United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2022 No. 177

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 16, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF ALFREDO ACOSTA FIGUEROA

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent and dear friend, Alfredo Acosta Figueroa, for his lifelong dedication to social justice and his relentless advocacy for civil rights during the Chicano Movement with Cesar Chavez and Bert Corona.

Alfredo Acosta Figueroa was born in Blythe, California, to a fifth-generation indigenous-Chicano family from the Colorado River Indian Reservation, which encompasses the Palo Verde Valley in California and all through Parker Valley in Arizona.

From a young age, Alfredo learned the values of social justice from his family. As a young kid working in the mines, his parents taught him the values of standing up for himself, caring for his neighbors, and standing by his coworkers.

Because of his family's lessons, he has dedicated his entire life to safeguarding the civil, voting, working, and environmental rights of disenfranchised and indigenous communities.

In the late 1950s, Alfredo and his brothers, known as the Figueroa Brothers, became actively involved in the civil rights movement. Together, they fought against injustices in Blythe, the Coachella Valley, and throughout the American Southwest.

Through it all, Alfredo was mentored by two highly respected Chicano leaders: Humberto ''Bert'' Corona, an immigration rights activist with the Mexican American Political Association; and Cesar Chavez, the civil rights leader of the United Farm Workers.

Corona and Chavez's mentorship only deepened Alfredo's passion for human rights, encouraging him to further pursue equity and social justice for his community.

Over the years, Figueroa has worn many hats and has undertaken monumental roles, including that of lifetime ''gambusino'' or miner, civil rights activist, humanitarian, farm labor organizer, staunch environmentalist, antinuclear activist, historian, political coordinator, boxing coordinator, folkloric singer and guitarist, indigenous traditionalist, and author, just to name a few.

So now, he leads the protection of sacred indigenous sites within the Lower Colorado River Basin and Palo Verde and Parker Valleys.

Thanks to Alfredo's leadership, many historical indigenous sacred sites and bodies of water have been protected. This includes the Sacred Mule Mountains, the Lower Colorado River, the world-renowned Blythe Giant Intaglios, and over 300 other sacred sites. Alfredo has achieved all this and more by following his guiding principle to never give up.

One of his famous sayings, ''La Lucha Indeterminable,'' or ''The Never-Ending Struggle,'' has kept him motivated in his lifelong mission to share, educate, organize, and regain indigenous cosmic traditional culture.

Alfredo's compelling force to provoke change has found inspiration in two indigenous philosophies: First, the Neltiliztli, or ''the birth of the new knowledge,'' meaning that we must always seek the truth;

Second, the ancient Nahuatl teachings of Tloque Nahuaque, or the saying, ''among all, we do all, for the betterment of all.'' Both have allowed him to persist in this long journey and inspire many others.

So, to my dear friend, Alfredo Acosta Figueroa, you personify the dedication, resiliency, and carino of so many of our communities. Your life of service will forever be an inspiration for all people, and we are in great debt to you.

On behalf of California's 36th Congressional District, I thank you for your continued dedication and challenging work in the protection of our ancestral sacred lands.

''Mexica Tiahui,'' ''Move Forward.''

HONORING THE SERVICE OF ANTHONY ''TONY'' G. D'ALEO

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Anthony D'Aleo on his recent induction into the Florida Veterans' Hall of Fame.

Anthony, better known as Tony, served in the U.S. Army and later in

Printed on recycled paper.

the U.S. Marine Corps during the Vietnam war.

After leaving Active-Duty service, Tony moved to Jacksonville, Florida, where he lives today and serves as the president of the Vietnam Veterans of America Local Chapter 1046. Through this leadership role, Tony has remained active in advocating for his fellow veterans suffering from service-related illnesses. His continued commitment to the veterans of Northeast Florida and dedication to the Nation are unmatched.

I take this opportunity to thank Tony for his continued efforts to support those who have sacrificed so much for our freedom and salute his service to this Nation. We owe Tony and veterans like him a debt of gratitude that we could never repay.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN LESLIE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate retired Navy Commander John Leslie for his induction into the Florida Veterans' Hall of Fame.

John spent a total of 39 years in active service and civilian service to the U.S. Navy, where he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross, three Meritorious Service Medals, seven Strike/Flight Air Medals, two Navy Commendation Medals, and numerous other service and unit decorations.

He is known by his friends and neighbors as an honorable officer, a devoted friend, a true patriot, and a loving husband to his wife, Patricia, who you see pictured here.

John's commitment to supporting those around him has continued into retirement through his service to his fellow veterans across Northeast Florida. He now devotes his time to leadership and volunteer roles at the Mayo Clinic, Community Hospice and Palliative Care, and Veterans Treatment Court in St. Johns County. John's legacy of dedication rightfully earned him a spot in the Florida Veterans' Hall of Fame.

On behalf of Florida's Fourth Congressional District, I thank Commander Leslie for his devotion to our Nation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ST. JOHNS COUNTY COMMISSIONER PAUL WALDRON

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember St. Johns County Commissioner Paul Waldron.

Paul was a lifelong resident of St. Johns County and a vibrant member of the community. Throughout his young life, Paul worked and operated his family's small business, Harry's Curb Market, before becoming a respected real estate professional.

Paul applied his experience running a small business to his role as St. Johns County commissioner through his efforts to support and expand recreation and tourism development and strengthen our economy.

Throughout his 6 years as commissioner, Paul also became a powerful advocate for residents in St. Johns County and continued to volunteer in a variety of capacities throughout the community.

His recent loss is a devastating blow to our community. He will be remembered as a strong leader, faithful husband, loving father, and beloved neighbor and friend. I was proud to call him my friend.

On behalf of Florida's Fourth Congressional District, I extend sincere condolences to Paul's wife, Stephanie, and their two daughters, Ashley and Kati.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TYRONE WINFREY

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tyrone Winfrey, a beloved resident of Michigan's 13th Congressional District. He was a tireless advocate for our students, a fighter for higher education opportunities, and so much more.

Tyrone Winfrey served as the Executive Director of Community Affairs for Detroit Public Schools Community District and was the former school board president. He worked tirelessly to advocate for our youth, and to ensure that every single student had access and an opportunity to quality education and a pathway for college and higher education opportunities.

Tyrone served our communities at Detroit public schools for almost 35 years, and during his time, he inspired, supported, and uplifted so many of our students and families.

He lost his 5-year battle with cancer, and I am proud to stand here in honor of his life and his love for our community and our youth. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, the Detroit Public Schools Community District, and all who were impacted by Tyrone Winfrey.

RECOGNIZING THE ISLAMIC CENTER OF AMERICA

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Islamic Center of America for their outstanding service on behalf of our communities of Wayne County and Southeastern Michigan as they celebrate their 60th anniversary.

They were founded in 1962, and there, the Islamic Center of America's roots can be traced back to 1949 when our religious leader, scholar, Imam Chirri, who could not speak or understand English, came to America at the request of a small group of residents.

A committed group of community members came together and worked to establish the Islamic Center as Michigan's first mosque and invited Imam Chirri to lead this family in faith.

Since its humbling beginnings, the Islamic Center of America has grown to accommodate its growing family in faith and offers numerous community programs, including education and senior services. They are a pillar of cross-cultural understanding in one of our area's most vibrant and diverse communities.

Please join me in recognizing the Islamic Center of America as they celebrate 60 years of faith and service.

IN MEMORY OF JOEY SMITH

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my sadness about the death of Joey Smith, a 12-year-old resident of Dearborn Heights, whose young life was tragically cut short when he was struck by a car.

A seventh-grade student at O.W. Best Middle School, Joey was always surrounded by friends and classmates who will dearly miss him. He will be remembered for his bright smile.

I offer my deepest condolences and sympathy to Joey's family and his friends as they mourn his loss.

As a mother myself, my heart especially goes out to Joey's mother, Katie. I pray that she finds the strength and peace during this very difficult time of unimaginable grief. Our community is deeply saddened by this tragedy.

Please join me in honoring the memory of Joey Smith.

NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate the eighth annual National Apprenticeship Week. It is the perfect time to reflect on what is and what isn't working in our Nation's workforce development programs.

There are more than 10 million unfilled jobs in this country and nearly 6 million unemployed individuals. There is clearly a crack in the education-to-workforce pipeline.

The best way to address our country's skills gap and worker shortage is to promote workforce development programs that actually work.

I have been encouraged to see many businesses coming up with their own workforce development programs. Time and again, employer-led programs prove to produce the best results.

More industries are embracing apprenticeships as a solution for upskilling and re-skilling workers. As employers realize that baccalaureate degrees do not always prepare workers to fill needed roles, more alternative pathways will be needed.

Many businesses are already removing unnecessary degree requirements and are, instead, replacing them with apprenticeship programs. This is a great development for our country and our workforce.

Americans should not have to take out mountains of crushing student loan debt to study a subject that has nothing to do with their intended career, only to have to start from scratch once they enter the workforce.

For too long, the college-for-all mentality has pushed young people into obtaining a baccalaureate degree, regardless of their intended career. This mentality is slowly shifting, and our country will be better off for it.

Now that more young people are turning to apprenticeships, it is important to ensure that there are high-quality programs available.

We need apprenticeship programs that prepare workers for the open positions today, not the positions that were open yesterday. We need cutting-edge programs. One-size-fits-all, Washington-knows-best models are not the answer.

While President Biden touts his support for apprenticeships, his cancellation of employer-led apprenticeship programs tell a different story. President Biden supports only apprenticeships he can control.

Since terminating employer-led apprenticeship programs, the Biden administration has doubled down on support for the registered apprenticeship model.

Because this system, founded in 1937, has not been substantially updated in eight decades, it is not easily adapted for innovative industries. Using this model to expand and modernize apprenticeships would be like starting on a journey on an already-leaking ship. We can push as hard as we want, but in the end, the vessel can only take us so far before we sink.

It is time for a new system, one with employers in the driver's seat. Job creators know the tools workers need to be successful. Washington swamp dwellers, on the other hand, are clueless.

□ 1015

Why the Biden administration believes bureaucrats in Washington are more equipped to run apprenticeship programs than those on the ground is beyond me. It is no surprise that the vast majority of successful and thriving apprenticeship programs are led by private industry.

Take Kentucky FAME, for example. The Kentucky Federation for Advanced Manufacturing Education is a partnership of regional manufacturers that creates a pipeline of highly skilled workers through an earn and learn program. By the time participants are done with this program, they will have an associate's degree, an advanced manufacturing technician credential, and years of work experience, all with no student loan debt.

This organization operates in 12 States and has an 85 percent employment placement rate. This is an excellent workforce development model that other industries can learn from.

The more employers embrace apprenticeships, the better off our economy will be. The best way for our workforce to thrive is for the Federal Government to get out of the way and for industry leaders to lead the way.

So, for this National Apprenticeship Week, let's tell the Biden administration to stop putting special interests ahead of workers; let's recommit ourselves to empowering job creators to provide their own solutions; and let's support those jobseekers who want an opportunity to learn and earn at the same time.

PASSING ELECTORAL COUNT ACT REFORM

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm that the 117th Congress and, indeed, this body is on track to surrender its last chance to safeguard American democracy.

It has been 1,045 days since this Capitol, this very building, this very Congress, was attacked on January 6, 2021, in a violent insurrection orchestrated by President Trump in an attempt to stop the transfer of power to the legitimate winner of the 2020 election.

Former President Trump tried to use violence and the flaws of the 1887 Electoral Count Act to overcome his loss in the 2020 election. That was 1,045 days ago.

By contrast, there are less than 20 days during which this Congress can still pass legislation to reform, amend, and clarify the 1887 Electoral Count Act and ensure that events like January 6 never happen again.

We must act. We cannot fail. Former President Trump has set the stage for his supporters to use the flaws in the 1887 law to put aside the electors that reflect the will of the voters in key States and, instead, send forward electors loyal to Trump.

In 135 years since the Electoral Count Act of 1887's enactment, the United States was fortunate to experience continuous, peaceful elections and transfer of power. Former President Trump shattered that cherished norm on January 6.

My colleagues, the fact that we came back into the House Chamber to formally confirm the 2020 electoral college count, despite the violent threats made against our lives, is a source of immense pride not only to us but to America.

We now know that the previous transfers of power took place despite the law and its failings, not because of it.

Tragically, President Trump and his antidemocratic allies' efforts to exploit the loopholes in the Electoral Count Act did not end on that infamous day. Over the last 2 years, unscrupulous MAGA Republican officials have been carrying out a deliberate and coordinated plan to build on the big lie by enacting State laws that allow partisan lawmakers to reject the will of the voters and undermine American democracy.

During the recent 2022 midterm election, 170 of Trump's endorsed election-denying candidates running for Congress and critical State offices have been projected to win their races.

Finally, last night, we watched former President Trump carry out the next step in his plan by formally declaring his candidacy for Presidency in 2024.

The stage is now set for these actors to once again exploit the ambiguities of the Electoral Count Act as early as 2024.

These dangerous actions have already undercut public trust in our electoral system and their elected officials. If left unaddressed, they could prove catastrophic and bring about an end to America's 245 years of democratic tradition.

Congress must now reform the outdated 1887 law to ensure that no State legislature controlled by any party can subvert a Presidential election by ignoring the will of the voters in that State.

Fortunately, the House recently passed the Presidential Election Reform Act, which would significantly improve the Electoral Count Act. I applaud Chairwoman ZOE LOFGREN of the House Administration Committee and Ranking Member LIZ CHENEY, who brought the legislation forward.

Additionally, the U.S. Senate Committee on Rules and Administration recently marked up the Electoral Count Reform Act, a competing proposal.

I call upon my colleagues in the key committees to promptly bring forward compromise legislation that we can enact into law.

Democracy is fragile, and it is our responsibility to protect it. Americans have upheld this responsibility for more than two centuries of challenges and adversities. If we fail to seize this opportunity to fix the broken Electoral Count Act, I fear that our democratic system will not get another chance.

Congress has waited 1,045 days, and there are only 20 remaining. Time is running out.

ADDRESSING THE DIESEL SHORTAGE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every few weeks, we read headlines of another crisis: baby formula; fertilizer; and now another important input, diesel fuel.

This administration not only continues to turn a blind eye but perpetuates harmful policies that worsen these crises.

From day one, President Biden has launched a war on American energy, and now it must end. Through executive actions, the Biden administration paused domestic production of oil while limiting and disincentivizing investments in American energy infrastructure and refining capacity.

On his very first day in office, President Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, thus declaring war on our domestic energy production. Seven days later, he paused new oil and gas leasing on public lands and offshore waters. Then, in November 2021, the EPA proposed new source performance methane standards on the oil and natural gas industry, tying the hands of smaller producers.

Just last week, at COP 27, President Biden doubled down on this proposal and announced even more burdensome requirements on U.S. oil and gas sources. Meanwhile, Americans were pumping away their paychecks as prices for gas and home heating skyrocketed.

This administration needs to refocus its priorities by increasing domestic energy production, expediting pipeline permitting, and abandoning burdensome rulemakings that are harming American agriculture.

Let's face facts. America's farm families and consumers have struggled with fractured supply chains, skyrocketing input costs, and historic levels of inflation, economic woes exacerbated by congressional Democrats' excessive spending and the Biden administration's burdensome regulatory agenda. Under this administration, farm production expenses are up nearly $80 billion, led by an 84 percent, or $21 billion, increase in fertilizer expenses and a 65 percent increase in fuel expenses.

As the Biden administration's self-inflicted energy crisis surges into a diesel shortage, they continually pass the buck by blaming domestic energy producers.

Further, Biden's regulatory assault destroys any incentive for domestic energy producers to invest in energy infrastructure, which worsens energy market volatility and increases costs for vital farm inputs such as diesel fuel and fertilizer.

In October 2022, EIA reported the distillate fuel oil inventory at 106 million. This is the lowest stock since 2008; the lowest stock for this time of the year since 1982; and, in some regions, the lowest inventory since 1950.

Diesel fuel is used every day to power farm and ranch equipment and deliver goods to the marketplace. This Biden-inflicted diesel crisis further exacerbates record inflation, skyrocketing farm input costs, and consumer prices. The national average price for diesel fuel per gallon is $5.36 a gallon, an increase of $1.71, or 50 percent, from this time just last year.

By gambling away American energy and resource independence in the name of climate change, the Biden administration has harmed the very industry, U.S. agriculture, that contributes to 13 percent of the annual greenhouse gas sequestration.

Just this past summer, President Biden went to the Saudis and begged OPEC+ to increase production. Instead of relying on our adversaries and asking them to produce more, we should be focused on the responsible development of America's own abundant natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have solutions focused on reversing industry-crushing regulations and market signals, unleashing production of crude oil, streamlining permitting and environmental review processes, and restoring refining capacity.

We must reverse this self-inflected crisis and unleash our domestic energy production.

DELIVERING STUDENT DEBT RELIEF

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

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise today in full support of President Biden's student debt relief plan in the face of Republican efforts to block economic relief for millions of people.

The $1.9 trillion student debt crisis has cost people more than just money. It has stripped countless people of the opportunity to start a family, buy a home, start a business, or further their education.

My office has been collecting heartbreaking stories from constituents across Missouri's First District about how student debt relief would impact their lives for the better. Here are some of their stories.

Michelle H. writes: ''The ongoing gloom and constant worry of student loan debt will lessen significantly. Even if some of the debt I have accumulated through student loans was forgiven, my entire quality of life will drastically increase, and my mental health would also increase. This would be absolutely life-changing.''

Amy V. notes: ''We will be able to buy a house, my first mortgage. This will allow me to pay off other bills and increase my credit score. I cannot afford the monthly payment of over $900 per month.''

Alison M. writes: ''I have been swimming in debt since I graduated college with a degree and a job. At one point, I couldn't even afford to move out of my parents' because my student loans were over $1,000. Sallie Mae ruined my credit score, and now that I finally have somewhat of a stable income. If this debt relief comes through, I can actually see a light at the end of still a long tunnel. But, before, I never even thought there was such a light.''

These are just three of the 43 million borrowers who are depending on transformative student debt relief measures that will change their lives forever.

I share my own personal story of my journey grappling with immense student loan debt. As a single mom of two, working an hourly job that made less than $10 an hour, even after working there for 10 years, I struggled to provide for my family and myself. I knew I needed a change, a career change, but that meant I would need to go back to school and that I would ultimately incur student debt.

I thought that once I graduated and got a steady job, I would be able to pay it back quickly. So, I enrolled in nursing school, took out loans, and a few years later, I was a registered nurse.

□ 1030

For the most part, everything went as I expected, and it wasn't until I was faced with that first payment that I realized just how astronomical this debt burden became. Even with a job that paid more money than I had ever made before, it still felt impossible to be able to pay it off.

Ultimately, I was able to pay off my student loans, but it took years. During those years I struggled to pay these loans, I faced multiple eviction notices and was evicted, had difficulty feeding my two babies and affording childcare as I worked long and odd hours as a nurse. It was hard, and at times it felt impossible. I would have welcomed debt relief, and it is why I am pushing so hard to remove that economic burden for current and future generations.

Education should be affordable, equitable, and accessible to absolutely everyone. It should lead to prosperity and opportunity, not debt.

I share these stories with you, my colleagues, and implore us all to continue supporting the Biden administration in backing down the dark money and right-wing attacks on student debt relief and to continue standing with borrowers by extending the payment pause beyond December 31st and using every single legal authority to deliver student debt relief. We have a responsibility and an obligation to cancel student debt now.

WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME AND KANSAS FOOD AID LEGACY

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the American farmer and to deliver the 15th installment of my farm bill impact series.

The United States is the most food–secure country in the world thanks to the strength and determination of American farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers. With America's robust resources, we have been committed to ensuring food security at home and around the world, and Kansas has been on the cutting edge of that effort for nearly a century.

In September of 1953, Peter O'Brien, a farmer from Cheyenne County, Kansas, stood up at his local county farm bureau meeting to share an idea. He wanted to use Kansas grain to help hungry people around the world. Over the next several months, today's Food for Peace program was crafted. The following year, one of Kansas' favorite sons, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, signed parts of the program into law. That was the beginning of what is now a longstanding Kansas tradition of commitment, care, and leadership in the international effort to address global hunger.

Two weeks ago, I hosted David Beasley, the executive director of the World Food Programme, in Kansas for an event to thank the American farmer. Executive Director Beasley had just been in Egypt, Ethiopia, and Rome, but he came to Kansas because he understands the impact that farmers in my

State have had on international food aid. American farmers use their resources to feed, fuel, and clothe the world, which is no small task. It takes grit, determination, and a strong partnership between the public and private sectors. The World Food Programme won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2020, and it is the world's largest humanitarian organization specializing in using American-grown commodities for international food assistance. It is a great example of what we can accomplish when public-private partnerships thrive.

Now, with the 2023 reauthorization of the farm bill upon us, we see that the Kansas legacy of international food aid is alive and well. Today, our country administers in-kind food assistance primarily through farm bill programs, such as the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust and the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program, just to name two. These programs have an especially strong return on investment because they support American agriculture producers today while greatly reducing the need for conflict or war-related dollars tomorrow. In the long run, these programs save the American taxpayer money. We know that when food rations are accessible in developing countries, conflict decreases. International food aid is, therefore, a way to stop wars before they start.

I have the privilege and responsibility of advocating for Kansas' top priorities in the farm bill. That means protecting crop insurance, promoting trade, and ensuring that any oversight within the bill doesn't needlessly handcuff American producers with red tape. Congress must also ensure that international food aid programs remain strong in the farm bill. Around the world today, hungry people facing starvation in emergency situations rely on American farmers, who have provided nutrition in the place of starvation, created careers of dignity in the place of aimlessness, and secured peace in the place of war.

I will be back on the floor soon to deliver another installment of my farm bill impact series and highlight more programs and titles within the bill that I believe Congress must understand and support to ensure that agriculture thrives in America. The people who feed, fuel, and clothe us all deserve our unwavering support.

RECOGNIZING CHIEF MASTER SERGEANT JOHN JONES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Master Sergeant John Jones of Utica, New York, who retired in October of this year after nearly 30 years of full-time service in the Air National Guard.

Chief Master Sergeant John A. Jones entered the Air Force in August of 1993, serving in ever-increasing positions of responsibility over the next 29 years, culminating in his most recent position as superintendent of the 174th Maintenance Operations Flight at Hancock Field Air National Guard Base in Syracuse, New York.

Chief Jones started his career at Dover Air Force Base in Delaware as an airlift aircraft maintenance specialist, where he maintained the C–5 Galaxy. He accumulated hundreds of flying hours in both peacetime and combat missions.

He transitioned to the 174th Fighter Wing of the New York Air National Guard in 1997, serving 9 years as an attack controls systems specialist and electronic integrated systems specialist. In those roles, he maintained critical electronic systems of the F–16 Fighting Falcon.

In 2006, Chief Jones moved to the Maintenance Group Quality Assurance office as the avionics inspector, eventually serving as the chief inspector and superintendent.

Chief Jones deployed multiple times to the European and Middle Eastern theaters of operation in service of our country to support Operations Deliberate Force, Southern Watch, Noble Eagle, and Enduring Freedom.

Chief Jones was also instrumental in the modernization of New York's Air National Guard fleet, including playing a pivotal role overseeing the aircraft conversion from the F–16 Fighting Falcon to the MQ–9 Reaper.

I have come to personally know Chief Jones through his dedicated work as the New York Wing commander of the Civil Air Patrol, a program I care deeply about and have consistently supported as a Member of Congress and also as a member of the New York State Assembly. My son, Trey, who is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and a Marine officer, was once a young man in the Civil Air Patrol's cadet program.

I saw firsthand how Civil Air Patrol's educational program and leadership training lit a spark within him that played a role in propelling him to serve our Nation. CAP continues to do the same for young men and women across our country.

I had the opportunity recently to explore just how the Civil Air Patrol's New York Wing conducts disaster relief missions when I joined Chief Jones and his cadets for a training session in Rome, New York. I saw young cadets experience their first flights and was able to ride in a Civil Air Patrol plane myself.

Thank you to Chief Jones for his experience as well as decades of service to our community and our Nation. I wish him the very best in retirement, and I am confident he will continue to find ways to give back to our region and continue to empower and inspire leaders of the next generation.

SUPPORTING DELPHI SALARIED RETIREES

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call upon the Senate to quickly pass the Susan Muffley Act, which you may remember passed this body earlier this year with strong bipartisan support.

Under the Obama administration, the Delphi salaried retirees had their pension benefits slashed, while unionized hourly workers received their full benefits. This was an injustice to the Delphi salaried retirees that must be remedied, and it was the fault of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, a Federal program.

The Susan Muffley Act, led by Congressman DAN KILDEE and Congressman MIKE TURNER, would fully restore the Delphi salaried retirees' full pension benefits with backpay.

I was honored to support this legislation when it passed the House of Representatives in July. Thank you to all of my colleagues across the aisle and everyone who recognized this grave injustice and supported these hardworking people who deserve these benefits restored.

Now, the Senate must pass this legislation before it expires at the end of this year. The Delphi group has been fighting for almost 15 years to correct this wrong, and it would be a travesty if they lost this battle.

That is why I am calling on Senate leadership and all the Senators to bring the Susan Muffley Act to the floor, to support it, and to include it in their end-of-year work this legislative session. Together, we can make the Delphi employees whole and can right this wrong and this terrible injustice to these hardworking Americans who just did their job and paid into their own pension system and were not able to receive the benefits that were the fruits of their labor.

REMEMBERING DEPUTY JAMES LEE

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Jefferson County Sheriff's Officer Deputy James Lee, who tragically passed away on July 9, leaving behind a legacy of service to Jefferson County.

Deputy Lee was a marine who started with the Jefferson County Sheriff's Office in 1973 and was 71 years old when he passed away.

He was known as someone who enjoyed going to work to protect his community, who was tough but always showed compassion.

He leaves behind a wife and son, who will follow in his father's footsteps at the sheriff's office. Though he may be gone, I know that Deputy Lee is still watching over his beloved community and family.

Please join me in recognizing the extraordinary life and service of Deputy James Lee.

HONORING PAT HALLISEY

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the retirement of a local leader and dedicated public servant who I am proud to call a friend, the

outgoing mayor of League City, Texas, the Honorable Pat Hallisey.

Throughout his 6 years as mayor, Pat's dedication to League City was clear. He maintained a community with high standards of safety, health, and prosperity. He left League City better than he found it.

As mayor, Pat led the city through recovery efforts stemming from the damage caused by Hurricane Harvey. And I am proud to have worked with him over the years to revitalize Galveston County's largest city.

On behalf of a grateful community, it is my privilege to honor Mayor Pat Hallisey and his beautiful wife, Janice. Along with her and his family, friends, and colleagues, I want to extend absolute best wishes to Mayor Pat Hallisey in his retirement.

HONORING JUDGE MIKE NELSON

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of the Honorable Michael Nelson, or as his friends and family call him, Mike. He has dedicated his life to serving the people of Galveston County.

Judge Mike was born on June 17, 1949, in Gould, Arkansas. At 18, he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps, served three tours in Vietnam, and retired from service in 1976. He is married to the former Carol Rotenberry of Santa Fe, Texas, where they raised their four daughters: Sarah Jane, Peyton, Heather, and Michaelia; and four sons: Doug, Michael John, Michael Jr., and Curtis.

Mr. Nelson served as a justice of the peace and a municipal court judge since 1986 in Galveston County.

A true testament to his character, in 2017, he was awarded the Man of the Year from the Chamber of Commerce of Hitchcock.

Mike is a man of purpose, honor, and unwavering determination for the betterment of our community. He has left a positive impact on that very same community.

Judge Mike is a beloved member of his community and a fearless advocate for his constituents, whom he cares for deeply. He always had an open-door policy for any constituent who wished to meet with him. His accomplished record and willingness to serve are evident in his over 35 years of public service.

On behalf of Texas' 14th Congressional District, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize his exceptional leadership and his example as a true public servant.

I thank Mike for being an incredible leader. He will be remembered for generations to come. He is a man of his word, he is intelligent, he is disciplined, and he treats people with respect. It is an absolute honor to know him.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF BILL NEILD

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Bill Neild or, as described by a lifelong friend, the John Wayne of Beaumont, Texas. He passed away at age 85 on August 24, 2022, leaving behind a community of friends and family and a legacy of hard work, sacrifice, and service.

Bill was an extraordinary community leader and had a true servant's heart. He served 4 years as the mayor of Beaumont. He was chairman of the board of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce. He was a member of the Board of Directors of First City Bank, and he served as chairman for many organizations in the city.

He was a man of integrity, and his passion and service to the community was felt, and will continue to be felt, far and wide.

I take this time to honor the life of service exemplified by Mayor Neild. I thank him and his family for their dedication to our fellow citizens on behalf of a very, very grateful 14th District of Texas.

□ 1045

HARRISONBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT CELEBRATES 150 YEARS OF SERVICE

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, if you drive around Harrisonburg, Virginia, you are bound to see an officer with the Harrisonburg Police Department, keeping residents, visitors, and college students safe.

As HPD reminds us, ''So many things have changed since those handwritten meeting notes of November 12, 1872 . . . when the 700 residents of the town of Harrisonburg at that time wrote the single-man police department into being.''

By January 1, 1873, the force was comprised of the Chief of Police, Joseph Kelly, and a ''police aide,'' Officer Willis.

Current HPD Captain Jason Kidd said of the anniversary, ''It is so important to reach this milestone because the city has grown tremendously and developed tremendously during these past 150 years. The growth of the department, personnel, added positions, and technological improvements have allowed the department to police better and police smarter and just do the best job they can for the community.''

To celebrate this milestone, HPD established a 150-year committee, and the officers will be sporting a 150-year badge to mark the occasion. HPD will also be building a time capsule to look back on this milestone in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I join the citizens of Harrisonburg in thanking the Harrisonburg Police Department for their 150 years of service.

THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY SEASON INFLATION WOES

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are all looking forward to the holiday season.

Unfortunately, the annual pre-Thanksgiving shopping receipt will be a sad reminder that Washington hasn't been working for them.

Up and down the grocery store aisle, prices have risen on all our Thanksgiving necessities. Turkeys cost 23 percent more, eggs cost 43 percent more, butter is up 27 percent, and milk up 15 percent. The overall price of groceries over the last year has risen 12.4 percent. For those traveling far to see their families and loved ones this year, airline fares are up 43 percent over last year.

While everyone is having to tighten their budgets, those working two jobs or on fixed incomes are getting hit the hardest, forcing roughly one in four Americans to forego Thanksgiving dinner altogether.

An additional $9 trillion in government spending has fueled this inflation crisis, and hardworking Americans are paying the price.

If we are going to get this country back on track, Congress needs to cut spending, unleash American energy independence, and push pro-growth policies.

It is time to fix a broken Washington and save America from this administration's failed economic agenda.

STUARTS DRAFT COUGARS CHEER TEAM WINS AGAIN

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Stuarts Draft Cougars cheer team for winning this year's Class 1–2 Virginia State cheerleading championship. This victory marks the program's fifth straight title in 6 years.

The Cougars faced numerous hurdles to reach this victory, placing second behind Fort Defiance during the first round.

However, before the second round began, Coach Tammy Carter told the team to be ''the athletes they trained to be,'' and they did just that. By focusing on what they needed to improve, the Cougars left it all on the mat and increased their score by over 30 points, earning the State title.

These talented young ladies include Lexi Almarode, Addison Colvin, Jenna Comer, Sofia Coppola, Taylor Huffman, Zoe Mader, Zane Marshall, Abby Mikolay, Caydence Morris, Tarynn Morris, Baleigh Painter, Eiko Puckett, Olivia Puckett, Alyssa Sanner, Holly Stevens, A'mya Swats, and Natalie Thompson.

For six seniors on the team—Mses. Coppola, Mader, Marshall, Mikolay, Morris, and Painter—this was their last memory of cheering together. There was an outpouring of emotion hoisting the State championship trophy for one final time.

Senior Zane Marshall said of her class' historic reign, ''To have three State championships, I don't even know how to feel. It is crazy.''

The seniors will leave their high school cheerleading careers with their heads held high, knowing their leadership and performance have left a lasting legacy on their team.

Congratulations to all the talented athletes and dedicated coaches on this incredible victory. They have earned it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHUCK LARSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life of Chuck Larson, or Charles Larson, Sr.

Chuck passed away earlier this month, surrounded by his family at the age of 87. Chuck's life was dedicated to public service, serving both in the military and in government. He was active in the United States Army Reserves for 33 years, where he was a recipient of the Legion of Merit award and retired as colonel.

Following his military service, Chuck worked with Iowa Governor Terry Branstad as a member of his cabinet, served on Iowa's Board of Parole, and served as the director of the Alliance on Substance Abuse.

Additionally, Chuck served under President Ronald Reagan and President George H.W. Bush as the U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Iowa.

I am grateful for Chuck's career in public service, and my thoughts and prayers are with his family during this difficult time.

CONGRATULATING TODD HAFNER ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Todd Hafner for his retirement from William Penn University.

Todd has been the head coach of the football team at William Penn University in Oskaloosa for the past 19 years. During his career, the Statesmen had a winning record of 112–93–1, giving him the most wins of any coach in the school's history. Under Todd's coaching, he won league titles in 2010, 2012, and 2016.

Todd's accomplishments have not gone unnoticed by his colleagues. He was named a three-time conference coach of the year, the Victory Sports Network National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics coach of the year, and the AFCA Region 2 coach of the year in 2010.

I thank Todd for his role in furthering William Penn's football program, mentoring of young athletes, and his 19 years of success.

COMMENDING HEALTHY SAVANNAH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Healthy Savannah for earning one of only two 2022 REACH Lark Galloway-Gilliam Awards for Advancing Health Equity Challenge.

Healthy Savannah is a public-private partnership of more than 200 businesses, nonprofits, faith- and community-based organizations, schools, and healthcare and government agencies.

Healthy Savannah aims to make Savannah, Georgia, a healthier place to live with a particular focus on reducing health disparities and increasing health equity for African Americans with lower incomes and those disproportionately affected by chronic disease.

The CDC chose Healthy Savannah for this award because of its outstanding work improving the health and well-being of people in the communities in which they live. The members of the organizations within Healthy Savannah are all to be commended for the hard work and dedication that they have towards improving the lives of members of their communities.

Congratulations, Healthy Savannah, and thank you for continuing to make our community a healthier place to live.

HONORING FIRE CHIEF RANDY MOBLEY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Fire Chief Randy Mobley, an exceptional Georgian and selfless leader in his community.

In 1982, Mr. Mobley was hired as a fireman. Chief Mobley went on to dedicate 40 years of service to the city of Brunswick, 10 of which were spent as the fire chief.

Over four decades of noble labor, Randy has implemented many programs that have helped keep Brunswick citizens safe.

His safety smoke alarm program provided smoke alarms to all residents in his community. Through this program, Brunswick was able to maintain a class 1 ISO insurance rating, the highest protection rating you can receive.

What an inspiration it is to go to work every day and put your own life on the line to save others. Individuals like Chief Randy Mobley make me proud to represent the First Congressional District of Georgia.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 75th anniversary of India's independence from the British Empire.

On August 15, 1947, the Parliament passed the Indian Independence Act, officially establishing India as a sovereign nation after nearly 90 years under the Raj. This act of Parliament marked the creation of the largest democracy in history, responsible for governing a nation over a billion strong.

Though it may not seem like it at first glance, the United States and India share much in common. Our national identities were both forged from a rejection of British rule by crown or company. We both recognize the vital importance of autonomy, of independence, and freedom from foreign rulers.

India's commitment to democracy and self-government has been unwavering in the past decades, and its future today is brighter than ever before.

I am excited for America's relationship with India to continue flourishing, as it has for the past 75 years, and I am proud to call the people of India our friends.

REMEMBERING PATRICIA ''PAT'' BOHLER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Patricia ''Pat'' Bohler, a woman who was a staple within the Garden City community for over 50 years.

After being born in Texas, Pat moved to Georgia, where she attended Armstrong State University, earning a degree in education before earning her master's degree at Georgia Southern University.

As a teacher with the Savannah-Chatham County Public School System, she touched the lives of countless elementary-aged children. Her work as a title I reading teacher will shape generations to come.

In a display of her true desire to serve the community around her, she spent considerable time teaching adult education classes.

Pat faithfully attended and served at Garden City United Methodist Church, where she was a member for 57 years. She taught Sunday school and was the president of the United Methodist Women. Outside of this, she was active as a Girl Scout leader and softball coach.

She raised four daughters with poise and taught them the values of education, service, and community.

She will be deeply missed and remembered by the innumerable lives she shaped.

I extend my sincere condolences to Pat's family, friends, and community.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BUSTOS) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Sovereign God, for Your name's sake and out of the goodness of Your love, deliver the people of Ukraine from their enemy's unrelenting attacks. We pray for the poor and needy, who have lost hope and home. Heal the hearts of those wounded within, who have lost faith and family. Consider those whose lives and livelihoods have faded away like the evening shadows. Shine on them the light of Your saving love.

Help the men and women, those of old age and the children, those who

have fled their persecutors, and those who remain defiantly in place to preserve their land, the political leaders and the warriors who battle on all fronts. Protect each of them according to Your unfailing love.

Then may the foes who pursue them know that it is Your hand that has preserved Ukraine. May those who curse Ukraine be made mute by Your just word. May those who attack be put to shame by Your righteousness. And may those who continue to serve You faithfully in this, their time of trial, find reason to rejoice in You.

For You, O Lord, stand at the right hand of the oppressed, to save them from their distress.

And so it is with hope in Your salvation and in the strength of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. TLAIB led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

MARKING TRANSGENDER AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark Transgender Awareness Week.

In recent years, we have seen increased transgender visibility, whether on our TV screens with Angelica Ross on ''Pose'' and ''American Horror Story'' and Amy Schneider's success on ''Jeopardy!'' or in the Federal Government with the confirmation of Admiral Levine, the Assistant Secretary for Health.

Transgender people want and deserve the same thing we all want: to be treated with respect and to be equal members in our communities under our laws.

To the transgender community, I am standing here on the floor of the House of Representatives today to tell you that you are valued, you are loved, and your stories matter. Your identities should not just be affirmed but celebrated.

As chair of the Congressional LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus, I will never stop fighting for your ability to reach your full potential without fear of discrimination, violence, or stigmatization. You deserve full equality, nothing less.

RECOGNIZING TARRANT COUNTY UNITED WAY'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the United Way of Tarrant County's 100th anniversary.

United Way has supported the community in many ways and has enriched the lives of the people in the area. They have helped residents, volunteers, donors, businesses, governments, nonprofits, and community stakeholders and brought them together to solve some of the toughest issues affecting Tarrant County.

I join in proclaiming November 17, 2022, as Get United Day, and I am proud of their work to encourage unity among all residents and commitment to building a stronger community.

I congratulate the United Way of Tarrant County for this significant milestone. I am confident they will continue their exceptional service to the community for the next 100 years.

In God we trust.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TYRONE WINFREY

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life of Tyrone Winfrey, a beloved resident of Michigan's 13th District, a tireless advocate for students, and a fighter for higher education opportunities and so much more.

Tyrone served as the executive director of community affairs for Detroit Public Schools Community District and was our former school board president. He worked tirelessly to advocate for our youth and to ensure that every student had access to quality education.

Tyrone served our community over 35 years at the school district, and during this time, he inspired, supported, and uplifted so many of our students and families.

Unfortunately, Mr. Winfrey lost his 5-year battle with cancer this month, but I am proud to stand here in honor of his life and his love for our community.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family and our school community, as well as all those impacted by Tyrone Winfrey.

BIDENFLATION IS A CRISIS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Americans are experiencing inflation at 40-year highs, with families in South Carolina paying over 14 percent more in the last year.

Under Biden, inflation has outpaced worker wages for 18 months in a row and will cost the average American household over $8,000 annually, which is a loss of a month of income.

A trip to the grocery store costs families 12 percent more from last year. Eggs are up 43 percent, flour up 25 percent, milk up 15 percent.

The Congressional Budget Office reports the irresponsible inflation expansion act will increase the deficit through 2026 and cost working families an additional $60 billion, destroying jobs.

Our country is in crisis, and Americans need relief, which is why voters have achieved a House Republican majority. Republicans will fight Bidenflation undermining American families.

Congratulations, Speaker-to-be KEVIN MCCARTHY.

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

SUPPORTING THE VIPER ACT

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the VA Infrastructure Powers Exceptional Research Act, called the VIPER Act, that the House will consider today.

In Buffalo in 1958, Dr. William Chardack and engineer Wilson Greatbatch teamed up to develop the first implantable pacemaker at our Buffalo VA hospital. Today, more than 3 million people around the world have implanted pacemakers, and the VA Pacemaker Program still monitors more than 11,000 veterans with pacemakers.

The VIPER Act will build on this record, bringing us another step toward the next generation of life-saving treatments.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation. It is an investment in a stronger future for veterans and our healthcare system overall.

CONGRATULATING CLARION KIWANIS CLUB ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(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 congratulate the Kiwanis Club of Clarion, Pennsylvania, on their 100th anniversary.

Since the club's founding on December 16, 1922, the members of the Kiwanis Club have been a crucial part of the community in Clarion.

The Kiwanis Club is an international organization of volunteers that strives to serve the needs of children. The Kiwanis Club has over 550,000 members internationally and seeks to help children by fighting hunger, improving literacy rates, and improving children's health and educational outcomes.

Across the world, Kiwanis Club members have taken part in over 150,000 service projects to benefit communities and to help make them better places to live.

Today, the Clarion Kiwanis continue to carry out the club's mission of giving back to the community by hosting regular fundraisers to benefit children and providing an annual scholarship for students in Clarion County.

Please join me in congratulating the Clarion Kiwanis Club on 100 years of service and thanking them for their many years of giving back to Clarion County.

MARKING THE 1984 ANTI-SIKH MASSACRE

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in solidarity with the south Jersey Sikh community. This month marks 38 years since anti-Sikh rioters in India massacred Sikhs over 3 days.

The massacre was retaliation for the assassination of Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. There were mass rapes and lynchings. Sikhs' homes and their businesses were destroyed, senselessly slaughtered for nothing more than their beliefs and their religion.

Following the slaughter, some of the Sikhs chose to flee India. Today, many of them call south Jersey home. They built lives for themselves, contributing to the education, economic, religious, and cultural richness of our region.

They also carry the knowledge of those dark days. They keep the names and the memories of those who were lost in those days very much alive.

In memory of those Sikhs lost to this senseless violence between November 1 and 3 of 1984, and with respect to those who carry on their legacy in south Jersey today, I stand here in solidarity with my Sikh brothers and sisters.

HANDS OFF WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE DECISIONS

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

Ms. MANNING. Madam Speaker, the midterm elections delivered a strong message to the GOP: Politicians should keep their hands off women's reproductive decisions.

