted.

The California bullet train project was approved in the late 1990s. It is still not built. Its costs, because of permitting delays, have gone from \$33 billion to \$105 billion.

The Mountain Valley Pipeline in Virginia and West Virginia began in 2015 to bring natural gas. There are only 20 miles left to complete. It might not ever be completed because of permitting delays. The Federal courts are delaying, delaying, and delaying energy projects.

The Kensington mine in Alaska, which now employs over 400 people—it is a gold mine with an average wage, by the way, of over \$100,000, the average wage—took 20 years to permit if you include the litigation. The list goes on and on and on.

When NEPA was originally passed, the EIS, the environmental impact statement, was to take less than a year. It usually took less than a year and was usually a couple hundred pages. Now the average EIS takes 4 to 6 years to complete on any project in America, and it usually costs several millions of dollars. We are killing ourselves as a country in our ability to build or to not build infrastructure projects.

What did we do in the infrastructure bill? It was bipartisan. We worked together and put together some pretty good permitting reform provisions. They are not nearly as good as I would have wanted them, but they were pretty good, pretty good, to get the infrastructure that is in this bill—roads; bridges; ports; yes, energy projects of pipelines for oil and gas, which we need—built quickly or at least in a reasonable amount of time, not in 20 years.

So here is the mystery. That all happened. The President said he liked it. The unions really liked it. The building trades—the men and women who build stuff in this country—liked it. I have worked with Terry O'Sullivan, the great leader of the Laborers, on permitting reform—this very issue. We have got some good things in there. So what is the mystery?

Here is the mystery: After all of this work and the President touting the infrastructure bill and our getting ready to build and having good impacts in terms of natural gas, not just on environment and emissions but in continuing to make us the global leader, the White House set out new rules in April, under NEPA, for infrastructure projects.

What did they do? They made the NEPA rules much harder to actually build infrastructure, not just for oil and gas, but it targeted oil and gas. This is for all infrastructure—roads, bridges, ports, renewable projects, LNG projects, natural gas projects.

The White House put out new NEPA rules rescinding the Trump administration's rules, which were quite good and similar to some of the reforms we got in the infrastructure bill, and everybody knows that these White House rules are going to delay infrastructure projects. Why in the heck would we do that as a country? We just passed a big infrastructure bill with permitting reform in it, and somebody over at the White House said: No, let's make it harder.

Here is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal that talks about the infrastructure NEPA regs. It is called: "How to Kill American Infrastructure on the Sly. The White House revises

NEPA rules that will scuttle [the ability to build] new roads, bridges and oil and gas pipelines.”

(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this editorial.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Wall Street Journal, April 20, 2022]

HOW TO KILL AMERICAN INFRASTRUCTURE ON THE SLY

(By The Wall Street Journal Editorial Board)

Americans are going to need a split-screen for the Biden Administration's policy contradictions. Even as the President on Tuesday promoted the bipartisan infrastructure bill he signed last November, the White House moved to make it harder to build roads, bridges and, of course, oil and natural-gas pipelines.

The White House Council on Environmental Quality is revising rules under the National Environmental Policy Act for permitting major construction projects. CEQ Chair Brenda Mallory says the changes will “provide regulatory certainty” and “reduce conflict.” Instead, they will cause more litigation and delays that raise construction costs, if they don't kill projects outright.

NEPA requires federal agencies to review the environmental impact of major projects that are funded by the feds or require a federal permit. Reviews can take years and run thousands of pages, covering the smallest potential impact on species, air or water quality. Project developers can be forced to mitigate these effects by, say, relocating species.

While the 1970 law was intended to prevent environmental disasters, it has become a weapon to block development. The Trump Administration sought to fast-track projects by limiting NEPA reviews to environmental effects that are directly foreseeable—e.g., how a pipeline's construction would affect a stream it crosses.

Some liberal judges, however, have interpreted NEPA broadly to require the study of effects that indirectly result from a project such as CO2 emissions. Now the Biden Administration is mandating this. CEQ's new rule will require agencies to calculate the “indirect” and “cumulative impacts” that “can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” This means death by a thousand regulatory cuts for many projects.

The Transportation Department will likely have to examine how a highway expansion could increase greenhouse-gas emissions in concert with new warehouses. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission might have to calculate how a new pipeline would affect emissions from upstream production and downstream consumption.

Wait—didn't FERC recently walk back its policy to do exactly this? The White House is thumbing its nose at West Virginia Sen. Joe Manchin, who blasted FERC's now-suspended policy for shutting “down the infrastructure we desperately need as a country.”

The rule's obvious intent is to make it harder to build pipelines, roads and other infrastructure that would enable more U.S. oil and gas production, even as the Administration makes phony gestures to reduce energy prices. Last Friday the Administration announced it would comply with a court order to hold oil and gas lease sales on public land. Those leases won't matter if energy companies can't get federal permits for rights-of-way.

While fossil fuels may be the rule's political target, don't be surprised if green energy is snagged in this trip-wire. Environmental groups have used NEPA to block new mineral mines and transmission lines that connect distant renewable energy sources to population centers. In this Administration, the left hand doesn't seem to know what the far left hand is doing.

Mr. SULLIVAN. So the new rules come out. They are clearly meant to kill infrastructure, especially oil and gas but kind of everything. The President is touting this infrastructure bill as one of his big achievements. It was bipartisan. A number of us, myself included, voted for it, but there is somebody out there who is trying to make sure the infrastructure doesn't get built. Hmm. That is the mystery. That is the mystery. Who would do that? Well, heck. I am trying to find the answer because I really care about this issue—permitting reform—in order to get infrastructure projects built. My State has been ground zero about projects being delayed. So who is it?

So I am starting to ask around the White House. Secretary Granholm was testifying in front of the Armed Services Committee 2 weeks ago.

I raised this issue with her: Madam Secretary, who the heck is doing it? Are you?

Senator, I didn't know anything about this CQ rule.

It is a little surprising. I mean, there was a lot about energy, but that is what she said in the hearing. Go take a look at it. I believe her. I don't think she was pushing to delay infrastructure.

Would it be the Secretary of Labor, Marty Walsh? He is a former laborer, a LIUNA guy, right? I supported Marty Walsh strongly because I talked to him before his confirmation about—Hey, look. There is a group in the White House who hates energy even though it has great jobs, and there are some in the White House who think that they want to help the building trades build stuff. If you are with that group, Marty Walsh, I will support you as Secretary of Labor. He said he was. So I don't think it is he.

As a matter of fact, when these regs came out, the Laborers' International put out a statement, saying:

Once again, communities in need of vital infrastructure and the hard-working men and women who build America will be waiting as project details are subjected to onerous reviews [by these new rules].

This is the Laborers' International. The men and women who build stuff are not happy about this new NEPA rule.

Americans will continue to bear the expense of NEPA-related delays, which cost taxpayers millions of dollars annually. Lengthy review processes and unpredictable legal challenges [will result from these new NEPA regs. They will have] a chilling impact on private investment in infrastructure.

Of course, when we need energy, these new NEPA rules will make it harder for Americans to get energy, and the price of energy is going to continue to go like this: on the backs of working families.

So was it the Secretary of Labor pushing this? I doubt it. I doubt it.

Who was it?

Well, as I have said on the floor of the U.S. Senate many times before, if there is something bad happening to the national interests of our country either domestically or internationally, it is probably not farfetched to assume John Kerry is near it. There is nobody in the Biden administration who so regularly tries to undermine America's national interests than John Kerry's kowtowing to the Chinese Communist Party or kissing up to Iranian terrorists. When Putin began his barbaric invasion of Ukraine, John Kerry publicly voiced his first concerns not about people dying and not about a democracy being overrun by a dictator; it was how Vladimir Putin might take his eye off his climate change goals.

This is embarrassing as Americans. He is a senior official. Now, he has no power in terms of being confirmed by the Senate. Yes, he is a former Secretary of State and a former Senator, but on these issues, he is so out of touch with the average American.

So who was pushing these new NEPA rules to delay energy projects for America? It is the big mystery. Heck, I don't even think it was the President. He seems proud of this infrastructure bill. He has told all of the unions he wants them to get to work and build, but now we have a new rule that is going to delay the building of infrastructure.

The mystery is solved. The mystery is solved.

This is a headline from a TIME magazine news story that just came out yesterday of John Kerry saying:

“We Have to Push Back Hard” on Efforts to Build New [Energy] Infrastructure in Response to Rising Gas Prices.

We have to push back hard. You can't make this stuff up. This is the guy. This is the guy. So we have a new bunch of Federal rules right now, driven by this guy—and probably Gina McCarthy—who want to drive up energy prices and make it harder for infrastructure to be built, which is exactly what this will do. Nobody is even arguing against that. It will drive up energy prices on the backs of working-class Americans, and now he is out publicly saying that we have got to do it—stop infrastructure.

We have this new revisionism suggesting we have to be producing more energy. Well, yes, we do. It is amazing. You never know whose side this guy is on, but he is not on America's side, I will tell you that.

So this is a new regulation, a NEPA reg. We have the authority here in Congress to use what is called a Congressional Review Act, a CRA. We have the power, when a new reg comes out, to say: No, we don't like that in the Senate. We are going to have a vote, a Congressional Review Act vote, on whether to rescind an amendment that is clearly driven by this guy—a regulation by

this guy—that will delay energy projects; that will delay renewable projects; that will make sure Americans continue to pay record high energy prices.

So we are going to have a vote on that. I plan on bringing that resolution to the floor soon. It is a privileged resolution, so we will get a vote whether Majority Leader SCHUMER wants to vote on it or not.

I am assuming the President will like my CRA because he can't want delays to his infrastructure bill. He can't want delays to getting energy relief for American families. This guy does, right? So we are going to have a little test, and we will have another mystery solved here on the Senate floor.

Two weeks ago, in the Commerce Committee, I had a little debate with a couple of my colleagues, friends of mine, but I made a statement, which I think is very true. It is certainly true in my State, and it is this: At the national level, my Democratic colleagues, when they have a choice between supporting guys like this and his radical environmental allies and the working men and women of America who want to build stuff, they always choose him and his allies.

My colleagues—some of them—really got upset: How can you say that, DAN? That is not true.

Well, it is true in Alaska. I see it every day.

So my CRA is going to just ask a simple question: Whom are you for? Whom do you stand with? Do you stand with the American working families, the laborers, the people who build the infrastructure that we need, the families who are suffering from high energy costs or this guy and his radical environmental ally and special interests who have a lot of power in this White House and who are clearly behind this reg that I am trying to rescind to make it harder to build infrastructure, especially American energy infrastructure?

For my colleagues who say no, we are with the working men and women of America—we will see. We will see. I hope you vote with me to rescind this reg that is only harming our country, only harming working families, only harming working Americans, and promotes the radical, out-of-touch agenda of John Kerry, Gina McCarthy, and the far-left, woke environmental interests that they answer to. It is going to be an interesting vote, and the American people are going to be watching.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

H.R. 3967

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this week, the Senate has worked towards passing the largest expansion of healthcare benefits for our veterans in a very long time. Millions of veterans today face the flabbergasting indignity. They served our country valiantly, were exposed to toxic chemicals in the line of duty but cannot get the healthcare benefits they need because of outdated rules at the VA.

This needs to change, and the PACT Act would provide the fix. Many on both sides want to get this bill done as soon as we can. We cannot have dilatory or destructive amendments to the PACT Act because it is too important for our veterans' well-being.

To that end, Democrats have spent the day working with Republicans on a list of amendments, and these negotiations are ongoing. But while we work on an agreement and to keep the process moving, I will be filing cloture so we can take the next step towards passing the PACT Act next week. We hope to get an agreement—and we are making good progress there—so we hope to get an agreement before that, but the legislative process must move forward.

So for the sake of our veterans who have made the ultimate sacrifice serving our Nation and defending our freedom, there is no reason we can't pass the PACT Act ASAP. Our discussions continue with our Republican colleagues in an effort to get that done, and I am hopeful that we will succeed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5076

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have an amendment to the underlying bill at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5076 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment numbered 5051.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 3 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Tester substitute amendment No. 5051 to Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967, a bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Jon Tester, Tammy Duckworth, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Kyrsten Sinema, Mark Kelly, Christopher Murphy, Sherrod Brown, Tina Smith, Jacky Rosen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Jeanne Shaheen, Mazie Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967, a bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Jon Tester, Tammy Duckworth, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Kyrsten Sinema, Mark Kelly, Christopher Murphy, Sherrod Brown, Tina Smith, Jacky Rosen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Jeanne Shaheen, Mazie K. Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, Thursday, June 9, be waived.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3967

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments to substitute amendment No. 5051 and the underlying bill, H.R. 3967, be at 4 p.m., Monday, June 13.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 849, 850, 851, 853, 854; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dana Katherine Bilyeu, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2023 (Reappointment); Leona M. Bridges, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2023; Stacie Olivares, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2024; Michael F. Gerber, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2022; and Michael F. Gerber, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the

Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2026 (Reappointment) en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 22-0G. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 18-19 of June 26, 2018.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22-0G

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(C), AECA)

(i) Purchaser: Government of Spain.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 18-19; Date: June 26, 2018; Implementing Agency: Navy.

(iii) Description: On June 26, 2018, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 18-19, of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of five (5) AEGIS Weapons Systems (AWS) MK7, six (6) shipsets Digital Signal Processing, five (5) shipsets AWS Computing Infrastructure MARK 1 MOD 0, five (5) shipsets Operational Readiness Test Systems (ORTS), five (5) shipsets MK 99 MOD 14 Fire Control System, five (5) shipsets MK 41 Baseline VII Vertical Launching Systems (VLS), two (2) All-Up-Round MK 54 Mod 0

lightweight torpedoes, twenty (20) SM-2 Block IIIB missiles and MK 13 canisters with AN/DKT-71 warhead compatible telemeter. Also included was one (1) S4 AWS computer program, five (5) shipsets Ultra High Frequency (UHF) Satellite Communications (SATCOM), five (5) shipsets AN/SRQ-4 radio terminal sets, five (5) shipsets ordnance handling equipment, five (5) shipsets Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Modules (SAASM), five (5) shipsets aviation handling and support equipment, five (5) shipsets AN/SLQ-24E Torpedo countermeasures systems, five (5) shipsets LM04 Thru-Hull XBT Launcher and test canisters, one (1) shipset MK 36 MOD 6 Decoy Launching System, five (5) shipsets Link Level COMSEC (LLC) 7M for LINK 22, five (5) shipsets Maintenance Assist Module (MAM) cabinets, five (5) shipsets technical documentation, five (5) shipsets installation support material, special purpose test equipment, system engineering, technical services, on-site vendor assistance, spare parts, systems training, foreign liaison office and staging services necessary to support ship construction and delivery, spare and repair parts, tools and test equipment, support equipment, repair and return support, personnel training and training equipment, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistic and program support. The estimated total cost was \$860.4 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted \$324.4 million of this total.

On June 15, 2020, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 20-0G of an additional thirty (30) All-Up-Round MK 54 Lightweight Torpedoes (MDE). The following non-MDE items were also included: MK 54 LWT expendables; MK 54 turnaround kits; MK 54 containers; one (1) MK-695 Torpedo Systems Test Set (TSTS); Support equipment including fire control modification platforms and spare parts; torpedo spare parts; training; publications; software; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services and other related elements of logistics and program support. The addition of these items resulted in a net increase in MDE cost of \$45 million, resulting in a revised MDE cost of \$369.4 million. The total estimated case value increased to \$940.4 million.

This transmittal reports the replacement of the previously notified MDE two (2) All Up Round MK 54 Mod 0 Lightweight Torpedoes (LWT) with two (2) Exercise MK 54 Mod 0 LWTs. Also included is additional Engineering Technical Assistance for redesign of Radar Signal Processing Group configuration and updates to IAFCL design; shipsets of SAASM units and associated spares; COMSEC equipment for use between test sites; and removal of one (1) shipset MK 36 Mod 6 Decoy Launching System. The MDE total value will remain \$369.4 million; however, the non-MDE estimated value will increase from \$571 million to \$810.6 million. The total estimated case value will increase to \$1.18 billion.

(iv) Significance: The proposed articles and services will support Spain's capability to commission their new F-110 frigates with the AEGIS Weapon System (AWS).

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally which is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist Spain in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology: The Sensitivity of Technology Statement contained in

the original notification applies to items reported here.

The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 8, 2022.

CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE OF ROMANI AMERICANS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to speak about S. Res. 124 that Senator WICKER and I introduced last year celebrating the heritage of Romani Americans. I applaud the passage of this resolution which was voted on favorably in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today and will now be moved to the Senate floor for consideration.

This resolution is significant as it expresses remembrance for the genocide of the Roma by the Nazis, commends the work of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in promoting this remembrance and awareness, and further expresses support for the annual International Roma Day to honor the history, culture, and heritage of the Romani people in the United States. Roma have been part of every single wave of European migration to the United States from the Colonial period to today, and there are now an estimated 1 million Americans who have some Romani ancestry. S. Res. 124 is the first resolution considered in Congress to acknowledge Romani Americans and to celebrate their heritage and history. Its passage will be a milestone for this community.

When Senator WICKER and I introduced S. Res. 124, we observed that Romani people enrich the fabric of our Nation and strengthen the transatlantic bond. The resolution mentions two dates of particular importance on both sides of the Atlantic. First, April 8 was the date of the first World Romani Congress, held near London. That date is therefore celebrated as the moment when transatlantic efforts to improve the situation of the Roma entered a new, more visible and more productive stage.

But more than that, it has become time for policymakers to focus on continued efforts to improve the situation of Roma. Ugly discrimination against the Roma persists and needs to be addressed. The European Parliament, for example, dedicates a week in April to review and advance Romani inclusion initiatives. Governments across Europe and the OSCE also use this as a time to focus on policy and the future. This resolution welcomes and encourages the Department of State's participation in such events and activities.

The second date specifically mentioned in the resolution is the night of August 2-3, 1944, when the Romani camp at Auschwitz was liquidated and more than 4,200 Romani men, women, and children were killed in a single night.

This day has been formally recognized as a day of commemoration by

the European Union, Poland, and other countries. Based on my work over many years in the Helsinki Commission, I know that the current situation of Roma in Europe today simply cannot be understood without learning about the genocide of Roma during World War II and the enduring legacy of that tragedy.

I believe more should be done to teach about Romani experiences during the Holocaust, and we welcome the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum's support for scholarship in this area. This resolution commends the Museum for its work in promoting remembrance of the Holocaust and educating successor generations about the genocide of Roma.

The museum welcomed the introduction of this resolution last year, observing, "House and Senate passage will help raise awareness about the history of the Romani people, the richness of Romani culture, and to unequivocally reject the dehumanization of Roma and any violence directed against their communities." I look forward to the opportunity for this resolution to be adopted by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the text of S. Res. 124 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 124

Whereas the Romani people trace their ancestry to the Indian subcontinent;

Whereas Roma have been a part of European immigration to the United States since the colonial period and particularly following the abolition of the enslavement of Roma in the historic Romanian principalities;

Whereas Roma live across the world and throughout the United States;

Whereas the Romani people have made distinct and important contributions in many fields, including agriculture, art, crafts, literature, medicine, military service, music, sports, and science;

Whereas, on April 8, 1971, the First World Romani Congress met in London, bringing Roma together from across Europe and the United States with the goal of promoting transnational cooperation among Roma in combating social marginalization and building a positive future for Roma everywhere;

Whereas April 8 is therefore celebrated globally as International Roma Day;

Whereas Roma were victims of genocide carried out by Nazi Germany and its Axis partners, and an estimated 200,000 to 500,000 Romani people were killed by Nazis and their allies across Europe during World War II;

Whereas, on the night of August 2-3, 1944, the so-called "Gypsy Family Camp" where Romani people were interned at Auschwitz-Birkenau was liquidated, and in a single night, between 4,200 and 4,300 Romani men, women, and children were killed in gas chambers;

Whereas many countries are taking positive steps to remember and teach about the genocide of Roma by Nazi Germany and its Axis partners; and

Whereas the United States Congress held its first hearing to examine the situation of Roma in 1994: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) remembers the genocide of Roma by Nazi Germany and its Axis partners and commemorates the destruction of the

"Gypsy Family Camp" where Romani people were interned at Auschwitz;

(2) commends the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for its role in promoting remembrance of the Holocaust and educating about the genocide of Roma;

(3) supports International Roma Day as an opportunity to honor the culture, history, and heritage of the Romani people in the United States as part of the larger Romani global diaspora; and

(4) welcomes the Department of State's participation in ceremonies and events celebrating International Roma Day and similar engagement by the United States Government.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK JOHNSON, JR.

• Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, I am pleased to commend Mr. Patrick Johnson, Jr., of Tunica, MS, for his service and contributions to the State of Mississippi while serving as the 86th president of Delta Council.

Organized in 1935, Delta Council plays an important role in uniting agricultural, business, and economic development leadership to solve problems and promote greater opportunities in the Mississippi Delta region, which encompasses 19 counties in northwest Mississippi.

Mr. Johnson has worked tirelessly this year to advance the priorities of Delta Council, including farm policy, economic development, flood control, and education. As a partner in Cypress Brake Planting Company, Tunica Air, Inc., and Buck Island Seed Company, he knows all too well the challenges producers currently face with increased costs and volatility in the agricultural industry. As a member of the Mississippi Commission on Environmental Quality, he is dedicated to helping find solutions to the Delta's groundwater and alluvial aquifer issues so that future generations can continue to produce crops and enjoy the recreation that is such a large part of the rich history of the Mississippi Delta. Mr. Johnson also understands the importance of economic development to the viability of the Delta and that, through efforts like Delta Strong, the region will continue to successfully attract new opportunities.

Mr. Johnson assumed the role of Delta Council president during a time characterized by difficulties, such as the ongoing and disruptive pandemic, rising inflation, and many other challenges. Patrick Johnson has been a steady and calm leader over the past year and has contributed his vast knowledge and service to many critical issues during his tenure as president.

Outside of his time spent working on his farm and serving Delta Council, Mr. Johnson contributes his time as a leader to many valuable organizations. He serves as a Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality commissioner, National Cotton Council Environmental Task Force member, American

Cotton Producers Farm Bill Task Force chairman, and Tunica County Chamber of Commerce member. In addition to serving as a member of Delta F.A.R.M., Mr. Johnson has also served on the Tunica County Farm Service Agency Committee and is a past director of the Tunica County Farm Bureau. Mr. Johnson and his wife, Emily, are members of Tunica Presbyterian Church where he sings in the choir.

It is my pleasure to join the citizens throughout the Mississippi Delta and the great State of Mississippi in offering congratulations to Mr. Patrick Johnson, Jr., and sharing our appreciation with his wife Emily Purifoy Johnson. His input over his year of service has undoubtedly contributed to the overall continued success and influence of this highly respected 87-year-old organization, Delta Council. •

RECOGNIZING THE INDEPENDENCE ASSOCIATION

• Mr. KING. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the outstanding contributions of an organization based in my hometown of Brunswick, ME. This year marks the 55th anniversary of Independence Association, and I could not be more grateful to everyone who has contributed to the organization's work to enrich our community by serving children and adults with developmental disabilities. For over half a century, Independence Association has helped individuals rise to their full potential, growing up and out as fully included, fully valued members of their communities. Their work, their creativity, and their contributions make all of us better.

The Independence Association we know today has changed over the decades. Its inception dates back to 1967—a time in which institutionalization was still prevalent—when five families founded the Youth Development Center to chart a different course for their children. The Youth Development Center immediately demonstrated that the right people, resources, and support made an inclusive and independent life a reality for their children, and they soon welcomed others with additional needs as well. That organization grew and, in 1977, became Independence Association; since then, its staff, volunteers, and parents have gone on to empower hundreds of people with disabilities to enjoy enriching lives in the Maine communities we all love.

Over the last 55 years, Independence Association has continued to be creative, collaborative, and comprehensive in supporting their clients' ever-evolving needs. Even during a pandemic, faced with severe staffing shortages, a challenging hiring environment, and stagnant reimbursement rates, Independence Association remains committed to the more than 400 clients they support and the hundreds of people they employ.

The staff, volunteers, and community partners of Independence Association

have expanded over the years, and they now offer a full range of services in nine Maine counties and more than 60 Maine cities and towns. Their services range from Spindleworks—a nationally recognized artist's collaboration, which created the State of Maine ornament for the White House Christmas tree in 2017—to single-level "Aging in Place" lifetime housing. Independence Association also provides transportation for clients who have jobs or volunteer commitments, skills training for community life, case management services, and boundless opportunities for growth and support.

As a champion of all people, Independence Association has grown and adapted with the ever-changing needs of their clients. Their vision of empowering people with disabilities has never waned, and our State is stronger because of their work. I join with the people of Maine in thanking Independence Association for its passionate caring, commitment, and unwavering service to our communities and look forward to their continued impact on our State.●

RECOGNIZING THE FOXHOLE

● Mr. PAUL. Madam President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize The Foxhole of Smiths Grove, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Take a look at any small town American Main Street, and you will likely see a common trend: small businesses are a bastion of creativity. All around the country, entrepreneurs break out into new ventures based on an idea that is uniquely theirs, and they work hard to support the enterprise that is their dream. Such is the story of Kellie B. Long and her store, The Foxhole. Founded in 2017, Kellie set out to open a store that offered a wide variety of items, from clothes and jewelry, to furnishings and tableware. In the years since her opening, the store has grown in its product variety, staff capacity, and customer reach. Though The Foxhole is well-loved by the residents of Smiths Grove, customers travel from all across Kentucky to peruse items that could only be found at this unique shop.

When customers walk in the door, they are surrounded by Kellie's unique vision for what defines beauty and creativity. This entrepreneur does not rely on products that are freshly made or unused; she curates a wide array of distinctive items that cannot be found in the typical clothes or home goods store. Moreover, Kellie appreciates the quality of a product that has been loved by a previous owner, and she takes pride in her keen eye for identifying items that deserve to be loved again. Her store offers products that

are notably vintage, along with lightly used items, as well as the occasional new and custom-made products. Despite the fact that her store is filled with products that are hard to find and potentially irreplaceable, Kellie is not shy or finicky about welcoming all clientele, even making the store dog friendly for those who cannot part with their pups. Furthermore, Kellie participates in "Second-Saturdays," which is a communal outdoor shopping experience for the residents of Smiths Grove. Second-Saturdays bring out food trucks, vendors, and entertainment for locals to shop, eat, and enjoy with their neighbors and friends.