Voters in California, Michigan, and Vermont enshrined abortion access into their State constitutions, and Kentucky voters rejected a ballot measure threatening abortion protections.

Postelection polls show a majority of voters want to see Congress protect abortion rights. But regardless of how unpopular their views, Republicans in Congress doubled down on their attacks on women's bodies.

We know it is going to be an uphill battle to codify Roe, and House Republicans made it clear they won't stop with banning abortion. Last July, 193 House Republicans voted against my bill to protect the right to birth control, a measure 95 percent of voters agree with.

The right to abortion and to birth control are critical issues for the American people. So, I ask my colleagues across the aisle: Why aren't they critical to you?

PUTTING PEOPLE OVER POLITICS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to highlight some of the historic results my colleagues and I have been able to deliver to the American people over the last 2 years. By putting aside political agendas and working for the betterment of our communities, we have made real change.

In the 117th Congress, House Democrats fought to pass landmark packages to address the disenfranchisement inherently embedded in our country.

We helped ensure more of our people can thrive by passing the American Rescue Plan, the bipartisan infrastructure law, the CHIPS and Science Act, and the Inflation Reduction Act.

Still, there is more work to be done. My colleagues and I remain committed to putting money back in the pockets of American workers and families by addressing inflation, lowering healthcare costs, and bolstering domestic manufacturing to create new, good-paying jobs—not scaring people, supporting them.

DEFENDING AMERICA'S BORDERS

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

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we have watched tens of billions of dollars be sent to defend another nation's border that is not our own.

Every single day, our border is invaded by people from foreign lands and also by drugs. Over 300 people are dying every single day. Americans are dying every single day from fentanyl poisoning.

Yet, the Biden administration and this Congress have not done anything to protect our Nation's border and the American people.

Just to remind everyone, the building that we are standing in, the Federal Government and everyone's paychecks here are paid by the American taxpayers. The American taxpayers and the American people deserve to have a secure border and deserve the protection of the Federal Government from the Mexican cartels that funnel drugs into America to kill Americans.

I am calling for an audit of every single penny that has been sent to Ukraine, including aid money and any other moneys that have been given to the Ukrainian Government to defend their national security while our national security has been ignored.

This must be done. It has to be done as soon as possible for the American people. They deserve transparency, and they deserve to see where their money is going.

□ 1215

SUPPORTING OUR SELFLESS VETERANS

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

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Strengthening VA Cybersecurity Act, legislation I introduced to support and protect our selfless veterans.

The VA is the largest integrated healthcare network in the United States, and it stores millions of records with personal information for veterans and their families.

This legislation will require the VA to obtain an independent cybersecurity assessment of its most critical information systems and develop a timeline and budget to fix any identified weaknesses and deficiencies.

We must continue to work to ensure that the VA has the tools it needs to effectively protect against new and emerging cybersecurity threats and safeguard our veterans' information.

I look forward to continuing to collaborate with all of my colleagues to move this commonsense and bipartisan legislation forward.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 15, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 15, 2022, at 4.39 p.m.

Appointment:

United States–China Economic and Security Review Commission.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

SPEAK OUT ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1464, I call up the bill (S. 4524) to limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment, 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 1464, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 4524

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 ''Speak Out Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Sexual harassment and assault remain pervasive in the workplace and throughout civic society, affecting millions of Americans.

(2) Eighty-one percent of women and 43 percent of men have experienced some form of sexual harassment or assault throughout their lifetime.

(3) One in 3 women has faced sexual harassment in the workplace during her career, and an estimated 87 to 94 percent of those who experience sexual harassment never file a formal complaint.

(4) Sexual harassment in the workplace forces many women to leave their occupation or industry, or pass up opportunities for advancement.

(5) In order to combat sexual harassment and assault, it is essential that victims and survivors have the freedom to report and publicly disclose their abuse.

(6) Nondisclosure and nondisparagement provisions in agreements between employers and current, former, and prospective employees, and independent contractors, and between providers of goods and services and consumers, can perpetuate illegal conduct by silencing those who are survivors of illegal sexual harassment and assault or illegal retaliation, or have knowledge of such conduct, while shielding perpetrators and enabling them to continue their abuse.

(7) Prohibiting nondisclosure and nondisparagement clauses will empower survivors to come forward, hold perpetrators accountable for abuse, improve transparency around illegal conduct, enable the pursuit of justice, and make workplaces safer and more productive for everyone.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) NONDISCLOSURE CLAUSE.—The term ''nondisclosure clause'' means a provision in a contract or agreement that requires the parties to the contract or agreement not to disclose or discuss conduct, the existence of a settlement involving conduct, or information covered by the terms and conditions of the contract or agreement.

(2) NONDISPARAGEMENT CLAUSE.—The term ''nondisparagement clause'' means a provision in a contract or agreement that requires 1 or more parties to the contract or agreement not to make a negative statement about another party that relates to the contract, agreement, claim, or case.

(3) SEXUAL ASSAULT DISPUTE.—The term ''sexual assault dispute'' means a dispute involving a nonconsensual sexual act or sexual contact, as such terms are defined in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code, or similar applicable Tribal or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.

(4) SEXUAL HARASSMENT DISPUTE.—The term ''sexual harassment dispute'' means a dispute relating to conduct that is alleged to constitute sexual harassment under applicable Federal, Tribal, or State law.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL ENFORCEABILITY OF NONDISCLOSURE AND NONDISPARAGEMENT CONTRACT CLAUSES RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT DISPUTES AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT DISPUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a sexual assault dispute or sexual harassment dispute, no nondisclosure clause or nondisparagement clause agreed to before the dispute arises shall be judicially enforceable in instances in which conduct is alleged to have violated Federal, Tribal, or State law.

(b) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF STATE LAW.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit a State or locality from enforcing a provision of State law governing nondisclosure or nondisparagement clauses that is at least as protective of the right of an individual to speak freely, as provided by this Act.

(c) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND TRIBAL LAW.—This Act shall not be construed to supersede a provision of Federal, State, or Tribal Law that governs the use of pseudonyms in the filing of claims involving sexual assault or sexual harassment disputes.

(d) PROTECTION OF TRADE SECRETS AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit an employer and an employee from protecting trade secrets or proprietary information.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY.

This Act shall apply with respect to a claim that is filed under Federal, State, or Tribal law on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will 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 S. 4524.

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, S. 4524, the Speak Out Act, empowers survivors of sexual misconduct by prohibiting the use of nondisclosure and nondisparagement clauses that serve to silence survivors who entered into agreements containing those clauses before a dispute arises.

Often buried in the fine print of contracts of adhesion that workers and consumers sign every day to secure employment, goods, or services, these confidentiality clauses have contributed to the culture of silence in cases involving sexual misconduct. As such, they have routinely enabled sexual predators to evade accountability.

The confidential nature of these clauses makes it extremely difficult to fully diagnose the scope of this problem. Nevertheless, experts estimate that more than one-third of workers in the United States are required to sign a nondisclosure agreement in their employment contracts.

This is particularly concerning because of the rampant nature of sexual abuse in the workplace. An estimated 81 percent of women and 43 percent of men will experience sexual harassment in their lifetimes, and more than half of all women report being subjected to unwanted sexual activity while in the workplace.

But these appalling numbers do not even tell the full story. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission found that the vast majority of survivors simply never report incidents of sexual harassment or sexual assault.

Today, we will take an important step toward fixing this problem by banning the enforcement of nondisclosure and nondisparagement clauses agreed to before a sexual harassment or sexual assault dispute arises. For the purpose of this bill, a dispute arises when a person chooses to exercise their legal rights by asserting a claim of sexual harassment or sexual assault in some official context, such as by complaining to a government agency or by filing a lawsuit.

This legislation continues Congress' important work to protect the rights of survivors to come forward and hold perpetrators accountable for abuse.

Earlier this year, on a bipartisan basis, we enacted H.R. 4445, which empowered survivors to decide whether they resolve their disputes in court or through arbitration. That bill was an example of how Congress can and should function. We worked together, across the aisle, to identify a problem, establish a bipartisan solution to that problem, and pass legislation to restore the rights of millions of Americans to their day in court.

The Speak Out Act is an opportunity for us to work together once again to end the oppressive culture of silence hiding sexual misconduct, promote transparency and accountability, and make the workplace safer for everyone.

This legislation has already passed the Senate unanimously, and it is supported by a broad coalition of public interest organizations, including the American Association for Justice, the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, RALIANCE, The Army of Survivors, the National Domestic Violence Hotline, and the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault.

I thank our colleagues, Representatives FRANKEL, BUCK, CICILLINE, JAYAPAL, GRIFFITH, BUSTOS, and OWENS for their leadership on this issue.

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

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

Madam Speaker, sexual misconduct is terrible and it is wrong. Those who engage in it should be held accountable. But this bill, while well intentioned, is misguided.

For starters, it is a massive Federal overreach. It regulates contract law that has been and should be handled at the State level. Some States have decided to regulate confidentiality clauses in contracts. Others have decided not to. That is how our system of government works. That is how our Constitution works, States experimenting to find out what, in fact, works best.

However, this bill creates a new Federal floor that undercuts the power of States in the process. This is just the beginning of a new push by Democrats to chip away at States' rights.

The White House said as much this week. In commenting on the bill, the Biden administration said it ''Looks forward to continuing to work with the Congress to advance broader legislation that addresses a range of issues implicated in NDAs and nondisparagement clauses.''

They are not hiding the ball here. Federalism is a serious issue, and Congress should not be taking power from the States just to impose its top-down approach.

Additionally, we should take a hard look at the findings included in the bill as passed by the Senate. House Democrats intentionally left these findings out of the version of the bill that the Committee on the Judiciary marked up. These findings include statistics about the percentage of men and women who have experienced some form of sexual harassment or sexual assault in their lifetime. It is not clear where these statistics and new findings come from, but they seem to rely on a study that uses a broad definition of sexual harassment, very broad, that included instances of ''misgendering'' as sexual harassment. That definition goes way beyond existing law.

A finding of Congress that effectively treats ''misgendering'' on its own as a form of sexual harassment will doubtlessly lead to future efforts to expand the law in other ways. If Democrats are going to include findings like this, they should at least have to debate it in the committee. We should think carefully about these findings before cementing them in Federal law.

Finally, this bill, as drafted, is too broad and will affect contractual matters completely unrelated to sexual misconduct. A confidentiality clause may cover a wide range of information. When the bill applies, it nullifies the entire confidentiality clause, with just a few poorly defined exceptions.

As such, it will give trial lawyers an incentive to add unsupported allegations in litigation so they can void a confidentiality clause and access and use confidential information unrelated to the sexual misconduct.

We all condemn sexual harassment and sexual assault, but this is a flawed bill, and it is going to create problems down the road.

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

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

I only wish this bill did what the gentleman from Ohio says it does. By his logic, we should never have passed the Americans with Disabilities Act. We should have left it with the States. That obviously didn't work.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL), the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very, very proud to rise today in support of this game-changing, historic bill, the Speak Out Act. I thank our Senate and House sponsors, Representatives BUCK and BUSTOS and Senators GILLIBRAND and BLACKBURN.

Thanks also to the Committee on the Judiciary, to our staff, and to Becca Flikier in my office. Most especially, thanks to two very, very courageous women who may be with us today, Gretchen Carlson and Julie Roginsky, who, against all odds, fought back against the abuse of powerful men and a powerful corporation and who have lifted the voices of women by leading efforts to stem the scourge of sexual harassment and assault in the workplace and civic society. Thank you to Gretchen and Julie.

Today, Madam Speaker, we will pass legislation that, in tandem with the no forced arbitration law, is aimed at stopping sexual abuse in the workplace and holding abusers accountable.

With all due respect to my friends on the other side, we are here to protect women from being raped, not States from being raped.

Current Federal law and most States allow employers and others to force nondisclosure agreements into employment and consumer contracts that silence survivors of sexual assault and harassment. These are known as forced NDAs, and one-third of our workforce is subject to them.

Madam Speaker, I have an example of one right here. I mean, for a layperson to look, I would just tell you, it is a bunch of gobbledygook. Nowhere would you know from reading this NDA, which is very typical, that it means if your boss rapes you, you can't tell a soul about it or you will be penalized.

Businesses are using these NDAs to cover up their dirty little secrets of sexual abuse that force survivors to bear the trauma in silence. It is not bad enough, Madam Speaker, that a survivor is humiliated, emotionally scarred, or physically hurt, that they have to quit their job or turn down a promotion or leave the field entirely. If they are forced to sign an NDA before a dispute arises, they must suffer in silence and not even be able to tell a spouse, a parent, or a coworker. If they do, they can be fired or disciplined or sued for damages and attorney's fees. That is crazy and that is unjust.

Forced NDAs punish the survivor and protect the perpetrator, who is set free to abuse and abuse and abuse again.

Today, we hold abusers accountable and change the culture of the workplace. Employers who were used to sweeping these stories under the rug will now be forced to stop toxic workplaces, sexual harassment, and sexual assault before it happens. This should lead to safer, more productive workplaces and a civic society for all.

The change couldn't come soon enough. It is not just the movie and the TV personalities we have read about that have been the victims of sexual abuse in the workplace. One in three women, disproportionately women of color, have suffered sexual harassment in the workplace. There are 71 million women in the workplace. That is millions and millions of women who have to endure this.

In our bipartisan Women's Caucus, we heard story after story from hotel maids raped by guests, waitresses pinched by their customers to earn tips, farmworkers assaulted in the field by their supervisors, a tech worker forced to date potential customers.

It doesn't matter whether you are a hotel maid, a farmworker, secretary, or CEO. People in all walks of life are being inappropriately touched, raped, and harassed by supervisors, coworkers, customers, and service providers. The Speak Out Act, Madam Speaker, will make these forced NDAs null and void.

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

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

□ 1230

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, it does not prevent a business from protecting its trade secrets, and it does not prevent giving the survivors an option to sign an NDA at a post-claim settlement if they choose.

So, folks, let's all say ''no'' to the dirty little secrets that promote sexual

abuse, ruin lives, and degrade businesses.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to vote ''yes'' on the Speak Out Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my friend and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I want to be the first to admit, this is a difficult bill to debate. It sounds good. I believe the intentions of the other side of the aisle are good as well. Nobody should be subjected to sexual harassment.

But there is a problem. We are legislating outside of our domain. We are violating States' rights in doing this. The law that is being proposed to pass today here has already in some form or another been implemented in 15 different States. But guess what, those 15 different States don't all have the same solution. It is sort of arrogant for us to sit here and say that we are going to come up with a one-size-fits-all that is going to be better than anything those 15 States have done.

I say to my constituents at home, that there are three tests that I apply to any bill before voting for it.

The first test is, is it constitutional. This bill is questionable whether it is constitutional because it would regulate intrastate contracts, not just interstate contracts. We all know we have no business inside of the States.

The other test that I apply is, can we afford it. Well, ostensibly, this bill doesn't cost that much to impose a new thing on employers or on contracts.

But the third test that I always apply is, is this something we should solve at the Federal level or can States do it better? That is where this bill fails. The States can legislate on this. The States have legislated on this; 15 different States since 2018 have legislated on this.

In fact, as I read this bill and as we debated it, I wondered what is the definition of sexual harassment. Well, the bill itself refers to the State definitions of sexual harassment. It is tacitly acknowledging that contract law is the domain of the States. There was a concern expressed during the debate in committee on this that is this the camel putting its nose in the tent when we let Federal laws intervene in or override State laws, and that was a concern that was expressed.

But it wasn't a conspiracy theory that there would be more legislation after that. In fact, the ink is not even dry on this; the vote hasn't happened today. But 2 days ago, just recently, the Executive Office of the President, OMB, issued a Statement of Administration Policy about this bill.

They are giddy at overriding State laws and breaking State contracts. In fact, their statement says: ''The administration looks forward to continuing to work with the Congress to advance broader legislation that addresses the range of issues implicated in NDAs and nondisparagement clauses.'' They can't wait to do more of this. They can't wait to take over the State legislatures' roles in legislating these issues.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' against this. I know it is a tough vote. I know the other side has good intentions, but this is the wrong bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank LOIS FRANKEL, CHERI BUSTOS, the chairman, and chairmen of our subcommittees, from DAVID CICILLINE to Chairman COHEN, for the work that they have done.

Let me agree with the gentleman from Kentucky in saying that it doesn't cost much. In fact, it doesn't cost much of anything as compared to the abuse that women have suffered for decades.

Let me also agree with the gentleman that there are and is something called States' rights under the Tenth Amendment, but let me be very clear that women don't have to suffer life-or-death circumstances under the Constitution.

I hold this book up for everybody to understand that this book does not require silence. This is not the Constitution of silence. This is not the Constitution of the 14th Amendment with equal protection of the law, yet as a woman you are silenced. It does not require due process, but you are silenced.

Let me give you a fact. More than half of all employed women report experiencing sexual harassment or sexual assault while at work. As a result, there is a significant concern that NDAs are, in fact, abusive, to the extent that it breaks a woman to not be able to tell of her harassment, abuse, or her rape.

Today, widespread sexual misconduct can be covered up by NDAs that are hiding the fine print that says, take it or leave it. When you have that, what you have is a circumstance where you are, in fact, promoting abuse and eliminating the power that women have and promoting the power that perpetrators have.

I would like to be able to stand on the Constitution that says to create a more perfect Union. This legislation does not allow the fine print, doesn't allow or make you sign an NDA before there is even an issue or a case that has arisen, and more importantly, I think it saves lives and future women from sexual assault and rape.

We know that Harvey Weinstein had this tool that was used over and over again. Employment contracts at his company included strict NDAs, which prevented survivors from coming forward with their stories.

I know that that is not the workplace that you want your daughters to go into, as our young women leave and begin to work from colleges, but also the women who work as factory workers, secretaries, and waitresses.

Those used to be the jobs that people would look down on and say: Oh, we know why they are in those jobs. No, they were in those jobs so they could support their family, being a single parent, raising up their children. I know those women every day. Busdrivers, schoolbus drivers getting minimum wage, but they encountered those conditions just as you would encounter them in the major corporations.

I am rising to support S. 4524, the Speak Out Act, and ask whether or not if you are a believer of the Constitution, where in it it says that you must be silenced, your due process is silenced, the 14th Amendment equal protection of the law is silenced.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, all of this is silenced. The threat of legal retaliation is daunting to these women, enough to keep workers from coming forward with their stories of abuse. The Harvard Business Review has indicated over one-third of the U.S. workforce is bound by NDAs.

Madam Speaker, I close my remarks by saying, I walk away from here and saying that when we cast this vote, we will cast a vote for creating a more perfect Union, and that women will not be second class, second rate without the same equal protection of the law as anyone else.

I applaud the secretaries, the busdrivers, the factory workers, the cafeteria workers who happen to be women, as well as I applaud the corporate women who are rising up the corporate ladder.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 4524, The Speak Out Act, that would limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment.

This bill is critical to ending the culture of silence that quiets the voices of survivors of sexual harassment and abuse.

We must protect women from harassment, abuse, and violence of all types, at every opportunity, and in every facet of life.

As chair of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I've led the fight against domestic violence for many years, and sponsored the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act, which led to VAWA's reauthorization in March.

Just as VAWA is vital to protect women in their personal lives, the Speak Out Act is vital to protect women in their work lives, empowering women against workplace harassment and abuse that can impair their careers and life paths.

Ending the cycle of abuse starts with eliminating the power that perpetrators have over their victims.

Currently, companies can sue workers for breaking a Non-Disclosure Agreement.

The threat of legal retaliation is daunting enough to keep workers from coming forward with stories of abuse.

These NDAs have become commonplace in many industries.

Harvard Business Review has estimated that over one third of the U.S. workforce is bound by NDAs.

These NDAs not only appear in settlements after a victim of sexual harassment has raised their voice, but also have become routinely included in standard employment contracts that are used at the time of hiring.

NDAs are being signed at the start of employment, prior to any abuse that occurs.

NDAs are intended to provide confidentiality and protection, especially with regard to corporate trade secrets.

But they have increasingly been misused to protect power dynamics that enable abusers to continue their dangerous and disgusting behavior.

One in 3 women has faced sexual harassment in the workplace during her career.

An estimated 87 to 94 percent of women who experience sexual harassment never file a formal complaint.

The reality is that many of these women have no voice because the system rewards male manipulators and penalizes women who challenge the status quo.

This amounts to institutionalized abuse.

The Speak Out Act can change this reality.

The Speak Out Act would prevent employers from enforcing nondisclosure or non-disparagement agreements (NDAs) in instances when employees and workers report sexual misconduct.

In the wake of the #MeToo and #TimesUp movements, our country has become acutely aware that men in power frequently leverage that power abusively to exploit women.

Sexual abuse and harassment can destroy a victim's financial security, mental health, and career path.

By standing up for their rights, the women who have been subjected to abuse often become mired in a lengthy and costly lawsuit that drains their finances, imposes a heavy psychic toll, and impairs their future job prospects by creating a misimpression that they are disruptive workers.

Women face a disturbing choice when sexually assaulted in the workplace: report the abuse publicly and face litigation, leave the company and abandon their income, or the choice that many are forced to make, put their heads down and pretend it did not happen.

Passing The Speak Out Act would provide victims with a third option to pursue justice.

It is time to amend the NDA system to strip the power from abusive employers and give it back to the employee.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), a valued member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the future chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Ohio. I think whatever else voters said a week ago, they said, don't go too far. That is the reason the gentleman to my right will be the Judiciary Committee chairman and the gentleman far to my left will no longer be.

This goes too far. In the chairman's comments in support of the bill, he gave the pieces of information that help us to detect why that is. One, he made reference to a bill, H.R. 4445, Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021, and he said, appropriately so, that that bill had bipartisan support, including mine. It made it so that women who suffer sexual harassment, anyone who suffers sexual harassment is no longer limited if they have entered into a contract forcing arbitration; for mandatory arbitration of a dispute of that nature, they can bring it to court. Court is public in the United States.

That bill was supported on a bipartisan basis because it is fair and equitable. The other thing the chairman said is that this bill, the one we are talking about now, will empower survivors of sexual harassment and sexual assault, but it also will empower nonsurvivors. That is to say, anyone who wishes to bring a nonmeritorious claim of sexual harassment forward in order to destroy someone's life also will be empowered by this to ignore any contract to do otherwise.

''A Rape on Campus'' is a retracted defamatory Rolling Stone magazine article written by Sabrina Erdely and originally published on November 19, 2014, that describes a purported group sexual assault at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. Rolling Stone retracted the story in its entirety on April 5, 2015.

The article claimed that a UVA student, Jackie, had been taken to a party hosted by UVA's Phi Kappa Psi fraternity by a fellow student. At the party, Jackie alleged in the article, her date led her to a bedroom where she was gang-raped by several fraternity members as part of a fraternity initiation ritual.

Jackie's account generated much media attention, and UVA President Teresa Sullivan suspended all fraternities. After other journalists investigated the article's claims and found significant discrepancies, Rolling Stone issued multiple apologies for the story.

It has since been reported that Jackie may have invented portions of the story in an unsuccessful attempt to win the affections of a fellow student in whom she had a romantic interest. In a deposition given in 2016, Jackie stated that she believed her story at the time.

On January 12, 2015, Charlottesville police officials told UVA that an investigation had failed to find any evidence confirming the events in the Rolling Stone article. UVA President Teresa Sullivan acknowledged that the story was discredited.

Charlottesville police officially suspended their 4-month investigation on March 23, 2015, based on lack of credible evidence.

The Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism audited the editorial processes that culminated in the article being published. On April 5, 2015, Rolling Stone retracted the article and published the independent report on the publication's history, and so forth.

Everyone remembers the Duke lacrosse incident in Durham, North Carolina. Everyone remembers the lives destroyed by these and other false allegations. They do happen.

The balance that we brought to the law by ensuring that every victim of sexual assault or harassment could come forward and sue, and if it is a suit against a public figure or against someone notorious or against someone rich or powerful, I have got to tell you, that will get publicity.

But it also is a system that has balance. People are subjected to discovery as to their motives. You have tools to find out and test the veracity of each side's views, each side's story.

This bill gives the green light to the false accuser. This bill says resume speed. It is a resume speed sign to those who would make false accusations. We brought balance to the law with the participation of Republicans and Democrats.

I grant you that that was a great bill. I congratulate you on bringing forward that bill, which I joined and voted for. This one is unfair and unbalanced. It goes too far.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, this bill goes so far; the gentleman from North Carolina tells us, this bill goes too far. It goes so far, in fact, that every Republican Member of the Senate voted for it. What a bunch of radicals.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, this bill is proof of the extraordinary leadership of Chairman NADLER and the Judiciary Committee. He has led our committee in a principled, determined way. I think as a result of his leadership, the Judiciary Committee has been the most productive, impactful, and effective committee in the Congress. While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle look forward to a different chairman, I acknowledge the extraordinary leadership of our current chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 4524, the Speak Out Act. I applaud the sponsors, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. BUCK, and all the other bipartisan leaders who were part of this effort, including you, Madam Speaker.

This commonsense legislation will prevent the enforcement of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement agreements in sexual harassment and sexual assault disputes.

□ 1245

It will ensure that any survivor who wants to share their story without fear of judicially enforced reprisals can do so.

In fact, it is unthinkable, I hope to all of us, that widespread sexual misconduct can be covered up and swept under the rug because of NDAs snuck

into these take-it-or-leave-it contracts. It is well beyond time for this abusive practice to end.

Enacting the Speak Out Act will bring sunlight and transparency to a system that relies on the shadows to hide horrific conduct. It will make our society more just. It will help end the culture of silence that allows predators to evade accountability.

I look forward to sending this bill to the President's desk and taking another step in our critical and ongoing work to eliminate the forced silence that prevents survivors of sexual misconduct from having their voices heard.

Before closing, I want to address the argument raised by some of my Republican colleagues that the Speak Out Act interferes with the rights of States to establish their own laws on this issue. They are missing the point. This legislation protects an American value by prohibiting survivor censorship and defending the freedom of survivors to tell their own stories. This baseline freedom should not vary from State to State.

Finally, I want to say that the Speak Out Act creates a floor for the basic protection of survivors' rights to speak out, not a ceiling. States remain free to enact stronger protections for survivors. According to reports, 15 States have done just that, with some States like California banning the use of NDAs entirely. Federal legislation is still necessary because survivors should not have to rely on a patchwork of varying States, uncertain which might apply to them.

Finally, I end by noting that I am a little bit confused and, I will be honest, disappointed by the opposition I have heard from some of my Republican colleagues in light of their previous statements.

For example, during consideration of legislation that prohibited the enforcement of forced arbitration clauses in the same kinds of cases, Mr. JORDAN, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, said: ''Victims of sexual harassment and sexual assault must have their claims heard. They must never be silenced or intimidated into silence.''

The Speak Out Act provides precisely that protection. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation that was passed unanimously in the Senate that builds upon the great work of you, Madam Speaker, in H.R. 4445 so that, once and for all, we can no longer provide protection to predators and abusers that are acting with impunity in workplaces all over America.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, what a strange world the woke are creating. Their open borders policy has produced an epidemic of child sex trafficking. They use taxpayer dollars to transport unaccompanied minors across the country. These children are then delivered to those claiming to be friends or family and then abandoned. The Biden administration has now lost track of 45,000 children that it has turned over to so-called sponsors in this manner.

Now, the Democrats won't even discuss the sex trafficking crisis that they have created, let alone do anything about it, because to condemn it is to acknowledge it, and they won't even do that. Yet, they bring a bill to the floor today to virtue signal their opposition to sexual harassment in the workplace. Specifically, it voids certain confidentiality clauses in cases involving sexual harassment.

Now, let's be clear, no civilized person condones such behavior, and several States have already passed laws similar to the measure before us today. That is where the Constitution rightly places such questions—with the States.

Federalism allows a State to try something out. If it works, other States copy it. If it doesn't, they can avoid it. This bill imposes the same standards across the country.

Now, what could possibly go wrong? Well, first, it references a study that includes among the definitions of sexual harassment a microaggression—I believe that is the word the woke use—such as misgendering.

The mere allegation of sexual harassment, without the necessity of any kind of proof, invalidates the nondisclosure agreement if the parties reach their agreement before the dispute arose. This bill doesn't define ''dispute,'' so we don't even know when exactly it will apply.

If an employee accidentally refers to a colleague by a pronoun that has just changed, should this really be grounds for publicly pillorying the employer for sexual harassment? The woke excel at targeting those they disagree with in such a manner. This makes it possible for them to do so under a wide range of circumstances.

Second, if the mere allegation of sexual harassment can void a nondisclosure agreement, would someone simply throw in such an allegation in order to air their real grievances? Remember, this bill voids the confidentiality clause entirely, even though those clauses can cover information unrelated to sexual misconduct.

Third, where do such confidentiality carveouts stop? Are references in the workplace to political ideology, religious beliefs, or cultural preferences, already branded as microaggressions by the woke, to be added one by one?

We know this bill is just the beginning. The White House said as much this week.

Perhaps these are questions best left to the States. Perhaps our time is best devoted to protecting the countless children that the crime cartels are sexually exploiting with their active assistance of the Democrats' open border policies.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan, bicameral Speak Out Act. I thank Representative LOIS FRANKEL and the chairman for their leadership.

This bill bans forced nondisclosure agreements in assault and harassment disputes and preserves the right of survivors to use their voices.

Women across this country have been told for a long time what constitutes appropriate behavior, what constitutes sexual harassment, and what doesn't. Well, let me tell you, it is time to let them speak up and shine a light on exactly what is happening.

The reality is that estimates are that a third of employees in the United States are covered by these NDAs.

Last year, we heard stories of exactly this situation in the Judiciary Committee. Last year, Tatiana Spottiswoode bravely testified under the protection of a friendly subpoena about the harassment and abuse that she endured from her boss and former CEO, Zia Chishti. Previously, Tatiana had been bound by a gag order that silenced her and prevented accountability for her abuser.

Madam Speaker, after her moving testimony, after bringing light and being able to talk about the horror that she experienced, Chishti was finally fired. He was finally held accountable. In fact, the former British Prime Minister resigned from the company's advisory board after that happened.

Why should she have been silenced in the first place? Why should she have been raped or any other woman been raped and bound to silence because of a nondisclosure agreement that was forced, in many cases, in order for these women to be able to actually have employment? That is absolutely wrong.

Why should women be forced to feel alone, feel like somehow this is their fault, that they are crazy? They should be able to talk about what has happened and bring light to the situation.

The reality is, Madam Speaker, this is about power. This is about who holds the power and how it is held.

That is why we need the Speak Out Act to be passed. It is the only way to make sure that we bring transparency and light to this.

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

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, for millions of survivors across the country who deserve to have their voices heard, vote ''yes'' on S. 4524. I thank those people on the other side of the aisle who agree with us and know that this is the right thing to do.

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

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

Madam Speaker, this bill is very simple. It removes a muzzle from employees if they have been raped or harassed in the workplace.

By allowing women to expose predators in the workplace, this legislation further protects future victims. It also puts employers on notice that they must be more careful in performing due diligence and doing background checks on applicants.

Finally, this bill is limited to cases of rape and sexual harassment. This bill doesn't stop a worker from waiving their constitutional right to free speech in any other circumstance.

If you have trade secrets, you may be subjected to a nondisclosure agreement. If you object to the management practices of your employer, you may be subjected to a nondisclosure agreement. If you are raped, you may not be muzzled.

This legislation gives us a choice. We can protect rapists, predators, and perverts in the workplace, or we can give voice to victims, survivors, and the most vulnerable among us. We can assure Americans that our employers will only hire those employees who respect others in the workplace.

This bill received unanimous support in the Senate and has bipartisan support in the House. The reason is simple: We all had mothers who faced antiquated attitudes in the workplace. We don't want our daughters and our granddaughters to face those same attitudes.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this commonsense legislation. I very much appreciate the Speaker and Representative FRANKEL's leadership on this issue, and I hope that Republicans step up and do the right thing.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), a member of the committee.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, this is not a Democrat or Republican issue. This is about stopping sexual predators.

For decades, Larry Nassar abused young girls on the U.S. women's national gymnastics team. At least 265 young women and girls—265 victims—were targeted and sexually abused by Nassar. It was all due to a nondisclosure statement that protected Nassar from justice.

Allowing sexual predators to hide behind nondisclosure agreements is wrong and is a crime.

Today, we have the power to stop sexual predators from hurting our loved ones.

I ask my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to vote for the Speak Out Act.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my great caucus cochair and good friend, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL, for this bill. I thank the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the Speaker for her extraordinary work in this area.

I sit here and think to myself: Are we living on two different planets? Why would any of you on the other side of the aisle want to prevent a woman or a man from speaking up if they were raped by someone in the office? Why would we allow for these NDAs?

Sexual harassment is an abuse of power made worse by the indignity of being silenced and gagged about your experience.

We have heard this morning that a third of the American workforce is bound by NDAs. Now, they were used originally to protect trade secrets. We appreciate that. We get that. But they have now been extended to be a weapon of choice for abusers and those orchestrating coverups.

Let's talk about the Washington Commanders' owner, Dan Snyder, at the NFL. Snyder assured his fans that he knew nothing about rampant and reprehensible harassment suffered by his employees, the women staffers forced to endure harassment and attempted assault. Some testified before the Committee on Oversight and Reform that they were told to avoid him at all costs and other predatory employees.

□ 1300

Snyder even had cheerleaders videotaped without their consent, and some without their knowledge, for a calendar photo shoot. The women posed topless using only their hands and arms or body paint to cover their breasts. Snyder knew they would have to change outfits and be exposed at times, and he made sure that he got the video to watch and share with his cronies.

Surprise: Snyder used predispute NDAs with many of those women staffers.

Abusers like Snyder, Weinstein, Roger Ailes at FOX, and others should not be allowed to be the predators they are in the workforce. Women and men who become victims should be able to call them out.

It is time to end this predatory practice of silencing survivors. It is time for workers to have the freedom to speak out. For those who say that this should be a States' rights issue, remind me: Isn't it your party who wants to ban abortions across the country and not leave it to the States?

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING).

Ms. MANNING. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Speak Out Act.

One in three women in our country experiences sexual harassment in the workplace at some point in her career. This appalling behavior is unacceptable, but it will not stop if survivors are silenced.

Let me be clear: any person who experiences sexual assault in the workplace or otherwise should be able to speak out and seek justice.

NDAs and nondisparagement clauses have been used for far too long to silence survivors of sexual harassment and assault in the workplace and instead shield abusers and the companies that enable them. The Speak Out Act helps to fix this flawed system and restores survivors' voices.

Contrary to some of the comments made by my colleagues across the aisle, this is a reasonable act that explicitly protects trade secrets and other proprietary information. It is carefully designed to remove the protection of predators. That is something we should all be in favor of.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to join me in supporting this critically important legislation so that those who wish to do so can hold perpetrators accountable and share their stories. This is something that should be important to all of us.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly support the Speak Out Act. It is carried by my dear friend and colleague, Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk to you about why this is so important. Eight months ago, I stood in this Chamber to speak about my bill to expand the rights of sexual assault and sexual harassment survivors to seek justice.

I wrote a bill that is now law after reading the haunting stories of the thousands of women from a company called Sterling Incorporated, the parent company of Kay and Jared Jewelers. Each story was more disturbing than the one before it: managers demanding sexual acts in exchange for employment benefits and company events where women were expected to undress publicly. In one story, a former employee attended an overnight meeting where she woke up with her underwear pushed to her ankles and her manager raping her.

All of this stayed quiet, in secret for years all because of a few words that are hidden away in legal language filed alongside other forms and filled out as part of employment paperwork.

The women at Sterling Incorporated were silenced by forced arbitration clauses that prevented them from seeking justice in a court of law. But we know that these aren't the first nightmare stories that we have heard, and they won't be the last.

For way too long, the sinister culture of silence has protected predators and has shamed survivors. But as the saying goes, sunshine is the best disinfectant. The one way to dismantle this culture of silence is to let the voices and

the stories of the survivors be heard because those stories are powerful.

Survivors' stories launched the #MeToo movement. Survivors' stories inspired my bill to end forced arbitration and today's bill, and it will be those stories that will continue to bring change.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand on the right side of history and support the Speak Out Act.

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

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

Madam Speaker, some have argued that the bill is not necessary because the courts may already choose not to enforce NDAs in certain cases. But this argument overlooks the reality that this scattershot approach to forced NDAs in sexual assault cases leaves survivors uncertain of their ability to tell their own stories without fear of reprisal, and it continues to allow NDAs to be used as an intimidation tactic by powerful corporations and abusers or as a coercive requirement for employment or everyday services.

Without a clear message from Congress that forced NDAs will no longer be enforceable in court, forced NDAs in employment and consumer contracts are likely to continue to have a chilling effect on survivors speaking out.

These contracts of silence limit the ability of millions of Americans to come forward in the first place. They contain sweeping prohibitions against any future negative statements about an employer. Standard language in these terms limit a survivor's ability to communicate by virtually any means, regardless of the truthfulness of the communication, in perpetuity.

In many cases, confidentiality clauses cover the existence of an NDA itself, meaning that even discussing the fact that one is bound by an NDA could constitute a violation of a contract.

There are cases in which survivors choose to waive their right to speak about their case. But that is a decision for survivors to make for themselves based on the circumstances, not something that should be forced upon them by their abusers or their enablers.

Last year, in a hearing that none of us will forget, the Judiciary Committee heard from four survivors of shocking workplace sexual harassment and assault. As they explained, after enduring horrific abuse at the hands of their perpetrators, confidential clauses in routine contracts prevented them from reporting and publicly disclosing their abuse.

The Speak Out Act ends this outrageous practice once and for all. Importantly, it does not prevent survivors from voluntarily entering into settlement agreements that include NDAs. Instead, it simply clarifies that these clauses cannot be enforced unless a survivor chooses to agree to the clause after the dispute arises.

The Biden-Harris administration has issued a statement strongly supporting this legislation, noting that: ''Prohibiting the use of predispute NDAs and nondisparagement clauses will increase access to justice and make the workplace safer for everyone.''

The United States Senate has unanimously passed this legislation.

I have heard the argument from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we should leave this to the States and that the national legislation impinges on States' rights somehow. This is from the same people who urge a national ban on abortion.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to send this critical message to the President's desk, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 4524, the Speak Out Act. I am proud to support this bill and thank my good friends and colleagues Senator GILLIBRAND and Congresswoman FRANKEL for their leadership, and Chairman NADLER and the Speaker for bringing it to the floor.

This bill is a step toward ending a culture of silence and coercion that further deprives survivors of sexual assault from achieving justice.

We must put an end to the enablement of perpetrators in the workforce by eliminating the use of NDAs in sexual misconduct cases.

While this bill is progress toward eradicating institutional protections for perpetrators, we cannot stop here. As a champion of sexual and reproductive health and rights, I hope that we continue joining efforts to fix this toxic system and empower survivors of sexual assault to be the authors of their own stories.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BUSTOS). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1464, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 109, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—315

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Conway
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Feenstra
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Flood
Flores
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sempolinski
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Stefanik
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth

NAYS—109

Aderholt
Allen
Babin
Baird
Banks
Barr

Bentz
Bergman
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Budd
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Davidson
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gibbs
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gosar
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Guest
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hollingsworth
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Mann
Massie
Mast
McClain
McClintock
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Mullin
Nehls
Norman
Obernolte
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Rogers (AL)
Rose
Rosendale
Roy
Rutherford
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Taylor
Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Yakym
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Cheney
Davis, Rodney
Doyle, Michael F.
Herrera Beutler
Kinzinger
Ryan (OH)
Waters
Welch

□ 1349

Messrs. ARMSTRONG, LATTA, and GOODEN of Texas changed their votes 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.

Stated for:

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, due to a conflict, I was not present to cast my vote on passage of S. 4524 The Speak Out Act. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 480.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Cicilline)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Cawthorn (Gaetz)
Courtney (Perlmutter)
Demings (Kelly (IL))
Gallego (Stanton)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Green (TN) (Fleischmann)
Himes (Perlmutter)
Jacobs (NY) (Sempolinski)
Johnson (TX) (Stevens)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Long (Fleischmann)
McEachin (Trone)
Morelle (Meng)
Murphy (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Newman (Correa)
O'Halleran (Pappas)
Palazzo (Bilirakis)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley (Bush)
Rice (SC) (Valadao)
Sherrill (Pallone)
Soto (Wasserman Schultz)
Thompson (CA) (Correa)
Waltz (Valadao)
Wild (Cicilline)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 4130

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 4130, a bill originally introduced by Representative TED DEUTCH of Florida, for the purpose of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP WEEK

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Apprenticeship Week and to highlight the importance of registered apprenticeships in building a diverse and talented workforce, expanding economic opportunity, and growing a more inclusive and resilient economy.

Registered apprenticeships allow workers to learn and earn both a living wage and a nationally recognized credential within their industry of choice.

Workers who go through apprenticeships earn an average starting salary of $70,000 a year, a salary that provides them with social mobility and economic security.

This Congress, we have passed historic legislation to fix our roads, bridges, ports, and infrastructure; to shore up domestic semiconductor manufacturing; and to combat climate change. The laws we pass create a need for thousands of well-prepared and fairly compensated workers.

Mr. Speaker, during this year's National Apprenticeship Week, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in expanding the opportunity to get more people, including more women and people of color, on the path to a good job by investing in registered apprenticeships.

HONORING LAURA WOOTEN

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate one of the unsung civic heroes of our time.

Last month, I attended a dedication ceremony of Laura Wooten Hall at Princeton University. Wooten Hall houses Princeton's Center for Human Values, and it is only fitting that it was named for a woman who devoted her life to something greater than herself.

For nearly 80 years, Laura Wooten served as a poll worker, ensuring that the people of New Jersey could exercise their sacred right to vote. Her service earned her the honor of being the longest continuously serving poll worker in United States history.

Despite living from the Jim Crow era through present-day attacks on voting rights, Laura Wooten's dedication to our democracy never wavered. May her life of selfless civil service be an inspiration to all of us.

□ 1400

PROTECTING THE DREAMERS

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize how critical it is for the Senate to protect the DACA program and the more than 800,000 Dreamers in America.

Brought here as children through no fault of their own, Dreamers have gone to our schools, grown up in our neighborhoods, served on the front lines for the pandemic, and are just as American as all of us in this room. Yet, the DACA program hangs by a thread because of right-wing politicians and judges.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of Americans already support Dreamers obtaining a path to legal citizenship. So I call on the Senate to act. America wants action. We must pass legislation this Congress, or our Dreamers will suffer. We must put people over politics, Dreamers over rhetoric. It is now or never for America's Dreamers. We must act.

HONORING REVEREND DR. CALVIN O. BUTTS III

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life and legacy of the legendary Reverend Dr. Calvin O. Butts III. As the pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church for 50 years, Reverend Butts understood his role as a leader went beyond the faith community.