Her participation in Second-Saturdays is not the only way Kellie stays involved in the community. Outside of her regular commercial activities, The Foxhole offers the occasional Bible study for residents of Smiths Grove to gather and share in their religion and faith. And though her Bible study is not a routine part of The Foxhole's activities, Kellie makes sure to incorporate her giving spirit into the running of her business. Every year as Americans observe Memorial Day, Kellie opens up her business to a greater cause, by donating 10 percent of her Memorial Day weekend sales to the Wounded Warriors project. Kellie understands that we all have a veteran in our life, and she does her part in giving back to the community that gave their all.

In addition to their annual sales donations to charity, Kellie is sensitive to whatever needs may arise from her Kentucky neighbors. After devastating tornados struck western Kentucky in late 2021, Kelly donated 21 percent of all of The Foxholes' sales recorded in the last 2 weeks of December to the Bowling Green Tornado relief fund. Kellie ensures that The Foxhole is a place where customers can find beautiful and unique items, while promoting community involvement and goodwill to all who dawn her storefront.

I want to congratulate this upstanding entrepreneur for her dedication to her community and for her drive to bring creativity and beauty to her corner of Kentucky. Congratulations to Kellie Long and the entire team at The Foxhole. I look forward to seeing their continued growth and success in Kentucky.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 3823. An act to amend title 11, United States Code, to modify the eligibility requirements for a debtor under chapter 13, and for other purposes.

H.R. 735. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 502 East Cotati Avenue in Cotati, California,

as the "Arturo L. Ibleto Post Office Building".

H.R. 767. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York, as the "Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building".

H.R. 1170. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 League in Irvine, California, as the "Tuskegee Airman Lieutenant Colonel Robert J. Friend Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 1444. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 132 North Loudoun Street, Suite 1 in Winchester, Virginia, as the "Patsy Cline Post Office".

H.R. 2324. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2800 South Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "D. Edwina Stephens Post Office".

H.R. 4591. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress periodic reports on the costs, performance metrics, and outcomes of the Department of Veterans Affairs Electronic Health Record Modernization program.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 12:48 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2377. An act to authorize the issuance of extreme risk protection orders.

H.R. 5879. An act to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the application of the price evaluation preference for qualified HUBZone small business concerns to certain contracts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7334. An act to extend the statute of limitations for fraud by borrowers under certain COVID-19 economic injury disaster loan programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7352. An act to amend the Small Business Act to extend the statute of limitation for fraud by borrowers under the Paycheck Protection Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7622. An act to amend the Small Business Act to include requirements relating to apprenticeship program assistance for small business development centers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7664. An act to amend the Small Business Act to include requirements relating to graduates of career and technical education programs or programs of study for small business development centers and women's business centers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7667. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7670. An act to amend the Small Business Act to require a report on small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7694. An act to amend the Small Business Act to modify the requirements relating to the evaluation of the subcontracting plans of certain offerers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7776. An act to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7910. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for an increased age

limit on the purchase of certain firearms, prevent gun trafficking, modernize the prohibition on untraceable firearms, encourage the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2377. An act to authorize the issuance of extreme risk protection orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5879. An act to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the application of the price evaluation preference for qualified HUBZone small business concerns to certain contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 7334. An act to extend the statute of limitations for fraud by borrowers under certain COVID-19 economic injury disaster loan programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 7352. An act to amend the Small Business Act to extend the statute of limitation for fraud by borrowers under the Paycheck Protection Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 7622. An act to amend the Small Business Act to include requirements relating to apprenticeship program assistance for small business development centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 7664. An act to amend the Small Business Act to include requirements relating to graduates of career and technical education programs or programs of study for small business development centers and women's business centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 7670. An act to amend the Small Business Act to require a report on small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 7694. An act to amend the Small Business Act to modify the requirements relating to the evaluation of the subcontracting plans of certain offerors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 7776. An act to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 138. A bill to waive certain pay limitations for Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior employees engaged

in emergency wildland fire suppression activities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-119).

H.R. 4363. An act to establish a daily public reporting requirement for covered contract awards of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117-120).

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.R. 6089. An act to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Michael Battle, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Tanzania.

Nominee: Michael A. Battle Sr.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to The United Republic of Tanzania.

(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:

All the contributions listed below were jointly donated by me (Michael A. Battle Sr.) and my wife (Linda A. Battie): \$25, 2019-04-25, Biden; \$20, 2019-05-02, Biden; \$20, 2019-06-02, Biden; \$20, 2019-08-02, Biden; \$20, 2019-09-02, Biden; \$20, 2019-10-02, Biden; \$20, 2019-11-02, Biden; \$20, 2020-01-02, Biden; \$50, 2020-01-02, Biden; \$22, 2020-01-28, Biden; \$15, 2020-01-28, Biden; \$42, 2020-02-28, Biden; \$25, 2020-03-04, Biden; \$25, 2020-03-17, Biden; \$23, 2020-05-01, Biden; \$20, 2020-05-08, Biden; \$23, 2020-05-27, Biden; \$26, 2020-07-05, Biden; \$25, 2020-07-13, Biden; \$1,000, 2020-07-28, Biden; \$26, 2020-08-03, Biden; \$25, 2020-08-13, Biden; \$25, 2020-08-20, Biden; \$25, 2020-09-01, Biden; \$500, 2020-09-17, Biden; \$25, 2020-10-14, Biden; \$50, 2021-01-09, Biden; \$50, 2020-01-09, Warnock; \$25, 2021-08-10, Warnock; \$40, 2020-03-23, DNC*; \$20, 2020-04-22, DNC; \$40, 2020-05-06, DNC; \$10, 2020-08-20, DNC; \$25, 2021-01-23, DNC; \$50, 2020-12-01, GDP*; \$25, 2020-12-20, Biden.

Inaugural

*DNC Democratic National Committee

*GDP Georgia Democratic Party

Elizabeth H. Richard, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large.

Nominee: Elizabeth H. Richard.

Post: Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the Rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Elizabeth Richard, None. Christopher Richard (spouse. Deceased), None.

Margaret C. Whitman, of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Pleni-

potentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kenya.

Nominee: Margaret Cushing Whitman.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Kenya.

(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:

General Motors Company Political Action Committee (GM PAC), \$5,000.00, 9/15/2021, Whitman, Margaret C; The Procter & Gamble Company Good Government Fund, \$5,000.00, 3/12/2021, Whitman Meg; New Hampshire Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 10/5/2020, Whitman, Meg; Michigan Democratic State Central Committee, \$10,000.00, 9/9/2020, Whitman, Meg; Hickenlooper for Colorado, \$2,800.00, 9/8/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Hickenlooper Victory Fund, \$2,800.00 9/3/2020, Whitman, Meg; Brynne Kennedy for Congress, \$2,800.00, 8/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; Capito for West Virginia, \$1,000.00, 7/24/2020, Whitman, Meg; Nevada State Democratic Party, \$10,000.00 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, \$106,500.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, \$32,700.00 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Georgia Federal Elections Committee, \$10,000.00 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; New Jersey Democratic State Committee, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Democratic State Committee (Delaware), \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Mississippi Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Democratic State Central Committee of Maryland, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Arizona Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret C; Democratic State Central Committee of LA, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret C; Massachusetts Democratic State Committee, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Biden Victory Fund, \$500,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Texas Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; Democratic Party of Wisconsin, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Kansas Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; Nebraska Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret C; Democratic Executive Committee of Florida, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret C; Ohio Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret C; Democratic Party of Virginia, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret, C; Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Pennsylvania Democratic Party, \$10,000.00 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, \$14,500.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret C MS; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, \$92,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret, C MS; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, \$4,300.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg C.; Colorado Democratic Party, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret C; North Carolina Democratic Party—Federal, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; State Democratic Executive Committee of Alabama, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Margaret; WVDP, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; New York State Democratic Committee, \$10,000.00, 6/26/2020, Whitman, Meg; DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee, \$2,800.00, 6/3/2020, Whitman, Margaret; Biden Victory Fund, \$5,600.00, 6/3/2020, Whitman Meg; Biden for President, \$2,800.00, 6/3/2020, Whitman, Meg; The Procter & Gamble Company Good Government Fund, \$5,000.00, 3/12/2020, Whitman, Meg; Jersey Values PAC, \$5,000.00, 11/6/2019, Whitman, Meg;

Across the Aisle PAC, \$5,000.00, 11/6/2019, Whitman, Margaret; Josh Gottheimer for Congress, \$2,800.00, 10/31/2019, Whitman, Margaret; Josh Gottheimer for Congress, \$2,800.00, 10/31/2019, Whitman, Meg; Max Rose for Congress, \$2,200.00, 10/31/2019, Whitman, Margaret; Elaine for Congress, \$2,200.00 10/31/2019, Whitman, Margaret; Biden for President, \$2,800.00, 9/26/2019, Whitman, Margaret; Hickenlooper 2020, \$2,000.00, 4/30/2019, Whitman, Margaret; The Procter & Gamble Company Good Government Fund, \$5,000.00, 3/26/2019, Whitman, Margaret C; American Possibilities PAC, \$5,000.00, 10/4/2018, Whitman, Margaret C; Josh Gottheimer for Congress, \$2,700.00, 10/4/2018, Whitman, Margaret; DCCC, \$1,499.98, 9/28/2018, Whitman, Margaret; UNITE America Election Fund, \$95,500.00, 9/25/2018, Whitman, Meg; Red to Blue Victory Fund, \$2,500.00, 9/24/2018, Whitman, Margaret; Romney for Utah, Inc., \$2,700.00, 6/26/2018, Whitman, Meg; Romney for Utah Inc., \$2,700.00, 6/26/2018, Whitman, Margaret C; Manchin for West Virginia, \$2,700.00, 6/7/2018, Whitman, Margaret C; Manchin for West Virginia, \$2,700.00, 6/7/2018, Whitman, Margaret C.; House Majority PAC, \$25,000.00, 5/31/2018, Whitman, Margaret; Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company PAC (HPE PAC), \$5,000.00, 5/31/2018, Whitman, Meg; The Procter & Gamble Company Good Government Fund, \$5,000.00, 4/4/2018, Whitman, Margaret C MS; Tom Reed for Congress, \$2,700.00, 11/16/2017, Whitman Margaret C MS; Team Graham Inc., \$2,500.00, 10/27/2017, Whitman, Meg C; Project West Political Action Committee, \$2,500.00, 10/23/2017, Whitman, Margaret C; Denali Leadership PAC, \$2,500.00, 9/30/2017, Whitman, Meg; Sensible American Solutions Supporting Everyone PAC, \$5,000.00, 9/29/2017, Whitman, Margaret; Dirigo PAC, \$2,500.00, 9/28/2017, Whitman, Meg; Comstock for Congress, \$2,700.00, 9/27/2017, Whitman, Meg; Josh Gottheimer for Congress, \$2,700.00, 9/24/2017, Whitman, Margaret; Jeff Flake for US Senate Inc., \$2,700.00, 9/20/2017, Whitman, Meg; Jeff Flake for US Senate Inc., \$2,700.00, 9/20/2017, Whitman, Meg; Team Josh, \$2,700.00, 9/11/2017, Whitman, Meg; Citizens for Josh Mandel Inc., \$2,700.00, 9/11/2017, Whitman, Meg; The Procter & Gamble Company Good Government Fund, \$5,000.00, 3/27/2017, Whitman, Margaret; Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company PAC (HPE PAC), \$5,000.00, 3/9/2017, Whitman, Margaret; Griffith Harsh—None.

Mari Carmen Aponte, of Puerto Rico, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panama.

Nominee: Mari Carmen Aponte.

Post: Republic of Panama.

(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:

Committee to re-elect Nydia M. Velazquez to Congress, \$1,000, 03/21/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Menendez for Senate, \$500, 03/22/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Menendez for Senate, \$500, 03/26/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Kaine for Virginia, \$250, 04/09/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Beto for Texas, \$1,000, 07/18/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Espallat for Congress, \$500, 08/20/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Menendez for Senate, \$1,000, 10/17/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Menendez for Senate, \$1,000, 11/01/18, Mari Carmen Aponte; Committee to re-elect Nydia M. Velazquez to Congress, \$1,000, 03/19/19, Mari Carmen Aponte; ActBlue, \$100, 04/25/19, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$1,000, 08/06/19, Mari Carmen Aponte; Committee to re-elect Nydia M. Velazquez to Congress,

\$750, 09/09/19, Mari Carmen Aponte; Melissa Mark-Viverito for the Bronx, \$1,000, 09/18/19, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$500, 12/09/19, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$500, 03/01/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Anibal Comisionado 2020, \$500, 03/06/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$1,000, 04/08/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$700, 04/08/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$250, 04/30/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$1,000, 06/09/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$25, 06/16/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; ActBlue, \$25, 06/16/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$10, 06/17/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Committee to re-elect Nydia M. Velazquez to Congress, \$1,000, 06/18/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Anibal Comisionado 2020, \$500, 06/23/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden Victory Fund, \$5, 07/02/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$5, 07/02/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden Victory Fund, \$250, 07/14/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$250, 07/14/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden Victory Fund, \$5,600, 07/22/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden for President, \$560, 07/22/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Pres. Transition Fund, \$5,000, 08/03/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden Victory Fund, \$25, 08/12/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Michelle for Kansas, \$1,000, 09/07/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Anibal Comisionado 2020, \$500, 09/08/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Menendez for Senate, \$1,000, 09/20/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Blue Victory Fund, \$250, 10/02/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Committee to re-elect Nydia M. Velazquez to Congress, \$2,800, 10/04/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Blue Victor Fund, \$275, 10/11/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Biden Victory Fund, \$50, 10/15/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Anibal Comisionado 2020, \$250, 10/19/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Black Economic Alliance PAC, \$1,000, 12/01/20, Mari Carmen Aponte; Sharice for Congress, \$250, 03/26/21, Mari Carmen Aponte; Committee to re-elect Nydia M. Velazquez to Congress, \$2,500, 04/01/21, Mari Carmen Aponte; Menendez for Senate, \$900, 05/27/21, Mari Carmen Aponte; Menendez for Senate, \$100, 05/27/21, Mari Carmen Aponte; Voto Latino, \$500, 06/03/21, Mari Carmen Aponte.

Michelle Kwan, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belize.

Nominee: Michelle Kwan.

Post: Belize.

(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:

Biden for President, \$25, 1/20/20, Michelle Kwan; Act Blue, \$25, 1/20/20, Michelle Kwan; Biden for President, \$250, 9/16/20, Michelle Kwan.

Michael J. Adler, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Sudan.

Nominee: Michael Adler.

Post: South Sudan.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

John T. Godfrey, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Ex-

traordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Sudan.

Nominee: John T. Godfrey.

Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Sudan.

(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:

None, John T. Godfrey.

None, Jennifer J. Hall Godfrey.

Michael C. Gonzales, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zambia.

Nominee: Michael C. Gonzales.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia.

(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:

Biden for President, \$400, April 27, 2020, Self; ActBlue (for Pete Buttigieg), \$100, August 10, 2019, Self; ActBlue (for Kamala Harris), \$250, January 26, 2019, Self.

Carol Ann Jenkins—Spouse—None.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Roxana Aguirre and ending with Peter S. Zube, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 17, 2021.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Barrett David Bumpas and ending with Charles Y. Wang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2022. (minus 1 nominee: Ryan Giralte)

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary.

John Z. Lee, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Salvador Mendoza, Jr., of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Stephen Henley Locher, of Iowa, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.

Nancy L. Maldonado, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Gregory Brian Williams, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

Joshua H. Hurwit, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho, for the term of four years.

Gerard M. Karam, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.

Jacqueline C. Romero, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern

District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE—TREATY

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 115-3: Amendments to the Treaty on Fisheries between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America with 1 declaration (Ex. Rept. 117-3)

The text of the committee-recommended resolution of advice and consent to ratification is as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Amendments to the Treaty on Fisheries between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America done at Port Moresby April 2, 1987, as amended, done at Nadi, Fiji, December 3, 2016 ("the Amendments") (Treaty Doc. 115-3), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Amendments are not self-executing.

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. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PADILLA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4365. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4366. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to seek to cooperate with allies and partners in the Middle East to identify an architecture and develop an acquisition approach for certain countries in the Middle East to implement an integrated air and missile defense capability to protect the people, infrastructure, and territory of such countries from cruise and ballistic missiles, manned and unmanned aerial system, and rocket attacks from Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4367. A bill to improve certain sexual assault and domestic violence prevention policies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4368. A bill to establish the Office of Global Competition Analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 4369. A bill to allow States and local educational agencies to use any remaining COVID-19 elementary and secondary school emergency relief funds for school security measures; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 4370. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for extensions of detention of certain aliens ordered removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4371. A bill to establish the Cesar E. Chavez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park in the States of California and Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4372. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to carry out a pilot program on developing and testing dynamic management of special activity airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 4373. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify delayed notice requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 4374. A bill to prevent price gouging at the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4375. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to establish special pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces assigned to cold weather operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 4376. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to sentencing of armed career criminals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 4377. A bill to designate the El Paso Community Healing Garden National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. Res. 668. A resolution designating June 12, 2022, as "Women Veterans Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 669. A resolution condemning the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizing the effect of conflict on global food security and famine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 346

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 346, a bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1116, a bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employees duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1167

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1167, a bill to eliminate subsidies for fossil-fuel production.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1428

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1625, a bill to authorize notaries public to perform, and to establish minimum standards for, electronic notarizations and remote notarizations that occur in or affect interstate commerce, to require any Federal court to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any State, to require any State to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any

other State when the notarization was performed under or relates to a public Act, record, or judicial proceeding of the notarial officer's State or when the notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 1692

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1692, a bill to provide better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related to dementias and their caregivers, while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

S. 2964

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2964, a bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 3357

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3357, a bill to substantially restrict the use of animal testing for cosmetics.

S. 3603

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3603, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to improve the ability of veterans to access medical care in medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and in the community by providing veterans the ability to choose health care providers.

S. 3607

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3607, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 3711

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3711, a bill to ensure that no cost reduction or cash refund is due under certain transportation cost-reimbursement contracts on the basis of the forgiveness of certain covered loans, and for other purposes.

S. 3741

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3741, a bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the private interim storage of spent nuclear fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 3797

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3797, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to support still-birth prevention and research, and for other purposes.

S. 3956

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3956, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a grant program to improve the effectiveness of education and outreach on "Do Not Flush" labeling, and to require the Federal Trade Commission, in consultation with the Administrator, to issue regulations requiring certain products to have "Do Not Flush" labeling, and for other purposes.

S. 4102

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 4102, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update the resource limit for supplemental security income eligibility.

S. 4217

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4217, a bill to ensure transparent and competitive transportation fuel markets in order to protect consumers from unwarranted price increases.

S. 4272

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4272, a bill to improve promotion practices in the National Guard, and for other purposes.

S. 4278

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4278, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the purchase of certain firearms by individuals under 21 years of age, and for other purposes.

S. 4290

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4290, a bill to impose certain requirements relating to the renegotiation or reentry into the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action or other agreement relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 4316

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4316, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to update and clarify its rule on substances generally recognized as safe and to es-

tablish within the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition of the Food and Drug Administration the Office of Food Chemical Safety Reassessment, and for other purposes.

S. 4331

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4331, a bill to require a plan on emergency military assistance to Taiwan and other support to Taiwan's defensive capabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 4364

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4364, a bill to prohibit contracting with persons that have business operations with the Government of the Russian Federation or the Russian energy sector, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 664

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 664, a resolution expressing opposition to the criminalization of essential healthcare, including the full range of sexual and reproductive healthcare such as abortion, gender-affirming care, and contraceptive care, and disapproving of the criminalization of pregnancy outcomes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5048

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 5048 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3967, a bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5061

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5061 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3967, a bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5072

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5072 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3967, a bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5075

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 5075 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3967, a bill to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4367. A bill to improve certain sexual assault and domestic violence prevention policies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print my bill for introduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The bill improves certain sexual assault and domestic violence prevention policies.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 4367

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting our Servicemembers through Proven Methods Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL PRIMARY PREVENTION RESEARCH AGENDA.

Section 549A(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

“(2) include a focus on whether and to what extent sub-populations of the military community may be targeted for sexual assault, sexual harassment, or domestic violence more than others;

“(3) seek to identify factors that influence the prevention, perpetration, and victimization of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and domestic violence;

“(4) seek to improve the collection and dissemination of data on hazing and bullying related to sexual assault, sexual harassment, and domestic violence;”; and

(3) in paragraph (6), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, by amending the text to read as follows:

“(6) incorporate collaboration with other Federal departments and agencies, including the Department of Health and Human Services and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, State governments, academia, industry, federally funded research and development centers, nonprofit organizations, and other organizations outside of the Department of Defense, including civilian institutions that conduct similar data-driven studies, collection, and analysis; and”.

SEC. 3. PRIMARY PREVENTION WORKFORCE.

Section 549B of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report comparing the sexual harassment and prevention training of the Department of Defense with similar programs at other Federal departments and agencies and including data collected by colleges and universities and other relevant outside entities.”; and

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

“(e) INCORPORATION OF RESEARCH AND FINDINGS.—The Primary Prevention Workforce

established under subsection (a) shall, on a regular basis, incorporate findings and conclusions from the primary prevention research agenda established under section 549A, as appropriate, into the work of the workforce.”.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4371. A bill to establish the Cesar E. Chavez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park in the States of California and Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the César E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park Act.

This legislation would establish the César E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park in California and Arizona to preserve the nationally significant sites associated with César Chávez and the farm worker movement.

In 2008, with strong bipartisan support, Congress enacted legislation directing the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of sites that are significant to the life of César Chávez and the farm labor movement in the Western United States. The National Park Service evaluated over 100 sites that were significant to César Chávez and the farm labor movement in the Western United States and found that five sites were “nationally significant.” Importantly, the Park Service wrote that these nationally significant sites depict a distinct and important aspect of American history associated with civil rights and labor movements that are not adequately represented or protected elsewhere. While the Park Service provided five management alternatives to protect these special places, they ultimately recommended that Congress establish a national historic park that would include several nationally significant sites.

In 2012, President Obama established the César E. Chávez National Monument. The property is in Keene, CA and is known as Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz. In his Presidential Proclamation, President Obama said: “This site marks the extraordinary achievements and contributions to the history of the United States made by César Chávez and the farm worker movement that he led with great vision and fortitude. La Paz reflects his conviction that ordinary people can do extraordinary things.”

While this was a critical step forward, the National Monument leaves out many nationally significant sites and leaves many important stories untold. The creation of a national historical park, as originally recommended by the Park Service, would allow the National Park Service to tell the full story of César Chávez and the farm labor movement for the benefit of all Americans.

This legislation would establish the Forty Acres in Delano, CA; the César

E. Chávez National Monument, which includes La Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz, in Keene, CA; and the Santa Rita Center in Phoenix, AZ, as part of a new César E. Chávez and Farmworker Movement National Historical Park. These sites contain nationally significant resources associated with César Chávez and the farmworker movement and would be preserved and protected as part of the National Park System.

This legislation would also establish a new National Historic Trail that would commemorate the 1966 Delano to Sacramento March, a major milestone event in the farm labor movement. According to the Special Resource Study, “More than one hundred men and women set out from Delano on March 17, 1966, and thousands of farm workers and their families joined in for short stretches along the way. By the time the marchers entered Sacramento on Easter Sunday, April 10, 1966, the farm worker movement had secured a contract and attracted new waves of support from across the country.”

We must honor and celebrate the life and legacy of César Chávez, the inspirational civil rights advocate and leader of the farm labor movement whose impact reverberated in California and across the world. His list of accomplishments is long, from creating the Nation’s first permanent agricultural labor union to helping secure passage of the first American law that recognized farm workers’ rights to organize.

While widely respected as the most important Latino leader in the United States in the 20th century, César Chávez was not just a leader for the Latino community. Following the principles of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr., César Chávez led a nonviolent movement of protests and boycotts to secure a union, better pay, and better working conditions for farmworkers. He also played a leading role in the broader labor movement, the Chicano movement, and the environmental movement. For Chávez, it did not matter where you came from or what your job was: he believed in the fundamental right to dignity and respect.

But this park will not just focus on Chavez’s legacy; it will also preserve the thousands of stories of people who played a role in the broader farm labor movement. According to the Special Resource Study, “During the 1960s, the farm labor movement attracted support from a wide array of individuals, including members of other unions, religious leaders, civil rights activists, high school students and college students (including young Chicanos and Filipinos), environmentalists, and justice-minded consumers across the country and abroad.”

As the son of immigrants from Mexico and the first Latino to represent California in the U.S. Senate, I believe the movement César Chávez created is just as important today as it ever has been. The National Park System—which preserves our natural, historical, and cultural heritage while offering

vital spaces for teaching, learning, and outdoor recreation—must paint the full mosaic of America. Through the sites preserved by this bill, we can ensure that the National Park System preserves the diverse history of our Nation that is too often overlooked. As a farm worker himself, César Chávez maintained a strong connection to the natural environment. This bill uplifts his story and those of others whose contributions helped build the farmworker and civil rights movements that are pillars of American history.

I thank the bill's cosponsors in the Senate and House of Representatives, and I especially want to thank Congressman RUIZ for spearheading this effort with me to ensure that our national monuments and historical parks better reflect the diversity of America's heritage.

Today and every day, let's recommit to the work César Chávez began. As he would say: *La Lucha Sigue*. We must not waver as we keep up the fight for justice and equality for all.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the César E. Chávez National Historical Park Act as quickly as possible.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4372. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to carry out a pilot program on developing and testing dynamic management of special activity airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4372

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 "Dynamic Airspace Pilot Program Act of 2022."