Witnessing the racial strife of the late 1960s, Reverend Butts became an ardent protector of Harlem, particularly the Black community, and often pushed for projects and policies that would increase access to dire needs like housing and education.

Reverend Butts led projects that included raising and investing $1 billion in housing and commercial development in Harlem through the Abyssinian Development Corporation and creating the Thurgood Marshall Academy for Learning and Social Change.

Reverend Butts preached a message of faith and education, and he motivated each of us through his teachings to be an active and exemplary member of Harlem, uplifting communities while giving back through service, engagement, and social reform.

A dear friend and icon of Harlem, may he rest in peace, and may his legacy be cherished and never forgotten. Keep the faith.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN SLAVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, as my friends are assisting me, I

shall start by thanking the leadership for the opportunity to give this message today. I believe this is a message that is long overdue. In fact, it is hundreds of years overdue.

I thank the persons who are assisting me. They have done an outstanding job. I thank all of the persons associated with this body for making it possible for me to have this opportunity to speak today on a matter of vital importance, an issue that is hundreds of years overdue, an issue that can make a difference in the life of our country.

I am AL GREEN, Member of Congress from Texas, and still I rise, Madam Speaker, and still I rise today to call to the attention of the Congress that I will be asking for a Congressional Gold Medal for the many persons who toiled and slaved in this country such that our country is the economic and, quite frankly, the world powerhouse that it is when it comes to all of the things that can make a country great as it relates to its economic standing.

This is the message that I would have my colleagues take note of, the message that I hope they will give consideration to.

The message: Confederate soldiers were awarded a Congressional Gold Medal in 1956. When some people hear this, they have what we call a double take, because it is difficult for them to believe that Confederate soldiers were awarded a Congressional Gold Medal.

Some things bear repeating. A Confederate soldier, more than one, were awarded a Congressional Gold Medal in 1956. What Congress did for the soldier enslavers it should do for the enslaved. I am asking my colleagues to support the historic Congressional Gold Medal for America's economic foundational mothers, fathers, and children.

I say children because in this country, persons of African ancestry early on were born into slavery, lived in slavery, and died in slavery. This was the status of things in the United States of America at one point and when the country was known as the colonies at another point.

The enslaved people made a difference in the lives of those who were living here as persons other than slaves. The deadline for this document, this monumental piece of legislation, this bill requesting a Congressional Gold Medal, will be February 1, 2023. This will be the first day of Black History Month.

Black History Month has been chosen, Madam Speaker, because the history of Africans in America has not been told. There are many aspects of it that have been deleted from history. I believe that it is time for us to clear the record.

The deadline will be February 1, 2023, the first day of Black History Month. This date was chosen because Black history has not been told. It is one of the greatest stories never told, and we are still trying to complete it. This will be a part of that process, to let people know more about what the enslaved people in this country contributed to the country.

Some people would say to me, and I have had at least one person to say: Do you really believe that Congress will accord a Congressional Gold Medal to the slaves? And my answer is: Yes, I believe Congress will do it.

I believe Congress will do it because I remember what the father of Juneteenth suffered in his effort to get Juneteenth as a holiday in Texas. I remember how he was called names and castigated. I remember how there were people who felt that Juneteenth was a country holiday, they felt that it was too bucolic, too rustic, for intellectual society to embrace. But he fought and he won. The Honorable Al Edwards is now the father of Juneteenth. At the time he introduced it, he was thought of as a person who would never succeed in the Texas House of Representatives, but he served well and he showed and demonstrated to us that persistence can make a difference.

So we plan to be persistent with this legislation, and we plan to make sure that we continue until we get the legislation passed.

The letter that I will send to my colleagues reads—continuing to read it—on July 18, 1956, Congress—this would be the House and the Senate—awarded a Congressional Gold Medal to Confederate soldier enslavers. However, to this day, Congress has never awarded a Congressional Gold Medal to the over 10 million enslaved men, women, and children.

I have to pause. Ten million men, women, and children. Who can imagine that a country would have a process by which a person is born into slavery, lives his or her entire life in slavery, and dies in slavery. This was the status of things in this country at one time.

The country has never awarded a Congressional Gold Medal to the over 10 million enslaved men, women, and children who toiled for over 240 years to build the economy and the infrastructure, the foundation, if you will, of the wealthiest nation to ever exist on the planet Earth.

These foundational mothers and fathers of our country labored arduously, constructing our roads, bridges, wells, and cities. They laboriously planted as well as harvested the food that fed our Nation. How ungrateful can we be to people who made such a sacrifice for this country, to still to this day see them as less-thans, to this day not accord them some degree of honor and dignity for the suffering that they endured for some 200-plus years.

They were the de facto producers of the cash crops that fueled our Nation's foundational wealth. America is the wealthy powerhouse that it is today because of Black people, people from Africa, who were enslaved, brought to this country, and made to work their entire lives, many of them, so that America could be the economic powerhouse that it was then and has continued to be until this day.

These enslaved human beings of African ancestry toiled as slaves without remuneration or recompense. They have not been given any emolument, and to add insult to this injury, they have not been given any degree of respect for what they did to make this country great.

Their humble hands were relied on for the erection of some of our Nation's most renowned edifices and monuments, including the White House, the Capitol Building—this is the Capitol Building, for those who may be unaware—and the Washington Monument. Humble hands, forced to do the bidding of those who lived lives of luxury, many of them, made America great, built the Capitol, humble hands, the Washington Monument.

In truth, their sacrificed lives provided the genesis of our Nation's economic preeminence. These sacrificed human beings—men, women, and children—were the greatest contributors to the foundational economy whose contributions are almost universally forgotten, underrecognized, ignored, overlooked, and/or undervalued.

□ 1415

Many of the things that I read to you today I will repeat. They have not been said before. They should be heard multiple times, and some things just bear repeating.

So let me repeat. These sacrificed human beings—men, women, and children, with the emphasis on children—were the greatest contributors to the American foundational economy whose contributions are almost universally forgotten, underrecognized, ignored, overlooked, and undervalued.

For these and countless other justifications, I am beseeching the Congress to award the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the human beings who are the foundational fathers, mothers, and children who toiled as slaves without recompense or recognition for their unparalleled contributions to the infrastructural and economic development of the Nation that we enjoy today.

Awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to groups of individuals is not unprecedented, as a Congressional Gold Medal was awarded to Confederate enslavers. I think this bears some sidebar commentary. Confederate enslavers. The people who fought to maintain slavery have been awarded a Congressional Gold Medal. The people who sought to maintain the institution that prevented people from having the freedom that they had have received a Congressional Gold Medal.

What is wrong with us? What mindset could we have had in 1956 when this House decided that it would accord Congressional Gold Medals to Confederate soldiers? I cannot understand how we would ever do this. But then to add additional insult to injury, to never consider the people who helped build the country, the people who made it the economic powerhouse that it was then and is now.

What is wrong with us? Is racism such a disease that it infects our minds to the extent that we cannot see and concentrate with the degree of clarity necessary to make righteous decisions? This was one of the saddest days in this Congress when it voted to give a Congressional Gold Medal to Confederate soldiers.

But there is a way for Congress to redeem itself. Redemption is at hand. And here is the means by which you can redeem yourself, Members: Give these persons who toiled and slaved, born into slavery, lived and died in slavery, give them the same level of respect that you gave the people who sought to enslave them, that fought to enslave them. Some of them died in their effort to keep them in chains, in bondage, subject to the whims of their masters, and their whims were many times things that are unacceptable in decent societies.

Awarding a Congressional Gold Medal to groups of individuals is not unprecedented, as a Congressional Gold Medal was awarded to Confederate soldier enslavers, also to the Tuskegee Airmen—some of them received their Congressional Gold Medals antemortem, and some others postmortem—to the Navajo Code Talkers, and posthumously to the servicemembers who perished in Afghanistan on August 26, 2021.

So, friends, the point to be made here is, you can't make the argument that we can't do it because it is a group of people. We have done it for other groups. You can't make the argument that we can't do it because none of them are alive. We have done it posthumously for others.

There is really no argument to make except you don't believe that persons who toiled all of their lives—many of them lived, died, born into it—that they deserve respect and recognition. That is what this is about, respect and recognition.

I am bringing this to your attention so that you can give consideration to it. We won't ask for signatures until the next Congress because to ask for them in this Congress with the short period of time left would be futile, and I believe that we should wait, and we will wait until February 1 of next year to do it during Black History Month.

It is my belief that men, women, and children who suffered a great crime against humanity—and this was a crime against humanity; slavery was a crime against humanity, one of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated on humanity—it is my belief that men, women, and children who suffered a great crime against humanity, toiling unremunerated as slaves, many for their entire work lives, are more deserving of a Congressional Gold Medal than those who soldiered to preserve slavery.

To be as clear as I can be, perspicuously so, it is my belief that those who were enslaved have a greater entitlement to a Congressional Gold Medal than the soldiers who fought to maintain slavery.

The zeitgeist of our time, the mood, the spirit, the zeitgeist of our time impels the introduction of this historic legislation. I am going to ask if Members wish to be recognized as a courageous historic original cosponsor, they should contact my office. We will more than honor requests that are made early, but officially we will start in the next Congress. We will have this historic legislation made available on our website. In my office, you might contact Aaron, and his email address is readily available for those who would like to contact him, or you can simply call our office, and we will be more than pleased to speak to you.

I will close by talking about a couple of pictures that I have here. It is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. This is a depiction of the arrival of these first 20 or so persons in this what is now the United States of America. It wasn't then, 1619. If you can see this, you can see a representation of persons who are standing around.

This is purported to be the White Lion, the ship that brought them here, and these persons standing around, you can see that they have on clothing that would protect them from the weather. It appears to be a day wherein the weather is not kind, inclement weather. But if you look at the persons who are enslaved, shackled, to say that they are scantily clad is a gross understatement. It would be an insulting euphemism.

This picture speaks volumes about what slavery was all about. It was about people who were thought of as less than human. Didn't have to treat them fairly. Didn't have to keep them warm if you chose not to. Didn't have to keep them alive. One insult could cost a person his or her life. The picture is worth a thousand words. These people, well-clothed, looking on, some of them possibly contemplating what they would do with these human beings.

I plan to go to Norfolk, Virginia, Old Point Comfort, if you will. I want to see this place. It is identifiable. I want to see it. I want to say I was there. I want to say I stood on the soil where human beings were first introduced, by many accounts. There may be some discrepancy, but my most accounts, this is where it happened. I am going to go.

Here is another rendition. This one shows a baby. Looks like the baby is with a female, possibly the mother, dressed in clothing that I would consider more acceptable for the weather than in the other. There are many renditions, but we still have the White Lion, and we still have persons standing around talking about these human beings, contemplating their fate is my speculation.

What kind of person enslaves a baby? What kind of person enslaves a baby? What kind of person would see a child and see labor that can be the benefit of having this human being survive and have this child grow up and deny the child an opportunity to get an education? What kind of person denies a baby the opportunity to grow up and just understand the world by virtue of being able to read?

There are still places on the planet where young girls are not allowed to get the same level of schooling and education as young men. I am opposed to that. I am opposed to the people who do that. I have good reason to be opposed. Here is one. I understand what has happened.

What kind of person keeps people in ignorance intentionally? The kind of person who would want to make sure that this person never has a life, but only an existence. They didn't have a life. They just existed to serve their masters.

Anybody who believes that this piece of legislation is inappropriate is a person that doesn't understand this, and I am being kind by saying what I just said. There are many other ways; there are many adjectives.

When I first examined these photos, I had tears well up in my eyes because I realized who they were. Not only were they human beings, these were my relatives. These are the people on whose shoulders I stand. More than 240 years they suffered. These are the people that this country ought to honor and appreciate, and these are the people that deserve what we have given to the enslavers.

□ 1430

I won't give up, friends. I will not. These are my people. I am not ashamed to say that I am a proud descendant of the enslaved people who made America great. I am not ashamed of it.

My dear brothers and sisters, my dear friends, I beg that you give consideration to the legislation. Those who want to have further query can call me, talk to me. I will be on the floor.

It would be no surprise, when I initially thought about introducing the legislation, my thought was, well, we will just wait and introduce it and start asking for signatures. But, no, I want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to read it, peruse it, dissect it, scrutinize it, and do all the things you need to do to make a decision. Then, once we file it, I am going to come back to this floor, and I am going to announce and thank the persons who have signed on to the legislation. Anybody who signs on to this legislation deserves a word of gratitude, and I will be one of the many who will, hopefully, give these expressions of gratitude. I plan to come back to the floor and say to the public at large: We thank you for supporting this legislation.

My hope is that we will get the signatures necessary for the benefit of the public at large. You cannot get this legislation passed in the House with a majority of votes. It will take 290 votes or more.

I see the Parliamentarian looking in my direction. If I am incorrect, Madam Parliamentarian, will you give me some nod as to being correct or incorrect? She indicates that I am correct. So, now you have heard it from me and you have heard it echoed from the Parliamentarian: 290 votes we will need, not 289, 290 people of goodwill who have the courage to recognize the people who made America great.

Others have done things to make America great. I don't mean to minimize the efforts of any others. I just mean to maximize the efforts that have been ignored, that have been, quite frankly, with intentionality pushed aside.

They are people who are ashamed to acknowledge that they are the proud descendants of the enslaved people who built this country. I am not one of them, of course. But there are still people who are. They are ashamed. We have to change that. I want to do everything I can to bring about that change.

I will return to Al Edwards, the father of Juneteenth. I remember what he went through. He was my friend. I saw him suffer. I know about his fight to rid South Africa of Apartheid, how he went to jail in that struggle.

I am prepared to do whatever it takes, however long it takes, as long as I am in Congress.

Madam Speaker of the House of Representatives, I thank you for this time, and I will be asking for additional time to have additional commentary about this subject. I assure you that those who take this seriously will be doing the righteous thing, not just the right thing, but the righteous thing.

Again, I will close with Maya Angelou's very powerful words. She reminded us that we—persons of my ilk, if you will—were:

Bringing the gifts that my ancestors gave,
I am the dream and the hope of the slave.

I plan to fulfill their dreams.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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 do appreciate my friend, Congressman AL GREEN. We are friends. People have said: ''What do you have in common with AL GREEN?'' Well, actually, he is my brother. We are Christian brothers. He adds significantly to this body, and I am proud to be his brother.

Slavery does shock the conscience, and, I agree, it is really a crime against humanity. And it is still going on. It is happening across our southern border. It is horrendous what is happening to some of the people who are being sex trafficked.

We saw it in Nigeria after the 250-plus girls were kidnapped by Boko Haram from a Christian girls school and handcuffed to beds and, according to some of the stories from the girls who had escaped, repeatedly raped day after day. Just horrendous conditions.

I had been asked to fly over to meet with some of the parents of the girls who were kidnapped. We had to go out a few hours from the city to a safe house. We met with no fathers, all mothers. I asked the pastor who was there with them during a break in our meeting, ''Where are all the fathers?'' He said that is part of the tragedy. The fathers don't feel like they did their jobs as a father since their daughters were abducted and, they knew, were being made to perform acts, chained and handcuffed to beds, being raped every day repeatedly. The fathers didn't feel like they had done their job or that they deserved to have a home and a bed, so they went out into the bush. As I understood, later on, many of them had died out there.

It is tragic. It is a form of slavery. Horrendous. To think that is still going on, I was totally shocked.

I thought humanity had advanced so far, yet during the later years of the Obama administration, we learned that, in the world today, there are currently more slaves than ever in the history of the world, with over 40 million people in slavery while the United States is a superpower.

I know the people in Nigeria told me they had word from the Obama administration that if Nigeria would legalize same-sex marriage and would legalize and provide abortions, then the United States would help Nigeria defeat Boko Haram. But as a very scrupulous, caring Catholic bishop in Nigeria said, our Christian beliefs are not for sale to the United States, to President Obama, or to John Kerry. We are not selling our Christian beliefs.

That seemed pretty tragic, too, that we would basically try to compel people to go against their Biblical beliefs so that they could get help removing children from sex slavery.

I was surprised many years ago to find out that as a history major—I was with the Army 4 years, so I was going to be going there. I loved math; I was good at it. Biology was very interesting. Not as interesting to me was botany. I loved history, and I majored in it. It turned out that when the horrendous mistake, crime against humanity, whatever you want to call it, it was horrendous, that first ship brought slaves to America, it turns out they weren't the first slaves to North America.

There were numerous cases of Indian tribes that would war with another tribe. They would kill many of the braves, the males, and often take women and children as slaves. That is something for which mankind should not be proud at all. There are even references in the Bible to people selling children to pay off their debts. It is just tragic.

Hopefully, in the days ahead, we can do more to alleviate this crime against humanity that has grown substantially in the world today.

I saw this article from The Washington Times: ''DHS released unvaccinated Afghans while threatening to fire unvaccinated Border Patrol agents.'' That seems grossly unfair to American law enforcement, kind of a war against law enforcement. We are going to force you, even though we know that the vaccinations don't actually prevent the spread of COVID.

That is science now. That should be clear. Even Fauci and President Biden have admitted that what they thought was originally true was not. It doesn't prevent people from getting COVID. We are told, ''Oh, it keeps it from being as serious,'' unless you happen to get myocarditis or one of the other terrible side effects that have been found to occur.

Then we got Secretary Mayorkas maintaining the border is secure. While he is saying the border is secure, we have had millions of people come across illegally just since President Biden has been in office.

Then a big headline recently has been the big Democrat donor Sam Bankman-Fried, SBF some call him, the founder of FTX, the second largest contributor to the Democrat-affiliated political action committees. The company he founded dealing in cryptocurrency, FTX, has gone bankrupt, and he has gone out of business. We have a letter that was prepared by one of our Republican colleagues to Secretary Blinken.

□ 1445

It points out: ''It has come to our attention that millions of taxpayer dollars sent to Ukraine to assist with their war efforts were potentially invested in a crypto exchange that then made massive donations to Democrats in the United States during the 2022 midterm elections.

''In March 2022, the Ukrainian Government officially—and for the first time—partnered with crypto exchange FTX Trading Limited to launch a crypto donations website, 'Aid for Ukraine' ''—it was called—''within days of President Joe Biden pledging billions of American taxpayer dollars to assist the country with war efforts against the Russian invasion.''

It goes on to say: '' . . . the Ukrainian Government also invested portions of the $54 billion of U.S. economic assistance into FTX to keep Democrats in power.''

Madam Speaker, this is just incredibly outrageous.

So their answer is being demanded, and Secretary Blinken will need to respond. I feel sure that he will be called as a witness shortly after the first of the year.

I hate to think that with all the suffering going on in Ukraine that some of that money intended to help them ended up helping FTX before it went broke, and, obviously, some of his money went to the Democrat campaigns. So we will see what is going on there.

I have made a dear friend since I have been in Congress, and he has been co-chair of the Thursday Morning Prayer Breakfast. He is a friend, and he is a fine person.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to read into the RECORD a poem by an American poet who happened to live in my district in the 1800s. This poem was brought to my attention by my sister, Rosemary Lloyd, and the poem was brought to her attention by a historian from my college, Boston College, Heather Cox Richardson.

In this poem Walt Whitman spoke about America's choosing day. We see the confrontations and divisions we have in our country right now, but in 1884 there were great divisions in this country, less than 20 years after the Civil War, and there was great disruption among the political parties to decide how we would move forward.

Madam Speaker, I want to read Walt Whitman's poem into the RECORD. It is a great guidance for all of us today.

If I should need to name, O Western World, your powerfulest scene and show,
'Twould not be you, Niagara—nor you, ye limitless prairies—nor your huge rifts of canyons, Colorado,
Nor you, Yosemite—nor Yellowstone, with all its spasmic geyser-loops ascending to the skies, appearing and disappearing,
Nor Oregon's white cones—nor Huron's belt of mighty lakes—nor Mississippi's stream:
This seething hemisphere's humanity, as now, I'd name—the still small voice vibrating—America's choosing day,
The heart of it not in the chosen—the act itself the main, the quadrennial choosing,
The stretch of North and South arous'd—seaboard and inland—Texas to Maine—the prairie States—Vermont, Virginia, California,
The final ballot shower from East to West—the paradox and conflict,
The countless snowflakes falling—a swordless conflict,
Yet more than all Rome's wars of old, or modern Napoleon's: the peaceful choice of all,
Or good or ill humanity—welcoming the darker odds, the dross:
Foams and ferments the wine? It serves to purify—while the heart pants, life glows:
These stormy gusts and winds waft precious ships,
Swell'd Washington's, Jefferson's, Lincoln's sails.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, and my apologies if calling the gentleman my friend gets him in trouble.

There is an article in The Epoch Times by Joseph Hanneman titled: ''Judge's Latest Refusal to Grant Bail Looms Large for January 6 Defendant Maced Twice by D.C. Jail Guard.''

Having been a felony judge in Texas handling how many thousands of felony cases, nobody gets more incensed than I do when judges abuse their position. I recall having a bailiff. I found out that during recesses he was trash-mouthing, talking terrible to people who I was sentencing. When I found out, I called him in and said, look, I am sentencing these people to prison. We are supposed to show the example of civility. When you trash-talk somebody when they come into court, it builds up hatred and anger. They seethe during the time they are in prison, and it makes them more likely to come back and recidivate. There is no reason to do that. We are going to treat them civilly and fairly and make sure they are not abused verbally and physically.

Yet, I see Federal judges who seem to have the attitude of gee, I am confirmed for life, so once I am confirmed, I will do as I please and as I think I can get away with on appeal. It is outrageous.

So I am encouraging my friends on the Judiciary Committee that there is such abuse by Federal judges, there is such abuse by the Department of Justice, and by the FBI adopting gestapo tactics.

They didn't used to act like that. I heard so many FBI just tell me, you remember how it was in the eighties and nineties? We didn't go break down doors of people we knew would show up voluntarily if we just told them when and where. We didn't do it in the middle of the night to scare families and drag them out in their underwear and alert the news media so they would be there to humiliate them. Yet, it has been going on.

People say January 6 and think that justifies the worst criminality by the Department of Justice and even Federal judges. Because I do believe it is a breach of a Federal judge's oath when they ignore due process requirements and they take the position, I am not going to do anything about somebody that is being abused in jail until I am told to by an appellate court.

So I am hoping that the Judiciary Committee will even be subpoenaing judges to find out—not belabor specific cases—but to find out what their judicial philosophy is that allows them to avoid due process and to allow prisoners to be punished in pretrial confinement against the constitutional rights they have, and what allows and provokes a Federal judge to act like a dictator in their courtroom?

Here are some examples: I would not know U.S. District Judge Emmet Sullivan if he was here in the room, but I have read and heard firsthand from people who have had to deal with some of the injustice of him.

And I know the Federal judge that refused to recuse himself so he could sentence Dr. Simone Gold, even though he dated her, and she wouldn't date him anymore, so he looked forward to abusing his position to sentence her as the first woman with no criminal record and only guilty of a misdemeanor trespass. He got to sentence the girl that quit going out with him—the woman, the brilliant lawyer and MD—to a maximum security facility down in Miami.

He needs to come in and answer about recusal and who he thinks he is, above the law. It is in the law that a judge must recuse himself or herself if there is even an indication there might be some impartiality there.

We have got a lot of cleaning up in the Federal system to do, and I am glad that Republicans will be able to do that.

The article points out:

''Despite audio and video evidence showing former Tennessee sheriff's deputy Ronald Colton McAbee did not assault a police officer on the Capitol steps on January 6 as alleged by prosecutors, a Federal judge again refused the defendant's motion to be released from the District of Columbia jail pending trial.

''The issue took on added urgency on September 5 when McAbee, 28, was twice assaulted with chemical spray by a guard in the District of Columbia jail for not wearing a COVID mask, his wife Sarah told The Epoch Times.

'' 'This is just inhuman,' Sarah McAbee said. 'It doesn't even matter what your political beliefs are. You should never treat somebody that way. Are we living in the same universe?' she asked. 'This is not the America I once knew.'

''McAbee is charged by Federal prosecutors with seven January 6-related crimes: assaulting, resisting, or impeding a Federal officer; two counts of civil disorder; entering and remaining in a restricted building or grounds with a deadly or dangerous weapon; disorderly and disruptive conduct in a restricted building or grounds with a deadly or dangerous weapon; engaging in physical violence in a restricted building or grounds with a deadly or dangerous weapon, and committing an act of physical violence in the Capitol grounds or buildings.''

That sounds horrible. But then when you find out that actually—if you listen to the audio as you watch the video, Madam Speaker—you find out he was helping a Capitol policeman who was down. Yet, this judge has the audacity to say, we are not listening to the audio, so he could hear that evidence.

Why wouldn't you listen to the evidence as well as watch a video that gives a false impression?

Why?

Then to chastise this guy and punish him even more because he was law enforcement, he should have known better than to assault a police officer, but he wasn't.

The judge doesn't want the facts to get in the way. He is too busy being a tyrant and punishing January 6 defendants while they are in pretrial and punishing them with pretrial.

People need to answer for the tyranny of our justice system as it has become.

I have no problem—and I didn't as a judge—punishing people who deserve

the punishment. There were people on January 6 who deserved to be punished. But it sounds like that corruption continues to grow in the Department of Justice, the FBI, and even in our judicial courts, Federal courts.

It is tragic. He had been pepper sprayed in the jail twice and was not allowed to clean it all off. It was a threat to his health.

By the way, this request for bail sat in front of the judge 117 days. In our State courts, we make sure somebody has a hearing—we used to, I am sure they still do—within 48 hours. If they had other evidence to bring in, then we would set a hearing and have that.

But this judge had this matter sitting in front of him for 117 days while the prisoner was being abused in the D.C. jail where there was a deputy warden that had tweeted out, F the supporters of Trump.

□ 1500

Well, she made sure what she tweeted was what was being done at the jail.

Judge Sullivan took 69 days after the hearing to issue a ruling on whether somebody should stay in jail or not. What kind of judge is that? And then he dismissed the new video and audio evidence, calling them ambiguities the Court could not resolve.

Well, apparently the only reason he had a hearing in the first place was because the U.S. Court of Appeals was going to require it if he didn't do it. So he did it, begrudgingly.

This matter had gone before a U.S. magistrate in the Middle District of Tennessee, he heard the evidence and saw the evidence and he ordered McAbee to be released to home detention pending trial after hearings were had in August and early September of 2021.

That judge said, ''I do not believe that Mr. McAbee poses a future danger to the community if he were to be released between now and the time that he resolves this case. And the government, despite my request that they provide me any evidence that he's presented any sort of a danger to the community, have been able to point to absolutely nothing beyond the events around and during January 6.''

Well, prosecutors knew they had to get that matter away from the judge in Tennessee where there was more evidence of who McAbee really was to the core. So they got it up here to Judge Sullivan, who immediately rescinded that order and kept him in jail as punishment, despite the requirement to the contrary by the U.S. Constitution.

It really is outrageous. If a judge were deciding whether Judge Sullivan breached his sworn oath, that judge could say exactly what Judge Sullivan said to McAbee. Judge Sullivan said, ''Someone tasked with enforcing the law has shirked that responsibility, and that is why they are dangerous.''

Well, it sounds kind of like that is where Judge Sullivan is. He has shirked his responsibility to the law and the Constitution, and that is why he is a dangerous judge. I hope they will have hearings and get to the bottom of what his problems are with following the Constitution.

Last summer, there were a number of times, I met Pastor Tommy Nelson of Denton Bible Church in Denton, Texas. I listened, years ago, to hours and hours of Bible study he did. I am very impressed with him, and I love the fact that he loves history so much. He uses that as he speaks.

I heard him online doing sermons to his church, and he would kid and say: I am going to include that when I get to speak to Congress some day. I talked to Tommy, and I said: Look, you know, you are not going to be able to come in and talk to Congress as Tommy Nelson, but I can pass on your messages, we quote people all the time. Put together what you think would be good to have Congress hear and I will deliver that.

Tommy provided me this information. ''His father was born in 1914''—and these are Tommy's words. ''If you had asked my father if one should steal, kill, cheat on his taxes, commit adultery, or lie, he would have said 'Absolutely not'. If you had asked him, 'Why not?', he would have said, 'Because it is wrong'. If you responded, 'Says who?', he would have said, 'God'. If you said, 'Where does God say it is wrong?', he would have said, 'The Bible'. If you asked for an explanation, 'How do you know it is true?', he could not have given much of a defense of Biblical authority. But his world view, like most of his generation was of a Western or Judeo-Christian world view. He connected all the dots of diversity within the unity of an infinite personal God who had spoken truly to all mankind through His word, the Bible, and had intersected man through the Bible's chief idea, the incarnation of God in His son, Jesus Christ.''

The God we speak of, actually, I am glad to say, is the one mentioned right up there: In God we Trust; because we used to.

Tommy said: ''If you had said to any of that greatest generation, 'Truth is something relative to what you want it to be'. Or 'There is no final truth', not only would there be wonderment at you, but anger. They would have seen you as a threat to their day.

''Wisdom to that generation and every generation of Americans before them was to know the truth and to follow the will of God as truth was not simply the way that was true but the way that was best. Truth that carried them through the hardest century of our history.

''Now? That former view is seen as antiquated, as though greater minds have progressed beyond that. That former view is now seen as that which holds back the growth of society.

''But the belief in 'oughtness', in moral truth, is the marvelous byproduct of belief in the true God.

''It was Plato who said, 'In life we must seek the best opinions of men and hold to them as to a boat in a storm unless we have a more certain word of God.' The idea of God, the Bible, Christ the Redeemer is the highest dream of the hopes of man. We can know what must be known to truly be mankind. Morality, marriage, the home, the dignity of man, the meaning of love, right and wrong, all are revealed on that which was the foundation of our civilization, Bible.

''It brought a world view which was light and salt to our culture and our country. It brought law and order and dignity. It served as a point of integration to which all answered. Our only problem was our refusal to live in keeping with it.

''But our day has cut off the limb upon which we were sitting in our rejection of God, banning school prayer, permitting the murder of children in the womb, and abolishing traditional marriage.

''Modernism is the belief that God can be rejected and yet be replaced by the reasoning and science of man. Postmodernism is the recognition that modernism will not work. Because post-modernism states that there is no such thing as absolute truth and with God refused, society as we have known it 'dis-integrates'. The earthquake beneath our feet began in the country's shift in the 1960s. The tsunamis followed and with each year more and more devastating. We are now worse than in the jungle. The jungle has natural law which governs it. But the law that governs man is God. Man as in God's image chooses. He can be angelic or demonic based on those choices. Without God and His word to guide man his fallen nature is unleashed. And unlike nature, man has become more and more immoral, violent, ignorant, and cruel. And that is the horror that is sweeping our country day by day. And as it has laid waste to Europe, it is about to eliminate the greatest culture in the history of man, the Western culture, the Judeo-Christian world view that sees all of life through the perspective of the God of the Bible which we, the leaders of the United States as a body have renounced.

''Washington's last words to us were to beware of following the path of Europe. A path that began in the exaltation of reason and science in the Enlightenment. We have not heeded his words, and now Europe's inhumanities of the 20th century have become ours.

''I need not spend much time on the violence, contempt of authority, breakdown of the home, violence in our cities, decay of our educational system, the division of our leaders and citizens, pornography, STDs, 65 million dead through abortion, gender confusion, illegal immigration, drug addiction, opioids, loss of constitutional freedoms, the homeless, the increase of mental illnesses, pedophilia, gun control, racial tensions. Not to speak of the economy and COVID.

''And yet in all this plethora of dysfunction, the terms 'God, righteousness, sin, repentance, Jesus Christ, the

Bible, and salvation' are forbidden terms. We cry over 'what ain't right' and yet offer nothing but Band-Aids and tourniquets.

''Man must be changed. His heart must be changed at the deepest level. He must have a new birth. He must be born again as a child of God. He must as Nineveh in the days of Jonah, repent and heed the warning of God that destruction awaits.

''Our country and its leaders must 'humble themselves and pray and turn from their wicked ways that God may hear our prayer, forgive our sins, and heal our land.

''We must be reconciled to Him who is our life and being. It starts with us, the God-ordained leaders.

''Sadly, repentance cannot be legislated.

''It begins in revival. It begins in the yearning of individuals who have cast off the blinders of modern man and face the truth that their can be no truth, right, love, or life without the unique personal God of the Bible.''

Tommy Nelson referenced a quote from Alexis de Tocqueville. I want to provide some, with thanks to William Federer's research and publication, there is much to be learned from Alexis de Tocqueville.

He was born July 29, 1805. He was a French social scientist, he traveled the United States in 1831, and wrote a two-part work ''Democracy in America,'' 1835, and then the second in 1840, which has been described as ''the most comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the relationship between character and society in America that has every been written''.

In it, de Tocqueville said: ''Upon my arrival in the United States, the religious aspect of the country was the first thing that struck my attention; and the longer I stayed there, the more I perceived the great political consequences resulting from this new state of things, to which I was unaccustomed.

''In France, I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom marching in opposite directions. But in America, I found they were intimately united and that they reigned in common over the same country . . . ''

He also said: ''They brought with them . . . a form of Christianity, which I cannot better describe, than by styling it a democratic and republican religion . . . ''

''From the earliest settlement of the emigrants, politics and religion contracted an alliance which has never been dissolved.''

That was Alexis de Tocqueville's note back in the 1800s. He said: ''Religion in America . . . must be regarded as the foremost of the political institutions of that country; for if it does not impart a taste for freedom, it facilitates the use of it . . . This opinion is not peculiar to a class of citizens or party, but it belongs to the whole Nation.''

De Tocqueville says: ''The sects that exists in the United States are innumerable. They all differ in respect to the worship that is due to the Creator; but they all agree in respect to the duties which are due from man to man. Each sect adores the Deity in its own peculiar manner, but all sects preach the same moral law in the name of God . . .

''Moreover, all the sects of the United States are comprised within the great unity of Christianity, and Christian morality is everywhere the same.''

□ 1515

De Tocqueville also said: ''In the United States the sovereign authority is religious . . . there is no country in the whole world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence than in America . . . ''

Inserting parenthetically, that drove and led to the Civil War. There were so many people that were going, wait a minute; we can't treat brothers and sisters with chains and bondage. Yes, I understand some fought for States' rights. But let's face it, it was about slavery for most.

De Tocqueville said: ''In the United States the influence of religion is not confined to the manners, but it extends to the intelligence of the people . . . Christianity, therefore, reigns without obstacle, by universal consent . . . ''

He is talking about America. He said: ''The Americans combine the notions of Christianity and of liberty so intimately in their minds, that it is impossible to make them conceive the one without the other; and with them this conviction does not spring from that barren traditionary faith which seems to vegetate in the soul rather than to live.''

In Book Two of his Democracy in America, de Tocqueville wrote: ''Christianity has therefore retained a stronghold on the public mind in America . . . in the United States . . . Christianity itself is a fact so irresistibly established, that no one undertakes either to attack or to defend it.''

Wow, things have changed.

Tommy Nelson points out: ''Remember the words of the atheist, John Paul Sartre, without an infinite reference point by which all things are judged, all singular points are meaningless. Without God, all of life disintegrates.

''It has always amused me that in 1789 two historical events occurred simultaneously. The American Constitution in Philadelphia and the French Revolution in Paris, both representing opposite world views. The American Constitution though not uniquely Christian reflected the historic Christian world view of 'nature's God' and the 'inalienable right' of life and liberty. It gave birth to a culture that France honored in their sending us the Statue of Liberty because our country was successful. Not because of our revolution but because of our Constitution. Revolutions are relatively easy. They are simply tearing down. What is difficult is rebuilding. The French had their revolution, but their replacement was not a document that reflected the Bible. It was a culture that reflected French enlightenment; atheism that replaced God with nature, science, and unaided reason. With no divine standard it collapsed into a socialistic bloodbath that prompted a new term, 'guillotine.' All of Europe would follow and by 1848, the year of revolution, all European monarchies were gone.

But in France without the God of truth their replacement failed only to be conquered by a dictator to bring order, Napoleon, who plunged Europe into darkness.''

And let me add, I agree with historians that have said the major difference between the American Revolution and the French Revolution was the American Revolution, like Tommy Nelson points out, it was about liberty that stemmed from biblical belief, whereas the French Revolution was about revenge. And we see how that worked out.

''The same would happen in Russia who exchanged the church for the communism of Marx and Lenin and, finally, the horror of Stalin.''

Tens of millions killed.

''Germany had Hitler; China had Mao; and Cuba had Castro.

''But as a Russian pastor has said: 'Russia is a nation of darkness looking for the light. America is a country of the light searching for the darkness.' Our search has sadly been successful.

''The Christian philosopher and author Francis Schaeffer said: 'Where there is no absolute to govern society, society is absolute.' There is nothing magic about democracy or 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people'. It assumes that the majority of the voting public has the wisdom and character to place worthy men and women in places of authority. Should that society over time abandon their historic world view and adopt a modern one where truth is shaped by individual opinions . . . or should that society reject God and enthrone man, then absolute divine law will erode with each generation until the tyranny of the majority removes the freedoms enjoyed by the past. And considering the influence of modern media the majority will be controlled by the few. And the America of history will be just that . . . past history.

''To abandon God is to disintegrate.

''Imagine, if you will, a great metal machine operated by a man. The parts are sharp and pointed, moving with great speed and perfect synchronization. Anything that would get caught in the machine would be ground into nothingness within seconds. As long as the man operating the machine is careful to stay outside of the machine, he is safe. But should he catch a shirt sleeve in the gears, he will soon disintegrate. Such is man and the universe. As he stands unique in God's image outside of nature, man can observe the machine, use it and marvel at it. But should he become part of the impersonal, he is ground into mulch.

Such is man and nature. Though part of the creation, man stands infinitely distinct from it as in the image of God. As distinct from the impersonal machine, man maintains his glory but to be merely part of nature, all of the glory of man, mind, reason, conscience, soul, and will, merely become biological phenomena. The loftiness and magic of 'man' is lost in the machine of nature.

''King David wrote, 'When I consider the heavens and the works of Thy hands what is man that Thou art mindful of him? Yet Thou has made him for a little while lower than the angels. Thou dost crown him with glory and majesty and Thou dost appoint him over the works of Thy hands.' And these are the 'hands' that America has rejected.

''Man without God is a cosmic orphan with no one who gives him meaning, care, or hope of redemption or life after death. There is no way, truth, or life without God.

John 3:16 evaporates in that circumstance. ''For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.''

''Man may 'act' atheistic, wise and secular, but he cannot 'react' as an atheist. As soon as he is sinned against and done unjustly, he becomes a Puritan longing for an injustice to receive absolute retribution. Without God the only thing man can feel guilty about is guilt. Guilt assumes transgression, and transgression assumes law that assumes God. Without God there can be no final law, guilt, or true government. No civility to build a civilization. No 'cult' or religious rules to build 'culture'.

''We cannot legislate a return to truth. One hundred and fifty years of governmental, academic, artistic, scientific, philosophic, moral, domestic, medical, education, and judicial denial cannot be naturally fixed. We are beyond hope for a return. We are too stubborn, and too proud, and too self-centered, and too indulged.

''Our only hope is the divine reprieve of Nineveh in the day of Jonah. A prophet who rose from the dead promised life or destruction in 40 days upon their response to his prophecy of destruction. From the king to the people and even to the animals, a fast was called for and all wore sackcloth. The disaster was averted, and so it is now. Prophets who rise from the dead after 3 days and nights are not to be disregarded.

''If indeed man, has judged rightly for 20 centuries that there is an infinite and personal God who has revealed Himself in the Bible, the foundation of history's greatest culture, who raised His son from the dead to offer man repentance and salvation, and if he is indeed a God of wrath upon those countries who hold Him in contempt . . . then our country revels today in the shadow of Vesuvius.

''Jeremiah 48:42, 'Moab will be destroyed from being a people because he has magnified himself against the Lord'.

''Icarus may fly high with his wings of wax, but should Hubris carry him too high, his wings will melt, his feathers fly to the wind, and he shall come to a violent end.

May those who have ears to hear, take heed, repent and reform accordingly.''

Tommy Nelson has profound truth that he has provided, but that is because it comes from truth beyond him, which he readily acknowledges.

Dostoevsky was quoted by Solzhenitsyn. I had not seen the quote before Solzhenitsyn used it in The Gulag Archipelago. Dostoevsky was taking on the crazy ideas of this nut named Marx, a sad man, sad family, who couldn't even foresee the formation of unions.

Dostoevsky said that the big problem with Marxism is not economic. Obviously, that is a problem. They always go broke eventually. The problem with Marxism is atheism.

I hear some of my colleagues talk about how wonderful progressivism is. That is the new term for Marxism; how great it will be when everybody shares and shares alike.

But as Khrushchev found when he set up a commission to come up with a plan of how you move to true communism, where there is no government, everybody shares and shares alike, he ended up disbanding the commission because there is no way to ever get to a place; until the Messiah comes, it won't happen because you have got to have a totalitarian government that takes away everybody's rights and tells them what they will be allowed to do and not do, and that government becomes the God. That is what Dostoevsky was saying.

So, I won't be back next year. I will be back in 2 weeks and the week after that.

Madam Speaker, I continue to have hope that springs eternal in the human breast that we won't lose the greatest freedom, the greatest country, the greatest gift of a country any people has ever received, that it will not be our generation that sees it lost.

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

□ 1530

REFLECTIONS ON CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, on a lighter note, this will be one of the last opportunities that I will have to address this Chamber as Representative of the people of the Third Congressional District of western and north central Wisconsin.

It has truly been the honor of my life, but Tawni and I decided last summer that it shouldn't be the honor for our entire lives, so we decided to make this our last term after 26 years of serving the people back home.

As a kid growing up on the north side of La Crosse, Madam Speaker, if someone had told me, the son of a telephone repairman, that I would one day be serving in a place like the United States Congress, I would have thought they were crazy.

I thought this was a place where only the politically connected, the Kennedys, the Rockefellers, or those with great wealth, would come to. I guess I am a living example that if you want to serve your Nation, there are still opportunities to do so at all levels.

I had a chance to cut my political teeth as a college undergrad with one of my political icons and heroes back home, Senator Bill Proxmire.

From him, I learned the importance of fiscal responsibility, something that I have tried to practice each year in Congress, tried to instill in my colleagues, the need for us to balance our books.

I was a big advocate back in the 1990s when I joined this Congress for pay-as-you-go budgeting rules, which is a simple concept. It just means that if you are going to have a spending increase or a tax cut, you have to find an offset in the budget to pay for it in order to maintain that balance.

Then, if you are able to hit the sweet spot with strong economic growth, increased worker productivity, and with that comes increased revenue to the Treasury, you can actually not only balance budgets but run some surpluses, something that the second term of the Clinton administration demonstrated with 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses where we were actually paying down the national debt rather than adding to it.

But in my humble opinion, Madam Speaker, I believe I have represented the most beautiful congressional district in the Nation. Throughout western Wisconsin, in an area called the Driftless Area, where the glaciers missed, we have such beautiful natural resources.

I have more miles that border the Mississippi River than any other congressional district in the Nation, so I took it upon myself as a particular duty and responsibility to do what I could to better protect and preserve the Mississippi River and the watershed basin for future generations.

It is a huge source of tourism, outdoor recreation, and commercial navigation, which is vital to the economy and the quality of life in the upper Midwest.

I am proud that when I first got here back in 1997, I helped form the first bipartisan Mississippi River Caucus. We were able to do some good work, Republicans and Democrats working together, to manage river issues and make sure that we approached it as one

continuous ecosystem rather than just a northern and southern Mississippi area.

We have a lot of rivers, a lot of lakes, beautiful bluffs and hills and coulees that people enjoy back home.

More importantly, it has been such an honor to represent the people of the district: good, honest, hardworking, salt of the earth.

I have seen time and time again over these last 26 years, when a community got hit with a natural disaster—for us in western Wisconsin, it was typically bad flooding that hit people in their communities and flooded their homes and businesses. I saw people rally, and there weren't labels. It wasn't Republicans or Democrats or Independents or whatever. It was just, hey, we need to help our neighbor and get through this. It was demonstrated time and time again.

I also saw, through the years, how communities rally for our fallen heroes on the battlefield. People over the last year, knowing that I was going to be stepping down at the end of this term, have asked me: What was the most difficult part of your job serving in Congress?

Besides the obvious, the amount of time that you have to be away from and sacrifice from your family, those missed opportunities, clearly, the most difficult part of this job is receiving that phone call from the Pentagon and then having to deliver that message to the family back home that their loved one has just fallen on the field of battle, and how absolutely soul-crushing that is to have to deliver that message and hear the family's reaction to it and then go to that soldier's funeral in the community.

But it was also inspiring, seeing how the community rallied around that family and truly honored that fallen hero at the time—27 of them, unfortunately, in my congressional district alone, from the deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan.

On the other hand, people have asked me what has been one of my prouder accomplishments as a Member of Congress. I tell them it wasn't anything particular that I did or a piece of legislation that I may have drafted and passed or some type of project back home that I was able to help complete. It was more the opportunity I had as a Member of Congress representing the people back home to go travel and be with our troops in the field, seeing what our fine young men and women in uniform do for us each and every day.

We send them off to these faraway battlefields with strange-sounding names and weird histories and conflicts that are centuries old, and we ask them to perform incredibly dangerous and difficult missions, and they do it.

They are so well trained. They are so well motivated. They are the best our Nation has to offer.

It is just inspiring, being in their presence, especially the five times I went to Iraq, the six times I was in Afghanistan, the one time I went to Kosovo at the height of that air war in the late 1990s, seeing the job they do for us.

There is no other Nation in the world that can do what our military does. They do it with decency, and they do it by abiding by the Geneva Convention. That is something that the world expects of us.

We have well-trained and well-motivated men and women on our behalf securing our freedom and our liberties but also advancing the cause of peace throughout the world.

I just wish everyone, as a citizen of this country, could see and go do the things that I did in meeting with our troops in the field.

That clearly is the proudest moment. I have never been prouder to be an American than during those opportunities to be with them.

I have enjoyed the committee assignments that I have had through the years. Initially, when I came to Congress, I was assigned to the Natural Resources Committee. Of course, with all the work we were doing for the Mississippi River, I have been one of the cochairs of the National Park Caucus for a number of years now—truly, America's greatest idea.

It is kind of neat to think that that democratizing principle that we created in the National Park System, that just because we were citizens of this great Nation, all of us are co-owners of some of the most beautiful and most expensive real estate in the entire world, our national parks.

They are calling for us to visit. They are beautiful places. I fell in love with them as a kid, and I wanted to pass that on to my family and my children. So, every August during our recess here in Congress, I take the family to a different national park where I can meet with the superintendents and the park personnel and get a park briefing. But I also took the family out in the back country, where we went backpacking.

We started that when the boys were just toddlers and could just barely carry their own sleeping bags. But as they got older and stronger, Tawni and I tended to load down their backpacks more and more, and that made backpacking a lot easier on us.

I encourage our citizens to take advantage of the great national parks we have, the national wildlife refuges that we have.

I also helped form and cochair the National Wildlife Refuge Caucus, having three of the most beautiful ones in my congressional district as well. They are objects of splendor, meant for us to enjoy and utilize.

I also served on the Education and Labor Committee. I represent 6 of the 11 State universities in Wisconsin, 4 of the greatest technical schools that we have. I made it a priority to focus on access to the affordability of higher education, making sure that those doors remain open to all of our kids, regardless of their socioeconomic background.

I was one of the champions of the need-based financial aid programs because I benefited from that myself. Again, as a kid of a telephone repairman, I was the first generation to go on to school.

My family didn't have the resources to send me to college, let alone technical school, but through a combination of student loans, the work-study program, and I qualified for a Pell grant being a low-income student, I was able to make it work financially.

In fact, I think I still hold the undergraduate career for the most toilets cleaned in a 4-year span. It was the most disgusting job on campus, but it paid the best through work-study, so I was willing to do that 2 hours a day, every year, for 4 years in college while I was still trying to play college football and all that other stuff that I wanted to do.

I wanted to make sure those programs continued and were strengthened for the next generation because I didn't want to be one of those Representatives that pulls the ladder up behind me and tells the next generation, ''Tough luck. You are on your own.''

It is one of the wisest investments we can make as a Nation in our youth, expanding those educational opportunities, because the truth is, the jobs of the future are going to put a premium on higher education learning. I mean, that is just the way the world and the global economy are today. We have to expand that access.

The work we did on committee, too, for workforce development and worker safety issues, I am very proud of that.

I served on the Budget Committee for a number of years. I had a short stint on the Agriculture Committee. I was one of the leading voices on farm bill reform. I tried to move away from these huge taxpayer subsidies that were going to a few but very large agribusinesses, very much at the expense of our family farmers. I have been proud to be able to represent a large rural area in Wisconsin where farming, family farming, is a key component of our economy.

Wisconsin is the Dairy State. Cheese—everyone is kind of familiar with that, and we wear that label proudly.

It has been really neat throughout the years to go out on the family farms and visit with those farm families and see the incredible work they do for us to enable our food security, something that we, as Americans, kind of take for granted. Yet, we shouldn't because farming is tough: the ups and downs of commodity prices, the expenses, the fixed costs that they face.

The last year or so has been particularly difficult with the increase in fuel and fertilizer that they have without a corresponding increase in commodity prices.

It is a hard business, especially if you are a dairy farmer because that is 24/7.

Cows have to be milked every day. You don't have the luxury of being able to step away for a few days at a time. There are challenges there that I tried to understand and tried to address in my role as Representative of one of the larger dairy-producing districts in the Nation.

I especially enjoyed my time as a member of the Ways and Means Committee over the last 16 years. It is the only committee that is constitutionally mandated. In the early years of our Republic, it was the only committee that Congress had. Then, finally, it was starting to get piecemealed and torn apart and that, but we still have incredible jurisdiction over most of the economic issues: obviously, the tax code; trade policy; Social Security and Medicare; healthcare policy.

It has been fun working in that committee and working with my colleagues to try to develop good policy that makes sense for our country. The work I especially focused on is healthcare reform, trying to implement a value-based system so that we are actually paying for the quality of care that is given to us and not the volume of care, not the tests and procedures and things that are done to us without any results, but making sure that we are getting value out of the dollars that are spent.

I still believe that is going to be one of the keys to healthcare reform in our country, moving to that value, that quality-based outcome system that we need.

I benefited from having some of the best healthcare providers in the world operating in my congressional district: the Gundersen Health System, the Mayo Clinic Health System.

I think I still have more Mayo doctors in my congressional district throughout western Wisconsin than they even do in Minnesota or other places in the country, the Marshfields and the Auroras and the ThedaCares. We are very lucky in the State of Wisconsin to have such quality providers.

But, clearly, healthcare is still too expensive. We need to continue to think creatively on how we can bring those costs down and make sure that it is accessible for all of our citizens.

I was proud of being able to create the Veterans History Project. This is an attempt to record our veterans' stories before it is too late and they pass away because I believe it is an important part of American history that needs to be preserved.

I teamed up with Amo Houghton, a Republican friend, back when he was a Marine. We introduced the legislation on the House side. We teamed up with Max Cleland and Chuck Hagel on the Senate side. I think we still have the record for the shortest period of time from when a bill was introduced to when it was signed into law by Bill Clinton because, every once in a while, the urgency—at the time, it was the World War II generation that was passing away at 2,000 a day. We wanted to get this program up and going in order to start capturing their stories.

We are archiving it at the world's greatest library, the Library of Congress. They have done a tremendous job of handling that program and collecting all of these stories, digitizing them now, making them available on the internet for everyone to access, but especially our younger generation.

What gave me the idea to create the Veterans History Project—and I am proud to report today we have over 120,000 of these veterans' stories collected nationwide. Now, we are shifting the focus to the Vietnam generation, who are starting to pass away because they are getting up there in age, too.

What gave me the spark to create it was Father's Day weekend. I was out at the picnic table with my dad, Korea generation, and my uncle, his brother, Donnie, who flew bomber missions in the Pacific during the Second World War. For the first time, they started talking to me about their experience. I said, holy cow, and I told them to stop as I ran into the house and got the family video camera and then came out and set it up. My two boys were just toddlers at the time, and I wanted them, when they were old enough to appreciate it, to be able to hear it from their grandfather and their great-uncle.

I came back to Washington that next week and said, given the technology that is available today, we need to be doing this nationwide. So, we quickly drafted the legislation, moved it through both Chambers, and got it implemented into law.

It has been a lot of fun being able to not only interview our veterans but seeing this program grow and the history that we are preserving so future generations never forget the type of service and sacrifice that came before them.

□ 1545

I did a lot of work on the veteran front, obviously, trying to ease their transition from Iraq, Afghanistan, to back home. We had 2 million of them coming home with special needs, physical and mental, that still needs to be addressed.

At the VA hospital in my district, I spent a lot of time making sure we had better coordination of care and better outcome of care for our veterans. More needs to be done on that front. It is a promise our Nation has to live up to, given the type of service and sacrifice that these men and women do for us.

I was also co-chairing the Rural Healthcare Caucus. Obviously, as a Representative of a lot of rural providers in my district, I teamed up with CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for a number of years to make sure that our rural providers had a voice when it came to healthcare policy, given the unique challenges that they face with recruitment, retention, and just those rural settings generally, and the type of obstacles that we have to overcome.

In many cases, these rural hospitals are the anchor of these rural communities. If they lose it, it has huge economic impact, and it also makes it very difficult then for the people in that region to access the type of quality healthcare that they need.

When I first got here, I helped form the New Democratic Coalition. It was back in '97 with Cal Dooley, Tim Roemer, Jim Moran, and others, who felt that we needed to try to restore the sensible center in Congress with a pragmatic group of House Members who could get together on a weekly basis, figure out how we can complement each other's work, but also figure out ways of building bridges rather than tearing them down around here, form those crucial bipartisan relationships to get things done, working closely with the Clinton administration initially and then subsequent administrations.

I got the honor of chairing the New Democrat Coalition for 4 years. Today, I think we are close to 100 Members in the Democrat Coalition, great Members, hardworking, earnest, again, those trying to build bridges and get things done around here. I think that group has a lot of hope and promise in the coming Congress now of finding the relevancy and finding those crucial relationships across the aisle that we need in order to advance the issues and the policies that benefit our Nation.

I know I am leaving that New Democrat Coalition in very good with hands with the young, bright, talented leadership that has come up now and taken over the reins.

Also, I had some good mentors as I was growing up. I mentioned Senator Bill Proxmire, who I had a chance to intern for, wrote many of his speeches about the need for the Senate to ratify the antigenocide treaty.

He was one of the first sounding the alarm about fiscal irresponsibility and how we have a responsibility as Representatives to be good stewards of the dollar.

Also, Senator Gaylord Nelson from Wisconsin, one of my heroes, one of the great conservationists of all time, not just in Congress but for the country and for the world. Here is a guy who grew up in a 400-person town called Clear Lake and later became Governor of Wisconsin, Senator from Wisconsin, and the father of Earth Day, a day that we commemorate every year about the need to protect our vital natural resources across the globe, celebrated in 144 nations today. It is a great story of how one person can make a difference, especially a small-town kid from northern Wisconsin and the impact that he left behind with his legacy.

So, obviously, you can't do all of this. This job is too big for one individual. Everyone here, all of my colleagues know the truth in the statement that you are only as good as the people you surround yourself with. I have been so blessed and so lucky throughout the years to have the best

staff that any Member could hope for, whether it was here in Washington or back home in my district offices. These are incredible individuals, typically young, hardworking, smart, just trying to do the best they can servicing people back home, whether it was the legislation that we worked on together here or the casework that my district office staff members would do.

Nothing brought me greater joy than traveling around the congressional district, having people come up and say: Ron, I have got to thank you and your office because of what you did for me or a family member, whether it was a veteran's issue or a lost Social Security check or some farm program that a family farmer was trying to access. I mean, the list goes on and on and on. I give all the credit and all the laurels to my staff for the job that they did throughout the years.

I had wonderful chiefs of staff, from Cindy, Erik, Travis, Mike, Hannah, and Alex, who ran a tight ship and just created a great atmosphere for all of us to work in. They were true partners through all of this.

I had two wonderful district directors back home: Lauren Kannenberg, who I recruited as a principal out of a Catholic high school to be my district office manager way back when, and later Karrie Jacqueline, who were able to manage those offices and the outreach that we ask our staff to do and to report back to us so that we stay in constant touch and communication, if we are not out on the road ourselves meeting with people back in the community.

The committee staff is just tremendous, the work that they put in, how helpful they are to us as individual Members, but also to our staff people. The people we have serving here on the floor, they are the ones that are behind the scenes, but they try to bring some function to the dysfunction that occurs too often in this place. We couldn't do it without them. It is the kind of seamless energy that they bring to making the trains run on time and just doing the basics for us to be able to do our job.

We have an official reporter right now taking down my words. They never get to say a word when they are here, but I know how important their job is as the guardian of the public record. Somehow they do it so well, even when we are yelling over each other in heated debates and trying to get all of that down. It is not an easy job. I know this personally because my wife is an official court reporter for a judge back home. I know the type of skill that it takes to perform these duties. I just want to thank them for their service to our Nation.

The Capitol Hill police. Obviously, January 6 is going to go down as a dark mark in American history. It was our Capitol Hill police that were the true vanguard of making sure that it didn't get uglier or deadlier than it did that day.

I mention these kinds of ancillary personnel who make Capitol Hill run, because through the years—and for me, 26 years—you get to know these people as individuals and as human beings and develop those friendships. It is something that I will truly miss.

Bob and Rose in our cloakroom, who keep us so well informed of what is happening all the time and what the schedule is and what we should anticipate, those types of relationships you are never going to forget.

I also benefited throughout the years in one of those competitive swing districts. I love the fact that my district was 50/50. We have too few of those districts today with gerrymandering where it is overwhelmingly Republican or overwhelmingly Democrat. That wasn't the case in my district. My district has always been about one-third, one-third, and one-third in registration. That forced me to play it down the middle and to understand that I was going to be taking incoming from the far right and the far left. I always reminded my staff to not worry about that, because that is not where are our district is. In fact, if I wasn't taking incoming from the far, far right and the far, far left, I probably wasn't doing a good job of adequately representing the people in the district that I had.

It was such a joy, because they did place their trust and confidence in me to make good decisions on their behalf, even though a lot of them will tell you they had disagreements with me throughout the years. But I think they saw the hard work we put in and the honesty and civility that I tried to bring to this job. It was a great congressional district to represent.

But I couldn't have gotten here without the help of my campaign staff, the campaign managers throughout the years, the staff, the fieldworkers, the volunteers, the supporters, the friends, people like Wally Capper, Paul Barkla, Bob Welsh, Nancy Johnson, Vicki Burke, Margaret Wood. These are the people who have enough belief and trust in you that they are willing to give you one of the most precious things that we own as human beings and that is our own time. They were, time and again, campaign after campaign, always there helping out and pitching in. That is true for thousands of people back home who supported me throughout the years.

They not only made it possible for me to win in a very competitive district, but they also made it fun. Because as candidates going through tough campaigns, it means a lot knowing that you have a lot of friends and a lot of supporters who have your back and care about you and care about the outcome of our democracy. They have been terrific.

Most of all, I thank my family. It starts there and it ends there, especially my soulmate and my partner in all this, my wife, Tawni. I don't know how she did it. When we first ran, our first son, Johnny, was born just a few days before our primary. In the midst of that chaos, the first congressional campaign, with everything swirling around, suddenly we have a little boy in our arms. Boy, you talk about a life moment that just brings it down to the basics. At that point, when he was delivered, nothing else mattered. We win, we lose, it didn't matter; we have this beautiful little boy in our arms now. He was such a stabilizing force.

Then 2 years later came Matt. How she did it all of those years with me running back and forth every weekend, back to the district, coming out here for my duties in Washington. I am home representing a 19-county, large rural area, constantly on the road, getting out into the communities that I represent. So most of this fell on her to raise two beautiful sons, who are doing incredible things right now. She and I couldn't be more proud of Johnny and Matt.

They were born into this racket. It is kind of weird for them knowing dad is stepping down, because this life of me serving in Congress is all they have known. In fact, for a while, when they were little guys and Tawni would drop me off at the airport, they literally thought my job was getting on a plane and flying overhead all week and then landing, because they would come and pick me up then. Every time they saw a plane go by, ''Oh, there's daddy.'' Then they started tuning in to C–SPAN and seeing me engaged in debates on the floor. Wait a minute: What is going on here? They started figuring it out. I couldn't have done it without Tawni's support and partnership and the kids.

So many times I had to be away from them, but there were also fun family events we could do, too, in the course of my duties. Parades, we lost count at about 1,500. I started losing the boys when they became teenagers, after about 1,200 parades that they did. County fairs, they would go along with me, the great dairy breakfasts that we have back home in Wisconsin during the summertime where we visit dairy families, have great breakfasts, community events, everyone coming together. So there were a lot of fun, enjoyable things we could do as a family that overlapped with my official duties. They never complained, even though it probably would have been more fun for them to be doing something else or hanging out with their friends.

Now, I am proud to say that Johnny, after playing college football, is with an engineering firm in La Crosse, doing great work there, we couldn't be prouder.

Our son Matt, after graduating Harvard, immediately signed up for officer candidate school at Quantico, and now he is an infantry commander for the Marines at Camp Lejeune. Yes, they fixed the water problem down at Camp Lejeune, after seeing all of those ads on TV lately. That is what they have been able to do.

Tawni and I are very, very lucky to have those two sons and the type of young men and citizens that they have become.

I would also be remiss if I didn't mention our ''third son'' whom we didn't adopt, Oscar, who is an exchange student, who came and lived with us throughout his high school years, going to school with our boys. He went to Madison UW. He is working at Epic now and applying to med school. He is from Luoyang, China. He is just a great kid. He is home for the holidays with us and does family vacations with us and goes backpacking with us. That has been a lot of fun, too.

It has been quite the ride. Obviously, many, many people made this happen. I feel very blessed and very fortunate having the opportunity to be able to represent such a neat, beautiful area with some great people and families back home in Wisconsin.

We are looking forward to the next chapter. We don't know what that is yet. No final decisions have been made. But Tawni and I are going to be looking for new ways of being able to contribute to the community and being able to support our democracy.

As I leave here today, just a note of caution. The type of polarization that we are experiencing right now in this country, the hyperpartisanship, is not healthy. The key to the survival of any democracy is the ability to compromise. It is the give and take. It is being able to reach out across the aisle to a good friend, like DAVE SCHWEIKERT, who is on the Committee on Ways and Means with us and find some issues that we can work on together and try to advance. That is the only way this place is going to survive. It is the only way our country and democracy are going to be able to survive.

□ 1600

Unfortunately, in recent years, people getting involved in politics are looking at the other side not as reasonable people that you can disagree with and have heated debates about the best course of action for the future of our country, but the enemy that needs to be destroyed.

These campaigns are getting uglier, and they are getting nastier, and the division is growing, which is leading to events like we had here on Capitol Hill on January 6. This can't continue.

One of my prouder achievements that I tell people back home is, I have been consistently ranked as one of the most bipartisan Members of Congress through the surveys that are taken, the bills I introduce, the legislation we advance, who I am working with across the aisle. I wear that as a badge of honor, not as something to be ashamed of or run away from.

Too many of my colleagues now fear that if they are seen working with a Democrat or working with a Republican, someone on the other side, that would be the kiss of death for them in their primary back home. That is not the way this place is set up to function.

We have got to figure out a way to fight through this bad era of American politics and remind ourselves that, ultimately, at the end of the day, we are all Americans with a commonality that can't separate us. We cannot be enemies.

We need to find a way forward of healing the division and the partisanship that has poisoned our politics and the alternate realities that are being created today through many different mediums because if you don't have that basic commonality of what the facts and what the truth are, there is no way you are going to be able to reach agreement on some of the tough issues facing our country. I mean, the separation, the gulf will be too great.

I didn't mean to lecture my colleagues here or future Representatives to this place, but it is an issue that we have to stay focused on.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the recognition, the honor of being able to address this Chamber for one of my last times and to thank, ultimately, the people in the Third Congressional District for the trust and the responsibility that they placed in me these past 26 years.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2617. An act to amend section 1115 of title 31, United States Code, to amend the description of how performance goals are achieved, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4834. An act to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a join resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 63 Joint Resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020.

THE MATH ALWAYS WINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Sckweikert) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, RON is one of the good guys. For those of us who are blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee, many times it is one of those committees where you have to do adult stuff that affects not only this country but the world. Having people that you can talk to and work it through with is important. RON is going to be missed. I thank him for being one of the good guys.

Madam Speaker, this is going to be sort of a two-parter. I am going to come back in 2 weeks and provide solutions, but right now I need to define the problem.

As you know, right now around the Capitol complex, we have dozens and dozens of brand-new Members and hundreds of potentially new staffers. They are all trying to find their office and which way is up and where the bathrooms are; I mean, all the things we go through when we are brand-new around here.

My fear is no one is telling these Members that are new—and even talking to the Members who have been here a while—the truth. The truth is the math, and the math always wins.

We are in real trouble. What scares me is with some of the things going on in the economy right now, with where interest rates look like they are going, with inflation now becoming structural, it is potentially just devastating to the individuals out there, our brothers and sisters in the country, just the affordability, being able to afford a house, food, but you have got to understand what it also means to the stability of this country.

Let's actually walk through it. Some of this is big-boy math, it is going to be complex, but there are a couple punch lines in here I want to be remembered.

I am not going to take you back to 1965, but let's do last year. This is last year's budget cycle. Understand, over 71 percent of all of our spending is on autopilot. The fact of the matter is this is what we call mandatory. Only 13 percent was defense, 16 percent was discretionary, what we functionally debate here which we really fight over.

But this mandatory here, you see red, your government functionally is an insurance company with an army. This is health, Medicare, Social Security, other benefits, pensions for military, for government workers, those sorts of things. This is mandatory. And it is on autopilot.

I don't think there is a Member here who has ever ultimately voted on this red portion. It is a formula. You turn 65, you get certain benefits. You serve in the military a certain amount of time, you get certain benefits. It is autopilot.

Defense, well, that we debate, we work through, but the fact of the matter is defense sort of stays within a certain mean of the GDP.

And then domestic. The crazy thing, domestic, actually, as a percentage of GDP, at the end of a decade will be flat.

So where is all this debt coming from? Where is all this growth coming from?

I am going to give you an answer, and it is going to make people really unhappy. You need to understand, when we talk about just last year's borrowing, does anyone out there understand how big it was?

Okay. So we borrowed, functionally, $1.375 trillion.

How much is that?

It is $114 billion a month.

It is $26 billion a week.

It is $3.7 billion a day.

It is $159 million an hour.

It is $2.6 million a minute.

We are told with big numbers, how do you get it so it is understandable? If I came to you right now and said to you, how much last year did your government borrow every second? Anyone in this body able to answer that? It turns out it was $43,600 a second. We borrowed $43,600 every second last year.

Does anyone see a problem? Or is it one of those things that as long as we are handing out goodies and subsidizing the folks who will vote for us or contribute to us, the world is good?

Where is all this debt coming from? Brian Riedl, Manhattan Institute, basically just put out a series of slides where they take the Congressional Budget Office, the OMB office from the administration, and sort of look at it and say, what is driving the debt?

Today we hold $31 trillion of total debt. That is borrowing from trust funds and everything, but that is the total debt.

But from today for the next 30 years, based on a previous interest rate calculation—so we haven't even plugged in the new higher interest rates that we are borrowing money on—anyone want to guess what the borrowing is from today to the future, how much money? We are going to borrow, functionally, $114 trillion. There is a $114 trillion shortfall.

Now, the interesting thing—remember on that previous slide, I was saying, here is mandatory, here is discretionary. Well, it turns out the discretionary military we calculate today to actually have about a $1.9 trillion surplus over the next 30 years.

So where is $114 trillion of borrowing coming from? This is really uncomfortable. I will tell you, I believe the Democrats did something actually really crappy during the election, but it is a knife fight. I accept the knives come out, it is all about winning.

But when you had campaigns out there—''They are going to cut your Medicare''—you can't even have an honest conversation here what is going on.

The shortfall in Medicare, when you add in the interest cost, is $80 trillion. The shortfall in Social Security is $35.8 trillion. The entire borrowing over the next 30 years is Social Security and Medicare.

We got old. The fact of the matter is this place didn't pay any attention. There was this thing called baby boomers.

You get the clown show around here that says, well, we will do Medicare for All. That is a financing bill. It had nothing to do with what we pay. ObamaCare, that is a financing bill; who gets subsidized, who has to pay. The Republican alternative was ultimately a financing bill. You need a revolution in what we pay, not who pays it.

But that is actually more uncomfortable here than actually having a debate over raising taxes or doing entitlement reform, an actual discussion of should we legalize technology, should we legalize the things that actually create disruptions in providing our brothers and sisters the healthcare that we as a society made a deal? We are going to keep our promise on Social Security and Medicare. Well, I think we are.

I mean, the fact of the matter is, what is it now? In a decade, because of the new COLA increase, we just shortened the lifespan of the Social Security trust fund by, what?, almost a year. So you have a little bit over a decade, and our brothers and sisters who live on Social Security are heading toward a 25 percent cut.

What is this place going to do?

Medicare is just unsustainable. The stunning amount to finance our brothers and sisters, our promise for those who turn 65 and get Medicare, to finance it, basically consumes every dollar of this government.

It is math. It is the reality.

How many of you during this last campaign had an honest debate, honest conversation, anyone who was even willing to talk about this? Really dangerous because the other side will run nasty ads about you to scare people, yet by not dealing with it, you are sentencing our seniors to misery because at some point this hits the wall.

So what is going on? Why am I even more dour right now than I was several months ago?

It is inflation, it is the cost of everything. It is the affordability in our society. But you are crushing people. We are going to walk through a little bit of that. But you have got to understand—I am sorry, I am going to geek out on interest rates for a moment, but then I am going to try to show what it actually means to everyone in this country. What we are doing to you and so many of our brothers and sisters out there, you don't understand how—oh, I am sorry, it is a sort of high-level, technical, economic term—how screwed you are.

Let's sort of walk through this. We were building budgets a year ago on an assumption that U.S. sovereign debt when you did the 2-year, the 5-year, the 10-year, the 20-year, the 30-year, the blended interest rate, the weighted daily average, it was all these fun calculations. Actually really interesting stuff.

We were originally about 1.78 we thought would be our mean interest rate. Then last—what was it, was this March or May?—March we recalculated because of this thing called inflation. Oh, we are going to be up to 2.10. Then the reality of it is that we ended up at a recalculation of, hey, the U.S. mean now is heading toward 2.85. That is on the 10-year.

We have some economists around us who are starting to say, it is going higher; it is going higher. I am going to show you a couple things here of what happens to us as a country if the way the Federal Reserve has to stop inflation is raising, raising, raising interest rates, breaking the labor market because you understand within there, even though there is this delay effect, that also means what you and I have to pay the interest back on all the borrowing, and the biggest part of the borrowing cycle has not even hit us yet because we are just now starting to absorb and get ready for the huge spike in costs because of our demographics.

Remember, baby boomers, the final tail end of the baby boomers is moving into their retirement benefits, and as they get slightly older and a little bit older, a little bit older, the Medicare costs start to really go up, and we haven't even hit that financing cycle. It is coming. What happens if we have to finance that at the higher interest rates?

You start looking at some of this. Three months T-bill back in March was 0.2. That was our Biden administration estimate for the 3-year. The actual 3-year right now is 1.75.

Let's see, what is the difference between a 0.2 and a 1.75? Can anyone say ''a whole lot''?

This may not mean much to you, but this is money your taxes are going to be paying back.

□ 1615

Here is the punch line. I am going to make it really simple. What if this inflationary cycle stuck with us? What if instead of that, what was it, 1.78 or even the 2.3 percent interest rate on U.S. sovereign debt, what if it were 2 points higher, just 2 percent higher?

Fifteen years ago, that is where we were at. Remember, we actually had a reprieve, a completely fake economic reprieve for a decade with artificially low interest rates. We were borrowing, and the Federal Reserve kept interest rates lower, particularly since 2008. Now, we are about to pay the cost of it.

What would happen if we paid that 2 percent higher? Functionally—and my math is a little bit less—the end of 30 years, 100 percent of all tax receipts, of all taxes, all tariffs, all everything that comes into the government, 100 percent goes just to pay interest.

You have to understand how sensitive we are as a government, as a society, as a country, how fragile we have made ourselves because we structurally are going to borrow another $1 trillion to $1.3 trillion—there is one estimate of $1.4 trillion—this year. We are never paying off anything.

It gets worse and worse because of our demographics as we get older, unless we crash the price of healthcare. Two weeks from now, we are going to talk about things we can do to accomplish that.

Are you prepared to live in a country that if our mean interest rate goes up 2 percent and stays there, all tax receipts go just to cover our interest?

There is no more government. There is no more military. There are no more benefits. There is no more Social Security. There is no more Medicare.

That is why it is so crucial around here to have an honest conversation where people put batteries in their calculators. Instead, this place is living on theater. Oh, modern monetary policy—we can spend all the money we want, and look, nothing happens. Oh, got it. Didn't work.

I can show you right now the largest tax increase in modern history has happened in the last year. If you live in my Phoenix-Scottsdale area and are a working person, you are a hardworking taxpayer, and you have not had a pay hike, do you realize you have lost 6 weeks, maybe more, of your labor? We are still at 12.1 percent inflation in my community. You have lost 6 weeks of your labor.

If I had walked in and told you that I was going to take a month and a half of your salary, that that is going to be my new tax hike, you would have lost your mind. But if we do it through this thing called inflation, where we strip the affordability of your groceries and your gasoline and everything else in your life, did you notice it? Well, you know there is a problem. You know life has gotten much harder. You know sometimes you get to the checkout stand and are taking things back because the price just doesn't work on your budget.

The perverse thing, you are going to see a chart here, my next one, where actually there is going to be this little drop in sort of the debt-to-GDP and those things. That is because that inflation actually has been a tax. We lowered the value of your income. We lowered the value of your savings. At the same time, we lowered the value of all this debt because we are going to pay it back with what we call inflated dollars, which is wonderful up until the next year or 2 when we have to refinance the debt and refinance the new spending at the higher interest rates. Then that little benefit of taxing you through inflation goes away, and we are off to the races, and it becomes hell.

Remember, this has brought down other countries for hundreds of years, and it is right in front of us. No one seems to come behind these microphones—they talk about it, educate about it, and for the last couple years I have come here behind these microphones and tried to show solutions, and then it drives the lobbyists out of their minds.

Let's take a look at this. Let's see if I can make this work. These are deficits during the Biden administration fiscal year 2023 budget baseline versus a 1 percent rise in interest. Do we all agree that we have had at least a 1 percent rise in interest rates? Yes. Do you see this one little bit of a fall right there? This orange is what happens when you tack on the additional interest. That little fall is, functionally, the fact that we devalued your dollar. That is our little benefit from taxing you in a way you didn't know.

But then, boom. Functionally, the budget cycle we are about to work on is the 2024 budget cycle. You are basically going to have a budget deficit of $1.4 trillion, and then, boom, it is $1.5 trillion. You get out a couple more years, you are heading toward $1.75 trillion. In less than a decade, you are well over $2 trillion a year in just borrowing. This chart explodes if we go beyond that 1 percent rise in interest rates.

Structurally, even if I say we are going to go back to living in that world of that fantasy artificially low interest rate, we are still heading toward $2 trillion a year borrowing. It just takes 10 years. This is insane.

Right in here, interest will be just the basic borrowing. All of defense, a whole bunch of discretionary, and other things will all live on borrowed money.

Most people have no idea what the concept of debt-to-GDP is. It is the concept of: Here is the size of my economy, and, yes, we are borrowing all this money, but look how big my economy is, and that economy's ability to finance—just like your income finances your credit cards. As long as your income keeps going up faster than the debt on your credit cards, you can live. You are going to be okay. What happens when your economy isn't growing, when your income isn't growing as fast as you are borrowing on those credit cards? At a certain point, it comes to an end.

We are heading toward a time where if we add—this is our baseline. If we start adding a little bit of higher interest rates because we have to finance the debt, we have to sell our bonds, the bond markets are expecting higher interest rates because of inflation—you start seeing the chart where you are hitting a world where at the end—now, I know these are 30-year projections, but remember, we are selling 30-year bonds. The baseline number is 185 percent of debt-to-GDP. That means the debt will be 85 percent bigger than the entire economy. If we had 3 percent higher interest rates, the debt is, functionally, 245 percent bigger than the entire economy.

Do you think we ever get anywhere—because this is what we are doing to ourselves. This is already baked in the cake if these interest rates go up. But this down here, the base CBO assumption—remember, we are already over 100 percent. Right now, our borrowing is already substantially bigger than the entire size of our economy.

It is why growth is moral but is also necessary. If we don't start growing this economy and we are continuing just the borrowing—remember, what was the primary driver of our borrowing? Medicare and Social Security. We got old. It is demographics. Getting old is not Republican or Democrat; it is just who we are. That is driving most of our borrowing. We are not adopting policies that maximize growth at every opportunity.

We are destroying the future. I need my brothers and sisters on the left to at least embrace some basic truths.

The very end of 2017, we did tax reform. Some people go, oh, it was tax cuts, except the rich actually pay a higher percentage of Federal income taxes today than they did under the old tax system. But, 2022, tax receipts, the highest in U.S. history by far, and this is under the new tax system. If you are going to demagogue us for doing tax reform, trying to bring businesses back to the United States and get them to domicile and manufacture and do things here in this country, you can at least pull out a chart and show me where the revenues disappeared because they didn't. They are right here.

We brought in $4.8 trillion in tax receipts last year, and we are still borrowing $1.3 trillion. The spending has just exploded around here, and now we hit our structural deficits because of our demographics. It gets uglier and uglier, and we have made ourselves incredibly fragile.

God forbid we ever have a failed bond auction or an undersubscribed one, and interest rates start to spike. Do you understand what happens to the entire world, let alone your savings?

We don't need to do this to ourselves. There are solutions, but this body is incapable of having that debate.

Dear God, please, with a Republican majority, no matter how thin it is, maybe we will actually try to do something honest and adult with the calculators.

You keep looking at the charts, and there are charts out there. It is not revenues. There is this whole line of thought out there that has been worked on by the left and the right that we raise taxes, somehow we stay within a certain mean of the size of the economy. When we have lowered taxes, somehow the revenues come back up. Taxes always seem to come in just right about here. If this is 20 percent of GDP, you raise the taxes, the economy seems to shrink, the growth shrinks, we fall back to the mean. You lower taxes, the economy grows, the revenues come back. You have decades and decades of data. You look at the charts, and it is pretty darn clear. We are going to take in 19.1 to 20 percent. Sometimes we fall down to 18 percent of the economy in revenues, in receipts, in taxes.

The art here is to design a tax code, design a regulatory code, adopt embracing of technology and other things that maximize growth. The ultimate solution is grow, grow, grow, and then adopt disruptive technologies that lower prices, so affordability.

Imagine if you had a society once again that was growing, your wages were going up, but inflation wasn't; where your healthcare costs were actually going down; where your savings, your investments, your planning for retirement, your ability to help your

kids go to college got better. We can do that. We did that in 2017, 2018, 2019, even the first quarter of 2020 before the pandemic. There is a model to do it.

All that progress, all that closing income inequality, making the poor less poor, the hardworking, tax-paying middle class, making them more prosperous, it is all gone. The Democrats succeeded, in 18 months, in crushing the people of this country by really crappy policy—great virtue signaling, just incredibly good virtue signaling, really crappy policy.

Once again, I need my brothers and sisters on the left to buy a calculator and understand if you came in and said I am going to take every dime, you make small businesses, rich people, high-income earners, if I take every dime—if you make $500,000, the next dollar we just take everything. You have heard this, oh, rich people aren't paying enough, take every dime. You, functionally, don't get anywhere.

This is assuming that they continue to work as hard, that they make the same amount of money so they don't change their behavior at all. It is a math experiment, and you get about 5.1 percent of GDP in taxes.

The problem is our borrowing is already about to hit 6 percent, and in a couple more decades, we are over 12 percent. It is a fantasy.

Look, the Republicans have their sin, too. We will often say, well, waste and fraud, foreign aid, that is just almost a rounding error. Remember a little while ago, $40,000-plus a second in borrowing?

□ 1630

The scale of the problems ahead of us is terrifying, and it is no longer getting postponed to the future.

I have gotten in front of audiences, and, A, they will boo when you try to explain to them the truth of the math. They say, Well, I was told this 10 years ago.

Yes, but we had 10 years of artificially low interest rates that allowed Congress to engage in really crappy policies.

What is that saying, ''the chickens are coming home to roost''? I am not particularly good at colloquialisms. But it is time. It is here.

Will this new Congress with a divided government step up, tell the public the truth, tell our new freshman class the truth, and actually take on a really tough decision?

Madam Speaker, do you want a society and a country that is prosperous, innovative, and disruptive but we are growing so fast and so healthy that you can imagine a world where healthcare prices aren't going up twice as fast as inflation, where your wages go up faster than inflation, and where affordability when you go to the grocery store or your gasoline station doesn't take your breath away?

We can do that. At least I think we can do it.

I just want to know: Are we going to have partners on the other side to do what is honorable?

Because growth is moral.

Are we going to do the right thing for our society, for our brothers and sisters out there, or are we going to continue with virtue signaling?