SEC. 2. DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF DYNAMIC SCHEDULING AND MANAGEMENT OF SPECIAL ACTIVITY AIRSPACE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON SPECIAL ACTIVITY AIRSPACE SCHEDULING AND MANAGEMENT.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) where it does not conflict with safety, dynamic scheduling and management of special activity airspace (also referred to as "dynamic airspace") is expected to optimize the use of the national airspace system for all stakeholders; and

(2) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Secretary of Defense should take such actions as may be necessary to support ongoing efforts to develop dynamic scheduling and management of special activity airspace, including—

(A) the continuation of formal partnerships between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense that focus on special activity airspace, future airspace needs, and joint solutions; and

(B) maturing research within their federally funded research and development cen-

ters, Federal partner agencies, and the aviation community.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a pilot program on developing and testing dynamic management of special activity airspace in order to accommodate emerging military training requirements through flexible scheduling, along with increasing access to special activity airspace used by the Department of Defense for test and training.

(2) TESTING OF SPECIAL ACTIVITY AIRSPACE SCHEDULING AND MANAGEMENT.—Under the pilot program established under paragraph (1), the Administrator and the Secretary shall jointly test not fewer than three areas of episodic or permanent special activity airspace designated by the Federal Aviation Administration for use by the Department of Defense, of which—

(A) at least one shall be over coastal waters of the United States;

(B) at least two shall be over land of the United States;

(C) access to airspace available for test and training is increased to accommodate dynamic scheduling of airspace to more efficiently and realistically provide test and training capabilities to Department of Defense aircrews; and

(D) any increase in access to airspace made available for test and training shall not conflict with the safe management of the national airspace system or the safety of all stakeholders of the national airspace system.

(c) REPORT BY THE ADMINISTRATOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less than two years after the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (b)(1), the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the interim findings of the Administrator with respect to the pilot program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An analysis of how the pilot program established under subsection (b)(1) affected access to special activity airspace by non-military users of the national airspace system.

(B) An analysis of whether the dynamic management of special activity airspace conducted for the pilot program established under subsection (b)(1) contributed to more efficient use of the national airspace system by all stakeholders.

(d) REPORT BY THE SECRETARY.—Not less than two years after the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the interim findings of the Secretary with respect to the pilot program. Such report shall include an analysis of how the pilot program affected military test and training.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "special activity airspace" means the following airspace with defined dimensions within the National Airspace System wherein limitations may be imposed upon aircraft operations:

(A) Restricted areas.

(B) Military operations areas.

(C) Air Traffic Control assigned airspace.

(D) Warning areas.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 668—DESIGNATING JUNE 12, 2022, AS "WOMEN VETERANS APPRECIATION DAY"

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas, throughout every period of the history of the United States, women have proudly served the United States to secure and preserve freedom and liberty for—

(1) the people of the United States; and

(2) the allies of the United States;

Whereas women have formally been a part of the Armed Forces since the establishment of the Army Nurse Corps in 1901 but have informally served since the inception of the United States military;

Whereas over 3,000,000 women have served the United States honorably and with valor on land, on sea, in the air, and in space, including—

(1) as "Molly Pitchers" during the American Revolution, providing support to the Continental Army and taking their place on the artillery gun lines as soldiers fell;

(2) by passing as men to serve as soldiers during the Revolutionary War, the Early Republic, and the Civil War;

(3) as doctors, nurses, ambulance drivers, and Signal Corps telephone operator "Hello Girls" during World War I;

(4) as, during World War II—

(A) members of the Women's Army Corps (commonly known as "WACs");

(B) Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (commonly known as "WAVES");

(C) members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve (commonly known as "SPARS");

(D) Women Airforce Service Pilots (commonly known as "WASPs"); and

(E) nurses;

(5) as permanent members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, serving as nurses, physicians, physical therapists, air traffic controllers, intelligence specialists, communications specialists, logisticians, and clerks in the Korean War and Vietnam War; and

(6) as fixed and rotary wing combat pilots, surface warfare sailors, submariners, artillerymen, air defenders, engineers, military police, intelligence specialists, civil affairs specialists, logisticians, and, most recently, in all combat roles in the Persian Gulf, Iraq, and Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of 2020, women constitute approximately 17 percent of Armed Forces personnel on active duty, including—

(1) 21 percent of active duty personnel in the Air Force and Space Force;

(2) 20 percent of active duty personnel in the Navy;

(3) 16 percent of active duty personnel in the Army;

(4) 9 percent of active duty personnel in the Marine Corps; and

(5) 15 percent of active duty personnel in the Coast Guard;

Whereas, as of September 2020, women constitute more than 21 percent of personnel in the National Guard and Reserves;

Whereas women have been critical to COVID-19 relief, including as part of the personnel in the National Guard and Reserves

activated to support COVID-19 response efforts;

Whereas women have been critical to responding to the unjustified invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation, including as members of the National Guard and as active duty personnel in the Armed Forces who have been deployed to contribute to foreign assistance efforts;

Whereas 13 members of the Armed Forces, including 2 women, were killed during Operation Allies Refuge, in which over 120,000 people were evacuated in the largest civilian airlift in the history of the United States;

Whereas, in 2020—

(1) the population of women veterans reached nearly 2,000,000, which represents a significant increase from 713,000 women veterans in 1980; and

(2) women veterans constitute approximately 10 percent of the total veteran population;

Whereas women are the fastest growing group in the veteran population;

Whereas an estimated 1 in 3 women veterans enrolled in the healthcare system of the Department of Veterans Affairs report having experienced military sexual trauma (MST) during their military service;

Whereas the United States is proud of, and appreciates, the service of all women veterans who have demonstrated great skill, sacrifice, and commitment to defending the principles upon which the United States was founded and which the United States continues to uphold;

Whereas women veterans have unique stories and should be encouraged to share their recollections through the Veterans History Project, a part of the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress, which has worked since 2000, to collect and share the personal accounts of wartime veterans in the United States; and

Whereas, by designating June 12, 2022, as “Women Veterans Appreciation Day”, the Senate can—

(1) highlight the growing presence of women in the Armed Forces and the National Guard; and

(2) pay respect to women veterans for their patriotic military service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates June 12, 2022, as “Women Veterans Appreciation Day” to recognize the service and sacrifices of women veterans who have served valiantly on behalf of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 669—CONDEMNING THE USE OF HUNGER AS A WEAPON OF WAR AND RECOGNIZING THE EFFECT OF CONFLICT ON GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY AND FAMINE

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 669

Whereas in 2020, 155,000,000 people experienced crisis levels of food insecurity (Integrated Food Security Phase Classification phase 3 or above), with nearly 100,000,000 people living in environments where conflict was the main driver of hunger, and the COVID-19 pandemic has worsened rising global food insecurity;

Whereas conflict acutely impacts vulnerable populations such as women and children, persons with disabilities, refugees, and internally displaced persons;

Whereas armed conflict impacts on food security can be direct, such as displacement from land, destruction of livestock grazing areas and fishing grounds, or destruction of food stocks and agricultural assets, or indirect, such as disruptions to food systems, leading to increased food prices or decreased household purchasing power, or decreased access to supplies that are necessary for food preparation, including water and fuel;

Whereas conflict disrupts the distribution and buying and selling of food within a food system due to a shortage of produce, risk, or perceived risk of travel, the formation of illegal distribution channels and markets, and the breakdown of a government's ability to enforce regulations or perform its judiciary functions;

Whereas aerial bombing campaigns targeting agricultural heartlands, scorched earth methods of warfare, and the use of landmines and other explosive devices have direct impacts on the ability of vulnerable populations to feed themselves;

Whereas effective humanitarian response in armed conflict, including in the threat of conflict-induced famine and food insecurity in situations of armed conflict, requires respect for international humanitarian law by all parties to the conflict, and allowing and facilitating the rapid and unimpeded movement of humanitarian relief to all those in need;

Whereas efforts to restrict humanitarian aid and the operational integrity and impartiality of humanitarian aid works and distribution efforts, including through blockades, security impediments, or irregular bureaucratic requirements is another means by which combatants employ starvation and food deprivation as a weapon of war; and

Whereas the United States Government has the tools to fight global hunger, protect lifesaving assistance, and promote the prevention of conflict, including through the Global Fragility Act of 2019 (title V of division J of Public Law 116-94), the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-195), and the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-334), and has the potential to hold accountable those using hunger as a weapon of war through the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the use of hunger as a weapon of war through the—

(A) starvation of civilians;

(B) intentional and reckless destruction, removing, looting, or rendering useless objects necessary for food production and distribution such as farmland, markets, mills, food processing and storage areas, foodstuffs, crops, livestock, agricultural assets, waterways, water systems, drinking water installations and supplies, and irrigation works;

(C) denial of humanitarian access and the deprivation of objects indispensable to people's survival, such as food supplies and nutrition resources; and

(D) willful interruption of market systems to affected populations in need in conflict environments by preventing travel and manipulating currency exchange; and

(2) calls on the United States Government to—

(A) prioritize diplomatic efforts to call out and address instances where hunger and intentional deprivation of food is being utilized as a weapon of war, including efforts to ensure that security operations do not undermine livelihoods of local populations to minimize civilian harm;

(B) continue efforts to address severe food insecurity through humanitarian response efforts, including in-kind food assistance, vouchers, and other flexible modalities;

(C) ensure existing interagency strategies, crisis response efforts, and ongoing programs consider, integrate, and adapt to address conflict by utilizing crisis modifiers in United States Agency for International Development programming to respond to rapid shocks and stress such as the willful targeting of food systems; and

(D) ensure that the use of hunger as a weapon of war is considered within the employment of tools to hold individuals, governments, militias, or entities responsible such as the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 2656), where appropriate, and taking into consideration the need for humanitarian exemptions and the protection of lifesaving assistance.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5076. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3967, to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5076. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3967, to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. . EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 4 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have eight 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 ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMODITIES, RISK MANAGEMENT, AND TRADE

The Subcommittee on Commodities, Risk Management, and Trade of the

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHEMICAL SAFETY, WASTE MANAGEMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND REGULATORY OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Chemical Safety, Waste Management, Environmental Justice, and Regulatory Oversight of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, MEDIA, AND BROADBAND

The Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE AND REGIONAL SECURITY COOPERATION

The Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of

the Senate on Thursday, June 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 13; and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967; further, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 13, 2022, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:48 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 13, 2022, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SAMUEL R. BAGENSTOS, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD

DANA KATHERINE BILYEU, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 11, 2023.

LEONA M. BRIDGES, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 11, 2023.

STACIE OLIVARES, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2024.

MICHAEL F. GERBER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2022.

MICHAEL F. GERBER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2026.

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT STEVEN HUIE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING ANNIE WIRTH
ON HER WIN AT THE IHSA
STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN LONG
JUMP

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Annie Wirth, a junior from Geneseo High School, who won first place at the Illinois High School Association (IHSA) State Championship in Long Jump.

Annie's win at the IHSA Girls Track and Field State Championship can be summed up by shattered records and a team trophy. With the bar set at 5 feet, 10 inches, Annie began her attempt with a slight jump before sprinting at the bar and bending around it nearly six feet in the air. She knew that jump would set a new record, and the height of the jump was the tallest out of any of the three classes. Annie medaled again after a 17-foot, 7¾ leap, placing third in that competition. She also placed fifth in the 300m hurdles, running 45.35 in the rain. As a former athlete, I commend Annie for her dedication to her team and to her sport and am proud of how far that has taken her.

Annie's athletic success is remarkable. I am incredibly proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District and student-athletes like Annie Wirth. Madam Speaker, I would like to formally congratulate Annie Wirth again, the Illinois High School Association State Champion in Long Jump.

SALEM AMERICAN LEGION BAND

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the 75th birthday celebration of the Salem American Legion Band. The Salem American Legion Band was started in 1947 by World War II veterans. Today, the band is comprised of young musicians, both veterans and non-veterans, from all over Salem County, as well as neighboring South Jersey counties. The Salem American Legion Band performs two major concerts each year. In May, they have their Spring Veterans Concert, where they honor and recognize our nation's veterans for their service. Then, in the winter, the band hosts their Christmas concert. In addition to their semi-annual concerts, the American Legion Band performs at various events around the South Jersey area. Congratulations to the band on their 75th year and thank you to our veterans for their brave service. God Bless the Salem American Legion Band, and God Bless our United States of America.

HONORING JEFFERSON COUNTY'S
230TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. TIM BURCHETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the 230th anniversary of Jefferson County, Tennessee.

Governor William Blount formed Jefferson County in 1792 from land that was formerly part of the Southwest Territories, and it was one of the few counties created before Tennessee became the 16th state in 1796.

Davy Crockett, one of our nation's most prominent frontiersmen, called Jefferson County home for 15 years and represented Tennessee in the U.S. House of Representatives. During his residence in Jefferson County, Davy Crockett married his wife, Polly Finley, in 1806 at the Finley Homeplace.

Today, Jefferson County is home to many small businesses, abundant farmlands, and incredibly kind and wonderful residents. It is also home to several academic institutes, such as Carson-Newman University, that are shaping the minds of our future leaders.

I am proud to represent Jefferson County and its residents in the U.S. House of Representatives, and it is my honor to recognize Jefferson County's 230 years of rich history.

RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY SPECIAL FORCES AND HONORING THE "FATHER OF THE SPECIAL FORCES", COLONEL AARON BANK

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, June 19, 2022, we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the United States Army Special Forces—the most versatile Special Operations soldiers in the world.

Since their establishment in 1952, Special Forces soldiers have distinguished themselves globally and continue to go above and beyond the call of duty to defend the United States in combat theaters worldwide. However, due to the covert nature of many of their missions, both the measure of their sacrifice and their contribution to freedom here and abroad may never be known.

I hope all Americans will join me in celebrating their 70th anniversary and thanking them for giving more to this country than could ever be repaid and perhaps, could ever be measured.

In valor, courage, and fidelity, the Special Forces are the world's finest fighting force, and I am thankful that they are in the business of protecting the United States of America and its citizens.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Colonel Aaron Bank, the founder and first commander of the Special Forces. After World War II, it was clear there was a place for highly trained unconventional forces. Colonel Bank began working to convince the U.S. Army to adopt a permanent unconventional warfare force. After tireless efforts, the U.S. Army launched its first Special Forces unit, the 10th Special Forces Group (Airborne), based at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, with Colonel Bank as its first commander.

Since then, the U.S. Army Special Forces has spawned special operations units from the other military branches such as the Navy SEALs, Air Force Combat Controllers, and the Marines' Force Recon.

We have Colonel Bank to thank for emphasizing the strategic and tactical importance of such units, which he modeled in designing, implementing, and commanding the Army's first Special Forces unit.

I consider it an honor and privilege to participate in recognizing both his contribution and the legacy of his vision and foresight, the United States Special Forces.

My most sincere gratitude goes out to Colonel Bank and all Green Berets as they celebrate the 70th anniversary of the U.S. Army Special Forces.

NICHOLAS GEORGE

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I attended Nicholas George's Eagle Scout Court of Honor. Nicholas is a junior at Ocean City High School and a member of Boy Scout Troop 79 in Upper Township. For his Eagle Scout project, he created a permanent memorial honoring Marienus J. Segeren (Mar-e-en J. Seg-e-ren), a trooper who died serving the New Jersey community in 1971. He decided to create this memorial because he has a strong interest in pursuing law enforcement as a future career path. Nicholas planned the project, solicited the funding, organized the labor groups, and installed the memorial all on his own. In addition, he presented the excess of funds that he obtained for the memorial to the New Jersey State Police Survivors of the Triangle to assist in the rebuilding of the lives of surviving families of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. Nicholas is a very special young man with high ideals. He should be proud of his contributions to the law enforcement community in New Jersey, and I wish him the best of luck in pursuing his own career in law enforcement. God Bless Nicholas, and God Bless our America.

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

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

HONORING LT. COL. COURTNEY
KILUK

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the exemplary service of Lieutenant Colonel Courtney Kiluk as an Army Congressional Fellow and Army Legislative Liaison. Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk is transitioning from her current assignment to taking command of the Army Aviation Battalion-Japan.

A native of St. Louis, Missouri, Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in Aviation from the Purdue University ROTC program. She also earned a Master's Degree in Organizational Business and Security Management from Webster University, and a Master's Degree in Legislative Affairs from George Washington University.

Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk has served in a broad range of assignments during her 18 years as an Army officer, including Platoon Leader at Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Georgia; Company Commander at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, Korea and Hickam Army Airfield, Hawaii; Brigade Executive Officer at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and Legislative Liaison in Washington, D.C. She also has served two combat deployments in Iraq and one combat tour in Afghanistan.

I have had the privilege of working directly with Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk, first as a fellow in my Capitol Hill office from 2017 until 2018. Her professionalism, performance and commitment to the mission, as both a fellow and liaison, are in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and made a lasting impression to both Members and staff of the United States Congress. Throughout her career, Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk has positively impacted soldiers, peers and superiors alike.

On a personal level, I have had the honor of also meeting Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk's family, who, as with all American military families, share her selfless commitment to our country. I thank her husband, Josh, as well as her children, Andrew and Luke, for their sacrifices made in supporting her service to our country.

Madam Speaker, it has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk since the second session of the 113th Congress. Our country has benefited from her extraordinary leadership, judgment and passion for the Army profession. It is with great appreciation that I recognize and commend Lieutenant Colonel Kiluk for her service to our country and wish her all the best as she continues her service in the United States Army.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY
OF DISABLED AMERICAN
VETERANS

HON. JERRY MCNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Disabled American Veterans on the 100th anniversary of its founding.

In 1920, Judge Robert Marx, a disabled veteran from World War I, convened a group of veterans in Cincinnati, Ohio to form the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, or DAVWW. The DAVWW spoke for the hundreds of thousands of veterans who were rendered disabled during their service.

In 1932, Congress granted a federal charter to DAVWW, establishing it as the official voice of disabled veterans. In 1943, with the coming of another world war, the organization shortened its name to Disabled American Veterans, or DAV.

Disabled American Veterans has been among the leading organizations in advocating for legislation that improves the treatment of disabled veterans. Filing claims, providing rides, creating job placement programs, and advocating for legislation are just some of the ways Disabled American Veterans have helped our wounded warriors return to full, productive lives in our communities.

Veterans who have sacrificed so much to protect our way of life, deserve our admiration, respect, and support. I commend the Disabled American Veterans' commitment to our Nation's veterans and invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Disabled American Veterans and its century of service.

CHRISTOPHER LEMON

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending Christopher Lemon's Eagle Scout Court of Honor. Christopher belongs to Troop 1079 of Seaville, South Jersey. For his Eagle Scout project, he created and gifted Shore Medical Center over 200 wooden hearts for their memorial recognizing COVID-19 patients who recovered in their hospital. Christopher painted the hearts with Shore Medical Center's colors, purple and white, and put them on posts. The posts were placed in the front lawn of the center and resided there for several weeks during the summer of 2021. This young man should be proud of his contributions to the memorial and I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors. God Bless Christopher, and God Bless our America.

HONORING KNOX COUNTY'S 230TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. TIM BURCHETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the 230th Anniversary of Knox County, Tennessee.

Governor William Blount formed Knox County in 1792 before Tennessee became a state, and Tennessee's first Governor and founding father, John Sevier, called Knox County home during his time in office.

Today, Knox County is home to many small businesses and large companies, abundant farmlands, and a community of the kindest folks you could ever meet. It also holds sev-

eral academic institutes that are shaping the minds of our future leaders. Tennessee's flagship university, the University of Tennessee Knoxville, was founded in Knox County in 1794 as Blount College. It also became one of our nation's first co-educational education colleges when it admitted five female students in 1804. The University of Tennessee is the alma mater of notable alumni like NFL legend Peyton Manning and American astronaut Scott Kelly.

I was proud to serve Knox County as its mayor for eight years, and I'm equally proud to represent these folks today in our Nation's capital. It is my honor to celebrate Knox County for 230 impactful years of history.

HONORING MIKE KRZYZEWSKI

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Coach Mike Krzyzewski of Duke University on his retirement. Blue Devils everywhere are proud of his remarkable legacy, a historic career that has seen Coach Krzyzewski win five national titles and five Olympic gold medals.

I previously taught at Duke and have represented the campus and Durham for a number of years. I know firsthand of Mike Krzyzewski's character and integrity. He is not only a world-class coach; he is also a committed educator who has trained and inspired his players to succeed in whatever they undertake in life. Over his career, his players earned a combined 81 All-ACC Academic Team honors.

A native of Chicago, Coach Krzyzewski, affectionately known as "Coach K," began his 46 year-long coaching career at the United States Military Academy before becoming the longtime coach at Duke. Over his 42 years as their head coach, he garnered three Naismith Hall of Fame Coach Awards, 15 ACC championships, 13 Final Four appearances, and five NCAA Division I national championships.

Coach Mike Krzyzewski's 1,000th career victory came on a Sunday afternoon in New York City at Madison Square Garden against the Red Storm of St. John's University, surpassing his former Coach Bob Knight and establishing himself as the winningest coach in basketball history and becoming the first head coach with a four-figure win total.

With 1,129 of Duke's 2,246 all-time victories coming under Coach K, he holds claim to the NCAA record for most wins by a coach at one school and has presided over more than half of all Duke men's basketball victories. Coach K is a five-time Olympic gold medal winner—in 1984 and 1992 as Team USA's assistant coach, and in 2008, 2012, and 2016 as its head coach. Krzyzewski has consistently made history by winning.

Mike Krzyzewski's accomplishments are impressive by any measure. Equally as impressive, though, is his work off the basketball court and commitment to his local community.

I am proud to have collaborated directly with Coach K, and his wife Mickie, in securing federal support for what became the Emily Krzyzewski Family Life Center, which opened in Durham in 2006. Named after his mother,

the Center has helped to revitalize Durham's West End neighborhood and provide a safe and positive environment for disadvantaged children and families from the community. Its educational programs are unusually intensive, taking students from elementary school through college and equipping them with skills to successfully complete higher education, connect to promising careers, and become agents of change in their communities.

Beyond the Center, Coach K has been active in the Jimmy V Foundation for Cancer Research, named after his long-time friend and North Carolina State University Coach, Jim Valvano, Duke Children's Hospital, the Brain Tumor Center at Duke, and many other endeavors that have strengthened the community.

Over the course of his career, Coach K built a legacy that few in the history of basketball can compare with—his career is nothing short of astonishing. On behalf of Duke University and basketball fans everywhere, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Coach Mike Krzyzewski on his historic career and to wish Mike, Mickie, and the rest of the Krzyzewski family all the best on their next journey.

MICHELLE PURDY

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of honoring Michelle Purdy with the Republican of the Year award. Michelle is a lifelong Galloway, South Jersey resident who runs several South Jersey businesses with her husband, Don. In her spare time, she served as the President of the Family School Association for 12 years, as well as became a member of the Galloway Township Education Foundation. In 2018, Michelle won both the Outstanding leadership Award and the Citizen Advocate for Education Award. She also serves as an executive board member of the Absegami High School softball program. Then, in 2021, Michelle became the President of the Galloway Township Republican League, where she was able to embrace her passion for Republican values. Michelle is a true conservative, and it was my honor to award her with the Republican of the Year award. God Bless Michelle, and God Bless our America.

RECOGNIZING BWXT WORKERS
FOR THEIR DEDICATION TO A
SAFE WORKPLACE

HON. DAVID P. JOYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight a significant milestone for a group of men and women in my district who work on some of the most complex components of our nation's nuclear reactors. With their unmatched skills and diligence, the men and women at the BWXT facility in Euclid, Ohio have surpassed five million work hours without a single accident.

While they belong to a workforce that is so accustomed to safety, those who work at the Euclid plant have jobs that demand exacting requirements and have unforgiving tolerances. They are producing the control rods used in the Navy's reactors that power our submarines and aircraft carriers. These hardworking Buckeyes follow in a long line of great Americans fabricating our Navy's powerplants as far back as the Great White Fleet. Their commitment to delivering flawless equipment to our Navy is among the many reasons the United States remains unmatched on, and underneath, the seas.

To surpass the equivalent of 570 years without a single accident at a facility such as BWXT's in Euclid speaks to the highly skilled and trained workforce employed there. Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating these workers on such an impressive milestone and thanking them for their contributions to our nation's technical and advanced manufacturing operations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHANIE N. MURPHY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on Roll Call No. 253 on June 8, 2022.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 253.

GREG SPEED

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I attended the retirement ceremony of Greg Speed, who was the CEO of Cape Counseling in South Jersey. Greg worked in the behavioral health sector for 48 years. He served at Cape Counseling Services for 37 years, where he worked as the Unit Director of Screening and Specialized Services from 1982 to 1995. Then, in 1995, Greg became the Vice President of Mental Health Services until 2000 when he became the CEO. At Cape Counseling, his leadership, direction, and vision were essential in completing a successful and seamless merger between Cape Counseling and Acenda. At Acenda, Greg continued his decade-long career and became the Chief Integration Officer during the merger. In addition, he also served and chaired multiple boards including the Human Services Advisory Committee, the Cape Alliance Steering Committee, the Health Community Coalition, and the Long-term recovery group after Hurricane Sandy. Greg should be proud of his notable career in the behavioral health sector, and I am glad I was able to attend his retirement ceremony. God Bless Greg, and God Bless our United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT FITZGERALD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, due to a family commitment, I was unable to be recorded for votes on Thursday, June 9, 2022. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 255.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, on June 8, 2022, I was otherwise detained and absent from the vote on Roll Call No. 246. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 246, H.R. 7352, the PPP and Bank Fraud Enforcement Harmonization Act.

WILLIAM PROBASCO

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the honor of attending William "Liam" Probasco's Eagle Scout Court of Honor ceremony. Liam is a senior at Cumberland Christian School and plans on attending Asbury University beginning this fall. He is a member of Daretown Troop 60 and worked very hard to attain his Eagle Scout ranking. For his Eagle Scout project, Liam built a 40-foot walkway bridge at Jersey Oaks Camp in Canton, South Jersey. He decided to build this walkway because access to the large field at the campground was greatly limited by ravine and hedgerow. The walkway opened up this field, which makes up 35 percent of the Jersey Oaks Camp property. Now, because of Liam's walkway bridge, the camp is planning to winterize the facility and add more buildings so that they can better serve their campers. Liam should be proud of his service to South Jersey, and it was my honor to have had the honor to attend his Court of Honor ceremony. God Bless Liam, and God Bless our United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRED KELLER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Rollcall No. 254.

CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF
LIEUTENANT LONNIE T.
VINESETT, JR.

HON. RALPH NORMAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the outstanding career of Lieutenant Lonnie T. Vinesett, Jr., a dedicated community leader and honorable police officer.

Known as “Bubba” or “Terry” to his friends and family, Lt. Vinesett grew up in Indian Land. At the age of 14, he entered the Cadet Program at the Fort Mill Police Department. Shortly after, he became a security guard for Mercy Hospital. At the age of 21, Lt. Vinesett was hired by the Lancaster County Sheriff’s Office, where he began his police career. During his time with the Lancaster County Sheriff’s Office, he proudly served the same community he grew up in and loved deeply.

In 1999, Lt. Vinesett was hired by the York County Sheriff’s Office—his ultimate goal when he began his police career. During his tenure with the York County Sheriff’s Office, he experienced major milestones in his career and received numerous accolades and awards. For example, in 2007, Lt. Vinesett was working on Operation Rolling Thunder, a multi-jurisdiction operation based in Spartanburg, during which he made a traffic stop on a vehicle traveling from Atlanta to Washington, D.C. Lt. Vinesett found a secret compartment with 35 kilos of cocaine—the fourth largest interdiction drug stop in South Carolina state history.

Later in his career, Lt. Vinesett attended a Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) training on combatting sex trafficking. Shortly after this training, he and then Master Deputy Phillip Aldridge were monitoring a known website for prostitution in the Charlotte area and observed a female that appeared to be underage. The two quickly began their operation and, in consultation with the FBI, investigated and charged the man involved. This was the first case of a successful prosecution and conviction for sex trafficking of a child in South Carolina state history. Lt. Vinesett and Master Deputy Phillip Aldridge received the Merit Award from Sheriff Tolson and a recommendation from then FBI Director James Comey.

Lt. Vinesett consistently goes above and beyond the call of duty. In addition to these well-deserved accolades, he has dedicated countless hours to volunteering for community events and serving the school district in which he lives. Lt. Vinesett leads by example and has served as a guide for his children, family, and friends. He has never met a stranger, and his colleagues describe him as a “mentor and leader” to all. These stories are not outliers for a day in the life of Lt. Vinesett. His sense of service and selflessness is above reproach, leading him to earn the respect of law enforcement and citizens all over the state. His 25-year career is a testament to all the good our men and women in blue do for our communities. On behalf of the 5th District of South Carolina, I thank Lt. Vinesett for his continued sacrifice and service, and I congratulate him on his well-deserved retirement.

HUNTER CLARK

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the honor of presenting Hunter Clark with Congressional record paperwork and a challenge coin at his Eagle Scout Court of Honor. Hunter currently attends St. Augustine’s Prep in Richland, South Jersey and plans to attend American University in the fall. He achieved the Eagle Scout ranking as a part of Daretown Troop 60. For his Eagle Scout project, Hunter made some improvements to the beach at Camp Edge in Alloway, New Jersey. Camp Edge is part of Ranch Hope Ministries and provides care and outreach to troubled boys in the South Jersey community, as well as hosts a camp during the summer for kids of all ages. Hunter replaced some of the timber boundaries on the beach at Camp Edge. In addition, he added fishing pole hangers to the beach. Hunter should be proud of his service to South Jersey, and I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors at American University. God Bless Hunter, and God Bless our United States of America.

PROTECTING OUR KIDS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting Our Kids Act, legislation in response to the gun violence that is affecting our communities, especially our children.

Mr. Speaker, our communities continue to be ripped apart by gun violence. In the high-profile recent mass shootings in Buffalo, NY and Uvalde, TX shootings, 31 lives were lost, and many more lives were tossed into turmoil because of the actions of armed individuals. It is too easy for guns to end up in the wrong hands.

According to the Washington Post, there have been 61 mass shootings in the month of May alone. It is important that we protect our children and our communities from gun violence.

What is more important than protecting our children? Which is why I again call on the Senate to act on the commonsense legislation the House has already passed to expand background checks (H.R. 8) and our bill to close the Charleston loophole to help keep guns out of the hands of prohibited buyers.

And this week, the House will consider legislation to put in place effective and commonsense protections that can help stop gun violence and contribute to safer communities.

This includes the bill on the floor today that would bar those under the age 21 from purchasing semiautomatic rifles. The legislation would also largely bar the sale, transfer, or possession of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, create new gun trafficking penalties including for straw purchasers who buy guns to pass on to someone who is pro-

hibited from having one, and would strengthen regulations against hard to trace “ghost guns” that are turning up at more and more crime scenes in our communities.

We must do everything in our power to protect our children. Our children must be able to feel safe in their classrooms. Or the movie theater. Or in their place of worship. Our seniors and others must feel safe to go to the grocery store.

This legislation is a start. But there is more that we can and must do, including increasing investments in our children and communities such as my bill to provide grants to community-based organizations to provide deescalation training to help keep conflicts from turning violence or escalating in the first place.

I urge support of this bill.

CONGRATULATING ALICE SOTELO
ON HER WIN AT THE IHSA
STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN TRACK
AND FIELD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alice Sotelo, a junior from Sterling High School who won the Illinois High School Association (IHSA) Class 2A State Triple Jump title.

Alice won the 2A State Title in the triple jump with a final clearance distance of 11.36 meters, setting a new school record. It was also her fourth time setting a new school record in the last month. As a former athlete, I commend her for her determination and attitude. Alice is an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud to see her represent Sterling so well throughout the state and the country with her talent and passion.

It is because of student leaders such as Alice that I am especially proud to serve Illinois’ 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Alice Sotelo on her Class 2A State Title in the triple jump.

MATT WESCOTT

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the honor of attending Matt Wescott’s Eagle Scout Court of Honor ceremony. Matt attained his Eagle Scout ranking as a member of Boy Scout Troop 60 in Daretown, South Jersey. For his Eagle Scout project, Matt led some of his fellow scouts in building a Gaga Ball pit at Alloway School. Gaga Ball is a very popular game with elementary and middle schoolers in the South Jersey community. However, the game needs to be played inside of an octagonal shaped court, which is why Matt decided to build the school a court. This will provide years of entertainment for the Alloway community and students. Matt should be proud of his project, and it was my honor to have had the opportunity to recognize him for his service to the

South Jersey community. God Bless Matt, and God Bless our America.

HONORING PRESIDENT DR. WILLIAM R. HARVEY ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM HAMPTON UNIVERSITY

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. William R. Harvey for his 44 years of extraordinary service as the president of Hampton University, ending one of the longest serving tenures of any sitting college president in our country.

After obtaining degrees from Talladega College, Virginia State University and Harvard University, Dr. Harvey became the 12th president of Hampton University, then-named Hampton Institute, in 1978. A native of Alabama, he looked forward to returning to the south and working at an Historically Black College & University (HBCU) after receiving his doctorate at Harvard.

Over the course of his legendary tenure, he has ensured that Hampton University has remained focused on both the academic achievement and personal development of its students. He has remained responsive to the needs of his students, building one of the nation's most premiere institutes of higher education, and he has overseen the graduation of more than 38,000 students.

Under Dr. Harvey's presidency, Hampton has built over 30 new buildings, introduced over 90 new degree-granting programs, including 12 doctorates. The average SAT score for accepted students has risen by more than 300 points during his tenure. Thanks to Dr. Harvey's visionary leadership, Hampton University is home to the world's largest free-standing proton beam cancer treatment institute. It also became the first HBCU to lead a NASA mission, launching weather and atmospheric research satellites into space. The university's endowment, which stood at \$29 million when he became president, has grown exponentially under his tenure and now exceeds \$400 million, securing a bright future for the university for generations to come.

Most recently, Dr. Harvey successfully guided Hampton University through the COVID-19 pandemic by following the science. Also leading by example, Dr. Harvey recently opened the doors of Hampton for the upcoming summer semester to refugees displaced by the Russian War in Ukraine.

Aside from his work at Hampton University, Dr. Harvey has served on numerous boards, including the National Geographic Society, National Merit Scholarship Corporation, and National Collegiate Athletic Association. He is also the sole owner of a plant that bottles Pepsi products in Houghton, Michigan. Dr. Harvey has been the recipient of many accolades and awards over the years, including the Daily Press Citizen of the Year and the Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities Humanitarian Award.

Madam Speaker, as the Hampton University community gathers this weekend to celebrate a truly remarkable leader, I want to congratulate Dr. Harvey on 44 years of legendary serv-

ice to Hampton University, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation. I also want to thank Norma Harvey, his wife and partner for over 50 years, for her countless contributions, and their three children—Kelly Renee, William Christopher, and Leslie Denise—and five grandchildren, Taylor, Gabrielle Lauren, Victoria, and Chloe. I thank Dr. Harvey for his decades of service and extend congratulations on a well-deserved retirement.

STOP PRICE GOUGING THE MILITARY ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the "Stop Price Gouging The Military Act." I thank U.S. Senator ELIZABETH WARREN (D-MA) for sponsoring the companion legislation in the United States Senate.

Our "Stop Price Gouging The Military Act" would prevent defense contractors from overcharging the Department of Defense on equipment parts, closing loopholes in regulations that affect taxpayers, American service members, and businesses that fairly support military readiness. As chair of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness, I know how much it costs to keep our military ready and this bill would ensure that prices for equipment parts are fair and defense contractors are rewarded for quality performance.

The Truthful Cost or Pricing Data Act requires contractors to provide accurate cost and pricing data to the government. However, current broad definitions for "commercial items" prevent military contracting officers from accurately assessing fair prices. While prices for these "commercial items" should already be reasonable because of assumed competition in the commercial market, these parts are often only sold to the Department of Defense or are drastically changed from their original commercial counterpart. Some defense contractors can then overcharge the Defense Department because there are no market checks on the price, and they are not required to provide accurate data to military contracting officials.

The Defense Department also pays companies before work is completed, and money is rarely recouped if the contractor is behind schedule or work quality is poor. With this model, there is no way to incentivize performance.

This legislation would strengthen competition requirements by amending government acquisition laws to only waive requirements to provide cost or pricing information when there is price competition. It would also restore market dynamics to the commercial item definition by closing loopholes for when a good or service has been modified from what is sold on a commercial market, create a pilot program to tie payments to performance, and require annual disclosure of changes in costs of goods sold, gross margins, and pricing strategies.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all Members to cosponsor my "Stop Price Gouging The Military Act" and support our service members, provide accountability to the taxpayer, and reward quality business that support military readiness. The legislation I introduce today would ensure just that.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote during last night's vote series. I would have voted to retain Title III, which is consistent with my voting for the final passage of H.R. 7910. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 239.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I was not present in the House Chamber for the vote on Retaining Title II of H.R. 7910, Roll Call vote 238. Had I been present, I would have voted No on this measure.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF CHRISTOPHER OAKS AND THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF GOOD MORNINGS WITH CHRIS OAKS

HON. ROBERT E. LATTI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mr. LATTI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Christopher Oaks, from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District who has served his region through his radio program, Good Mornings with Chris Oaks. Chris has focused his career in radio on keeping his community informed and up to date on a range of issues. Whether it is news, sports, or weather, Chris is on the air providing the listeners with the information to start their day. Chris has always been an influential voice on the air in Ohio. In his early career, he hosted radio shows in Bellefontaine, Lima, Cincinnati, and mornings and afternoons at WFIN's sister-station WKXA.

Chris joined WFIN in June of 2002. His program, Good Mornings with Chris Oaks, quickly gained a dedicated following every weekday morning. Chris provides in-depth insight on a wide range of issues including local and regional concerns as well as relevant state and federal issues. During the school year, listeners can rely on Chris to provide the latest school delay and closing information, which help hundreds of parents to arrange their busy schedules. His listeners know they can tune in to hear interesting interviews and compelling guests every day. Chris also writes a syndicated morning show preparation report which is published monthly.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the Twentieth anniversary of Christopher Oaks and his radio show Good Mornings with Chris Oaks. It is my great pleasure to recognize this outstanding achievement, and I thank Chris for his service to our community. On behalf of the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio, I wish Chris the best in all his future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING MATTHEW MARCUM ON HIS WIN AT THE IHSA STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN TRACK AND FIELD

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 9, 2022

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Matthew Marcum, a Senior from Rock Falls Township High School, who won the Illinois High School Association's Class 2A State Champion in the 300-meter hurdles, running a 39.59 at the state final.

Although Matthew began the race for the championship on the wrong foot, he managed to finish his final year at Rock Falls as a State Champion. He posted the fastest time in IHSA's Class 2A State Boys Track & Field prelims at 39.73 seconds for the 300-meter hurdles. Matthew had qualified for state finals in the 300 hurdles last year as well, placing sixth in a very tight race. After reaching the state final again as a senior, he was determined to go out on top. In this year's 2A State Championship, he ran even faster, running a 39.59 on his way to a state championship. As a former athlete, I appreciate the fortitude Matthew displayed to achieve his dream of being a state champion and commend him for his determination and attitude. Matthew is an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Rock Falls so well throughout the state.

It is because of student leaders such as Matthew that I am especially proud to serve Illinois' 17th Congressional District. Madam Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Matthew Marcum a 2A State Champion in the 300-meter hurdles.

COMMEMORATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 340B DISCOUNT DRUG PROGRAM

SPEECH OF

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 2022

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the 340B drug pricing program in this 30th anniversary year of ensuring access to patient care through our Nation's safety net providers.

The 340B program is critical for safety-net providers in my district, including a total of 22 combined hospitals, and medical centers all of which uses its program savings to provide a range of services in response to social determinants of health screening, such as

Food pantries within hospitals;

Emergency food/meal delivery assistance, and pilot programs focused on providing housing and transportation assistance; and

Strengthening the health sciences career pipeline and educational attainment efforts through targeted academic enrichment and youth workforce development for more than 3,000 pre-K thru college students.

On a personal level, there is the case of Erika Aguero who was uninsured when she was diagnosed with breast cancer. Erika called many places to try and schedule treatment but because of her insurance status, providers were unable to help her access affordable care. She thought cancer was going to end her life. When Erika called Mount Sinai hospital in Chicago the hospital provided her access to affordable chemotherapy treatment using the hospital's 340B savings. Mount Sinai provided Erika with a 340B-supported discount card that enabled her to receive eight cycles

of intravenous chemo and seven cycles of chemo medications. Erika says, "I felt like I had a new opportunity to carry on and keep fighting." Today she is healthy and thankful to Mount Sinai.

340B has been vital for 30 years and will continue to be vital for decades to come. We must protect 340B. It is only fitting that we meet today on the 8th day of Black History Month. I am pleased to represent the historic 7th Congressional District, which has been central throughout the nation to the progress of the poor and underrepresented and underserved people of color, namely African Americans throughout American history:

It is the location in City of Chicago where Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. established his northern Freedom Campaign headquarters to demonstrate against racial discrimination and expose the north's quality of life disparities in 1966.

It is the location of the Illinois Black Panther Party headquarters where my colleague BOBBY L. RUSH risked his life fighting and where Chairman Fred Hampton was assassinated while fighting to close quality of life disparities for poor black people in 1969.

Today, it is where there are more hospital beds to care for the sick and the poor than any other district in the Nation.

I believe that the 340B Program stands consistently in kindred spirit with the public policies advocated by President Abraham Lincoln, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Chairman Fred Hampton. I am pleased to stand in this tradition with my continued support of this vital program which addresses the critical health needs of the citizens of the 7th Congressional District and indigent populations throughout the Nation.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2875–S2898

Measures Introduced: Thirteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4365–4377, and S. Res. 668–669. **Page S2893**

Measures Reported:

S. 138, to waive certain pay limitations for Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior employees engaged in emergency wildland fire suppression activities, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 117–119)

H.R. 4363, to establish a daily public reporting requirement for covered contract awards of the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 117–120)

H.R. 6089, to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, with amendments. **Page S2891**

Measures Considered:

Honoring Our Pact Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 3967, to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2875–83, S2884–87**

Pending:

Tester/Moran Amendment No. 5051, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2875**

Schumer Amendment No. 5065 (to Amendment No. 5051), to add an effective date. **Page S2875**

Schumer Amendment No. 5076 (to the text proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 5051), to add an effective date. **Page S2887**

A motion was entered to close further debate on Tester/Moran Amendment No. 5051 (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, June 9, 2022, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 13, 2022. **Page S2887**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of Tester/Moran Amendment No. 5051 (listed above). **Page S2887**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments to Tester/Moran Amendment No. 5051 (listed above) and the underlying bill be at 4 p.m., on Monday, June 13, 2022. **Page S2887**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the bill at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, June 13, 2022; and that the motions to invoke cloture filed on Thursday, June 9, 2022 ripen at 5:30 p.m. **Page S2898**

Executive Reports of Committees: Senate received the following executive report of a committee:

Report to accompany Amendments to the Treaty on Fisheries between the Governments of Certain Pacific Island States and the Government of the United States of America (Treaty Doc. 115–3) (Ex. Rept. 117–3). **Page S2893**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 51 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. EX. 223), Robert Steven Huie, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California. **Page S2883**

By 49 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 224), Samuel R. Bagenstos, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services. **Page S2884**

Dana Katherine Bilyeu, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2023.

Leona M. Bridges, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2023.

Stacie Olivares, of California, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2024.

Michael F. Gerber, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2022.

Michael F. Gerber, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2026.

Pages S2887–88

Messages from the House: **Pages S2890–91**

Measures Referred: **Page S2891**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S2891**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S2891–93**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2893–94**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S2895–97

Additional Statements: **Pages S2889–90**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S2897**

Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Pages S2897–98

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today.
(Total—224) **Pages S2883–84**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:48 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 13, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2898.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

AGRICULTURAL TRADE

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Subcommittee on Commodities, Risk Management, and Trade concluded a hearing to examine agricultural trade, focusing on priorities and issues facing America's farmers, after receiving testimony from Neal Fisher, North Dakota Wheat Commission, Mandan; Gopinath Munisamy, University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Athens; Karla Baker Thompson, JET Farms Georgia and Integrity Farms, Camilla; and Sheryl Meshke, Associated Milk Producers Inc., New Ulm, Minnesota, on behalf of the National Milk Producers Federation.

SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine saving Social Security, after receiving testimony from Stephen C. Goss, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration; and Nancy J. Altman, and Alex Lawson, both of Social Security Works, Robert Roach, Jr., Alliance for Retired Americans, Maya MacGuineas, Committee for a Responsible

Federal Budget, and Shai Akabas, Bipartisan Policy Center, all of Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, Media, and Broadband concluded an oversight hearing to examine the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, after receiving testimony from Alan Davidson, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce.

USFS BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2023 for the Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Randy Moore, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure concluded a hearing to examine S. 4244, to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the manufacture, processing, use, and distribution in commerce of commercial asbestos and mixtures and articles containing commercial asbestos, after receiving testimony from Linda Reinstein, Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, Redondo Beach, California; Danny Whu, International Association of Fire Fighters, and Robert J. Simon, American Chemistry Council, both of Washington, D.C.; and David Lee Boone, Copiah Water Association, Hazlehurst, Mississippi.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 4171, to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1160, to prioritize efforts of the Department of State to combat international trafficking in covered synthetic drugs and new psychoactive substances, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3211, to continue the whole-of-government approach to ending global wildlife poaching and trafficking by permanently reauthorizing the activities of the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3861, to require the Secretary of State to submit annual reports to Congress on the assistance provided to Somaliland and to conduct a feasibility study, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, on establishing a security partnership with Somaliland, without recognizing Somaliland as an independent state, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3895, to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2024, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4250, to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to provide for rewards for the arrest or conviction of certain foreign nationals who have committed genocide or war crimes;

H.R. 6089, to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, with amendments;

H.R. 7276, to direct the President to submit to Congress a report on United States Government efforts to collect, analyze, and preserve evidence and information related to war crimes and other atrocities committed during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine since February 24, 2022;

S. Con. Res. 40, welcoming the Prime Minister of Greece to the United States for an address to a joint meeting of Congress;

S. Res. 124, celebrating the heritage of Romani Americans, S. Res. 394, recognizing the 25th anniversary of Radio Free Asia and its mission to provide an independent source of news to closed societies in Asia, with amendments;

S. Res. 394, recognizing the 25th anniversary of Radio Free Asia and its mission to provide an independent source of news to closed societies in Asia, with amendments;

S. Res. 458, recognizing the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations Children's Fund, with amendments;

S. Res. 540, supporting the goals of International Women's Day, with an amendment;

S. Res. 568, supporting the goals and ideals of "Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month" and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction;

S. Res. 589, recognizing, honoring, and commending the women of Ukraine who have contributed to the fight for freedom and the defense of Ukraine, with amendments;

S. Res. 638, commending the Government and people of the Republic of Moldova for their heroic efforts to support Ukrainian refugees fleeing President Putin's illegal war against Ukraine, with an amendment;

S. Res. 646, expressing the Senate's support for Finland and Sweden's accession into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the expedited ratification of accession protocols, with an amendment;

The nominations of Mari Carmen Aponte, of Puerto Rico, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, Michelle Kwan, of California, to be Ambassador to Belize, Elizabeth H. Richard, of Virginia, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large, Michael J. Adler, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, Margaret C. Whitman, of Colorado, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya, Michael Battle, of Georgia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania, John T. Godfrey, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Sudan, and Michael C. Gonzales, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia, and routine lists in the Foreign Service, all of the Department of State.

EUROPEAN ENERGY SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation concluded a hearing to examine European energy security, focusing on America's role in supporting Europe's energy diversification agenda, after receiving testimony from Amos Hochstein, Presidential Coordinator, Department of State.

DOMESTIC EXTREMISM IN AMERICA

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine domestic extremism in America, focusing on white supremacist violence in the wake of recent attacks, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Yates, Human Rights First, New York, New York; Eric K. Ward, Western States Center, Portland, Oregon; and Michael German, New York University Law School Brennan Center for Justice, and Nathan A. Sales, Fillmore Global Strategies LLC and former Ambassador-at-Large and Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Department of State, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of John Z. Lee, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Salvador Mendoza, Jr., of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Stephen Henley Locher, to be United States

District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa, Nancy L. Maldonado, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Gregory Brian Williams, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, and Gerard M. Karam, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District

of Pennsylvania, Jacqueline C. Romero, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and Joshua D. Hurwit, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho, all of the Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 32 public bills, H.R. 7993–8024; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 95; and H. Res. 1162–1169 were introduced.

Pages H5444–46

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H5447–48

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2773, to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–359); and

Supplemental report on H.R. 7606, to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture (H. Rept. 117–357, Part 2).

Page H5444

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Takano to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H5413

Federal Extreme Risk Protection Order Act: The House passed H.R. 2377, to authorize the issuance of extreme risk protection orders, by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 202 nays, Roll No. 255.

Pages H5415–30

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–46, modified by the amendment printed in H. Rept. 117–356, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill.

Pages H5415–19

H. Res. 1153, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2377) and (H.R. 7910) was agreed to yesterday, June 8th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H5429.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

Committee Meetings

A 2022 REVIEW OF THE FARM BILL: ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES ON TITLE I COMMODITIES AND TITLE XI CROP INSURANCE

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing entitled “A 2022 Review of the Farm Bill: Economic Perspectives on Title I Commodities and Title XI Crop Insurance”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a markup on H.R. 7900, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023”. H.R. 7900 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a markup on H.R. 7900, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023”. H.R. 7900 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations held a markup on H.R. 7900, the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023”. H.R. 7900 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

TERRORISM AND CRYPTOCURRENCY: INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism held a hearing entitled “Terrorism and Cryptocurrency: Industry Perspectives”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING CIVIL RIGHTS LITIGATION REFORM, PART 2: STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYER LIABILITY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Examining Civil Rights Litigation Reform, Part 2: State and Local Government Employer Liability”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COAL COMMUNITY PROTECTION AND REVITALIZATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Coal Community Protection and Revitalization”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Yarmuth and Representative Cartwright; Todd Parfitt, Director, Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality; and public witnesses.

TURNING THE TIDE FOR OCEAN CLIMATE ACTION: UNLEASHING THE CLIMATE BENEFITS OF OUR BLUE PLANET

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Turning the Tide for Ocean Climate Action: Unleashing the Climate Benefits of Our Blue Planet”. Testimony was heard from Richard W. Spinrad, Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere and Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and Monica Medina, Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Department of State.

HEARING ON THE JANUARY 6TH INVESTIGATION

Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol: Full Committee held a hear-

ing entitled “Hearing on the January 6th Investigation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY,
JUNE 13, 2022**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee’s jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2023, 5:30 p.m., SR-232A.

House

Committee on Oversight and Reform, June 10, Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled “The U.S. and International Humanitarian Response to Russia’s Invasion of Ukraine”, 9 a.m., Zoom.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2543, the “Federal Reserve Racial and Economic Equity Act” [Financial Services Racial Equity, Inclusion, and Economic Justice Act]; H.R. 2773, the “Recovering America’s Wildlife Act of 2021”; and H.R. 7606, the “Meat and Poultry Special Investigator Act of 2022” [Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act], 2 p.m., H-313 Capitol and Webex.

Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, Full Committee, hearing entitled “January 6th Investigation”, 10 a.m., 390 Cannon and Webex.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, June 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3967, Honoring our PACT Act.

At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Tester/Moran Amendment No. 5051, in the nature of a substitute.

The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to Tester/Moran Amendment No. 5051 (listed above) and the underlying bill is 4 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, June 13

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extension of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Burchett, Tim, Tenn., E603, E604
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E603, E606, E608
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E608
Fitzgerald, Scott, Wisc., E605
Garamendi, John, Calif., E607
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E603

Joyce, David P., Ohio, E605
Keating, William R., Mass., E607
Keller, Fred, Pa., E605
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E607
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E604
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E606
Murphy, Stephanie N., Fla., E605
Norman, Ralph, S.C., E606

Price, David E., N.C., E604
Rodgers, Cathy McMorris, Wash., E607
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E604
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E605
Scott, Robert "Bobby", Va., E607
Van Drew, Jefferson, N.J., E603, E603, E604, E605,
E605, E605, E606, E606



Congressional Record

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.

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