Because virtue signaling may be brilliant politics, but it is really crappy economics.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1 of House Resolution 1230, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 17, 2022, at 10 o'clock a.m. 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–5898. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Addition of Chitosan (Including Chitosan Salts) to the List of Active Ingredients Permitted in Exempted Minimum Risk Pesticide Products [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0701; FRL-7542-05-OCSPP] (RIN: 2070-AK56) received November 3, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC–5899. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Paint Stripping and Miscellaneous Surface Coating Operations at Area Sources Technology Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2021-0016; FRL-8339-02-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AV34) received November 3, 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–5900. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the States of Arizona and California [EPA-R09-OAR-2021-0962; FRL-9400-04-R9] received November 3, 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–5901. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nitric Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OAR-2022-0363; FRL-10247-01-OCSPP] received November 3, 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–5902. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetic Acid, 2-Ethylhexyl Ester; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0084; FRL-10295-01-OCSPP] received November 3, 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–5903. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1,3-Benzenedicarboxylic acid, 5-sulfo-, sodium salt (1:1), polymer with 1,3-benzenedicarboxylic acid, 1,4-cyclohexanedimethanol and 2,2'—oxybis[ethanol]; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0505; FRL-10301-01-OCSPP] received November 3, 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–5904. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maryland; Clean Data Determination and Approval of Select Attainment Plan Elements for the Anne Arundel County and Baltimore County, MD Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0325; FRL-10364-02-R3] received November 3, 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–5905. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's policy statement — Standard Applied to Complaints Against Oil Pipeline Index Rate Changes [Docket No.: AD20-10-000] received November 3, 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–5906. A letter from the Office Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — American Society of Mechanical Engineers 2019-2020 Code Editions [NRC-2018-0290] (RIN: 3150-AK22) received October 31, 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–5907. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Direct Expansion-Dedicated Outdoor Air Systems [EERE-2017-BT-STD-0017] (RIN: 1904-AD-92) received November 7, 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–5908. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Issuance of Regulatory Guide — Dedication of Commercial- Grade Digital Instrumentation and Control Items for Use in Nuclear Power Plants, Regulatory Guide RG 1.250, Revision 0 received November 3, 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–5909. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Issuance of Regulatory Guide — Acceptability of ASME Code, Section XI, Division 2, ''Requirements for Reliability and Integrity Management (RIM) Programs for Nuclear Power Plants'', for Non-Light Water Reactors, Regulatory Guide 1.246, Revision 0 received October 31, 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–5910. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Delisting and Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Snail Darter From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2020-0152; FF09E22000 FXES11130900000 212] (RIN: 1018-BE62) received November 3, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–5911. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Emperor Penguin With Section 4(d) Rule [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2021-0043; FF09E21000 FXES1111090FEDR 232] (RIN: 1018-BF35) received November 3, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 404. A bill to improve the management of driftnet fishing, with an amendment (Rept. 117–561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 570. A bill to require operators of offshore oil and gas facilities to report failures of critical systems to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 667. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Indian Health Service, to acquire private land to facilitate access to the Desert Sage Youth Wellness Center in Hemet, California, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–563, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1415. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of Tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 117–564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1733. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide funds to States and Indian tribes for the purpose of promoting economic revitalization, diversification, and development in economically distressed communities through the reclamation and restoration of land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining carried out before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1734. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to allow the Secretary of the Interior to delegate certain emergency reclamation activities to the States and Tribes, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–566 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2026. A bill to assist in the conservation of highly endangered amphibian species in foreign countries, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 117–567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2444. A bill to establish Fort San Gerónimo del Boquerón in Puerto Rico as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 117–568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2512. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Chisholm National Historic Trail and the Western National Historic Trail, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2551. A bill to designate and adjust certain lands in the State of Utah as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2872. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal Governments and other entities, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3228. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to improve science, data, and services that enable sound decision making in response to coastal flood risk, including impacts of sea level rise, storm events, changing Great Lakes water levels, and land subsidence; with an amendment (Rept. 117–572 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3540. A bill to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4458. A bill to establish a grant program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to award grants to eligible entities for the purpose of carrying out projects on the conservation, restoration, or management of kelp forest ecosystems; with an amendment (Rept. 117–574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4494. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land in Frederick County, Maryland, for the Historic Preservation Training Center of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4677. A bill to direct restoration and protection of the New York-New Jersey watersheds and estuaries hydrologically connected to New York-New Jersey Harbor, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5345. A bill to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to establish a regional program to assess, monitor, and benefit the hydrology of saline lakes in the Great Basin and the migratory birds and other wildlife dependent on those habitats, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 6142. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Buckeye Trail as a national scenic trail, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 6199. A bill to revise the boundary of the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes (Rept. 117–579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 2923. An act to improve the Fishery Resource Disaster Relief program of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. Ending Hunger in America: Challenges, Opportunities and the Political Will to Succeed (Rept. 117–581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 667 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1734 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3228 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 Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 9305. A bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to require employers who are ordering a plant closing or mass layoff to cover the cost of an economic impact study in each impacted unit of local government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 9306. A bill to authorize the use of FBI criminal history record information for administration of interstate compacts, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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 Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PORTER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 9307. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to address certain issues relating to the extension of consumer credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. JACOBS of California (for herself, Mr. CORREA, Ms. BASS, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PORTER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LIEU, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. CHU, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BERA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. WILD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ISSA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CONWAY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 9308. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6401 El Cajon Boulevard in San Diego, California, as the ''Susan A. Davis Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Mr. BACON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MACE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 9309. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H.R. 9310. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to give the United States Preventive Services Task Force the authority to take early action based on scientific evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 9311. A bill to authorize the Community Advantage Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 9312. A bill to provide enhanced capabilities to combat transnational criminal cartels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 9313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low-income housing tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 9314. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to a labor organization the members of which are education professionals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 9315. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to require the accounting principles standard setting body to comply with the Administrative Procedure Act and the Government in the Sunshine Act, to require the head of such body to testify annually before Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 9316. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th Anniversary of the United States Marine Corps, and to support programs at the Marine Corps Heritage Center; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 9317. A bill to direct the Librarian of Congress to obtain a stained glass panel depicting the seal of the District of Columbia and install the panel among the stained glass panels depicting the seals of States, which overlook the Main Reading Room of the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson Building; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 9318. A bill to provide for advancements in carbon removal research, quantification, and commercialization, including by harnessing natural processes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, 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. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 9319. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide for the reissuance to households supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits to replace benefits stolen by identity theft or typical skimming practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 9320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against income tax for tuition expenses incurred for each qualifying child of the taxpayer in attending public or private elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 9321. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the development and publication of independent value assessments for drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 9322. A bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 9323. A bill to establish a task force on child and family economic security and stability for economic growth; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. AGUILAR):

H. Res. 1473. A resolution expressing support for the designation of November 16, 2022, as ''National GIS Day''; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK (for herself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARSON, Mr. SOTO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. DONALDS):

H. Res. 1474. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of Everglades National Park; 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. CLYDE:

H. Res. 1475. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives any record created on or after January 21, 2021, under the control of the President or the Secretary, respectively, that refers to the Department of Defense and includes certain terms and phrases relating to gender; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLYDE:

H. Res. 1476. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain documents or records relating to coordination between social media companies and the Biden administration on information, censorship, and censorship meetings in order to suppress or deplatform persons or information the administration views as misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation on COVID-19, Hunter Biden, and elections, and certain documents or records relating to plans to provide grant funding to consortiums, including the Democratic National Committee, in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLYDE:

H. Res. 1477. A resolution calling for the submission to the House of Representatives of certain information in the possession of the Attorney General regarding NICS Indices Self-Submission Forms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYDE:

H. Res. 1478. A resolution calling for the submission to the House of Representatives of certain information regarding the decision of the President of the United States to institute the ''Ghost Gun'' Rule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYDE:

H. Res. 1479. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President transmit certain documents in his possession to the House of Representatives relating to the surveillance or monitoring of pro-gun, pro-life, or conservative groups under the Internet Covert

Operations Program operated by the United States Postal Inspection Service; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SIRES:

H. Res. 1480. A resolution promoting stronger economic relations between the United States and countries in Latin America and the Caribbean; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H. Res. 1481. A resolution urging United States policy toward Guatemala to support the rule of law and address challenges of kleptocracy, organized crime, private and public sector corruption, illicit campaign financing, criminalization of and attacks on justice operators, journalists, and human rights defenders, and restrictions resulting in the closure of civic space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-238. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 4, memorializing the 117th Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to enact legislation, S. 3213, known as the IDEA Full Funding Act, which would fully fund the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ML-239. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 5, urging the United states Congress to amend the United States Social Security Administration's index of earnings to ensure that a decline in aggregate wages due to COVID-19 does not result in decreased benefits; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ML-240. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, urging the President and Congress of the United States to amend Section 402(d)(1) of Title 42 of the United State Codes and any other necessary statutes to allow recipients of DAC benefits to continue to receive those benefits upon marriage; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ML-241. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 15, urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take action to restore honor to the sailors unjustly blamed for, and the sailors convicted of mutiny following the Port Chicago disaster, and to rectify any mistreatment by the military of those sailors; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

ML-242. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 9, recognizing October 12, 2021, as the 20-year anniversary of the enactment of the exemption from nonresident tuition during the 2001-02 Regular Session; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 9305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MANN:

H.R. 9306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the President ''. . . shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.''

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 9307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. JACOBS of California:

H.R. 9308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 9309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H.R. 9310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 9311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 9312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 9313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 9314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 9315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate commerce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 9317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 9318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 9319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, §8, cl. 1 and Article I, §8, cl. 18.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 9320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U. S. Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 9321.

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 Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 9322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 9323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 291: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 336: Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 948: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1330: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1362: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 1401: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 1596: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 1704: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1814: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2021: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 2294: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 2326: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 2525: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2549: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2565: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2791: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3015: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 3079: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 3150: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 3183: Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3514: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 3554: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3592: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 3783: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 3921: Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 4141: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 4309: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 4319: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 4779: Mr. GOLDEN and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 5026: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5029: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 5038: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 5232: Mr. EVANS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 5473: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5782: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5854: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 6056: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 6366: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 6394: Mr. FINSTAD, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6498: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 6559: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 6584: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 6658: Mr. FINSTAD.
H.R. 6976: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 6985: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 7122: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 7213: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 7236: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 7382: Mrs. STEEL.
H.R. 7570: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 7580: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 7627: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 7630: Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 7644: Mr. KIM of New Jersey and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 7752: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 7773: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 7775: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 7826: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 7995: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 8181: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8195: Mr. FINSTAD and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 8210: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 8219: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 8406: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 8558: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 8565: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 8585: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.
H.R. 8616: Mr. MORELLE and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 8800: Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 8817: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 8913: Mr. PENCE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 8978: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 9074: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 9088: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 9128: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 9130: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 9135: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 9148: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 9160: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 9162: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 9198: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 9201: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 9202: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 9203: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 9207: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 9208: Ms. ROSS and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 9233: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 9238: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 9245: Mr. CASE, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 9251: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CONWAY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. VALADAO, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 9275: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 9279: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 9304: Ms. SCANLON.
H.J. Res. 94: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.J. Res. 95: Mr. NEHLS, Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 113: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. MFUME.
H. Res. 118: Mr. ELLZEY.
H. Res. 352: Mr. FINSTAD.
H. Res. 548: Mr. FINSTAD.
H. Res. 644: Mr. GOSAR.
H. Res. 1226: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 1317: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H. Res. 1382: Mr. ALLRED.
H. Res. 1389: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 1397: Mr. CLINE.
H. Res. 1400: Mr. SIRES.
H. Res. 1457: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. PENCE.
H. Res. 1462: Ms. TITUS and Mr. GROTHMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

PT-153. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 379-22, urging the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco to instruct the City's state and federal lobbyists to work in support of decriminalizing all Entheogenic Plants and plant-based compounds that are listed on the Federal Controlled Substances Schedule 1; the Judiciary.; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2022 No. 177

Senate

The Senate met at 1:45 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O, God who keeps us in the midst of dangers, shelter us from temptations. Keep us from the pride that encourages us to think of ourselves more highly than we ought. Save us from procrastination, from refusing to face the unpleasant, and from analyzing things until it is too late to ever do them.

Today, guide our lawmakers away from the temptations of criticism and fault-finding. Give them the strength to resist the weakness of thinking the worst of others.

Lord, provide us all with the purity to overcome evil with good.

We pray in your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT—Motion to Proceed—Resumed

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 8404, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 449, H.R. 8404, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I want to begin by thanking and recognizing the House Judiciary chairman, JERRY NADLER, and the entire House Equality Caucus for introducing the House bill and starting up this effort.

This legislation passed the House of Representatives with a strong bipartisan vote of 267 to 157, with all Democrats and 47 Republicans supporting the bill.

I also want to extend my heartfelt appreciation for my Senate colleagues who have worked tirelessly to get us up to this point. I want to thank the lead sponsor of the bill, Senator FEINSTEIN, and also thank and recognize the hard work and effort of Senator COLLINS, Senator PORTMAN, Senator SINEMA, and Senator TILLIS for their steadfast commitment. We couldn't be where we are right now without their efforts.

I also want to thank the staff of all of these offices for the long hours and hard work that went into this legislation, including my own counsel, Becca Branum, and my chief of staff, Ken Reidy.

Lastly, I want to thank all of the advocates who have fought for marriage equality for decades.

We are on the cusp of a historic vote in the Senate because of everybody's efforts.

I decided, in thinking about what I wanted to share today, that I wanted to put a face on this debate; actually, more accurately, three faces.

Let me introduce you to my dear friends Margaret, Denise, and their daughter Maria, and just tell you a little bit about them and then how this underlying issue impacts them.

The marriage and long partnership that my dear friends Denise and Margaret share began in Oklahoma in 1981. They were there as organizers, working to pass the Equal Rights Amendment in that State. They were organizing support for the ERA so that we might add a few simple words to the U.S. Constitution, specifically, ''Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.''

That they met one another during a struggle for social justice surprised no one who knew either Denise or Margaret, for, really, the pursuit of equality and equity and justice has defined each of them as individuals as well as life partners.

Their professional and personal lives and the movements for women's rights, LGBTQ rights, educational equity, affordable housing, economic justice—they are all inextricably linked.

Their first date occurred in December of 1981 over coffee in Oklahoma City. And as that ERA campaign came to an unsuccessful close in 1982, they chose to move together to Madison, WI. I vividly recall meeting them shortly thereafter in the autumn of 1984.

Denise hailed from Milwaukee, WI—this is Denise—Margaret, from Webster City, IA. They were incredibly and are incredibly committed to one another, but they also determined, as they got a little older, that something was missing. Actually, I want to say someone was missing. Denise's and Margaret's journey to find that someone was arduous. Yet they never gave up.

In 2003, after working with an adoption agency for many years, Denise received a video of their daughter, this lovely, brown-eyed Maria. And the family you now see here—this is, actually,

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

Printed on recycled paper.

several years old. Maria is now a sophomore at the University of Wisconsin, Madison campus, so a little bit dated. But I wanted to put a face or a series of faces on this because it is such an all-American family and an all-American story.

But as everyone knows about the debate we are about to enter, marriage was not an option for Margaret and Denise until after the Obergefell decision. The things that most married people take for granted are things that couples like Margaret and Denise had to think about and had to figure out how do they protect one another, how do they protect their family.

We often think, when we think about marriage, of the wedding and the ceremony and the celebration, but we don't often think about the hundreds upon hundreds of rights and responsibilities that civil marriage confers upon couples.

Margaret and Denise were telling me about their recollection of when the city of Madison passed a domestic partnership ordinance allowing them to register. And when that happened, for the first time, they could be on one another's health insurance. That is something that married couples kind of take for granted—that they could have one another on their health insurance. They had to think a lot about what they would do in an emergent situation where one might be in the hospital because without marriage, you are technically legal strangers. And, literally, if Margaret were in the hospital after an accident, for example, Denise, without having the appropriate papers—a healthcare power of attorney—would be viewed as a legal stranger and potentially denied access.

Adoption is something that has made many a family in the United States. Yet prior to marriage rights, Denise and Margaret had to make a choice of only one who would have the official adoption, but then they had to go through a whole bunch of legal rigamarole, if you will, so that Margaret, if need be had to go to a parent-teacher conference or to pick Maria up at school, had some documentation at the school that she, too, was a parent.

Estate planning, you have to think about that. You had to think about that intently prior to marriage rights being conferred.

I wanted you to get a quick chance to meet Margaret and Denise and Maria because they reflect the experiences of literally tens of millions of people in the United States. It is why the Obergefell decision was so key.

I want to switch to focus on why it is so critical that we adopt the Respect for Marriage Act—because Obergefell right now is the law of the land, but there is great concern that that legal precedent could be in jeopardy.

Some of my colleagues have questioned the urgency and maybe even the necessity of passing the Respect for Marriage Act. Some have asserted that there is no threat to these rights in America. Some have said that there is no case currently making its way up to the U.S. Supreme Court challenging these rights so there is nothing really to worry about. Others have suggested that proponents of the Respect for Marriage Act are raising the issue just to drive further divisions among Americans.

I believe that there is an urgency to pass the Respect for Marriage Act in order to heal such divisions and provide certainty to married interracial and same-sex couples that the protections, rights, and responsibilities that flow from their marriages will endure.

Right now, millions of Americans—our family members, our neighbors, our congressional staff members, and, certainly, our constituents—are scared; scared that the rights they rely upon to protect their families could be taken away. And they are scared for good reason.

Let's face it. Regardless of your position on the issue of abortion, the highest Court of the land has just overturned a precedent of nearly 50 years. There is no questioning that. And the same legal arguments that the Supreme Court rested upon to reverse Roe v. Wade could just as easily be applied to reverse numerous other cases related to families, related to intimate relations, to contraception, and marriage.

In the wake of the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade, in the Dobbs case access to abortion care or denial of such care has been left in the hands of the States. By the way, in Wisconsin, we are subject to a criminal abortion law that was passed in 1849, 1 year after Wisconsin became a State and before women had the right to vote and certainly before women served in the legislature that serves to rule upon their rights.

There are landmark cases related to marriage that could be threatened should the Supreme Court consider cases challenging those earlier decisions. One such case is Loving v. Virginia, which was decided in 1967. The Supreme Court ruled in Loving that State laws prohibiting interracial marriage were unconstitutional based upon the equal protection and due process clauses of the 14th Amendment and its liberty provisions. At the time of the Loving decision, 16 States had laws banning interracial marriage. And you might be surprised to learn that it took until the year 2000 for the last State to repeal the law on its books banning interracial marriage.

Another landmark case relates to same-sex marriage. In Obergefell v. Hodges, the Supreme Court decided in 2015 that the equal protection and due process clauses of the 14th Amendment prohibit States from outlawing and refusing to recognize same-sex marriages.

Some 35 States across the country prohibit same-sex marriage in their laws, constitutions, or both. And the so-called Defense of Marriage Act that bars Federal recognition of same-sex marriages and was ruled unconstitutional by a narrow 5–4 Supreme Court—that law is still on the books.

Given this landscape, it is not unreasonable for same-sex and interracial couples to be fearful that the protections of their marriages are in real jeopardy. The fact that the constitutional principles of liberty, privacy, self-determination, and equal treatment under the law, upon which Roe v. Wade was originally decided, are the same constitutional principles on which the Loving and Obergefell cases were decided makes the Supreme Court's reversal of Roe v. Wade all the more shocking and frightening to those in interracial and same-sex marriages.

Several of my colleagues have maintained that, even if the Court may someday revisit these cases, there is no urgency right now since there is no case challenging interracial or same-sex marriage that is currently making its way up to the Supreme Court. But think about today's world. Given the Supreme Court's use of procedural mechanisms like cert before judgment or use of a shadow docket, cases often reach the Supreme Court faster than ever before.

And when it comes to the merits, one needs to pay attention to the concurring opinion of Justice Clarence Thomas in the Dobbs decision. In his opinion, Justice Thomas explicitly said that the rationale used to overturn Roe v. Wade should be used to overturn cases establishing rights to contraception, same-sex consensual relations, and same-sex marriage. He was essentially providing an open invitation to litigators across the country to bring their cases to the Court, inevitably instilling fear among millions of Americans.

The Supreme Court should not be in a position to undermine the stability of families with the stroke of a pen. So now Congress must act, and Congress is acting with a full-throated endorsement from the American people. More than 70 percent of Americans support marriage equality, including a majority of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

This legislation unites Americans. With the Respect for Marriage Act, we can ease the fear that millions of same-sex and interracial couples have that their freedoms and their rights could be stripped away. By passing this bill, we are guaranteeing same-sex and interracial couples, regardless of where they live, that their marriage is legal and that they will continue to enjoy the rights and responsibilities that all other marriages are afforded. And this will give millions of loving couples the certainty, the dignity, and the respect that they need and that they deserve.

For my dear friends Margaret and Denise and their daughter Maria, passing this legislation will remove the weight of the world from their backs. While they worry just like the rest of us about the cost of living and staying

healthy and saving for retirement, passing this bill will take away a worry that someday their marriage might be on the chopping block at no fault of their own.

By the way, I think I failed to mention it, but I was so honored back in December of 2018 to be a copresider at their wedding. The wedding took place 37 years after they first met and became a couple, and it happened on Maria's Sweet Sixteen birthday.

But for the millions of other Americans in same-sex and interracial marriages, this shows that the American Government and people see them and respect them.

With that, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote yes on the motion to proceed to the Respect for Marriage Act and to help come together to move our country forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Respect for Marriage Act, a bipartisan bill that Senator BALDWIN and I have introduced with our colleagues Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator PORTMAN, Senator SINEMA, and Senator TILLIS.

Madam President, this bill recognizes the unique and extraordinary importance of marriage on an individual and societal level. It would help promote equality, prevent discrimination, and protect the rights of Americans in same-sex and interracial marriages. It would accomplish these goals while maintaining and indeed strengthening important religious liberty and conscience protections.

I am proud to be the lead Republican sponsor of this legislation, and I am grateful that a similar bill passed the House with strong bipartisan support.

As the Senate considers and prepares to vote on this historic legislation, I would be remiss if I did not begin by recognizing the tremendous progress that LGBTQ individuals in this country—in our country—have made in recent times in achieving equal rights.

It was not long ago that patriotic Americans could not be honest about their sexual orientation while fighting to protect our country—our freedoms—in the Armed Forces. I led the fight with former Senator Joe Lieberman of Connecticut to repeal the discriminatory don't ask, don't tell law.

It was not long ago in America that a person could be fired merely for being gay. I strongly supported the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, known as ENDA, which passed the Senate in 2013 and would have prohibited such discrimination. Seven years later, the Supreme Court in Bostock held that the Civil Rights Act protects employees from discrimination based on their sexual orientation or gender identity.

And it was not long ago in America that individuals could not marry the person whom they loved if that person were of the same sex. The Supreme Court's landmark decision in Obergefell found that the fundamental right to marry is guaranteed by our Constitution.

Madam President, let us remember that we are talking about our family members, our friends, our coworkers, our neighbors. I am proud to have stood with them, and I will continue to stand with them in efforts to protect and secure their rights, while at the same time steadfastly protecting and respecting religious liberty.

The Respect for Marriage Act would accomplish two primary goals. First, it would guarantee that a valid marriage between two individuals in one State is given full faith and credit by other States, meaning that States must recognize a valid marriage for purposes of public acts, judicial proceedings, and rights arising from a marriage regardless of that couple's sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin. That means that same-sex and interracial couples can rest assured that their marriages will be recognized regardless of the State in which they live.

We need to remove the cloud that is now over these couples that is causing them such consternation, as my colleague from Wisconsin has mentioned.

Second, it would require the Federal Government to recognize a marriage between two individuals if the marriage was valid in the State where it was performed. It would do so by getting rid of a law that is on the book, known as the Defense of Marriage Act, which has been invalidated by the Supreme Court's ruling yet remains on the books.

With these changes, Federal law will provide that all married couples are entitled to the rights and responsibilities of marriage. This includes, for example, making medical decisions for an ill spouse and receiving spousal benefits from programs like Social Security and Medicare, as well as those benefits earned from service in our Armed Forces.

To remove any ambiguity about the intent and scope of this bill, I have worked with my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as with a coalition of religious organizations, to develop an amendment designed to clarify the language and address concerns that have been raised with the House version of our bill.

First and foremost, this legislation would not diminish or abrogate any religious liberty or conscience protections afforded to individuals and organizations under the U.S. Constitution and Federal law, including the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Through our amendment, this fact is now stated explicitly in our bill.

The amendment also makes clear that this bill only applies to valid marriages between two individuals. In other words, it does not authorize or require recognition of polygamous marriages. They are already prohibited in all 50 States. This really was a straw argument, but we have made it clear nonetheless in our amendment that in no way would the Federal Government or other States be required or authorized in any way to recognize polygamous marriages.

Moreover, the amendment clarifies that the bill could not be used to deny or alter the tax-exempt status or any other status—tax treatment, grant, contract agreement, guarantee, educational funding, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, benefit, right, claim, or defense not arising from a marriage—for any otherwise eligible person or entity. In other words, no church, no synagogue, no mosque, no temple, no religious educational institution would have to worry that somehow their tax-exempt status would be in jeopardy if they do not perform same-sex marriages that are contrary to their religious beliefs.

Let me repeat that because this has been coming up time and again. For the first time and consistent with the First Amendment and the laws of many States, this legislation would make clear in Federal law that nonprofit religious organizations and religious educational institutions cannot be compelled to participate in or support the solemnization or celebration of marriages that are contrary to their religious beliefs.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement an excellent analysis by the 1st Amendment Partnership.

Some have said that this bill is unnecessary because there is little risk that the right to have a same-sex or interracial marriage recognized by the government will be overturned by the Supreme Court. Regardless of one's views on that possibility, there is still value in ensuring that our Federal laws reflect that same-sex and interracial couples have the right to have their marriages recognized regardless of where they live in this country.

I strongly believe that passing this bill is the right thing to do, and the American people agree. Indeed, more than 70 percent of Americans support marriage equality, including a majority of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

As I wrote in a Washington Post op-ed with my colleague Senator BALDWIN, ''Millions of American families have come to rely on the promise of marriage equality and the freedoms, rights and responsibilities that come with making the commitment of marrying the one you love. . . . Individuals in same-sex and interracial marriages need, and should have, the confidence that their marriages are legal.''

Simultaneously, we must also recognize that people of good conscience may disagree on issues relating to marriage. For many Americans, marriage is more than just a legal union; it is a religious institution grounded in their faith.

As Justice Kennedy, writing for the majority of the Supreme Court, explained in the Obergefell decision,

''[M]arriage, in their view, is by its nature a gender-differentiated union of man and woman. This view long has been held—and continues to be held—in good faith by reasonable and sincere people here and throughout the world.'' He went on to explain that ''neither they nor their beliefs are disparaged here.''

The same principle applies to our legislation, and that is explicitly acknowledged in the amended bill. Thus, it is important to me that our bill would not affect or diminish in any way religious liberty and conscience protections. Any interpretation of this legislation that would limit the applicability of these protections for individuals or entities because they have religious objections to same-sex marriages would be contrary to the plain language of our bill.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement a series of letters from religious organizations that endorse the religious liberty provisions of our bill.

They include letters from Elder Jack Gerard from the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Melissa Reid from the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Nathan Diament from the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, and from a host of other organizations: the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, the AND Campaign, the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance, the Center for Public Justice, and Tim Schultz of the 1st Amendment Partnership. We have worked very closely with all of them.

Madam President, in closing, let me once again salute the leadership of Senator BALDWIN, as well as Senator PORTMAN, Senator TILLIS, and Senator SINEMA, for their tireless efforts on this important legislation.

Let's do the right thing. Let's vote to proceed to this important bill, and let us pass it. I urge all of my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting the Respect for Marriage Act.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM SUPPORTERS GET IN THE AMENDED SENATE VERSION OF THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT (RMA)?

1) Explicit Congressional support for the truth that traditional marriage supporters and their beliefs are decent and honorable. This was stated by the Supreme Court in Obergefell, but many progressives refuse to acknowledge it. Congress endorsing this truth in a bipartisan law is a big deal. This can be cited in all future cases where progressives equate traditional beliefs about marriage with racism.

2) Demonstration that gay rights legislation will not pass without addressing religious liberty concerns. This has been denied by many progressive activists, who falsely use words like ''license to discriminate''.

3) Explicit protections under federal law against non-profit religious organizations that support traditional marriage having to facilitate marriages that violate their religious convictions.

4) A non-retaliation clause: the Act cannot be used by federal agencies to punish religious organizations in any way related to their views on marriage. Even if this clause will be rarely used in practice, it sets a very firm floor of religious protections that it will be difficult for future Congresses to reverse.

WHY SHOULD CONSERVATIVES WHO OPPOSED THE OBERGEFELL DECISION SUPPORT THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT?

Obergefell isn't going to be overturned. After all, Justice Thomas's concurrence in Dobbs was not signed by any other justice. Most conservatives wouldn't want to nullify the marriages made legal by Obergefell anyhow. Now, with Obergefell as the legal basis for same-sex marriage, there are no explicit corresponding religious freedom protections. Enacting RMA will put into law real religious protections that can't be won alone. And enactment of the amended RMA sends a strong bipartisan message to Congress, the Administration, and the public that gay rights can't trample religious freedom.

IS THIS A GOOD DEAL FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM?

Yes. Religious freedom advocates get protections that they have sought on a standalone basis but been unable to enact. Courts might grant some of these protections eventually, but litigation is costly and takes years to see results. In return, gay marriage advocates get something they already have: recognition of legal gay marriages, albeit now on statutory grounds.

WHY SHOULDN'T CONSERVATIVES DEMAND STRONGER RELIGIOUS FREEDOM PROTECTIONS IN THE RMA?

Senator Lee and others rightly desire to enact even broader religious protections. But our wish list is not going to be enacted into law all at once without major compromise. The similar ''First Amendment Defense Act'' never moved, even when Republicans had majorities. Any amendment demanding broader protections is therefore a messaging device that conservatives can vote for, even though it will not have the 60 votes needed to pass the Senate.

Conservatives should rest well still voting for the achievable protections in the RMA, knowing that they are still much more than conservatives have been able to pass in the eight years since Obergefell.

DOES THE RMA CREATE NEW RISKS FOR FOR-PROFT ENTITIES LIKE WEDDING VENDORS?

No. The RMA doesn't contain non-discrimination requirements that would put bakers and other for-profit entities providing wedding services in jeopardy. The Equality Act would create those risks, not the RMA. Note that there is no politically viable way to protect these for-profit religious entities in statute without at the same time advancing LGBT non-discrimination (like the Equality Act). Congress can, however, sketch out a vision of balanced fair play that this Supreme Court will find attractive. That's exactly what the RMA does.

WON'T THE RMA BE USED BY PROGRESSIVE ACTIVISTS TO SUE FAITH-BASED NON-PROFITS, INCLUDING ADOPTION AGENCIES?

No. We share your mistrust of progressive activities. But the RMA doesn't hand them any new litigation tools. Gay marriage is already legal—see Obergefell. Private rights of action to enforce legal gay marriage are already available under Section 1983.

Crucially, the RMA allows lawsuits only against those ''acting under color of state law.'' Neither current law nor the RMA defines non-profits that receive government money as ''acting under color of state law.'' Left-wing gadflies have long sought to redefine all civil society organizations (faith based and otherwise) as ''state actors,'' subject to the full equal treatment requirements of the Constitution. But they haven't gained any legal victories with this extreme theory, and their ''case'' has at most one vote on this Supreme Court.

DON'T THE RELIGIOUS PROTECTIONS IN THE RMA LACK AN ENFORCEMENT MECHANISM?

It doesn't need one. Religious liberty amendments have limited the RMA to avoid impacts on religion. The RMA states, ''nothing in this act shall be construed to . . .'' and then lists things the RMA can't do to harm religion. We understand that progressive activists abuse the courts all the time, but the RMA doesn't hand them any new tools and this Supreme Court would never entertain the idea that it does.

DOES THE RMA THREATEN THE STATUS OF FAITH-BASED SCHOOLS TO FULLY PARTICIPATE IN STATE FUNDED SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAMS?

No. The RMA addresses recognition by the federal government and state governments of lawful same-sex marriages as required by Obergefell. Section 6(a) of the RMA expressly states that it cannot be used to diminish existing religious liberties. Section 7(a) states that the RMA cannot be used to alter the eligibility for grants, accreditation, or ''educational funding'' benefits for which a faith-based entity is otherwise eligible. The RMA does not attempt to reach all future legal disputes arising in state legislatures over LGBT rights. But the clear ''teaching'' of the bipartisan Senate version of the RMA is that religious liberty in this space must be protected. The Congress is weighing in very clearly to that effect.

NOVEMBER 15, 2022.

Re The Respect for Marriage Act (H.R. 8404).

DEAR SENATORS: We are leaders of faith-based organizations representing tens of millions of Americans and hundreds of religious institutions. All our organizations hold to an understanding of marriage as between one man and one woman. Many of us privately expressed concerns about the House-passed version of the Respect for Marriage Act.

We are gratified by the substitute religious freedom language offered by Senators Collins, Baldwin, Sinema, Portman, Tillis, and Romney. It adequately protects the core religious freedom concerns raised by the bill, including tax exempt status, educational funding, government grants and contracts, and eligibility for licenses, certification, and accreditation. If passed, it would continue to build on the congressional wisdom represented by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (RFRA).

Attached are many statements from individual organizations.

Sincerely,

ELDER JACK N. GERARD,
The Quorum of the Seventy, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

MELISSA REID,
Director of Government Affairs, Seventh-day Adventist Church—North American Division.

NATHAN J. DIAMENT,
Executive Director for Public Policy, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

SHIRLEY HOOGSTRA,
President, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities.

REV. JUSTIN E. GIBONEY,
President, AND Campaign.

STANLEY CARLSON-THIES,
Founder and Senior Director, Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance.
STEPHANIE SUMMERS,
CEO, Center for Public Justice.
TIM SCHULTZ,
President, 1st Amendment Partnership.

STATEMENT FROM THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

The doctrine of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints related to marriage between a man and a woman is well known and will remain unchanged.

We are grateful for the continuing efforts of those who work to ensure the Respect for Marriage Act includes appropriate religious freedom protections while respecting the law and preserving the rights of our LGBTQ brothers and sisters.

We believe this approach is the way forward. As we work together to preserve the principles and practices of religious freedom together with the rights of LGBTQ individuals much can be accomplished to heal relationships and foster greater understanding.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS, BALDWIN, and PORTMAN: The Seventh-day Adventist Church in North America would like to express our profound appreciation for your commitment to the protection of this nation's historical and treasured religious freedoms in the context of the codification of same-sex marriage recognition.

The Seventh-day Adventist Church holds a traditional understanding of marriage as divinely established in Eden and affirmed by Jesus to be a lifelong union between a man and a woman. We recognize, however, that societal trends have departed from our Church's understanding of marriage, sexuality and family.

We are grateful for the members of Congress and their staff who have constructively engaged with us and with other faith institutions to ensure that the Respect for Marriage Act acknowledges that ''reasonable and sincere people'' can have ''decent and honorable religious or philosophical'' reasons to maintain traditional convictions about marriage.

The Adventist Church applauds you and your fellow Senators for the significant religious freedom protections included in the Respect for Marriage Act, including the protection of churches from being required to facilitate same sex marriages and the prevention of retaliation against religious organizations for their views on marriage.

Thank you for partnering together on legislation that reflects bipartisan commitment to religious freedom and diversity.

MELISSA REID,
DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS,
Seventh-day Adventist Church—North American Division.

UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA, ADVOCACY CENTER,
Washington, DC, November 15, 2022.

Senators SUSAN COLLINS, KYRSTEN SINEMA, ROB PORTMAN, TAMMY BALDWIN.

DEAR SENATORS: In anticipation of the U.S. Senate's consideration of H.R. 8404 (the ''Respect for Marriage Act''), as modified by an amendment you have offered, we write to you on behalf of the leadership of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (''Orthodox Union''), the nation's largest Orthodox Jewish umbrella organization.

In 2015, when the U.S. Supreme Court issued its ruling in *Obergefell* v. *Hodges*, the leadership of the Orthodox Union ''reiterated(ed) the historical position of the Jewish faith . . . Our religion is emphatic in defining marriage as a relationship between a man and a woman. Our beliefs in this regard are unalterable.'' At the same time, we noted ''that Judaism teaches respect for others and we condemn discrimination against individuals.''

At the time, our leadership said that ''in the wake of today's ruling, we turn to the next critical question for our community, and other traditional faith communities—will American law continue to uphold and embody principles of religious liberty and diversity, and will the laws implementing today's ruling and other expansions of civil rights for LGBT Americans contain appropriate accommodations and exemptions for institutions and individuals who abide by religious teachings that limit their ability to support same-sex relationships?

As the U.S. Senate prepares to consider H.R. 8404 the leadership of the Orthodox Union, in light of the religious principles reiterated above, cannot endorse the main purpose of H.R. 8404. However, we welcome the provisions added to this bill by your amendment in the nature of a substitute in the Senate that appropriately address religious liberty concerns (provisions that were absent in the version of the bill passed by the House of Representatives).

As amended, Section 2 of H.R. 8404 recognizes that ''diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises.'' Section 6 of H.R. 8404 provides that ''nothing in this act shall be construed to . . . abrogate a religious liberty . . . protection . . . available under the Constitution or Federal law'' and further provides that no religious nonprofit entity whose principal purpose is the advancement of religion shall be required to provide services or goods associated with solemnizing or celebrating a same sex marriage. Section 7 of H.R. 8404 provides that no government official or agency can deny a wide array of benefits—including tax exempt status, grants, contracts, accreditation or others—to an otherwise eligible entity or person on the basis of that entity or person not recognizing same-sex marriage. These provisions appropriately address the array of religious liberty concerns raised in the context of H.R. 8404 and its operative provisions.

Moreover, we note that your recognition that religious liberty interests must be explicitly and substantively addressed in the context of this kind of legislation is itself an essential act in a nation devoted to the principles of diversity, tolerance and religious freedom.

We thank you for your work with us and other faith partners to craft these important legislative provisions.

Sincerely,

MARK (MOISHE) BANE,
President.
RABBI MOSHE HAUER,
Executive Vice President.
NATHAN J. DIAMENT,
Executive Director—Advocacy.

Hon. Senator SUSAN COLLINS.
Hon. Senator TAMMY BALDWIN.

DEAR SENATORS: The CCCU strongly recommends that the Senate include the attached religious freedom amendment within the Respect for Marriage Act (S. 4556). The CCCU represents over 140 Christ-centered institutions of higher education in the United States encompassing over 500,000 students. The CCCU's mission is to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and help our institutions transform lives by faithfully relating scholarship and service to biblical truth. CCCU institutions adhere to Biblical values and traditions, including teaching the Biblical understanding of marriage as between one man and one woman as an essential foundation for a thriving society.

Since the *Obergefell* v. *Hodges* decision, the CCCU and other religious and First Amendment groups have sought to both uphold their sincere convictions regarding marriage and, in the spirit of *Obergefell*, advocate for a balanced legislative approach that preserves religious freedom and addresses LGBTQ civil rights. This carefully crafted amendment includes both strong religious liberty language recognized in the *Obergefell* decision and nonretaliation language that ensures this legislation cannot be used by state and federal agencies to punish religious organizations for their sincerely held beliefs.

This amendment provides explicit Congressional support for the truth that traditional marriage supporters and their beliefs are decent and honorable as was stated by the Supreme Court in Obergefell. It also sends a strong bipartisan message to Congress, the Administration, and the public that LGBTQ rights can co-exist with religious freedom protections, and that the rights of both groups can be advanced in a way that is prudent and practical.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY V. HOOGSTRA, J.D.,
President.

NOVEMBER 15, 2022.

Re The Respect for Marriage Act.

DEAR SENATORS: On behalf of the AND Campaign and our coalition of pastors nationwide, I would like to thank you for your significant efforts to protect religious freedom in the amended Respect for Marriage Act (the ''Act''). Your commitment to civic pluralism and the hard work of democracy provides a model for American politics to move forward in a healthier manner. We're thankful that you chose the path of good faith and dignity in a time of immense division.

The AND Campaign upholds the historic Christian sexual and family ethic, which defines marriage as a union between one man and one woman. Accordingly, we were encouraged to see the amended legislation acknowledge that ''diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises''. That acknowledgement coupled with strong anti-retaliation language is vital to protecting the free exercise of religion for millions of Americans who share our worldview.

Rather than engaging in zero-sum politics, your work demonstrates that thoughtful leaders can work through disagreements with respect and charity. We applaud the amended language and support the motion to proceed as necessary for a thorough debate on the Act.

Sincerely,

REV. JUSTIN E. GIBONEY, J.D.,
President, AND Campaign.

NOVEMBER 15, 2022.

Re The Respect for Marriage Act (H.R. 8404).

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND BALDWIN: The Center for Public Justice, and our Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance, thank you for your dedication to safeguarding religious freedom in the context of the statutory protection of same-sex marriage. We applaud Senators committed to bring forward for discussion the Respect for Marriage Act so the full chamber may discuss the proposed

amendment that we believe strongly protects religious freedom.

The proposed amended Respect for Marriage Act establishes that Congress agrees with the U.S. Supreme Court's decision authorizing same-sex marriage that reasonable and sincere people can hold other convictions about marriage due to their religious or philosophical convictions. Among other strong religious freedom protections we commend, we stress our thanks for the bill's language specifically protecting the tax-exemption of faith-based nonprofits and houses of worship.

As a Christian organization, we believe in the historic biblical understandings of marriage and human sexuality. Many in our society hold a different view, and in Obergefell, the Supreme Court mandated that same-sex unions be legally recognized as marriages. Significantly, in that same opinion, the Court acknowledged that reasonable and sincere people can have decent and honorable religious or philosophical reasons to maintain their traditional convictions about marriage. We believe that it will be of great legal and cultural significance if Congress enacts an amended Respect for Marriage Act that adds to the U.S. Code a statement of congressional agreement with the Court's positive view about the supporters of traditional marriage.

The amended Respect for Marriage Act contains other significant language embodying a congressional commitment to protecting religious freedom in the context of affirming LGBTQ rights. We regard adoption of the Act as the best opportunity since the passage of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (1993) and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (2000) for Congress to safeguard religious freedom with Democratic support. The amended Respect for Marriage Act codifies what is already the law of the land because of Obergefell while adding to the U.S. Code new protections for religious freedom in the context of marriage equality.

As a Christian public policy organization we are committed to policies that respect the dignity of all people. In our society with its many diverse communities of belief, justice requires creative pluralist policies. The religious freedom protections designed into the amended Respect for Marriage Act embody this pluralist approach. We commend you and your colleagues for your commitment to protecting religious freedom in our changing culture.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE SUMMERS,
CEO, Center for Public Justice.

STANLEY CARLSON-THIES,
Founder, Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS,
November 15, 2022.

DEAR SENATORS BALDWIN AND COLLINS: Thank you for diligently working to ensure the inclusion of important religious freedom protections in the Respect for Marriage Act, which is currently before Congress. Your efforts, if successful, will produce the first significant bipartisan legislation in many years advancing religious freedom for all, including for those who hold traditional views on marriage.

Your proposal would achieve several objectives that enhance the religious freedom of all Americans:

Expressing congressional endorsement of the Supreme Court's finding that those who hold traditional understandings of marriage are decent and honorable, deserving of respect under the law, rather than being equated with those who espouse racism and bigotry;

Demonstrating that Americans can respect the dignity of their fellow citizens and live in peace even when disagreeing on fundamental issues such as the nature of marriage;

Protecting traditional marriage supporters from having to facilitate marriages that violate their religious convictions; and

Protecting religious organizations from retaliation by federal agencies due to their views on marriage.

These are important, commonsense provisions that represent a significant contribution to strengthening the legal protections for chose who, like the members of the National Association of Evangelicals, continue to believe that God designed marriage as an exclusive covenantal relationship between a man and a woman for the purpose of creating strong families that in turn bless their community and nation. We cherish the freedom to preach, teach, and practice these core convictions, while respecting our fellow citizens who do not share these beliefs.

Be assured of our prayers for you as you continue serving our nation and defending the rights of all Americans.

Gratefully,

WALTER KIM,
NAE President.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA SCHOOL OF LAW,
November 16, 2022.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND BALDWIN: We are constitutional law scholars who have studied, taught, and written about the law of religious liberty for decades. All of us have persistently argued for religious liberty in legislatures and in the courts, including liberty for believers and institutions with objections to facilitating same-sex marriages.

We believe that H.R. 8404, the Respect for Marriage Act (RMA), with the additional religious freedom protections you have proposed, is a good and important step for the liberty of believers to follow their traditional views of marriage. Its protections for religious liberty, while not comprehensive, are important, especially in the context in which RMA arises.

A. THE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY PROTECTIONS ARE IMPORTANT

For several reasons, we believe the religious-liberty protections in RMA are meaningful and important even if not comprehensive.

1. First, RMA includes an explicit statement by Congress that ''[d]iverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage''—including the belief that marriage is between a man and woman rather than between persons of the same sex—''are held by reasonable and sincere people based on decent and honorable philosophical premises'' and that such beliefs ''are due proper respect.'' Section 2(2). This statement of respect for the belief in male-female marriage plainly distinguishes it from beliefs opposing interracial marriage, which receive no such affirmation (even as the statute protects interracial marriages).

The distinction is important for religious-freedom claims. The Supreme Court in Bob Jones University v. United States, 461 U.S. 574 (1983), upheld stripping tax exemptions from racially discriminatory private schools, including religious schools, on the basis of the ''firm and unyielding'' national policy against racial discrimination. Opponents of traditional beliefs about marriage regularly analogize those beliefs to racist beliefs for the purpose of resisting religious freedom claims by traditional believers and institutions.

Explicit congressional affirmation that the traditional male-female definition of marriage is ''reasonable'' and ''honorable'' would counter the analogy to racism and weaken the ground for relying on Bob Jones to justify rejecting traditionalist believers' religious-freedom claims. Obergefell v. Hodges included a similar statement of respect for traditional views, but it was dictum, and some commentators have questioned the Court's power to declare it. A congressional statement would be a legitimate, and powerful, statement of national policy—one favoring respect for (among other things) religious organizations that adhere to traditional views of marriage.

2. RMA includes specific protections for religious liberty. Most notable is the categorical exemption for ''nonprofit religious organizations''—comprehensively defined to include ''social agencies'' and ''educational organizations,'' and ''nondenominational'' and ''interdenominational'' organizations as well as houses of worship—from having to provide ''services, accommodations, advantages, facilities, goods, or privileges for the solemnization or celebration of a marriage.'' Section 6(b). The provision, although not a comprehensive protection for acts by religious nonprofits, guarantees that they can refuse to participate in the category of activities most relevant to RMA's coverage: ''solemnization or celebration of a marriage.'' The provision bars ''any civil claim or cause of action'' based on such a refusal: it sets no limitation on the nature or source of the claim or cause of action barred. Although courts might provide such protection under the First Amendment, this provision makes the right more secure and avoids lengthy constitutional litigation. The protection is categorical; unlike a claim of constitutional right, it cannot be overridden by a judicial finding of a ''compelling governmental interest.''

RMA also explicitly provides that it does not ''deny or alter'' any tax exemption, funding, license, accreditation, or ''any benefit, status, or right of an otherwise eligible entity or person''—including, plainly, of a religious organization. Section 7(a). Those who claim that the bill would be used as a ground for denying tax-exempt status to organizations adhering to male-female marriage, by analogy to Bob Jones, are disregarding the statutory text.

3. Finally, RMA both reflects and teaches that if proponents of LGBTQ rights want any advances or legislative protections for those rights, they must attend also to corresponding religious-liberty concerns. LGBTQ-rights proponents have failed to secure their goals in Congress through the Equality Act, or in many state legislatures, because they have been unwilling to make provision for religious liberty. The lesson applies to conservatives as well. Efforts like the First Amendment Defense Act (FADA) have likewise failed repeatedly because they made no provision for recognizing LGBTQ rights even in an incremental way. Religious liberty has been caught in the crossfire of warring groups unwilling to accept the smallest gain for the other side. And religious liberty has suffered as a result, both in its concrete scope and in its status as a fundamental civil right that all Americans should embrace enthusiastically.

This bill offers a chance to counter those trends and to enact religious-liberty protections in a bipartisan measure. RMA does not provide all the protection that traditionalist believers seek or that they should receive. But the protections it offers are important.

B. THE RELIGIOUS-LIBERTY PROTECTIONS ARE IMPORTANT IN LIGHT OF THE CONTEXT IN WHICH RMA ARISES

Moreover, the religious-liberty protections that RMA provides must be considered in the

context in which RMA arises. Three features of RMA's context reinforce that its religious-liberty protections are significant.

1. RMA poses little or no new risk to religious liberty beyond those that already exist from nondiscrimination laws combined with same-sex marriage rights under Obergefell v. Hodges. Those rules are currently in force, without RMA (and without the statutory religious-liberty protections it would provide).

RMA creates no new cause of action against any private religious entity, even one receiving funding from the state. Only a person acting ''under color of state law'' can violate the Act. Contrary to the claims of some RMA opponents, Supreme Court precedent is clear that entities do not act under color of state law—to use an equivalent term, they are not rendered ''state actors''—simply because they contract with the state, receive funding from the state (even the lion's share of their funding), or are heavily regulated by the state. Blum v. Yaretsky, 457 U.S. 991 (1982); Rendell-Baher v. Kohn, 457 U.S. 830 (1982). Blum, for example, held that a privately owned skilled nursing facility was not a state actor even though it was heavily regulated, received 90 percent of its income from Medicaid payments, received state subsidies for its capital costs, and was doing something the government required it to do—but what was challenged was a particular means of doing that thing, and the government did not require the means. ''[C]onstitutional standards are invoked only when it can be said that the State is responsible for the specific conduct of which the plaintiff complains.'' Blum, 457 U.S. at 1004 (second emphasis added). The state had not directed the specific conduct complained of in Blum. Nor, obviously, can the government be said to have directed a religious nonprofit's specific decision to disfavor same-sex relationships.

2. If RMA creates no new liability, then the only way it could make traditional believers' religious liberty less secure is if the Supreme Court were ready to overrule Obergefell, ending the constitutional right to same-sex marriage, and RMA then preserved a small portion of that right by statute. But the chances of overturning Obergefell are small. Justice Thomas's call to overturn it, made in his concurrence in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org., 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022), attracted no other votes. Rather, the Dobbs majority opinion emphasized, in three different places, that the overruling of constitutional abortion rights did not cast doubt on other substantive due process precedents, because abortion is a ''unique act'' involving termination of a ''life or potential life.'' 142 S. Ct. at 2277; id. at 2258, 2280. Justice Kavanaugh reiterated the point in his concurrence. Id. at 2309. Conservatives have generally urged taking these assurances from the Dobbs majority as genuine and reliable.

As constitutional scholars and observers, we agree. To overrule Obergefell, the Court would have to undo thousands of same-sex marriages entered into in reliance on that decision or else create a two-tier system in which some same-sex couples will be validly married for fifty or sixty years because they married during a window of opportunity while all future couples are barred in many states. We very much doubt that a majority will take that step.

3. Finally, as we have already emphasized, religious-liberty protections, however defensible and warranted, have repeatedly failed when embodied in legislation that provides no benefits (however incremental) to LGBTQ rights. The question is not whether this bill provides all the protections that traditional believers and institutions will need in all contexts. The question is whether the bill provides protections that are significant when compared with new risks to religious liberty that the legislation creates. Because we conclude that the bill's protections are important and that any new risks it creates are quite limited, we see it as an advance for religious liberty.

DOUGLAS LAYCOCK,
Robert E. Scott Distinguished Professor of Law, University of Virginia, Alice McKean Young Regents Chair in Law Emeritus, University of Texas.

THOMAS C. BERG,
James L. Oberstar Professor of Law and Public Policy, University of St. Thomas (Minnesota).

CARL H. ESBECK,
R.B. Price Professor Emeritus of Law and Isabelle Wade and Paul C. Lyda Professor Emeritus of Law, University of Missouri.

ROBIN FRETWELL WILSON,
Mildred Van Voorhis Jones Chair in Law, University of Illinois College of Law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I have come to the floor today to talk about legislation that is going to come before this Chamber this afternoon called the Respect for Marriage Act. I hope the Senate will consider this legislation and pass it. I think it is good for our country.

Marriage is really important in our society. It is a sacred bond that two people make to each other. It represents a lifetime of commitment and love and care in times good and bad. It is also the foundational unit upon which our entire society is built. I have witnessed this firsthand over the past 36 years with my wife Jane and our amazing family. I was fortunate to have an upbringing with parents who were together for five decades. The recognition and protection of this bond makes the couple, the family, and our country stronger. That is why there is a constitutional right to marry.

Same-sex marriage has also been a constitutional right since 2015. Today, there are about a million same-sex households. About 60 percent of them are married.

In the minds of most Americans, the validity of these marriages is a settled question, and the overwhelming majority of Americans want this question to be settled. According to Gallup, 71 percent of Americans believe that same-sex marriage should be recognized as valid by law. The majority of support for same-sex marriage, by the way, is seen across all age groups, races, religious affiliations, and even political parties. In fact, polling from just last year shows that 55 percent of Republicans support the legal recognition of same-sex marriage.

Now, the Respect for Marriage Act we are about to vote on actually doesn't go that far. It simply says that if you get married in one State, another State has to honor it.

So why are we here? Given this broad American consensus, why is the Senate debating this today as to whether we should recognize something that the vast majority of Americans already recognize and support? The answer is, because current Federal law does not reflect the will or beliefs of the American people in this regard. The current statute allows States and the Federal Government to refuse to recognize valid same-sex marriages.

While it is true that this law is not currently enforceable, I would argue, because of Supreme Court rulings, it still represents Congress's last word on the subject. So it is important to clarify that, to get the old legislation off the books. Likewise, current Federal law is silent on the question of interstate interracial marriage, believe it or not, so that needs to be addressed.

Given this disconnect between the American people and our current legislation, it is time for the Senate to settle the issue and pass the Respect for Marriage Act, as the House of Representatives has already done. By the way, that was an overwhelming vote in the House with 46 Republicans supporting it.

This bill simply allows interracial or same-sex couples who are validly married under the laws of one State to know that their marriage will be recognized by the Federal Government and by other States, if they move, in accordance with established Supreme Court precedent. That is why we have to do this.

Second, we have to do it because in a recent Supreme Court case, there was this notion that maybe this would get revisited, this issue of same-sex marriage. So it is important that we resolve the issue for both of those reasons. And people who are in same-sex marriages are understandably very interested in having that resolved. They want to clarify it. They've made financial arrangements, maybe adoptions, and so on. They want to be sure that their marriage can continue to be honored.

I think, in short, there are two main effects of this bill, and both are well within the constitutional authority of the Congress to address. First, to ensure that the marriages legally performed in one State are recognized as valid in other States, regardless of sex or race.

This is a straightforward application, by the way, of the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution anyway. Under this clause, States are required to recognize things like court judgments and public records from other States. This bill simply clarifies that marriage is one of those things that must be recognized across State lines.

Second, this bill specifies that the Federal Government will recognize a marriage that is valid in the State where it was performed. This portion of

the bill keeps the Federal Government out of the business of defining marriages, which is something, on my side of the aisle, among Republicans, particularly important because that leaves the decision to the States where it properly belongs.

I also want to take a moment to address what this bill does not do because I have had a lot of conversations with my colleagues over the last week or so about this; and in some cases, they are talking about things that this bill simply doesn't do. It does not require any State to perform same-sex marriages if it chooses not to, in the event the current Supreme Court case, let's say, is overturned. It just doesn't do that. It does not require anything not already required by the Supreme Court precedent.

It certainly does not allow polygamy. This is a point that has been raised by some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle. Polygamy is illegal in every jurisdiction in the United States, and this does nothing to change that. It actually adds another provision in our amendment—that I will talk about in a second—that explicitly prohibits polygamy.

This bill does not permit lawsuits against individuals or entities acting in a purely private capacity. That is important.

As you can see, the bill is really very narrow. It is constitutional, and it does not infringe on State sovereignty. It is a bill that simply ensures, as a matter of statutory law, that interracial and same-sex marriages that were legal in the State in which they were performed will be recognized if the couple moves to a different State.

I also want to address several points of criticism against the bill and the significant efforts that we have made to address those through a substitute amendment, which was written by all of us who have been involved in this process but also a number of outside groups. This amendment contains robust religious liberty protections. The amendment was developed collaboratively, again, between us—as TAMMY BALDWIN is here on the floor, SUSAN COLLINS, THOM TILLIS, also KYRSTEN SINEMA—also by listening to feedback and working extensively with many of our Senate colleagues, with faith-based groups on the outside, and also other stakeholders.

The first criticism that I heard was this bill does not sufficiently protect people of faith. I disagree. I believe religious freedom is a fundamental pillar of our constitutional order, and I am confident nothing in this will limit the religious and constitutional protections that exist under the First Amendment or any other Federal laws.

To further advance and protect our cherished religious freedoms, however, our amendment contains four very important provisions. First, it acknowledges that decent and honorable people who hold diverse views about the role of gender in marriage and that such people and their beliefs are due respect. This is very important to many of the religious organizations we have dealt with who are strongly supporting this legislation, to make the point that people can have different points of view. We are going to respect that.

It also has a very important application to the lawsuits that people are concerned about that might come up. In the Bob Jones case, as an example, there was a notion that was different with regard to interracial marriage. In this case, though, with regard to same-sex marriage, again, we respect people have different points of view. It is important to lay that out.

Secondly, it explicitly protects all existing religious liberty and conscience protections under the First Amendment, any other constitutional provisions, and Federal laws explicitly. I would argue it already did that, but I think it is important to make it explicit.

Third, it guarantees that this bill cannot be used to target or deny benefits, including tax-exempt status which is very important to a lot of religious organizations; also, grants, contracts, educational funding, licenses, and many others. Religious organizations helped us to put this language in place just to ensure that this bill cannot be used for that purpose.

Fourth, it ensures that nonprofit religious organizations, including churches, mosques, synagogues, religious schools, and others, cannot be required to provide facilities or goods or services for marriage ceremonies or celebrations against their will.

These religious liberty provisions are very significant. Several constitutional scholars, by the way, and advocates for religious liberty, led by Professor Doug Laycock of the University of Virginia Law School, have carefully analyzed this bill and sent us a letter concluding that overall this legislation is ''an advance for religious liberty.'' These are advocates, especially Laycock himself, who has taken cases to the Supreme Court representing religious schools. He is saying that this bill, on net, this bill actually increases religious liberty. Numerous other important faith groups agree. The Reverend Walter Kim, President of the National Association of Evangelicals described this amendment, if it passes, as ''the first significant bipartisan legislation in many years advancing religious freedom for all, including for those who hold traditional views on marriage.'' In other words, he is saying this legislation—forgetting the parts about same-sex marriage, which are very important—but with regard to religious liberty, it moves the ball forward, in his view, as the President of the National Association of Evangelicals.

Another criticism of this bill is that it will be used to target religious organizations by revoking their tax-exempt status under Federal law. I don't see how this would be possible without even having an amendment, but we wanted to clarify that. This bill does not require anything that is not already required by the Supreme Court. However, penalizing or targeting a private organization because of sincere views on same-sex marriage would be a clear First Amendment violation. I am confident the Court would not tolerate it. But to ensure that this bill cannot be used to target or deny benefits to religious organizations, our amendment explicitly prohibits it. The amendment specifies that this legislation may not be used to deny or alter any ''benefit, status, or right'' unrelated to marriage, period. This gives assurances to people and organizations of faith that their tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, licenses, and other benefits cannot be affected by this legislation.

The third criticism I heard is that this bill legalized and recognized polygamy. To address this, we put an explicit prohibition in place, even though no State permits it, so there cannot be a recognition of polygamous marriages, period.

As you can tell, we have worked hard to address concerns that have been raised and to craft an amendment that provides robust, affirmative protections of people of faith without diminishing the rights of couples in same-sex marriages. This is very important.

President Hoogstra of the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities, a group that is endorsing this legislation, observed this amendment ''sends a strong bipartisan message to Congress, the administration, and the public that LGBTQ rights can coexist with religious freedom protections, and that the rights of both groups can be advanced in a way that is prudent and practical.''

That is what is extraordinary about this bill. These two sometimes viewed as competing interests are working together. But as she said, we have shown here through this legislation that these rights can co-exist—religious freedom, on the one hand, LGBTQ on the other hand.

Achieving this kind of compromise could not have happened without hard work, good faith, and bipartisan negotiation. I want to extend specific thanks to the following groups who have worked with my colleagues to develop this legislation, including the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, also known as the Mormon Church; the National Association of Evangelicals; the Seventh Day Adventist Church; the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities; the Center for Public Justice; the AND Campaign; the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance; and the 1st Amendment Partnership.

It is my hope that, with the changes we talked about today and we have all now agreed to, we can pass this legislation with the same kind of overwhelming bipartisan majority we saw in the House of Representatives, and,

therefore, settle this issue once and for all. Millions of American couples, including many Ohioans, are counting on their elected representatives in Congress to recognize and protect their marriage, to give them the peace of mind to know that their marriage is, indeed, protected and secure. We must not let them down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today, the Senate has a chance to live up to its highest ideals by taking up legislation that will protect the rights of all Americans, regardless of who they choose to marry.

In many ways, the story of America has been a difficult but inexorable march towards greater equality for all people. Throughout our history, sometimes we have taken very important steps forward; other times, unfortunately, we have taken steps backward. But today, the Senate is taking a truly bold step forward in the march towards greater justice, greater equality, by advancing the Respect for Marriage Act.

It is a simple, narrowly tailored, but exceedingly important piece of legislation that will do so much good for so many Americans. It will make our country a better, fairer place to live.

Passing this bill is as personal as it gets for many of us in this Chamber, myself included. My daughter and her wife, my daughter-in-law, are expecting a baby next spring. I want to do everything possible to make sure their rights are protected under Federal law. I want them and everyone in a loving relationship to live without the fear that their rights could one day be stripped away. There are many of us who are deeply invested in seeing this bill succeed.

Originally, it was our intention to take action on the Respect for Marriage Act back in September, fresh off the House's strong bipartisan vote for the summer. Remember, 47 House Republicans joined Democrats to pass this bill. But at the urging of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, I agreed to hold off on scheduling a vote in order to make sure we had enough support to move forward. My job at the end of the day will always be to prioritize getting things passed through this Chamber, and marriage equality is too important an issue to risk failure. So I made the choice to trust the Members who have worked so hard on this legislation and wait a little bit longer in order to give the bipartisan process a chance to play out. It is much better to pass this legislation and move equality forward than simply have a showboat, which would bring political reckoning, but no real change for the American people.

I want to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who have led the charge in getting this bill ready for the floor and, hopefully, soon onto the President's desk—including our two leaders on our side, Senators BALDWIN and SINEMA, who have done a fabulous job and have worked this bill so hard and so well and so consistently. I want to thank Senators PORTMAN and TILLIS, and COLLINS on the other side who are part of this bipartisan team. They managed this process stupendously and I am optimistic their efforts will prove successful later today.

To the rest of my colleagues and to all Americans who are watching what the Senate does, this is a great chance to do something very important for tens of millions of Americans. No one—no one—in a same-sex marriage should have to worry about whether or not their marriage will be invalidated in the future. They deserve peace of mind knowing their rights will always be protected under the law. With this bill, we can take a significant and much-needed step in that direction.

The majority of Americans support us in this endeavor. They are joined, not only by hundreds of major American companies who support this bill, but also religious organizations who affirm that the Respect for Marriage Act is a sound and a commonsense piece of legislation.

So if both parties can come together, today could be truly one of the highlights of the year for this body. This has been an incredibly productive year in Congress, full of many significant achievements, but I think that passing the Respect for Marriage Act would be one of the more significant accomplishments of the Senate to date.

Like so many other bills this year, it will be an unequivocal bipartisan win. So I urge my colleagues: Think about those who you know and love who are in a same-sex marriage, maybe it is your friends, maybe it is your family, maybe it is someone on your staff. I hope with them in your heart, you will support this bill.

There is every reason under the Sun to move forward and begin debating this important legislation for the sake of ensuring equal justice under law, for the sake of millions of married couples who want to live their lives without discrimination, and for the sake of every person out there, young and old alike who wonder if they, too, deserve to be treated with fairness and dignity and basic decency.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote yes on moving forward with the Respect for Marriage Act later today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I, along with my colleagues who have spoken before me, am proud to be able to work on a very sensitive issue in a very collaborative and bipartisan fashion.

We did it in a way that was always respectful of the fact that many Americans come from different walks of life and many diverse beliefs and viewpoints.

We know that nearly a million Americans are already committed to same-sex marriages who simply want long-term certainty—not only the million who are already committed to same-sex marriages but the millions of people who attended the ceremonies, their friends, and their family.

As we went through this bill, we listened to the very sincere concerns of Americans with strongly held religious beliefs who simply wanted to make sure that Congress protects their First Amendment rights, especially the freedom of religion.

By casting politics aside and working hard behind the scenes over the past several months, we managed to strike a balance with this legislation. There will be permanent certainty for same-sex couples, and they can rest easy knowing their families are secure. And there will be robust protections for churches, religious organizations, protections that are more robust and expansive than currently exist in Federal law.

I want to talk a little bit about the compromise we reached and what it will mean for our constituents who voiced their concerns over the past few months. This bill protects religious liberty and conscience protections available under the Constitution and Federal law, including the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, commonly referred to as RFRA. This bill cannot be used to diminish or repeal any such protection.

The bill also makes clear that no religious organization will be required to provide any services for the celebration of a same-sex marriage. Simply put, that means that no church or religious organization will be required to perform, recognize, or celebrate same-sex marriages.

We also took steps to protect the tax-exempt status of religious nonprofit organizations. We didn't leave anything ambiguous. We included language that guarantees the bill cannot be used to deny or alter any benefit, right, or status of any otherwise eligible person or entity. This includes tax-exempt status, tax treatment, grants, educational funding, loans, scholarships, licenses, and certifications. Put together, the Respect for Marriage Act essentially preserves the status quo we have had in our country for the last 7 years, since the Supreme Court ruling.

Same-sex couples will continue to have the right to get married, now without the fear of government intervention, and churches and religious organizations will continue to operate and worship free from government interference.

This is a good compromise. It is one that is based on mutual respect for our fellow Americans, protecting the rights of Americans who may have different lifestyles or different viewpoints. I am proud of the work we did with this bill. I am looking forward to voting yes on it. And I am grateful for the leadership of so many people who were involved. Of course, Senator COLLINS, Senator PORTMAN, Senator BALDWIN, and Senator SINEMA. But I also want to thank

the Church of Latter-day Saints, the Seventh-day Adventists, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities that represents 150 different religious institutions of higher learning here in the United States alone, and they have operations abroad, and the National Association of Evangelicals, the Center for Public Justice and its Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance.

I believe this is a good bill, and bipartisan bills in any environment are difficult. And I think it is why it was so important we came together, had the courage to work together, recognized the viewpoints at either end of the spectrum, and came up with a carefully crafted compromise that I believe is good for all Americans.

And I look forward to everybody voting in favor of it. We will have some opposition, but at the end of the day, I think we will prevail. And that is a message to so many people out there who want this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Madam President, I rise today as our country takes an important step forward to protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans. Together with broad bipartisan support, the Senate will provide certainty to millions of Americans in loving marriages and enshrine into law the basic protections afforded all Americans while respecting our country's critical principle of religious liberty.

This historic milestone builds off of years of incredible strides we have made advancing freedom and equality, including hard-fought victories I have been honored to help lead.

Nearly two decades ago in 2006, at a time when our country was just beginning to debate marriage, Arizona proposed a ballot proposition banning same-sex marriage in our State's constitution. This issue was personal to me and to many other Arizonans. Similar ballot provisions had passed in States across the country, red and blue States alike, and the stakes were high. The pundits didn't give Arizona much of a chance.

I knew that in order to buck the trend and win, we would need to run a different kind of campaign that expanded the conversation, cultivated a diverse group of unlikely partners, and moved past the tired, partisan talking points.

That is why I worked across the aisle and teamed up with my good friend Steve May, a Republican. Now, we faced some criticism at the time for how we chose to run our campaign. Some wanted us to run a partisan campaign, convinced that highlighting the divides in our community and focusing exclusively on the LGBTQ community would put us over the top.

But I knew we couldn't do it just by talking amongst people who already agreed with our position. The polling showed it. And, frankly, we felt that in order to do right by our friends, our neighbors, and our fellow members of the LGBTQ community in Arizona, we had to do more than run a campaign that made our core supporters feel good but ultimately didn't build the broad-based coalition of Arizonans needed to win.

That is why we expanded the conversation to include how the proposition would harm all unmarried couples across Arizona, not just those in the LGBTQ community but people in domestic partnerships, people in common-law marriages because here is the truth: When we reach beyond partisan talking points to find common ground, we expand what is possible in Arizona and in our country.

We had open and honest conversations about the hopes and dreams that unite us, instead of the superficial differences that divide us.

In Arizona, we value our independence. We are proud of our families and our communities, and we work hard to protect them. We have our differences, but we share a strong sense of service, hard work, and self-determination.

We believe that everyone has the right to define his or her own destiny and that no one should be treated differently under the law. By focusing on these shared values, we found success. We defeated that ballot proposition—the first State in the country to do so—and I learned lessons that have shaped my work for Arizonans ever since.

Since 2006, we have seen long-term progress that makes today's important debate in the U.S. Senate possible. This work is ongoing. But the work can't and shouldn't be attributed to any one politician, any political party, or any piece of legislation. This work happens because people choose to be their most authentic selves and live their lives freely.

Being gay is normal. Being yourself is normal. Showing up to life every day happy to be who you are is normal. And being authentic with your friends, your family, your colleagues, and your community, that is also normal. That normalcy is what helps us listen to each other, understand each other, and grow in our community together. It is what changes hearts and minds in Arizona and around the country, and it is what, little by little, piece by piece, delivers sustainable progress.

Whether at home in Arizona or here in the U.S. Senate, in order to deliver real results to the Americans we serve, we need to work together. Working together means listening with open hearts, bridging divides, shutting out the noise, and focusing on our shared goals.

I have seen time and time again how this approach helps us overcome tough challenges.

A little over 6 months ago, it was thanks to that same approach that I stood here on the Senate floor and delivered remarks on the passage of our Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, a historic law we negotiated and passed with broad bipartisan support that makes our schools and communities safer and saves lives.

And before that, this same approach helped us pass our landmark legislation, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, into law, strengthening America through upgrades and repairs, creating good-paying jobs, and expanding economic opportunities across the country. Beyond these historic accomplishments, our approach of focusing on common goals and shared ideals has helped us pass a number of other lasting solutions, including long-awaited and necessary postal reform, support for Ukraine in its fight against Putin, and most recently, the passage into law of our bipartisan CHIPS and Science Act, legislation that boosts America's global leadership, spurring job creation and addressing our supply chain challenges.

As we can all see, this approach has proved successful, and right now we need this approach more than ever. You know, this summer Arizonans and Americans across the country were confused, and some were scared, following the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade. Women felt their health and well-being was endangered and our own abilities to make critical decisions about our futures were suddenly thrown into question. This fear trickled into other communities—including the LGBTQ community—as leaders with extreme ideologies mused about what other challenges could come next. But sadly, in response, we saw elected officials on both sides of the aisle exploit this fear and use it to fuel clicks, book cable news appearances, and drum up outrage to further their own partisan political agendas.

Outrage can help propel political stars, but it doesn't solve problems. It doesn't make life better for everyday people.

But amidst the noise, a few hard-working Senators from across our country and across the political spectrum understood there was a need to provide certainty to the American people, and we came to the table to get something done.

Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, our groundbreaking leader on this issue, partnered with my old friends Senators SUSAN COLLINS, ROB PORTMAN, THOM TILLIS, and myself, all of us no strangers to bipartisan success in a divided Senate. Together, we Senators all focused on the same goal, to help ensure married same-sex couples across the country are afforded the same protections as all other married American couples.

Along the way, we overcame obstacles; we made certain our language respected religious liberty; and we were careful to ensure that in shoring up some rights we did not infringe upon others.

We made our case to colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We listened to those who disagreed with us. We didn't pick fights. We didn't call names. We

just kept moving forward. And I am proud to say that by refusing to demonize each other and by focusing on our shared goals, we will deliver real, lasting results for the LGBTQ community.

We will make our country stronger and safer for American families in a way that honors and respects our diverse viewpoints on marriage, on family, and society.

I thank the many faith communities that helped us expand this policy conversation and ensure that our amendment would include robust and commonsense religious liberty protections.

In particular, I thank the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints that provided thoughtful suggestions and contributions. They summarized our holistic outcome when they wrote in their statement:

> We believe this approach is the way forward. As we work together to preserve the principles and practices of religious freedom together with the rights of LGBTQ individuals, much can be accomplished to heal relationships and foster greater understanding.

Not every American agrees on marriage or lots of other issues, and that is OK. Honest disagreements don't make us any less decent or honorable, especially if we see that disagreement as an opportunity to learn and grow.

If more of us dedicate ourselves to better understanding one another and our lived experiences, if we strive to see an issue from another person's point of view, and if we all work to practice a bit more patience and grace, I know we can continue finding paths forward together.

It may not seem like it in today's partisan world, but there has always been more that unites us as Americans than divides us.

The bipartisan support we have garnered in the Senate today proves this issue isn't a matter of one party being right or the other party being wrong. This issue is bigger than angry tweets and bombastic fundraising emails. This is about ensuring American families, who share the ideals of all marriages—love, devotion, and sacrifice—can continue to count on the basic rights and responsibilities that come with their marriages. It is about protecting the beliefs that unite us as Americans: the right to define our own destinies, the understanding that no one should be different in the eyes of the law, the freedom to reach for every opportunity and fulfill our greatest potential.

The truth is, if we allow our basic values of honor and dignity to become just another political football, we all lose.

As I learned back in 2006 in Arizona, we have to work together. We have to find willing partners in both parties, and we must bridge our divides before they rip us apart for good.

Our work is not done. As a body, we must resolve to do the right thing to continue this mission and keep working together to deliver lasting results. Our country deserves it, the American people deserve it, and the stakes are too high to stop our progress now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent that the vote previously scheduled for 3:15 p.m. be called immediately.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 449, H.R. 8404, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Baldwin, Brian Schatz, Margaret Wood Hassan, Patty Murray, Tammy Duckworth, Jeff Merkley, Jacky Rosen, Richard J. Durbin, Debbie Stabenow, Elizabeth Warren, Mazie K. Hirono, Alex Padilla, Gary C. Peters, Jeanne Shaheen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 8404, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 356 Leg.]

YEAS—62

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

NAYS—37

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Kennedy	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Toomey
Cruz	Lee	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	
Graham	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Sasse

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 37.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for as much time as I shall consume.

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

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as I reflect on my 28 years serving in the U.S. Senate, I am reminded of the lessons I learned from my former colleagues and friends who have served beside me in the Senate. I had the privilege of serving with many great titans for a fairly long period of time. Some maybe thought too long. I had the privilege of serving with the people whom I have known very well—people like Orrin Hatch and Mike Enzi, friends I miss dearly. I single them out because they are no longer with us.

In Senator Hatch's farewell speech in 2018, he reflected on the striking shift in polarization and partisanship of the Senate, and he yearned for the days of Members finding common ground and breaking bread together.

Orrin reflected on this in his farewell speech. He said: Could two people with polar-opposite beliefs and from vastly different walks of life come together as often as Teddy and I did? And the answer is yes. Can conservative Republicans and Democrats come together today? All the time, and they will in the future. But you may not hear about it because it is not newsy. The media doesn't really care if everybody loves everybody.

Then there is Barbara Boxer. Not too many people who are making their last speech talk about Members of the other party, but I will do this. I have shared this story many times with all of you about how former Senator Barbara Boxer of California and I worked together for many years as chair and ranking member of the EPW Committee to get things done. You can't get two more ideologically different Senators than Barbara and me—Barbara, a proud Democrat of the most far left State in the Nation, and me, a

proud Republican from the most conservative State in the Nation. But we were able to see past our ideological differences to work together, and we did. We got stuff done. We passed landmark legislation, from highway bills like the FAST Act to the Frank Lautenberg Chemical Safety Act. You remember that. Most people still remember that. We did it, and we did it time and time again.

Every Wednesday, as Republicans in this meeting in the Senate where the chairmen will go—I shouldn't probably be telling all you guys what Republicans do. But they go around the room and give an update on what their committee is working on. And I would always say at that time: Now is the time to hear from the committee that gets things done.

And I can say that—that Barbara Boxer and I got things done. And do you know what? We actually enjoyed it. Nobody believed that we would enjoy it so much and actually get things done.

Then there is JACK REED. Today, I have a similar relationship with the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am a Republican, and he is a Democrat. JACK is from Rhode Island, a very blue State, but we have worked together for years to pass the annual Defense authorization bill, which is the most important bill we pass every year.

I believe the secret to getting this bill done—and any bipartisan bill, for that matter—is determination, but also trust and respect in the Member that you are sitting across the table from, a lesson Senator Hatch set very well. In working with Senator REED over the years, he has my trust, and I have his respect. And it is why we have been successful in what I consider to be the most significant thing that we do every year.

For me, I was a builder and developer prior to running for public office and never contemplated getting involved in politics until one day on the job in South Texas. I was told that I needed more than a dozen permits to build a single dock. Now, that didn't make much sense to me, and so I decided at that time to run for office and try to get things done where people in this body are actually responding favorably.

I remember when I first came to the Senate from the House. After I gave a very spirited speech on the Senate floor, Senator Byrd came up to me and he said: Young man, the Senate doesn't work like the House. Let me tell you about the Senate. That day happened to be November 17, 1994, which was my 60th birthday. Until the day he died, I was still ''young man.'' And Senator Byrd explained to me—and this is something that a lot of the new Members who are just being sworn in as we speak, and are here for the first time, realize—that this is discipline and major differences. If you make enemies in the Senate, you are wiped out. That is not true in the House. I spent a lot of years in the House before.

Also, I remember friends across the aisle, like former Hawaii Senator Danny Akaka, who led our Prayer Breakfast each week; Ted Kennedy, who I helped out of the Capitol during one of the September attacks that was taking place; and former Majority Leader Harry Reid, who would sometimes move our voting schedule around so that I could get home and watch my grandkids' football games.

And then there is the one that we all love, SUSAN COLLINS, who is well-respected because she makes this institution a better place, and not just because of the Maine lobster rolls that are her signature fare for the eating groups.

Real friendship does exist in the U.S. Senate, but nobody knows it. It is a big secret around here.

Then there is a bipartisan Bible study that we have. Some of you know about the Senate Bible study that meets every Thursday in my hideaway in the Capitol. I have made a point not to miss a Thursday Bible study in 28 years. So I have a record going. There is no one who is going to beat it. Well, they could beat it, I suppose. After I was first elected to the House in 1986, I attended a Bible study led by a guy named Tom Barrett.

I am going to tell you a story that most people don't want to hear, but one day, Tom Barrett and a Member of Congress from Kansas invited me to the Members' dining room after Bible study. Keep in mind, this was 1986.

They said to me: Inhofe, we think that—we have been with you now for over a year, since you got here, and we think you never really accepted Jesus.

Well, I got mad. Who is this young guy there telling me about Jesus?

And they said: All right, when did you ask Him?

And I said: Well, every day.

They asked: How long have you and Kay been married?

At that time, we were newlyweds. We were probably, I think, celebrating our 29th wedding anniversary.

And they said: Do you propose to Kay every day?

And I said: No.

And they replied: Why?

And I said: Because we are already married.

Well, bingo, that meant something. And I thought—I was a little cautious because these guys were younger, and I wasn't sure I knew them that well. I said, just in case they were right in the Members' dining room at 2:30 in the afternoon on September 22, 1988, I reaccepted—reaccepted—Jesus as my personal Lord and Savior. Now, that is life-changing.

OK. Now there is Africa. Since joining the Senate, I have made 172 African country visits, alongside good friends from here, like Mike Enzi, JOHN BOOZMAN, MIKE ROUNDS, Trent Kelly, Tim Walberg, and arguably my closest friend, Mark Powers, a real brother, but it all started with Doug Coe. You see, people think of Doug Coe as having been someone who was a great diplomat. He had political influence and all that.

Years back, an article about Doug said this:

> The extent of Coe's influence in American politics is [real] . . . important figures have acknowledged his role on the national and international stage. For instance, speaking at the 1990 National Prayer Breakfast, President George H. W. Bush praised Coe for his quiet diplomacy.

Not many things are quiet around here. Doug spent his years in the countries across the world taking Jesus's name to the Kings. I remember him asking me for 8 years. He said: Inhofe, I wish you would go to West Africa.

And I had no interest in going to West Africa.

And he kept saying—and this lasted for 8 years. For 8 years, I said no to this guy, but he was very persistent. And I can't tell you why it happened, but then finally I said yes. And I still to this day can't figure out how that happened. But that changed lives, including mine, and it all came from Doug Coe.

You know, I would like to mention some of these people who were really heroes around here that most people don't even know. They don't remember. But they go back and they look them up and they see what great contributions they made. Not many people are aware of this, but here in the U.S. Senate, every Wednesday morning, we meet in the Spirit of Jesus. This is something Doug Coe started many years ago during the Eisenhower administration. It is scripturally based, Acts 2:42. We get together, eat together, pray together, fellowship together, and talk about the precepts of Jesus together.

I will always be thankful to Doug for his efforts to quietly speak of Jesus in most every country around the world.

Over my 172 African country visits as a Senator—sure, I did my military job while I was there—but I developed a deep love and appreciation for the people of Africa whom I will hold here with me forever.

One thing from my visits remains clear. Building meaningful and lasting relationships with African leaders is vital if the United States is to have a role on the African Continent. I was proud to lead the effort to establish AFRICOM. Some of you don't remember this, but AFRICOM didn't exist for a long period of time. Every other part of the world did but not Africa. But we set that up as a separate combatant command in 2007, and I have seen the benefits across the continent since that time.

The presence of U.S. military across Africa means a great deal to our friends and is a worthwhile investment for the United States. A strong and robust relationship with the United States has helped spur economic growth and regional stability across the continent.

I think it is important to talk about these things that other people don't talk about. I have faith that my colleagues in the House and Senate will continue the United States-African friendship long after I have retired from the Senate.

Western Sahara. Western Sahara. Over the years, I have been very outspoken about the situation in Western Sahara. A few years ago, I visited the Sahrawi refugee camps. I visited the children who lived there. They were joyous and happy and ordinary children who didn't know yet that they were part of the frozen, forgotten conflict, where their hopes and dreams were dying a cruel death.

I urge my colleagues to remember our ideals of democracy and extend that to the Sahrawians. Don't let the world forget them. I urge everyone in this body to stand strong to support Western Sahara's right to self-determination and reject Morocco's relentless attacks on Western Sahara.

Ethiopia. Then there is Ethiopia, a nation that is close to my heart for many reasons. The human suffering happening there is heartbreaking. Instead of focusing on the importance of creating lasting friendships with the Ethiopian people, some in the U.S. Government look for ways to punish them. Nineteen of my African visits have included Ethiopia, where I have watched firsthand the economic transformation that occurred.

Their middle class is growing; they have become a regional superpower; and they are a good friend of the United States of America. Their military is professional, capable, and they are punching above their weight in the war against terrorism that continues to plague the continent.

They promote regional peace and security by being one of the top contributors to the United Nations when they are called upon. Hopefully, we can find ways to grow this friendship, the Ethiopian friendship.

Then there is Zegita Marie. Now, many of you already know that I have an adopted granddaughter who was born in Ethiopia. Her name is Zegita Marie. We call her the Z-girl. She has a very special story and has grown up to be a very impressive star. Knowing the joys of adoption in my own family, I have worked to ensure all families who choose to adopt can.

In 2017, when Ethiopia decided to close intercountry adoptions, I worked directly with my friend then-Prime Minister Hailemariam so the families who were pending adoptions were able to complete their adoptions to bring their children home. That was a major thing, a major undertaking. You wouldn't think it would be. That should be natural.

Now, the Constitution. Yes, you have heard me say this line before. There are two things we should remember here in Congress: infrastructure and defense. That statement rang true 28 years ago when I got to the Senate, and it will ring true in the years to come.

Infrastructure—and we have gotten a lot done together on that front over the years. We passed bipartisan landmark infrastructure legislation from SAFETEA–LU to MAP–21, to the FAST Act, all of which rebuilt our Nation's crumbling infrastructure so the future generations of Americans still have safe roads and bridges to cross.

Before 2005, Oklahoma—my State—was a donor State to the highway trust fund. Now, what that means is we were paying more into the highway trust fund than we were receiving out of it, and of course we were going to change that.

SAFETEA–LU created a fair formula for apportionment so Oklahoma—I just want to say this. I want to make sure that people in Oklahoma, since I am bugging out of this place, realize some of the things that I have done. I know it is controversial in some circles to say this, but I have been one of the staunchest defenders of congressionally directed spending also known as earmarks. And an ''earmark'' must be defined as something that is both authorized and appropriate and should be the job of Congress to decide how the American people—how their taxes are spent, not unelected bureaucrats in the executive branch. And that is what we are trying to get away from when we are looking at why we should be using earmarks.

We have worked across the party lines to ensure the National Defense Authorization Act is signed into law every year. And as I said earlier, the NDAA is the most important bill that we do every year and for a good reason. This year will be the 62nd time that the NDAA has been signed into law—62nd time.

And I am proud to have had a hand in crafting the last 28 years of that bill. The Defense authorization bill ensures that our service men and women have the training, equipment, and other resources they need to defend America, here and on the road.

It also ensures that the families of the men and women who serve are taken care of. Some elected leaders criticize our military spending, but they need to know that our greatest expense in the military is taking care of our troops and building schools for the young people and how important that is. And why does it cost more for us to do that than other countries? than communist countries? It does because we do actually take care of our people.

With growing threats from China, Russia, Iran, and others around the world, it is more important now than ever that our troops have what they need to counter this aggression. Ronald Reagan used to say we maintain the peace through our strength, and that continues to be true today. After all of these years serving on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have come to know with certainty that America cannot lose its focus on fully investing in its defense capabilities.

And I have got to say this about Oklahoma. Oklahoma has come out pretty well. You all don't need to feel sorry for Oklahoma because I will take care of that. They are very happy right now. Oklahoma has five major military installations. From training pilots to building bombs, each is unique in its mission to support our military.

Since 1988, we have gone through five BRAC rounds. That is Base Realignment and Closure Commissions. And in each round, the Department of Defense closed bases and military installations in accordance with their performance. This is something we ought to be doing. And in each round, Oklahoma and the Department of Defense grew its presence in Oklahoma. So Oklahoma has done very well in that period of time.

I am going to tell a story here that will surprise a lot of people because the star of the story is—none of these kids will remember, except for reading about it—Ronald Reagan. When I was about 6 years old, my dad was a claims adjuster in a building where Ronald Reagan was an announcer for WHO radio, a sports announcer in Des Moines, IA—my dad and Ronald Reagan. In fact, I thought he was—I was about 6 years old at that time, and I thought that he was related to me. My dad and Ronald Reagan used to play the pinball machine together. He would come out to the house, and I always thought he was an uncle or some relative.

When I was young, my family moved from Des Moines to Tulsa—Tulsa, OK—but we never missed a Dutch Reagan movie, which is what my dad called him, Dutch Reagan.

We would drive—I remember one time we went all the way down from Tulsa to Durant, OK, and that was before turnpikes. We drove for hours to watch a Dutch Reagan movie. Never missed one of those. It is not a big deal, but it is to me, and I am the guy who needed it.

Fast-forward to when, as mayor of Tulsa and Ronald Reagan was President, when President Reagan wanted someone to tout his domestic agenda, he used me. We would appear on all the TV shows, sometimes together, and tell the people what they needed to know and what was happening in the administration.

I will always remember when, as mayor of Tulsa, I pushed the construction of a low-water dam on the Arkansas River. It ended up being one of the largest public projects in America that was totally privately funded. It had a lot of opposition, but it is pretty amazing. Go back and read about this, and you will see that anything Ronald Reagan wanted, he got.

Then there is the Wiley Post flight around the world. Now, people may not know who Wiley Post is. Everyone knows who Will Rogers is. Well, Wiley Post and Will Rogers were both pilots. The difference is, Wiley Post had just one eye and he was good. In fact, they were together when they died.

Back in 1991, I was still in the House, and a few friends and I created a Wiley Post 1931 flight around the world in my twin engine Cessna aircraft. It is hard to believe that was 30 years ago when we made that trip that left out of Oklahoma, with several stops on the east coast, then in Europe, and then in the Soviet Union. Wiley Post had my plane beat on the travel time. He did his in 8 days; it took me 16 days.

Looking back, I am not sure how Tom Quinn and I survived those stops in the Soviet Union. I remember praying: Lord, you got more for me to do. Get me out of this mess.

Fighting far-left environmentalists, it is no shock to anyone that the Washington Post has dubbed me public enemy No. 1 for radical environmentalists for decades now.

For much of my time in the Senate, I was chair and ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. Throughout that time, I pushed back against the Obama administration's far-left policies designed to upend the—sought to upend the lives of Oklahomans, like the Paris climate agreement, the waters of the United States rule, the Clean Power Plan, and many others. These policies were really about giving Washington bureaucrats sweeping control over the lives of millions of Americans. We are debating a lot of these same issues today, and I expect these disagreements will continue into the future.

Lastly, I want to take a second to say thank you to all of my current and former staff. They are hanging around out here now. I didn't get much work out of them today. They were pretty busy, but my staff knows that once they leave my office, they always have a place here. We have become very close. We don't have people who leave; they become friends.

I lovingly call my former staff the Has-Beens. It is something of a mark of honor. And to all of you, thank you. You are all about to be Has-Beens.

Most importantly, to my family: I love you.

When Kay and I got married 63 years ago, I could never imagine I would be standing here today with 20 kids and grandkids saying goodbye.

Thank you to all you guys for all you have done all these years, and thank you for putting up with me.

To Kay, my best friend and rock, I can never put into words what you mean to me.

Finally, I want to say to the people of Oklahoma that I really thank you for what you have done for me all these years. Thank you very much. I love you guys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES M. INHOFE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I just want to congratulate our friend from Oklahoma on an extraordinary career of service to his State and to our country, and I will be having a lot more to say about the senior Senator from Oklahoma a little later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to the say a few words about my colleague and friend and my battle buddy, Senator JIM INHOFE.

It has been a great honor to serve beside JIM. I am grateful—we are all grateful—for the legacy of his service he leaves in this Chamber.

For three decades, Senator INHOFE has served on the Armed Services Committees, from his time as a Member of the House of Representatives to his role in the Senate.

For more than 20 years, I have had the privilege to serve with him on the Senate Armed Services Committee—in turn, each of us serving as chairman and ranking member. Together, we have produced nearly two dozen National Defense Authorization Acts, traveled to combat zones and military posts around the world, and worked to support our men and women in uniform. No one could have had a better partner in those endeavors.

We both served in the Army earlier in our lives, and I know JIM carried out his deep sense of responsibility to our troops in the Senate each day. He never forgot that what we do here ultimately is executed by young men and women in the uniform of the United States. He never broke faith with those young men and women who wear that uniform, and the American military is stronger and the United States is safer because of JIM INHOFE.

I am especially proud that the Armed Services Committee voted to name this year's Defense bill the ''James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act.'' It is a fitting tribute and honor.

JIM is an extraordinary leader whose legislative skills and boundless capacity for hard work are unmatched, and he is a firm and fierce advocate for the people of Oklahoma. He has made sure that they benefit from his hard work and his great efforts, and he has done it with unswerving honesty and integrity.

Senator INHOFE, thank you for your leadership and dedication to the committee and the Senate and particularly the men and women of the Armed Forces. You have been a wonderful partner and colleague, and I believe I speak for the committee and the entire Senate when I say we will miss you dearly. Your steady, unselfish leadership will continue to help guide our Nation in the years ahead, and I wish you and Kay and the family much happiness as you plan for a well-deserved retirement.

May we all strive for the wisdom, courage, and humility that Senator JIM INHOFE imparted upon this great Nation and this distinguished Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Oklahoma, I can't tell you what an honor it has been to be able to serve with my senior Senator.

JIM INHOFE has for decades served our State. He has been reelected over and over and over again because the people of our State know he loves them, know he cares about them. They trust him in some very hard decisions that had to be made in this place, and they know JIM INHOFE has been there for our State.

I jokingly say—and Senator INHOFE mentioned his passion for infrastructure and for the U.S. military—that when I run into somebody who is griping about the construction traffic that they are currently sitting in, I will jokingly say to them: Well, blame that on JIM INHOFE because that new road, that new place, that new infrastructure has been his passion all along to be able to make sure our State and our Nation, quite frankly, continue to be able to advance.

In the days ahead, Senator INHOFE will be dearly missed in our State. There is not a town that I go to as I travel around our State that they don't ask me: What are we going to do when Senator INHOFE retires? Not one. They are all grateful, and they are all spoiled by Senator INHOFE's service to them.

But I can't tell you how excited my wife Cindy and I are for him and Kay getting time together because they have sacrificed much for our Nation and for our State for decades, and I am excited for them to be able to finally get some time to be able to wake up every day and to be able to see each other and, quite frankly, for JIM to not have to be in yet another vote-a-rama all night voting, that he can actually spend his time with Kay.

So if I can say for the State of Oklahoma, we are grateful for JIM INHOFE. We are grateful for the legacy he has left for our State. We are grateful for his firm conservative stand that he has taken year after year after year. We wish him very well in retirement and are very excited to still continue to be able to walk with him in the days ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Illinois.

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, my office recently received a message from a woman named Amanda. She lives in Illinois and the Chicagoland area. She tells me that she and her wife Cally will be celebrating their fifth anniversary as a married couple. The two of them have actually been together for 8 years, but after the Supreme Court's 2015 decision in Obergefell, they decided it was time to tie the knot.

That ruling affirmed their love and, just as important, their constitutional right. The Court declared that their right to marry is a fundamental liberty under the Constitution—for every American, regardless of sexual orientation. So in 2017, Amanda and her wife Cally exercised that right, and today they are the proud parents of two beautiful young children: a daughter, Austin, and a son, Wren.

Really, that should be the end of the story. With Obergefell, Amanda and her wife were guaranteed the same rights as me and my wife, and it should be the beginning of a new story: a loving couple who can now focus on their family and taking care of their day-to-day responsibilities: paying the bills, feeding the kids, navigating life as working parents.

But, sadly, Amanda and many others are now living in fear. Like millions of Americans, she is facing the very real prospect that this Supreme Court could soon rule that her right to marry the person she loves is not protected by the Constitution. She saw what this radical, far-right Supreme Court did with the Dobbs decision just a few months ago, the decision that erased the constitutional right for the women of America to make their own reproductive health choices; and now she and Cally are wondering: Will they come for our rights to marry next?

Amanda wrote to my office:

> Justice Clarence Thomas, in his concurring opinion in [Dobbs] . . . wrote that the court ''should reconsider all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including Griswold, Lawrence, and Obergefell.''

She said:

> For the first time in our history, Americans are facing the loss of civil rights—

by this Supreme Court.

> Our two young children are growing up in a world where they may, [and] in some cases [do], have less rights—

fewer rights—

> than their parents and grandparents.

Amanda tells me she and her wife are taking every legal step they can to ''ensure that our recognition as parents to our own children cannot be challenged. This is emotionally and financially taxing,'' she said, ''and yet, something that we feel we must do.''

There are more than 700,000 married same-sex couples in America, couples like Amanda and Cally, whose love and legal status were recognized under the law and protected by a Supreme Court decision in Obergefell; couples who, along with their friends and families, are demanding the Senate do what we should have done years ago: codify marriage equality.

We can put their minds at ease before Justice Thomas and the far-right majority even have a chance to rip away yet another fundamental freedom. And this is not an abstract exercise. Early next month, the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments in a case called 303 Creative LLC v. Elenis. It is a case that, apparently, is concerned with free speech, involving a website designer in Colorado who wants to build wedding websites but with the disclaimer that proudly announces she will not build websites for same-sex couples.

She sued the State of Colorado, demanding the right to boast about her plans to discriminate against LGBTQ Americans. Such a disclaimer would violate a State's civil rights law, which prohibits business from discriminating or intending to discriminate against someone on the basis of their sexual orientation.

If the Supreme Court's last term and the Dobbs decision are any indication, this radical far-right majority on the Court could very well use this case to start the erosion of protections of LGBTQ Americans. It is exactly the kind of judicial activism that we have come to expect from this current Court's conservative majority.

Remember when they boasted about the fact that Donald Trump was going to put on three Justices who would rule his way in future cases? It was pretty clear from that day forward that the Supreme Court had a political bent. The Federalist Society had to give its stamp of approval.

The Federalist Society is a multi-million-dollar political arm of the Republican Party. And before any judicial nominee had a chance in my Senate Judiciary Committee under the Republican days, they had to get the approval of the Federalist Society.

The Federalist Society, from the start, was setting out to eliminate a woman's right to choose. They had their victory in the Dobbs decision.

But the American people spoke on November 8. Overwhelmingly, they said across America: You can't get away with eliminating rights already established under the Constitution for any American.

I hope that that sentiment grows and, eventually, we reverse the Dobbs decision.

What we have seen is exactly the kind of judicial activism we can come to expect from the Court's conservative majority. They twist the law and set aside longstanding precedent to establish the policies they prefer.

It is not the Supreme Court's role to make the laws. How many times have we heard that speech from Republicans? We don't want judicial activists, they say. That job of making the laws belongs in Congress.

And today we can defend families like Amanda's by voting for the Respect for Marriage Act, which passed just a few moments ago here on the floor of the Senate with a strong bipartisan vote.

It will protect marriage equality under the Federal law, not just for LGBTQ couples but also interracial couples, whose rights could also be in peril by the Court's far right majority.

The issue of marriage equality is too important to get bogged down in partisanship, which is why this bill is a bipartisan compromise. I hope that getting 60 votes for the Respect for Marriage Act is going to be an indication of more cooperation to guarantee that Amanda and Cally do not have to lose sleep over the future that they have as loving individuals married to one another and parents.

In last week's election, the American people sent a clear message to Washington and to the Senate: Get it together. Work together. No more toxic culture wars. No more divisive rhetoric. No more Big Lie. Enough.

If you want to stand for family values, let's start by enacting protections for every family in America. We can do it, certainly, with the Respect for Marriage Act, and even more.

To Amanda and Cally, I would like to say, happy fifth anniversary. I hope that by the time your sixth anniversary comes around, you won't even have to think twice about whether your rights are secure.

RSV

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, as we head into the holiday season, parents and doctors nationwide are concerned about a dramatic surge in an illness called RSV, a respiratory virus. It can be especially serious for children and older Americans.

As a parent, there is no more terrifying or helpless feeling than knowing that your baby is sick. I know. I lived it.

Caitlyn Berg experienced that fear recently, too, when her 6-month-old daughter became ill with RSV and was struggling to breathe. The Bergs live in Mount Zion, IL, a small town downstate, near Springfield. Caitlyn Berg scoured the area looking for a hospital that would cure her sick daughter. After many frantic calls, she finally decided Springfield was the closest town with a hospital. She took her baby there and waited 8 hours in the emergency room before a bed finally opened up for her daughter.

Caitlyn Berg, incidentally, is a pediatrician. If a pediatrician has to struggle to find hospital care for her own sick infant, imagine the panic and fear other parents feel when their babies are struggling to breathe because of RSV. And it isn't just a problem in small towns or rural America.

Chicago is the third largest city in our country, with some of the best hospitals in the world, including some of the very best children's hospitals. The rate of emergency room visits for young children with RSV is now 10 times higher than in 2019—10 times higher than a normal season 3 years ago.

This chart demonstrates that. Look at this spike. As you can see, the number of children admitted for RSV has skyrocketed. In Chicago alone, there are hundreds of new cases each week, and nearly a dozen kids each day are being hospitalized.

Earlier this month, Comer Children's Hospital at the University of Chicago was full, with no beds for 53 straight days. And Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago is also running at full capacity. Ninety-five percent of pediatric ICU beds across Illinois are full during this time.

This crush on pediatric hospitals isn't limited to Illinois. Over the border in Franklin, IN, little Ophelia—you can see her here in the bed—struggled to breathe after contracting RSV at preschool. She went to the local hospital, and they transferred her to the

large children's hospital in Indianapolis, where she was intubated for 5 days. Thankfully, she is home safely now and recovered.

Across the country, children's hospitals are being pushed to the limit, caring for infants, toddlers, and young kids sickened by RSV. In extreme cases, kids and babies may require ventilators to breathe.

The timing of this surge in RSV is especially concerning, coming from the worst flu season in a decade and while new COVID variants are circulating. Those three viral variants together pose what many health professionals argue could be a ''triple-demic'' of viral illness. So let's look for solutions.

The Children's Hospital Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics has asked this President to issue an emergency declaration to free up more resources. I support them.

At the top of the list, America desperately needs more nurses, more doctors, more staff. Hospitals plagued with worker shortage even before COVID now have a pandemic that made the crisis even worse. If our children's hospitals had more staff, they could immediately open more beds to treat the kids.

Congress made some headway in the American Rescue Plan, which passed on the floor of the Senate without the support of a single Republican Senator. It included my provision to invest $1 billion in the National Health Service Corps for scholarships and loan repayments for new nurses and doctors who serve in urban and rural areas in need.

But we need to do more to end the healthcare worker shortage. Senators MENENDEZ, BOOZMAN, and SCHUMER have a bipartisan plan, which I support. It increases funding for medical residency slots to train the next generation of doctors, nurses, and other medical professionals. I support putting that plan in the end-of-the-year package we will consider in the next few weeks.

It is also critical that we fund our public health system adequately and provide for data collection so we can track RSV. The HELP Committee has been working on this priority, and I certainly support their efforts.

We are all in this together. The hospitals are doing their best. Doctors and nurses are working extra-long shifts to keep kids safe. We all need to do our part, too. For all of us, that means staying home when we are sick, still washing our hands, getting COVID booster and flu shots. For those of us in Congress, it also means providing the resources to get safely through this current surge of RSV and building the strong public health infrastructure that American families require.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I have spoken repeatedly about the many ways my Democratic colleagues' crusade for power has been disastrous for the American people. We have recordbreaking inflation, a chaotic southern border, and the collapsing energy industry. This is the world that the Democrats created in just 2 short years.

What is worse, this Democrat-led government has ignored the ripple effects of their reckless agenda in favor of maintaining a political narrative about progress. But to Tennesseans and to so many Americans, it feels like the country is not moving forward; it is moving backward.

I have come to the floor again today to talk about the ripple effects of the COVID–19 vaccine mandate that threatens to gut the ranks of the U.S. military. This body has had multiple chances to avert disaster, and each time the Democrats have decided to take the wrong path.

I introduced two amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act that would have kept politics out of the military's use of vaccines. They are simple. Each amendment is about one page long. The first of these would have prohibited involuntary separation of any servicemember for refusing the COVID–19 vaccine until each service achieves its authorized end strength.

You see, it makes absolutely no sense that we would be removing people from military service simply because they do not get a shot—a shot, by the way, that does not prevent you from getting COVID.

Now, the second amendment would make sure that members of the National Guard or Reserve maintain access to both pay and benefits while their request for an accommodation—a medical accommodation or religious beliefs accommodation—is pending. But, of course, my Democratic colleagues have blocked these two amendments. They are common sense. They protect our men and women in the military.

But it is my plan to offer them another opportunity to do the right thing. I have combined these amendments into a bill. That bill is called the Preserving the Readiness of our Armed Forces Act. It is filed. It is ready for more cosponsors. I am also going to give them another opportunity. When the NDAA finally comes to the floor, they are going to have the opportunity to consider these two amendments, and I am asking my colleagues to support me in this. I stand by my call to Leader SCHUMER to bring the NDAA to the floor for a vote and hope that my Democratic colleagues will change course and support these two amendments to protect our men and women in uniform.

But, right now, the ripple effect is seen as another reckless power play by this administration and their Department of Defense.

I went into detail earlier this week about how this would hamper the readiness of the U.S. military, and I want to focus on the death blow today that this has dealt to our recruitment. Keep in mind that this is information that is available to each and every Member of this Chamber. My Democratic colleagues have this information.

Here is what we have to consider: the number of new servicemembers who are joining the military is, right now—right now—at an all-time low. Academy applications for our military academies are also at an all-time low.

See, even high school students know something is wrong with this picture. So they are not sitting there thinking: ''I want to go to West Point'' or ''I want to go to Annapolis'' or ''I want to go to the Air Force.'' They are not thinking that. What they are saying is, Why is the military focused on all this other stuff other than on their core mission—keeping this country safe?

Now, again, statistics prove the point.

The Army has fallen 15,000 soldiers short of their goal for 2022, and they don't expect this situation to improve. In 2023, they think they are going to be 21,000 troops short. I want you to think about this. Think about what we are facing, whether it is attacks from the axis of evil—Russia, China, Iran, North Korea—or whether it is China's aggressiveness.

Think about this. Think about the difference that 10,000 troops, 15,000 troops, 21,000 troops make, and then ask yourself, why is it that men and women, citizens of this country, are not wanting to raise their hand and take the oath to protect and defend? If you are honest with yourself, you know that a big part of the problem is the way the military has been treated over the last couple of years.

We didn't have this problem previously. This is a problem that has been made for our military, for this Nation's security. It has been made by this administration.

The National Guard is missing their recruitment goals. Why is that? Could it be that having to take a shot—and bear in mind, it is not a vaccine like a polio vaccine or other vaccines; it is a shot for a certain strain of COVID. What you have is a Department of Defense that is willing to say ''You are fired'' to people who have volunteered to serve this country, and they are going to do it over a shot. They don't expect anybody running over the southern border illegally, I might add, to have the shot, but they expect members of the U.S. military, students at our academies, those who are on Active Duty, those who are reservists, those who are in the National Guard to get this even though President Biden has said the pandemic is over—it is over.

So you have to ask, why is it that they are continuing to beat down on the military? Why are they willing to pummel them over a shot? Why are they not willing to put the NDAA on the floor? We have done it for 61 years. Are we going to miss on year 62? Why is it not a priority? Could it possibly be that the NDAA is not a priority for my

Democratic colleagues, that the men and women in uniform protecting them and their families are not a priority? Could it be it is not at the top of their to-do list?

The choice to enter military service is a serious choice. It is a choice that people do not make lightly. But this hesitancy to serve should raise alarm bells in this Chamber. Looking at these numbers that are falling so far short of our recruitment goals, our retention goals, should ring some alarm bells. It is symptomatic of a much larger problem.

The past few years haven't been easy for anyone, but we all have the benefit of hindsight. We all have the benefit of lessons learned. But it appears that some people are just not willing to learn from those lessons, and anyone willing to be honest about how the Democrats have handled this can see two things pretty clearly:

First, turning the debate over the COVID vaccine into political warfare—that is a choice that the Democrats in this Chamber, the Democrats in Washington, DC, and this administration—that is a choice that they have made. Let's take this vaccine mandate, and let's turn it into political warfare.

Secondly, getting political about this particular vaccine or shot, as it is, in the context of military readiness—that was a choice; I might add, a very bad, a very inappropriate choice. The military is supposed to be apolitical. Servicemembers count on that when they sign up to serve, when they raise their hand, when they take that oath, but now punditry drives policy at the Pentagon, and this has eroded trust between the military, the servicemembers, and their families.

The Democrats are in charge of the Senate. If they had allowed it, we could have had an honest debate about my two amendments. As I said, they are each about one page long. They are there specifically to protect our men and women in uniform, to say we have to have them serve. We lost 5,700 to this COVID mandate. We are short—I have given you the numbers—15,000 this year and 21,000 for next year. That is what we are short. Recruitment is low. We are not hitting our marks there. Signing up for our military academies—the numbers are the lowest ever. We are not hitting the mark there. Why is it? Be honest with yourself and ask yourself, what has caused this change in attitude? You know, if you are honest with yourself, if the President were honest with himself, he could rescind that mandate. That would be a very good thing. But to ignore reality and pretend that these low recruitment numbers, these firings, these retention numbers are all OK—it is unconscionable.

It is time for my colleagues—my Democratic colleagues—to stop ignoring the reality, stop ignoring the ripple effects of their political agenda before it puts our Nation and our military in danger.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I want to share some words of wisdom with my colleagues. These words of wisdom come from 13 former top civilian and military leaders. I am going to start with the list of eight former Defense Secretaries: Dr. Ashton Carter, recently deceased; William Cohen, also a former Senator; Dr. Mark Esper; Dr. Robert Gates; Charles Hagel, also a former Senator; Gen. James Mattis, besides being Secretary of Defense; Leon Panetta, also a former Congressman; and Dr. William Perry. Also added to this list are five former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: GEN Martin Dempsey; GEN Joseph Dunford, Jr.; ADM Michael Mullen; GEN Richard Myers; and GEN Peter Pace. They offer some very sage advice for improving civil-military relations.

Everybody knows where this principle came from of civil control of our military. It happened December 1783 when GEN George Washington surrendered his papers to the Continental Congress and gave up being commander in chief at that particular time.

These words of wisdom appear in an open letter that was published September 6 in a national security blog, and that blog is entitled ''War on the Rocks.''

I intended to speak about this letter at the time that I first read it, but due to our extended recess, I am just now getting to it about 2 months late.

These former leaders warn us about what they call ''extreme strain'' in civil-military relations coming from all directions, and these are the directions that this strain is coming from, affecting civil-military relations: the pandemic, with social disruption; wars that ended with unachieved goals; military withdrawal from Afghanistan; rising great-power rivalries; ''extremely adverse'' political environment caused by the divisiveness of polarization in our American society, evidenced here in the Congress of the United States; and lastly, contested elections and the shaky transfer of power. After listing these points, these defense leaders then predict rising tensions.

This is a red flag that we all ought to observe. Civil-military relations are out of balance.

Although alarming, the open letter is both educational and reassuring. It offers guidance and remedies. Sixteen what they call ''core principles and best practices'' are spotlighted for restoring ''healthy American civil-military relations.'' Most of these remedies hinge on the all-important principle of civilian control of the military.

By the way, I spoke on that very subject from a different angle on July 14 of this year.

The letter that I am referring to views civilian control as I do: ''the bedrock foundation of American democracy.'' It is ultimately ''wielded by the will of the American people as expressed through elections.'' That core constitutional principle keeps our ''powerful standing military'' from threatening democracy.

''Healthy civil-military relations''—those four words are in quotes—''Healthy civil-military relations'' are instrumental to civilian control. They must rest on a rock-solid foundation of ''mutual trust.'' Mutual trust and respect between civilian and military leaders are essential for healthy civil-military relations. They are fostered in part by honest deliberations over policy choices. According to this open letter, mutual trust is cultivated when civilian leaders ''rigorously explore alternatives that are best for the country regardless of the implications for partisan politics.''

A ''dynamic and iterative process'' for policy development helps ''civil-military teams build up a reservoir of trust.'' That extra measure of trust will defuse friction when the military must ''faithfully implement directives that run counter to their professional military preference.''

When tensions rise over disagreement with the Commander in Chief's policy choices, the former Pentagon leaders offer this guidance in their very own words. And this is a fairly long quote:

> Elected (and appointed) civilians have the right to be wrong, meaning they have the right to insist on a policy or direction that proves, in hindsight, to have been a mistake. This right obtains even if other voices warn in advance that the proposed action is a mistake.
>
> Military officials are required to carry out legal orders the wisdom of which they doubt. Civilian officials should provide the military ample opportunity to express their doubts in appropriate venues . . . members of the military accept limits on the public expression of their private views—limits that would be unconstitutional if imposed on other citizens.
>
> Civilian and military officials should also take care to properly characterize military advice in public. Civilian leaders must take responsibility for the consequences of the actions that they direct.

Now, the advice of these former chiefs of staff and former secretaries of defense is honest, it is direct, and squares very much with the Constitution of the United States. The Commander in Chief's orders must be obeyed. The military must refrain from criticizing the President in public. And the President is accountable for policy choices.

On partisan political activities, the former chiefs and secretaries of defense offer a straightforward piece of advice:

> There are significant limits on the public role of military personnel in partisan politics, as outlined in longstanding Defense Department policy and regulations . . . military and civilian leaders must be diligent about keeping military separate from partisan political activities.

The final best practice that they offer us covers the responsibility of military leaders during the transfer of power after Presidential elections. They—meaning the military—have a dual obligation. First, they must assist

the incumbent Commander in Chief in the exercise of his or her constitutional duty. And, second, since the voters choose the new Commander in Chief, they must prepare to assist whomever the voters pick.

They carry out their responsibilities regardless of who sits in the White House. To summarize, this open letter provides sound advice that could help to moderate civil-military strife. It telegraphs a message to the top brass: It is time to hit the reset button and rebalance civil-military relations.

Now, I don't know the motive behind this letter, because there wasn't any indication of it, but the sum of it may be pointed directly at Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Milley. My advice to him: Take their sage advice to heart. A dose of humility burnishes one's integrity. As the Nation's most senior military officer, General Milley has a responsibility to set an example of excellence and cease all partisan political activity. Partisan political activity is harmful to civil-military relations and has the potential for creating dangerous divisions within the ranks of the Armed Forces.

Military personnel must stay out of politics. Period. End of story.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I rise today for my 286th ''Time to Wake Up'' speech, in this case to report back from the United Nations' 27th Conference of the Parties, or COP, the annual meeting where the nations of the world work to combat climate change. The Paris Agreement, for instance, sprang from the COP. Senators CARDIN, MARKEY, and I went to this year's COP in Egypt. Speaker PELOSI led a separate House delegation, and President Biden traveled there with a large executive branch delegation to make some important announcements.

Our Senate delegation met with government officials from many other countries, with American officials, with UN leaders, and with dozens of business leaders, labor leaders, environmental groups, environmental justice advocates, and oceans advocates.

We consistently heard that the work we accomplished right here in this Chamber through the Inflation Reduction Act and by ratifying the Kigali Amendment brought our country back into global leadership on climate. But we know that our work to tackle climate change is not over—not by a long shot.

Emissions from fossil fuel are still growing. 2022 fossil fuel emissions will blow right past previous record highs. Things are not getting better yet; they are getting worse. We need additional ambitious climate policies, both at home and abroad, to reduce those emissions.

And because climate disasters so often fall upon the most vulnerable, particularly in developing nations, we need the wealthier nations and the ultrawealthy corporations responsible for the lion's share of climate upheaval to step up to finance the clean energy transition for those countries.

So, what are the things the United States and other nations should do? At the COP, I spoke a lot about the upcoming European Union carbon border adjustment mechanism, or CBAM. The EU already applies a carbon price to energy-intensive manufactured goods. That is one of the main policies that is driving decarbonization in Europe, and they will start, later this decade, imposing a carbon tariff on goods from countries that don't impose a comparable carbon price on those imported goods.

My message to the COP: The EU CBAM is good policy. It creates an incentive for lower carbon manufacturing, no matter where the goods are produced. The United States should not—I repeat—the United States should not complain about the EU CBAM. Our manufacturers are among the least carbon intensive in the world, and they will pay far lower carbon tariffs than, for instance, Chinese manufacturers. That makes American companies more globally competitive and will move jobs and manufacturing our way to our shores.

So instead of complaining, we should match the EU CBAM or beat it with our own carbon border adjustment plan. And, by the way, we should urge the British and the Canadians and the Japanese and the Australians, anyone else interested in lowering emissions, to do the same. We should all pull together.

The beauty of a well-designed carbon border adjustment is that it prevents cheating by polluters to cross borders and pollute elsewhere for free.

A carbon border adjustment regime will drive decarbonization everywhere—in China, India, and around the world. If their manufacturers want to compete, they will have to reduce their emissions. So, yes, let's meet or beat the EU CBAM, not fear it or resist it.

By the way, when we heard quibbles about our IRA incentives for clean energy and electric vehicles and low carbon manufacturing being unfair to our foreign trading partners, my response was the same: Meet us or beat us. Pass incentives as good as ours or better. Let our IRA be an example that can be replicated around the world. As I mentioned earlier, President Biden came to the COP with ambitious proposals. He unveiled a new EPA proposal to reduce methane emissions from oil and gas production and transport by almost 90 percent.

This is—as President Biden might say—a ''BFD'' as methane emissions are responsible for about 25 percent of observed warming. The EPA proposal is a huge step in the right direction. It would create a new process for third-party monitoring of methane emissions. There are already a number of private and public entities that monitor methane emissions around the world using satellites, aircraft, drones. Utilize this data to quickly identify and eliminate large sources of methane emissions.

We should stand up an enforcement task force to make sure leakers promptly face the best enforcement methods to stop their leaks. Combined with my methane fee, which was adopted into the IRA as the Methane Emission Reduction Program, we now have the platform for the EPA, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, and interested State, local, and tribal authorities to, as they would say in the military, find, fix, and finish methane leak sources.

Given that methane emissions are a global problem, particularly in fossil fuel-producing countries like Russia, I also urged the U.S. and foreign officials with whom we met to stand up an international task force to identify overseas methane emissions and sanction parties, companies, and countries that don't eliminate them.

Buried within EPA's methane proposal is another important announcement, an updated social cost of carbon, pegged at $120 per ton, more than double the Obama-era estimate. This too is a ''BFD.'' But only if the Office of Management and Budget follows up and spreads its use beyond just the EPA and this regulation into rulemaking, procurement, grantmaking, investment decisions, leasing, trade policy, just to name a few. It would be transformative; and given the scale and scope of the Federal Government, it would have the power to move markets.

One note of warning, our success in the United States, as well as in countries around the world, will, in significant ways, be determined by the behavior of big corporations.

Corporate America has built the biggest political influence operation the world has ever seen. It surrounds this building, surrounds us here in Congress. Lobbyists, dark money, trade associations, political contributions, phony think tanks—it is an awesome apparatus, and it is one that corporate America has yet to switch on for climate legislation. They either sit out there doing nothing or they actually oppose it.

Despite often admirable corporate work to decarbonize their own operations and even their supply chains, much of the corporate political apparatus is actually actively hostile to real climate legislation. And on top of that, of course, is the fossil fuel industry's inveterate, ceaseless obstruction machine.

So I was pleased to see the United Nations Secretary General announce new criteria for assessing corporate climate pledges—criteria that will include their lobbying and advocacy behavior. The report states:

[Companies] must align their external policy and engagement efforts, including membership in trade associations, to the goal of

reducing global emissions by at least 50% by 2030 and reaching net zero by 2050. This means lobbying for positive climate action and not lobbying against it. [Companies] should publicly disclose their trade association affiliations. They should encourage their associations to advocate for positive climate action and have an escalation strategy if they do not, including the option of leaving the association if the necessary changes are not made.

I could not agree more. At COP, I repeatedly made the argument that companies should actually be required to file audited climate political footprint statements. Too many companies have been two-faced for too long. That climate political footprint statement should be the ticket that admits companies to COP and to other environmental gatherings.

But instead of corporate transparency about their political activities, more than 600 fossil fuel lobbyists swarmed this COP. Coca-Cola, the world's largest plastics polluter, was a leading sponsor. That ''worst climate obstructor''—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—hosted the big dinner and put on a speech by a fossil fuel services company president. It is hard for people around the world to take COPs seriously when the fossil fuel industry and other large polluters have such a prominent presence at the COP and they haven't had to even disclose their political efforts to undermine that very COP.

Instead of welcoming the big polluters to COPs, we should hold them accountable for the damages their pollution is causing. A windfall profits clawback on global excess fuel profits, just like the conservative Tories did in the UK, could help fund remediation, transition, and adaptation efforts in developing countries. It is a commonsense principle that polluters should pay for the harm that they cause.

At the end, I left this COP with a sense of pride that the Senate and the U.S. Government are finally getting going on climate, but also a sense of the awesome difficulty of the task ahead to bend that global emissions curve, to hit nature's emissions reduction targets.

Our work is not close to done. In fact, it has only just begun. After decades of delay, deliberately caused by the fossil fuel industry's multibillion-dollar campaign of denial and obstruction, we are now in a marathon that we will have to run as a sprint. But this past year proved that we are finally up and running, and the announcements at COP will pick up our laggard pace. Our joints may be stiff from disuse, our breathing may be ragged from years of lassitude on the couch, but we have at last begun to run. And, boy, does it feel good. We will only speed up and do better. Powered by the energy and enthusiasm of legions of young voters, we are, I dare to say, at last coming awake.

I will close with this last slide which shows how important it is to see this as a global problem.

Those are emissions from China, from the United States, from India, and from the EU. When you add them up, you see the global figure. If we address each of these or just our own, it does not help enough to avoid the consequences of that continuing upward emissions trajectory.

So that is where an internal social cost of carbon that cuts across every aspect of government, buttressed by a carbon border adjustment of the world's major economies—that is what can drive that line down and put us on a pathway to safety.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Washington.

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight to urge my colleagues to support the Respect for Marriage Act. Today, we took an important step by passing the procedural hurdle to make sure that marriage equality is put into law.

This legislation would ensure that both the Federal and State Governments will continue to recognize all marriages and continue to not discriminate based on gender, sexual orientation, national origin, ethnicity or race. These are strong protections that are long overdue.

I understand some of my colleagues do not see a need for passing this legislation, but I would ask them to stand in the shoes of someone in a marriage that is in danger of being dissolved overnight by a court decision. The same rationale for overturning Roe v. Wade can be used in this landmark Supreme Court decision we just saw that could erode further privacy rights and be used in same-sex marriages.

While marriage equality is constitutionally protected today, the Supreme Court's reasoning in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization indicated the Court is open to reconsidering cases that determine certain fundamental rights are protected under the equal protection and due process clause of the 14th Amendment.

I believe it is our job here in the Senate to represent the voice of our constituents, and those voices are loud and clear. An overwhelming majority of Americans support marriage equality. According to a Gallup poll, 71 percent of Americans approve of same-sex marriage. In September, over 220 businesses, representing more than 8.5 million employees, called on the U.S. Senate to pass this legislation.

And this was not a bill that garnered support from just a few Republicans for the sake of calling it bipartisan. Forty-seven Republicans and over 20 percent of the House GOP Members recognized that this should be enshrined into law and supported the legislation. It passed the House by a large majority—267 to 157.

Americans support this bill. Businesses support this bill. And now some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have taken the step to also support this legislation.

The State of Washington was one of the first 10 States to legalize same-sex marriage and did so by a vote of the people.

I recently received a letter from a constituent from Everett, WA, saying that she and her wife moved to Washington in 2016 because ''they needed to be somewhere where our rights would be protected in the event that they would be threatened.''

She said: ''As soon as I arrived in Washington, I felt like I had come home.''

Marriage equality has been protected under Washington State law for a decade. It has been protected by the Supreme Court for 7 years, and yet, here in the Senate, there are some who don't believe that we need to take further protections.

At least 11.5 million people in this country are in an interracial or same-sex marriage. That is no less than 20 percent of all marriages in the United States.

With a number like that, we all know someone in one of those marriages, whether they are our friends, our neighbors, our colleagues. We know that we need to give them the same certainty, and we know that codifying marriage equality into law, they will not be in jeopardy of losing those rights.

Same-sex and interracial couples deserve the assurance that their marriage will be recognized. They need to know that they will continue to enjoy the freedom and privileges that are afforded to other couples, and we need to make sure that this is for generations to come.

The American people want this legislation passed, and I urge my colleagues to come together and support this very important Respect for Marriage Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Respect for Marriage Act, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

I come from a State that has long been at the cutting edge of progress. Minnesota began protecting LGBTQ people against workplace discrimination in 1993. At that time, it was the first and only State in the Nation to outlaw discrimination based on gender identity. And two decades later, in 2013, we became the 12th State to legalize marriage equality.

Across the country, as we know, many States have made advances. Today, 23 States have laws protecting people from discrimination based on

sexual orientation or gender identity. And in 2015, the Supreme Court recognized that the U.S. Constitution guarantees same-sex couples the right to marry.

But as far as we have come, we still have miles to go until LGBTQ Americans can live their lives with freedom, authenticity, and equality. And we must also make sure that we protect the progress we make.

From what happened recently with the Dobbs decision, as we know, rights that people take for granted—nearly 50 years of Roe v. Wade—can vanish with one mark of a pen, with one signature on a piece of paper.

In fact, when it comes to gay marriage, when it comes to the protections granted by the Obergefell case—it was actually raised in one of the Justice's written opinions—we know that this is on the chopping block.

That is why, when a Supreme Court Justice signals that the hard-won legal protection for marriage equality could be on that chopping block, putting the legal rights of countless married couples and families in jeopardy, we felt—a number of Republicans and Democrats—on a bipartisan basis, that we had to step in. That is why we are here.

The way I see it, all three branches of government have a responsibility to protect people's rights. This is why our system of government was set up this way brilliantly. If one branch doesn't do its job, then it is up to another to step in. Yes, it is a system of checks and balances. Checks. If someone's power is out of control, as I believe happened here—out of the mainstream, out of consistency with the American people—that is a check. That is why we have it this way.

That is why you are seeing today—thanks to the leadership of our friends Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator BALDWIN, Senator COLLINS, Senator SINEMA, Senator PORTMAN, Senator TILLIS, and so many others—that we have reached a bipartisan agreement to move this bill forward.

As you know, in July, the House of Representatives passed the Respect for Marriage Act to protect marriage equality. They did that on a bipartisan basis as well. Forty-seven Republicans voted for that bill in the House of Representatives.

For our Senate bill, I will note that the bipartisan text also has broad support from faith-based organizations to more than 250 businesses, including Minnesota's own Target and Best Buy.

We have before us a bill that requires States and the Federal Government to respect marriages legally entered into in other States, regardless of the sex or the race of the people who are married.

This is the kind of bill that should get 100 votes. It is about equality; it is about dignity; and it is about love. It is about saying that we won't go back to the days when a patchwork of State laws determined whether the union of two people who loved each other would be recognized by their government; that we won't go back to the days when a gay soldier, killed on the battlefield, was denied the honor and the respect of an official notification of next of kin. And we won't go back to the days of hospital patients being left to spend their final moments alone without the person they love most by their side.

This bipartisan vote today, and the one that we will have in the coming days, is about, no, we will not go backward. We will not go backward in this Chamber. We will not follow the way that the Supreme Court has been going when it comes to folding back rights and denying rights. That is not what America is about.

We should all be able to agree that States shouldn't be able to discriminate against people based on whom they love. This bill gives each and every one of my colleagues the opportunity to make that statement.

We know that there is more to be done to make sure all Americans are entitled to equal protections under the law, but this is an important step toward ensuring that no American experiences discrimination because of whom they love.

This is a great moment. It is a wonderful moment because my colleagues were able to reach an agreement across the aisle. It is a wonderful moment because we are fulfilling our constitutional duty of checks and balances. It is a moment of joy.

We have to remember that sometimes in our job, we have these moments that actually people say thank you for what you just did. They stop you in an airport, as the Presiding Officer knows, and say thank you. A lot of people are going to be saying that this week because they know this is the right thing to do, regardless of people's political views, regardless of their religious beliefs. It is why we are so proud that so many religious organizations are supporting this bill.

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

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

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM RESTORATION ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, 29 years ago today—29 years ago today—President Bill Clinton signed into law a bill sponsored by then-Representative CHUCK SCHUMER that has aided in the defense of protection of one of the most fundamental freedoms that we have in our Nation; that freedom, religious freedom. The bill was called the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act passed by Congress today, 29 years ago, found that government should not substantially burden religious exercise without a compelling justification. It was truly a landmark piece of legislation to be able to add further protections to individuals who have religious liberty differences. And we have wide variations of religious expressions in the United States. It is part of what makes us such a unique nation. It is that we guard the rights of every individual to not have to believe the same as the government believes or not even have to believe the same as your next-door neighbor believes but to have the right to freely have a faith of your choosing, to change your faith at any point, if you choose to, or to have no faith at all and be respected as an American; quite frankly, to be protected as an American.

This landmark piece of legislation, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, has not been altered in the 29 years since it has been passed. The purpose of the act was to restore a compelling interest test to be able to make sure that if government acted in any way to affect anyone's religious liberty, there had to be a compelling reason for that from the government to guarantee its application in all cases where free exercise of religion is substantially burdened and provide a claim or defense for those whose religious exercise is substantially burdened by government.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act doesn't pick winners and losers. It provides a balancing test. The government may burden someone's religious exercise only if the burden is in furtherance of a compelling government interest and is the least restrictive means of furthering that compelling government interest. Twenty-nine years ago today.

Then, today, my colleagues moved forward on a bill that, instead of promoting equality for all people of all opinions, it specifically highlights areas of religious faith differences and says their opinions won't count this time.

It deals with this issue of marriage, which has been a controversial issue in America but was, quite frankly—since 2015 in the Obergefell decision in the Supreme Court, there have been no cases moved in the country to deny same-sex marriage to any individual in any State across the Nation.

Today, my colleagues moved forward on a bill to open up debate—without amendment, may I add—on a bill that would certainly affect the religious liberty of countless people across the country. That is not just my opinion. Religious liberty organizations from all faiths and from all backgrounds have already been speaking out on this issue. Just in the last 24 hours, the Alliance Defending Freedom, the American Association of Christian Schools, CatholicVote, the Center for Urban Renewal and Education, the Centennial Institute, the Christian Employers Alliance, Concerned Women for America, Eagle Forum, Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, the Faith and Freedom Coalition, the Family Research Council, the Family Policy Alliance,

The Heritage Foundation, the Liberty Counsel, Lifeline Children's Services, the National Religious Broadcasters, Religious Freedom Institute, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, and the Ethics and Public Policy Center have all spoken out and said this bill that is currently on the floor of the Senate will damage religious liberty.

Religious institutions are rising up, reading the text of this bill, rather than just listening to the debate of this bill, and saying: There is a problem here.

Practically, what would this mean? Practically, what could this mean?

I would say, first and foremost, we don't want anyone to be discriminated against in America—anyone to be discriminated against in America. All individuals should be honored. All individuals should be able to live their lives in freedom in America. But, practically, this bill puts faith-based child welfare organizations who are operating in accordance with their sincerely held religious beliefs, namely, to place children in loving families—it puts them in jeopardy.

While some of my colleagues may say, Well, that is farfetched, may I remind you, the Supreme Court has already handed down a decision in Fulton and would remind us this is continuing to happen. Catholic Charities has been shut out of the child welfare system in Illinois, in DC, in California, and in Massachusetts already, and then this bill is coming.

Let me tell you some of the problems with the bill because I have had individuals tell me about what they say is in the bill, and then I actually pull the text of the bill out and show it to them and say: Show me where that is in the bill. And their response to me typically is: Well, that is the intent of the bill.

Well, we don't deal with intent here in Congress; we deal with legislation and text. The words matter in this, and the words in this do not provide the level of religious liberty protections, as many on this floor who have come to debate this say that is actually in this bill.

Let me give you just some simple examples of this. This bill gives a private right of action for both—well, I should say gives protections from the Attorney General to be able to file charges against an individual that shows discrimination or a private right of action for an individual to be able to sue another individual or entity in this, unless the discrimination is for religious liberty. They are peculiarly left out.

If there is discrimination against someone's religious liberty issues and their personal beliefs or their entity's beliefs, they don't get this same private right of action. So the private right of action only goes against people that have religious objections. Those religious individuals, if they are discriminated against, are on their own. They get no protections in this bill.

The bill itself, I have heard individuals say: Well, it has a section in it that is literally titled ''No Impact on Religious Liberty and Conscience.'' So that is the big, nice title of that section, section 6 of the bill. So let me read section 6 of this bill to you.

The first part of it, section (a), says:

> Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to diminish or abrogate a religious liberty or conscience protection otherwise available to an individual or organization under the Constitution of the United States or Federal law.

Now, that has got to be the biggest ''no duh'' statement out there. This piece of legislation doesn't overturn the Constitution is what it says. That is an unnecessary statement on it. Of course the Constitution stands above it.

The second part of this, in part (b), says, basically, a rabbi, an imam, or a pastor is not compelled to perform a marriage ceremony that they are religiously opposed to. That is the whole religious liberty section of it—the whole section. First, it says it doesn't overturn the Constitution, and, second, it says pastors, imams, rabbis don't have to perform religious weddings that they are personally religiously opposed to.

That doesn't help. In fact, there is a qualifying feature in the middle of all this in that section, section 6, which limits the individuals that would even get any kind of protections on this by saying ''whose principal purpose is the study, practice, or advancement of religion,'' meaning an individual would first have to prove that your principal purpose is to study, practice, or advance religion before you even got those exceptions.

Why is that important? Well, I asked some of the sponsors of this bill why that particular piece of text is in there, and their explanation was, well, because we didn't want to include, for protections on religious liberty, private individuals and their personal religious expression or private businesses; that maybe the owners of that business have a personal religious belief in how they carry out their business, but they would not have religious protections because they are not principally a religious organization. So they do not get a defense. They don't get a private right of action to defend themselves. They just have to cave to the religious beliefs of this law.

Twenty-nine years ago, this Congress said we were not going to impose beliefs onto people. Today, this Congress said: If you are a faith-based individual and you have a difference of conscience about marriage, too bad. You have to prove you are a principally religious organization to have an exception; an individual doesn't count. A private business is specifically excluded.

In section 7 of this bill—I have had several of the sponsors who have told me: Section 7 covers everything else. It makes sure it protects nonprofits. It makes sure it protects all of your tax-exempt status, your grants—it is all in there. Until you read the text. No, those words are in there, but there are two big qualifiers that are also in that section.

The first of the qualifiers begins with ''Nothing in this Act . . . shall be construed to deny or alter'' the benefits, meaning if it is in something else, that is not protected. It has to be something specifically in this act.

The second thing is the very end of this. It gives a long section on this.

> Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to deny or alter any benefit, status . . .

It goes on to explain some of these things, and then it ends with this:

> Provided such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage.

That is the qualifier:

> Provided such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage.

Now, I have handed this around and asked legal counsel: Explain to me what that means. And the first response that I get is: Well, that is a clear protection for individuals that are married that if there is any right given to any other married couple, they get the same right.

And I was like, that makes total sense. What about for entities, because the word ''entity'' is in this list?

And that is where it gets fuzzy because it has this qualifier:

> Provided such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage.

We don't know how that is going to be interpreted for entities. So it is left for the courts to decide in the days ahead how that is going to be interpreted.

So what has been done with this? All these things have been brought up. We have had this text now for about 36 hours. It literally just got dropped on us. So for about 36 hours we have been going through it—and it is not long; it is three pages—asking questions: How does it work? What happens with it?

Several individuals have said: Hey, this is a real problem for religious liberty. We should fix this.

And others have said: Yeah, that is a good idea. Let's make sure that it is actually clear—except, now that the debate has started, amendments have been shut out. There are no amendments. All of these gaps that I talk about for individuals, for small businesses, for individuals of conscience, for the right to be able to protect yourself if you are facing religious discrimination on this, for the limiting portions in this act or from explaining ''not arising from a marriage,'' what that may mean, the issue of principal purpose and not having to prove your principal purpose, in a court of law, is a religious issue—everyone seems to nod their head and say: Oh, yeah, those are problems.

Multiple Members have brought amendments and said: Let's fix it. Yet they are being told over and over again: No amendments. We are not going to fix it.

You know what that tells me? These are not mistakes in the drafting. This was purposeful. That is what that tells me.

Listen, I believe the rights of every individual should be honored, but this is not choosing to be able to protect the rights of every individual. This is saying some people are more equal than others. That is a problem.

After the Obergefell decision was made, President Obama spoke to the Nation. He supported the Obergefell decision from the Supreme Court, but then he said this:

> I know that Americans of goodwill continue to hold a wide range of views on this issue. Opposition in some cases has been based on sincere and deeply held beliefs. All of us who welcome today's news should be mindful of that fact; recognize different viewpoints; revere our deep commitment to religious freedom.

Great words that seem to be on the cutting room floor today. It hasn't taken long for President Obama's statement after the Obergefell decision to say: Never mind.

This is fixable, but when people see the problem and the issue with it and choose to ignore it, I have to ask why.

Twenty-nine years ago today, President Clinton signed into law the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and 29 years later, Congress is saying: Never mind.

I find that a problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MEDICAL MARIJUANA AND CANNABIDIOL RESEARCH EXPANSION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before the Senate finishes this evening, there is one more important piece of legislation we are passing today, which I want to tout: the Medical Marijuana and Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act.

I have to give great credit to Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator SCHATZ. They have championed this legislation and worked hard to see that it has gotten support of all the Senators. It would eliminate the red-tape that hinders cannabis research, opening the door for new, innovative treatments derived from cannabis.

Now, if you are one of the millions of Americans who deal with conditions like Parkinson's or epilepsy or post-traumatic stress, or any number of other conditions, cannabis might hold promising new options for managing these diseases, but we need to do research first. And the Federal government, sadly, has been woefully behind the times on this front.

This bill will help fix that and, equally important, I hope that after passing this bill, the Senate can make progress on other cannabis legislation too. I am still holding productive talks with Democratic and Republican colleagues in the House and the Senate on moving additional bipartisan cannabis legislation in the lameduck, and we are going to try very, very hard to get it done. It is not easy, but we are making good progress. So I thank my colleagues for the excellent work on this bill and hope it portends more good cannabis legislation to come.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on a second matter, on rollcall No. 355, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. CAROLYN BERTOZZI

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I honor and pay tribute to American Dr. Carolyn Bertozzi. Dr. Bertozzi was awarded the Nobel Prize in Chemistry 2022 for her outstanding work and dedication to chemical biology research.

Dr. Carolyn Bertozzi is the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of Chemistry and Professor of Chemical and Systems Biology and Radiology at Stanford University. She is also the Baker Family Director at Sarafan ChEM-H at Stanford and an investigator of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute. She completed her undergraduate education in chemistry at Harvard University before earning her Ph.D. in chemistry at UC Berkeley. Following postdoctoral study at UCSF, she returned to Berkeley as a professor in the college of chemistry and led groundbreaking investigations published in major scientific journals. She is an elected member of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the German Academy of Sciences Leopardine. She has also received countless awards, including most recently the Nobel Prize in Chemistry.

The Nobel Prize in Chemistry for 2022 is a distinguished honor awarded to Drs. Carolyn Bertozzi, Morten Meldal, and K. Barry Sharpless for the development of click chemistry and biorthogonal chemistry. After Meldal and Sharpless laid the foundation of click chemistry, Bertozzi used click chemistry to study cellular reactions. Cellular machinery that modifies proteins with specific carbohydrates is now leveraged for targeted treatment of cancer and other conditions. I applaud her commitment to this life-saving invention.

It is a privilege to commemorate Dr. Bertozzi's Nobel Prize in Chemistry. Her students and peers are inspired by her dedication to her students and research. As a physician and husband of a breast cancer surgeon, I admire her exemplary work on click chemistry and its application to cancer treatment research. I am honored to recognize her today.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING STACEY JONES

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life of Stacey Allen Jones, who passed away October 8, 2022. Stacey was a native of Fort Smith, a leader, an educator, and a family man whose advocacy for the performing arts enriched the lives of people in western Arkansas.

Long-time residents of Fort Smith knew Stacey as a champion for the arts in the region. I knew Stacey as a fellow Northside Grizzly and a dear friend.

Before his recent retirement, he served as the associate vice chancellor of campus and community events at the University of Arkansas Fort Smith and led the Season of Entertainment on campus and at its predecessor Westark College for more than 39 years.

Through these programs, he brought nationally touring musicians and Broadway shows to the area and supported student productions to improve the quality of life in the community, provide opportunities for young people, and enhance the mission of the university. Along the way, he was also a mentor and advocate for thousands of students who participated in these programs.

Stacey was also well-known throughout the State for his dedication to the Miss UAFS and Miss Arkansas Programs. Because of his leadership, Westark College's local pageant became a qualifying event for the Miss Arkansas pageant. Among the many successful competitors who started at the Miss Westark pageant was Shawntel Smith, who went on to be crowned Miss America while representing Oklahoma in 1996.

Outside of the university, Stacey was a critical part of many community projects. As part of a coalition of local leaders, he regularly lent his voice and experience to help others in their efforts to enhance the arts, history, and culture of the region.

I extend my sincere condolences to Stacey's wife of 46 years, Sheila Jones; his daughters Stacie Kohles and Amanda Echols; his loving family; and many friends. Western Arkansas is richer because of his hard work, dedication, and genuine care for the university and the community. He will be missed.•

TRIBUTE TO SHERIFF TIM HELDER

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Washington County

Sheriff Tim Helder who is retiring after 43 years of law enforcement service in northwest Arkansas.

Sheriff Helder is a dedicated public servant who followed and built on his family's century-long legacy in public safety.

He began his career in 1979 as a dispatcher with the Washington County Sheriff's Office. He continued his service for 21 years at the Fayetteville Police Department before returning to the sheriff's office as chief deputy.

In 2004, Helder was elected Washington County Sheriff and has admirably served his neighbors and fellow citizens, who elected him to eight terms leading the department. During his time as sheriff, he has instilled a sense of duty, pride, and professionalism within the department and its officers.

Sheriff Helder also made efforts to ensure his own knowledge and leadership benefited from world-class training, including at the FBI National Academy, and partnerships with premiere task forces and other law enforcement agencies.

Engaging directly and frequently with the people of Washington County has long been a priority for the sheriff, including staying connected with community partners and elected leaders by hosting a monthly breakfast to keep everyone updated on county law enforcement issues and the importance of working together.

We can be proud of Sheriff Helder's lifelong service both in and out of uniform. He has embodied what it means to serve and protect and deserves our thanks for bettering communities in our State.

I applaud Sheriff Helder for his accomplished career and the leadership and perseverance he has demonstrated.

I wish him the best in his retirement, where I know he will be happy to spend more time with his wife Holly, their three children, and grandchildren. I know he will continue working in different but meaningful ways to build a better Arkansas.●

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL ASA HERRING

● Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Lieutenant Colonel Asa Herring, an American patriot and hero who served with the famed Tuskegee Airmen before going on to complete a 22-year military career in the U.S. Air Force.

Lieutenant Colonel Herring was born on October 3, 1926, in Dunn, NC. Despite being born during a time in American history when rights and opportunities for African-Americans were few, he persevered. At a time when high school graduation rates amongst African-Americans were in the single digits, Lieutenant Colonel Herring graduated at age 16 and then had to wait nearly 2 years before he could enter the military. After passing the Army Air Corps written examination, he entered Active Duty as an aviation cadet on December 27, 1944.

However, World War II ended before he finished his training. On April 26, 1945, the Tuskegee Airmen flew their last combat mission, and less than 2 weeks later, on May 8, 1945, Germany surrendered. Lieutenant Colonel Herring did not wish to serve in a segregated military, so he decided to request an honorable discharge in 1946.

On July 26, 1948, President Truman issued Executive Order No. 9981, ending the policy of racial segregation in the military. Less than a year later, Lieutenant Colonel Herring volunteered for service in the newly established U.S. Air Force and served until 1970. Throughout his service, Lieutenant Colonel Herring fought in both the Korean and Vietnam war, flew more than 350 combat missions, and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, a Bronze Star, and an Air Medal with 13 oakleaf clusters. He was also the first African-American squadron commander at Luke Air Force Base, where he trained pilots from several European countries in the F–104G Jet Fighter Gunnery Program.

After retiring from military service, Lieutenant Colonel Herring joined Western Electric in Phoenix, AZ, where he served in several management positions until 1989. Personifying the Air Force core values, he also dedicated much of his time and talent to community service organizations across Phoenix and to educating others on the history and incredible legacy of the Tuskegee Airmen.

I join Arizonans in mourning Lieutenant Colonel Herring's passing on May 22, 2022, at the age of 95. He was preceded in death by his wife of 61 years, Honor Herring, and is survived by his two sons, Asa D. Herring, III, and Mark Alan Herring; his seven grandchildren; and his 15 great-grandchildren—to whom we extend our gratitude for Lieutenant Colonel Herring's honorable service to his community and to his Nation.●

150TH BIRTHDAY OF GREAT BEND, KANSAS

● Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the 150th birthday of our home, Great Bend, KS.

Anticipating the westward expansion of the Atchison, Topeka and Sante Fe Railroad, D.N. Heiser and E.J. Dodge made the first settlement in the Great Bend Township in 1871. The railroad reached the township in July of 1872, and Great Bend was soon incorporated as the permanent county seat for Barton County, named after the great bend of the Arkansas River—pronounced Ar-Kansas—that the town sits on. Later, this great bend on the river became the crossing point for settlers and supply wagons traversing the Santa Fe Trail. Great Bend would go on to be a premier shipping point for cattle, as well as a center of regional trade and commerce for western Kansas. The oil and gas industry arrived in Great Bend soon after, with the county bringing in more than $30 million annually from the petroleum industry by 1930. From its beginnings, Great Bend has been pivotal in the development of Kansas's economy, and today, our agriculture and oil help feed and fuel the world.

I had the privilege of raising my family in Great Bend and delivering some 5,000 babies in the community. Thanks to investments of hard work, innovation, and determination, as well as great pride in our schools, Great Bend continues to serve as an economic driver for central Kansas. The city of Great Bend plays such a vital role in telling the story of Kansas, so it is my honor to celebrate the city's 150th birthday.

I would like to thank and honor everyone living in Great Bend and our predecessors for the pride they have in our city and especially thank everyone who helped organize the sesquicentennial celebration.

I now ask my colleagues to join the residents of Great Bend in celebrating the city's 150th birthday and recognize them all for their contributions to the city's 150 years of history.

I am humbled and proud to call Great Bend home.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5286. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5287. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2022–23 Season'' (RIN1018–BF07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5288. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers Eligibility for Legacy Participants and Legacy Applicants'' (RIN2900–AR28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5289. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; 2022 Horsepower on the Hudson, Hudson River, Castleton, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2021–0904)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5290. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5291. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5292. A communication from the Division Chief for Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Technical, Organizational, Conforming, and Correcting Amendments to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations'' (RIN2126–AC47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5293. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5294. A communication from the Attorney for Regulatory Affairs Division, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Standard for Infant Bath Tubs'' (16 CFR Part 1234) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5295. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–369; Bethel, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1163)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5296. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–370; Kenai, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1194)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5297. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–385; Kodiak, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0860)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5298. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–364; Kotzebue, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1156)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5299. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–235; Atqasuk, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1100)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5300. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–232; Fairbanks, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0026)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5301. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–382; Hooper Bay, AK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0857)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5302. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Coalgate, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0715)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5303. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Coldwater and Sturgis, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0758)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5304. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Mansfield, OH'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0714)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5305. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Alma, GA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0568)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5306. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace, and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Fort Pierce, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0668)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5307. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Brownsville, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0661)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5308. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Baltimore, MD'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0545)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5309. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Multiple Texas Towns'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0775)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5310. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class E Airspace; Watersmeet, MI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0766)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5311. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Dayton, OH'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1080)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5312. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22167'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0690)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5313. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes; Amendment 39–22169'' ((RIN2120–AA64)

(Docket No. FAA–2022–1067)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5314. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Honda Aircraft Company LLC Airplanes; Amendment 39–22154'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1057)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5315. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22150'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0160)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5316. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; MT–Propeller Entwicklung GmbH Propellers; Amendment 39–22153'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1056)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5317. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22109'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0290)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5318. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes; Amendment 39–22133'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0953)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5319. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc. and de Havilland) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22143'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0602)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5320. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22144'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0595)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5321. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor/Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drug Offender's Driver's License Suspension'' (RIN2125–AF93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5322. A communication from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Audit Standards'' (RIN3141–AA68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5323. A communication from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Submission of Gaming Ordinance or Resolution'' (RIN3141–AA73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5324. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment'' (RIN0790–AL50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5325. A communication from the Chief Innovation Officer, Rural Development Innovation Center, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rural eConnectivity Program'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5326. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Civil Rights Update to the Federal-State Agreement'' (RIN0584–AE75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5327. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's 2022 compensation program adjustments; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5328. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2020 annual report of the Farm Credit Administration Regulator of the Farm Credit System; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5329. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13959 with respect to the threat from securities investments that finance certain companies of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5330. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12170 with respect to Iran; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5331. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13536 with respect to Somalia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5332. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 14024 with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5333. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fair Credit Reporting; Facially False Data'' (12 CFR Part 1022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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:

H.R. 5343. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on case management personnel turnover of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–199).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Robert Harley Shriver III, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

*Richard L. Revesz, of New York, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 5099. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to address certain issues relating to the extension of consumer credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 5100. A bill to provide accountability for funding provided to the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Treasury under Public Law 117–169; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 5101. A bill to modify the Intercountry Adoption Act of 2000 to provide a specialized accreditation option for performing a background study on a child or a home study on prospective adoptive parents, and reporting on such a study; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 5102. A bill to authorize the Community Advantage Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. COONS):

S. 5103. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize law enforcement agencies to use COPS grants for recruitment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 5104. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the National Advisory Council on Indian Education to include at least 1 member who is the president of a Tribal College or University and to require the Secretaries of Education and Interior to consider the National Advisory Council on Indian Education's reports in the preparation of budget materials; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 5105. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to develop and disseminate an evidence-based curriculum for kindergarten through grade 12 on substance use disorders; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 5106. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure Medicare-only PACE program enrollees have a choice of prescription drug plans under Medicare part D; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 5107. A bill to strengthen the collection of data regarding interactions between law enforcement officers and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 5108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 5109. A bill to establish and implement a multi-year Legal Gold and Mining Partnership Strategy to reduce the negative environmental and social impacts of illicit gold mining in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 5110. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a right-of-way permit with respect to a natural gas distribution main within Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 5111. A bill to require Transmission Organizations to accept bids from aggregators of certain retail customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 5112. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th Anniversary of the United States Marine Corps, and to support programs at the Marine Corps Heritage Center; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 5113. A bill to make a technical amendment to the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 5114. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide training for Department of Homeland Security personnel regarding the use of containment devices to prevent exposure to potential synthetic opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 835. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 2022 as ''National Youth Justice Action Month'' ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. Res. 836. A resolution permitting the collection of clothing, toys, food, and housewares during the holiday season for charitable purposes in Senate buildings; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 403

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 403, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes.

S. 456

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 464

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 464, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to provide for further comprehensive research at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke on unruptured intracranial aneurysms.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1079, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the troops from the United States and the Philippines who defended Bataan and Corregidor, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service during World War II.

S. 1157

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1408, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 1521

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1521, a bill to require certain civil penalties to be transferred to a fund through which amounts are made available for the Gabriella Miller Kids First Pediatric Research Program at the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

S. 2130

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2130, a bill to modify the

disposition of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues and to open Federal financial sharing to heighten opportunities for renewable energy, and for other purposes.

S. 2264

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2264, a bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996.

S. 3018

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements with respect to the use of prior authorization under Medicare Advantage plans, and for other purposes.

S. 3417

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3417, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 3791

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3791, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of prescription digital therapeutics under such titles, and for other purposes.

S. 4069

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4069, a bill to amend the National Firearms Act to provide an exception for stabilizing braces, and for other purposes.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to make available additional frequencies in the 3.1–3.45 GHz band for non-Federal use, shared Federal and non-Federal use, or a combination thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 4260

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4260, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 4556

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4556, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 4739

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4739, a bill to allow additional individuals to enroll in standalone dental plans offered through Federal Exchanges.

S. 4908

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4908, a bill to improve the visibility, accountability, and oversight of agency software asset management practices, and for other purposes.

S. 4920

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 4920, a bill to provide enhanced protections for election workers.

S. 4998

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4998, a bill to establish uniform accessibility standards for websites and applications of employers, employment agencies, labor organizations, joint labor-management committees, public entities, public accommodations, testing entities, and commercial providers, and for other purposes.

S. 5008

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5008, a bill to promote affordable access to evidence-based opioid treatments under the Medicare program and require coverage of medication assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, opioid overdose reversal medications, and recovery support services by health plans without cost-sharing requirements.

S. 5021

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5021, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain broadband grants from gross income.

S.J. RES. 25

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 25, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. RES. 183

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 183, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 754

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 754, a resolution designating November 13, 2022, as ''National Warrior Call Day'' in recognition of the importance of connecting warriors in the United States to support structures necessary to transition from the battlefield.

AMENDMENT NO. 6401

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 6401 intended to be proposed to H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BURR, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 5100. A bill to provide accountability for funding provided to the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Treasury under Public Law 117–169; to the Committee on Finance.

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. 5100

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 ''IRS Funding Accountability Act''.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING PLAN FOR INCREASED INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RESOURCES.

(a) LIMITATION ON FUNDING.—

(1) INITIAL PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds described in paragraph (3) may be obligated during the period—

(i) beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) ending on the date that is 60 days after the spending plan described in subsection (b)(1)(A) has been submitted.

(B) ADDITIONAL MORATORIUM.—If Congress enacts a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c) with respect to the Internal Revenue Service spending plan before the date described in subparagraph (A)(ii), then—

(i) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall submit a new spending plan under subsection (b)(1)(A); and

(ii) the period described in subparagraph (A) shall not end before the date that is 60 days after such new spending plan is submitted.

(2) SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds described in paragraph (3) may be obligated during any period—

(i) beginning on the date Congress has enacted a joint resolution of disapproval under subsection (c) with respect to any spending plan described in subsection (b)(1)(B); and

(ii) ending on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has submitted a new spending plan under such subsection.

(B) ADDITIONAL MORATORIUM.—If Congress enacts a joint resolution of disapproval described in subsection (c) with respect to any new spending plan submitted under subparagraph (A)(ii) before the date that is 60 days after the date on which such new spending plan has been submitted, then—

(i) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall submit an additional new spending plan under subsection (b)(1)(B); and

(ii) the period described in subparagraph (A) shall not end before the date that is 60 days after such additional new spending plan is submitted.

(3) FUNDS DESCRIBED.—The funds described in this paragraph are the following:

(A) Any funds made available under clauses (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 10301(1)(A) of Public Law 117–169.

(B) Any funds made available under section 10301(1)(A)(i) of Public Law 117–169 other than funds used for the following purposes:

(i) Eliminating any correspondence or return processing backlog.

(ii) Reducing call wait times for taxpayers and tax professionals.

(b) ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) INITIAL PLAN.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a spending plan described in paragraph (2).

(B) SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year beginning after the plan described in subparagraph (A) is submitted and ending with fiscal year 2031, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a spending plan described in paragraph (2) on the date that the President submits the budget required under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(ii) REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any failure to submit a plan required under clause (i) by the date that is 7 days after the date the plan is required to be submitted und, the amounts made available under section 10301(1)(A)(ii) of Public Law 117–169 shall be reduced by $10,000,000 for each day after such required date that report has not been submitted.

(II) REQUIRED DATE.—For purposes of this clause, the term ''required date'' means, with respect to any plan required under this subparagraph, the date that is 7 days after such plan is required to be submitted.

(2) SPENDING PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A spending plan described in this subparagraph is a plan that—

(i) details how the funds appropriated under section 10301(1) of Public Law 117–169 will be spent over—

(I) the period consisting of the current fiscal year and the next 4 fiscal years ending before fiscal year 2032; and

(II) the period of consisting of the current fiscal year through the fiscal year ending with fiscal year 2031 (if such period includes any period not described in subclause (I));

(ii) contains the information described in subparagraph (B);

(iii) has been reviewed by—

(I) the Internal Revenue Service Advisory Council;

(II) the Comptroller of the United States;

(III) the National Taxpayer Advocate; and

(IV) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(iv) has been approved by the officers or entities described in subclauses (II) and (IV) of clause (iii).

(B) PLAN CONTENTS.—The information described in this paragraph is the following:

(i) A detailed explanation of the plan, including—

(I) costs and results to date, actual expenditures of the prior fiscal year, actual and expected expenditures of the current fiscal year, upcoming deliverables and expected costs, and total expenditures;

(II) clearly defined objectives, timelines, and metrics for quantitatively measuring the plan's annual progress, including with respect to measuring improvements in taxpayer services, revenue collection, information technology, cybersecurity, and taxpayer data protections; and

(III) a description of any differences between metrics described in subclause (II) and corresponding metrics used by the National Taxpayer Advocate, the Comptroller General of the United States, and Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.

(ii) A detailed analysis of the performance of the Internal Revenue Service with respect to the delivery of taxpayer services, including—

(I) the Level of Service (LOS) of phone lines (as a percent of phone calls answered by an Internal Revenue Service employee, not to include courtesy disconnects or automated call backs);

(II) the median and average wait time to speak to a representative of the Internal Revenue Service;

(III) the amount of unprocessed taxpayer correspondence, including tax returns, responses to Internal Revenue Service notices, tax payments, and other similar types of correspondence; and

(IV) the median and average length of time for processing the items described in subclause (III) and processing refund claims.

(iii) An analysis identifying any increase or decrease in total annual audits and annual audit rates by income group for the period beginning in 2018 and ending with the year the report is submitted. Such analysis shall include a detailed description of what constitutes an ''audit'' by the Internal Revenue Service, and if the definition of an ''audit'' used by the Internal Revenue Service differs from the definition used by the National Taxpayer Advocate, the Comptroller General of the United States, or the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, there shall also be included an analysis using such divergent definition.

(iv) A categorizing of the number of audits for each year in the analysis described in clause (iv) which were—

(I) correspondence audits;

(II) office audits;

(III) field audits;

(IV) audits under the Tax Compliance Measurement Program (TCMP); and

(V) other audits.

(v) A description of all taxpayer compliance actions or initiatives undertaken using funding appropriated under section 10301(1)(A) of Public Law 117–169 that do not rise to the level of an audit, with each action broken out by the total number of such actions undertaken for each income group and as a percentage of taxpayers in each income group.

(vi) An explanation of any unresolved or outstanding recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office and Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration pertaining to taxpayer-data privacy protections, Internal Revenue Service taxpayer services, and Internal Revenue Service technology modernization efforts that are addressed by the plan and a description of how they are addressed.

(vii) If such plan does not address any recommendations identified by Government Accountability Office and Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration as ''high risk'' or ''priority'', an explanation of why such recommendations are not addressed in the plan.

(3) TESTIMONY OF RELEVANT OFFICIALS.—Not later than 30 days after any spending plan described in paragraph (2) has been submitted, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall testify in person before any of the appropriate Congressional committees that request their testimony with respect to such spending plan.

(4) REQUIREMENT TO NOTIFY OF EXCESS SPENDING.—The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall immediately notify the appropriate Congressional committees if actual obligations and expenditures for any account for any period for which projections are made in a plan submitted under paragraph

(2) exceed the amount of obligations and expenditures projected for such account in such plan by 5 percent or more.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL OF THE IRS COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ''joint resolution of disapproval of the IRS comprehensive spending plan'' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which a spending plan submitted pursuant to subsection (b)(1)(A) is received by the appropriate Congressional committees and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ″That Congress disapproves the plan submitted on _____ by the Internal Revenue Service relating to the comprehensive spending plan under section 2(b)(1) of the IRS Funding Accountability Act with respect to fiscal year _____.″. (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(2) APPLICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT DISAPPROVAL PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The rules of section 802 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to a joint resolution of disapproval of the IRS comprehensive spending plan in the same manner as such rules apply to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of such section.

(B) EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(i) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution of disapproval of the IRS comprehensive spending plan described in paragraph (1), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

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

SEC. 3. QUARTERLY REPORTS.

(a) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the last day of each calendar quarter beginning during the applicable period, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a report on any expenditures and obligations of funds appropriated under section 10301(1) of Public Law 117–169.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report provided under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A plain language description of the specific actions taken by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue utilizing any funds appropriated under section 10301(1) of Public Law 117–169.

(B) The obligations and expenditures during the quarter of funds appropriated under section 10301(1) of Public Law 117–169 and the expected expenditure of such funds in the subsequent quarter, including a comparison of obligations and expenditures between amounts spent for taxpayers services and amounts spent for examinations and collections by each division or office of the Internal Revenue Service, including the Large Business and International Division, the Small Business/Self Employed Division, the Tax-Exempt and Government Entities Division, the Wage and Investment Division, the Criminal Investigation Office, the Whistleblower Office, and the Office of the Taxpayer Advocate.

(C) A description of any new full-time or full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, contractors, or other staff hired by the Internal Revenue Service, including the number of new hires, the primary function or activity type of each new hire, and the specific Division or Office to which each new hire is tasked.

(D) The number of new employees that have passed a security clearance compared to the number of new employees hired to a position requiring a security clearance, along with an indication of whether any new employee that has not passed a security clearance has access to taxpayer return information (as defined by section 6103(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

(E) A detailed description of any violation of the fair tax collection practices described in section 6304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by any employees, contractors, or other staff described in subparagraph (C) (including violations tracked in Automated Labor and Employee Relations Tracking System (ALERTS) of the Human Capital Office of the Internal Revenue Service).

(F) The status of recommendations provided by the Government Accountability Office and Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration identified as being addressed by the plan, including whether they have been resolved, are in progress, or open (including the expected date of completion for any recommendations identified as in progress or open).

(3) REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION.—In the case of any failure to submit a report required under paragraph (1) by the required date, the amounts made available under section 10301(1)(A)(ii) of Public Law 117–169 shall be reduced by $1,000,000 for each day after such required date that report has not been submitted.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the last day of each calendar quarter beginning during the applicable period, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate Congressional committees a report containing the following information:

(A) A plain-language description of the actions taken by the Secretary of the Treasury utilizing any funds appropriated under paragraph (1), (3), or (5)of section 10301 of Public Law 117–169. Any action which is described in a report made under subsection (a) may be described by reference to the action in such report.

(B) A detailed description of the specific purposes to which the funds appropriated under section 10301(3) of Public Law 117–169 has been (or is expected to be) obligated.

(C) A description of any new full-time or full-time equivalent (FTE) employees, contractors, or other staff hired by the Secretary utilizing funds appropriated under section 10301 of Public Law 117–169, including the number of new hires and whether the duties of each new hire includes any functions related to the Internal Revenue Service (including implementation of tax policies, enforcement, regulations, research, press or communications, or other purposes).

(D) A detailed description and explanation of any changes to the most recent Priority Guidance Plan of the Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service involving guidance projects that utilize any funds appropriated under section 10301 of Public Law 117–169 or which are related to the implementation of any provision of or amendment made by such Public Law.

(E) A description of any new initiatives planned to be undertaken by the Department of the Treasury within the existing or subsequent fiscal year which will (or may) utilize funds appropriated under section 10301 of Public Law 117–169.

(2) REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION.—In the case of any failure to submit a report required under paragraph (1) by the required date—

(A) the amounts made available under paragraphs (3) of section 10301 of Public Law 117–169 shall be reduced by $666,667 for each day after such required date that report has not been submitted, and

(B) the amounts made available under paragraphs (5) of section 10301 of Public Law 117–169 shall be reduced by $333,333 for each day after such required date that report has not been submitted, and

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—The term ''applicable period'' means the period beginning after the date the report under subparagraph (A) is due and ending on September 30, 2031.

(2) REQUIRED DATE.—The term ''required date'' means, with respect to any report required to be submitted under subsection (a) or (b), the date that is 7 days after the date the report is required to be submitted.

SEC. 4. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''appropriate Congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 5111. A bill to require Transmission Organizations to accept bids from aggregators of certain retail customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. 5111

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 ''Responsive Energy Demand Unlocks Clean Energy Act''.

SEC. 2. AGGREGATOR BIDDING INTO ORGANIZED POWER MARKETS.

(a) DEFINITIONS OF STATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY AND TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION.—In this section, the terms ''State regulatory authority'' and ''Transmission Organization'' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any prohibition established by a State regulatory authority with respect to who may bid into an organized power market, each Transmission Organization shall accept any bid from an aggregator of retail customers that aggregated the demand response of the customers of any utility that distributed more than 4,000,000 megawatt-hours in the previous fiscal year.

(c) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall issue a rule to carry out the requirements of subsection (b).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 835—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 2022 AS ''NATIONAL YOUTH JUSTICE ACTION MONTH''

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 835

Whereas the historical role of the juvenile court system is to rehabilitate and treat young people while holding them accountable and maintaining public safety, and the juvenile court system is therefore better equipped to work with youth than the adult criminal justice system, which is punitive in nature;

Whereas youth are developmentally different from adults, and those differences have been—

(1) documented by research on the adolescent brain; and

(2) acknowledged by the Supreme Court of the United States, State supreme courts, and many State and Federal laws that prohibit youth under the age of 18 from taking on major adult responsibilities such as voting, jury duty, and military service;

Whereas youth who are placed under the commitment of the juvenile court system often do not receive access to age-appropriate services and education and remain far from their families, which increases the likelihood that those youth will commit offenses in the future;

Whereas, every year in the United States, an estimated 53,000 youths are tried, sentenced, or incarcerated as adults, and most of those youth are prosecuted for nonviolent offenses;

Whereas most laws allowing the prosecution of youth as adults were enacted before the publication of research-based evidence by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice demonstrating that prosecuting youth in adult court actually decreases public safety as, on average, youth prosecuted in adult court are 34 percent more likely to commit future crimes than youth retained in the juvenile court system;

Whereas youth of color, youth with disabilities, and youth with mental health issues are disproportionately represented at all stages of the criminal justice system;

Whereas confining youth in adult jails or prisons, where youth are significantly more likely to be physically and sexually assaulted and are often placed in solitary confinement, is harmful to public safety and to young people in the legal system;

Whereas youth sentenced as adults receive an adult criminal record that hinders future education and employment opportunities;

Whereas youth who receive extremely long sentences deserve an opportunity to demonstrate their potential to grow and change; and

Whereas, in October, people around the United States participate in Youth Justice Action Month to—

(1) increase public awareness of the need to protect the constitutional rights of youth, establish a minimum age for arresting children;

(2) remove youth from adult courts and prisons;

(3) end the practice of sentencing children to life imprisonment without parole and consecutive or lengthy sentences that amount to de facto life imprisonment without parole; and

(4) provide people across the United States with an opportunity to develop action-oriented events in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that the collateral consequences normally applied in the adult criminal justice system should not automatically apply to youth arrested for crimes before the age of 18;

(2) expresses support for the designation of ''National Youth Justice Action Month'';

(3) recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of National Youth Justice Action Month; and

(4) recognizes the importance of and encourages the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to fully implement the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (34 U.S.C. 11101 et seq.), as amended by the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–385; 132 Stat. 5123), in a manner in keeping with the spirit and intent of the law.

SENATE RESOLUTION 836—PERMITTING THE COLLECTION OF CLOTHING, TOYS, FOOD, AND HOUSEWARES DURING THE HOLIDAY SEASON FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES IN SENATE BUILDINGS

Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 836

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COLLECTION OF CLOTHING, TOYS, FOOD, AND HOUSEWARES DURING THE HOLIDAY SEASON FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES IN SENATE BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the rules or regulations of the Senate—

(1) a Senator, officer of the Senate, or employee of the Senate may collect from another Senator, officer of the Senate, or employee of the Senate within a Senate building or other office secured for a Senator nonmonetary donations of clothing, toys, food, and housewares for charitable purposes related to serving persons in need or members of the Armed Forces and the families of those members during the holiday season, if the charitable purposes do not otherwise violate any rule or regulation of the Senate or Federal law; and

(2) a Senator, officer of the Senate, or employee of the Senate may work with a nonprofit organization with respect to the delivery of donations described under paragraph (1).

(b) EXPIRATION.—The authority provided by this resolution shall expire at the end of the second session of the 117th Congress.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 6481. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6482. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SASSE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 6481. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND MORAL CONVICTIONS

SEC. 201. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION OR SEGREGATION IN PLACES OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION.

(a) PLACES OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION.—Section 201 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

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

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

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

''(4) any store, facility in a shopping center, or online retailer or provider of online services that has 1 or more employees in the current or preceding calendar year;

''(5) a social media platform provider; and'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1) or (5)'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (6)'';

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

(E) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following: ''(4) in the case of an establishment described in paragraph (4) of subsection (b), it sells or offers to sell a product or service that moves, or has moved, in commerce; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) The provisions of this title shall not apply to a religious institution, including place of worship, religious camp, or religious school.

''(g) For purposes of this title:

''(1) The term 'online retailer or provider of online services' means a commercial business, acting through a web page that invites the general public to purchase a good or service by use of a credit card or similar payment device over the internet, that provides content for the web page. The term does not mean a commercial business, acting through a web page that gives information, including information on quality, price, or availability, about a good or service but does not permit such purchase directly from the web page.

''(2) The term 'social media platform provider' means the provider of a public website or internet application, including a mobile internet application, social network, video sharing service, advertising network, mobile operating system, search engine, email service, or internet access service, that promotes users posting content and others consuming that content.''.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 208. EXCEPTION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'small business' means an employer who does

not have 15 or more employees for each working day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—No small business shall be required, under this title or any other Federal, State, or local law, to provide a service related to a marriage of individuals of the same sex, if the small business declines to provide the service in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief, or moral conviction, that marriage is or should be recognized as a certain type of union. For purposes of this subsection, services related to marriage include services for any ceremony or related celebration of the marriage.''.

SEC. 202. DETERMINATION OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.

Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''Corporations'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Corporations'', and

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

''(B) DETERMINATION MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any determination whether an organization is organized or operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes or complies with legal standards of charity shall be made without regard to the organization's religious beliefs or practices concerning the validity of marriages between individuals of the same sex.

''(ii) RELIGIOUS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'religious' includes all aspects of religious belief, observance, and practice, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religion.''.

SEC. 203. CHILD WELFARE PROVIDER INCLUSION ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE OF SECTION.—This section may be cited as the ''Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act of 2022''.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are as follows:

(1) To prohibit governmental entities from discriminating or taking an adverse action against a child welfare service provider on the basis that the provider declines to provide a child welfare service that conflicts, or under circumstances that conflict, with the sincerely held religious beliefs or moral convictions of the provider.

(2) To protect child welfare service providers' exercise of religion and to ensure that governmental entities will not be able to force those providers, either directly or indirectly, to discontinue all or some of their child welfare services because they decline to provide a child welfare service that conflicts, or under circumstances that conflict, with their sincerely held religious beliefs or moral convictions.

(3) To provide relief to child welfare service providers whose rights have been violated.

(c) DISCRIMINATION AND ADVERSE ACTIONS PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Government, and any State that receives Federal funding for any program that provides child welfare services under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.) (and any subdivision, office or department of such State) shall not discriminate or take an adverse action against a child welfare service provider on the basis that the provider has declined or will decline to provide, facilitate, or refer for a child welfare service that conflicts with, or under circumstances that conflict with, the provider's sincerely held religious beliefs or moral convictions.

(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to conduct forbidden by paragraph (18) of section 471(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(18)).

(d) FUNDS WITHHELD FOR VIOLATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall withhold from a State 15 percent of the Federal funds the State receives for a program that provides child welfare services under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.) if the State violates subsection (c) when administering or disbursing funds under such program.

(e) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A child welfare service provider aggrieved by a violation of subsection (c) may assert that violation as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding and obtain all appropriate relief, including declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and compensatory damages, with respect to that violation.

(2) ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS.—A child welfare service provider that prevails in an action by establishing a violation of subsection (c) is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

(3) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—By accepting or expending Federal funds in connection with a program that provides child welfare services under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.), a State waives its sovereign immunity for any claim or defense that is raised under this subsection.

(f) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this section and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall take effect on the 1st day of the 1st fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this section, and the withholding of funds authorized by subsection (d) shall apply to payments under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.) for calendar quarters beginning on or after such date.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required for a governmental entity to bring itself into compliance with this section, the governmental entity shall not be regarded as violating this section before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the legislative body that begins after the date of the enactment of this section. For purposes of the preceding sentence, if the governmental entity has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CHILD WELFARE SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''child welfare service provider'' includes organizations, corporations, groups, entities, or individuals that provide or seek to provide, or that apply for or receive a contract, subcontract, grant, or subgrant for the provision of, child welfare services. A provider need not be engaged exclusively in child welfare services to be considered a child welfare service provider for purposes of this section.

(2) CHILD WELFARE SERVICES.—The term ''child welfare services'' means social services provided to or on behalf of children, including assisting abused, neglected, or troubled children, counseling children or parents, promoting foster parenting, providing foster homes or temporary group shelters for children, recruiting foster parents, placing children in foster homes, licensing foster homes, promoting adoption, recruiting adoptive parents, assisting adoptions, supporting adoptive families, assisting kinship guardianships, assisting kinship caregivers, providing family preservation services, providing family support services, and providing time-limited family reunification services.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, any commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, and any political subdivision thereof, and any Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that has a plan approved in accordance with section 479B of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 679c) or that has a cooperative agreement or contract with one of the 50 States for the administration or payment of funds under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act.

(4) FUNDING; FUNDED; FUNDS.—The terms ''funding'', ''funded'', or ''funds'' include money paid pursuant to a contract, grant, voucher, or similar means.

(5) ADVERSE ACTION.—The term ''adverse action'' includes, but is not limited to, denying a child welfare service provider's application for funding, refusing to renew the provider's funding, canceling the provider's funding, declining to enter into a contract with the provider, refusing to renew a contract with the provider, canceling a contract with the provider, declining to issue a license to the provider, refusing to renew the provider's license, canceling the provider's license, terminating the provider's employment, or any other adverse action that materially alters the terms or conditions of the provider's employment, funding, contract, or license.

SA 6482. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SASSE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, insert the following:

TITLE II—RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND MORAL CONVICTIONS

SEC. 201. PROTECTION OF THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND MORAL CONVICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7 of title 1, United States Code, section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, or any other provision of law, the Federal Government shall not take any discriminatory action against a person, wholly or partially on the basis that such person speaks, or acts, in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief, or moral conviction, that marriage is or should be recognized as a union of—

(1) one man and one woman; or

(2) two individuals as recognized under Federal law.

(b) DISCRIMINATORY ACTION DEFINED.—As used in subsection (a), a discriminatory action means any action taken by the Federal Government to—

(1) alter in any way the Federal tax treatment of, or cause any tax, penalty, or payment to be assessed against, or deny, delay, or revoke an exemption from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 of, any person referred to in subsection (a);

(2) disallow a deduction for Federal tax purposes of any charitable contribution made to or by such person;

(3) withhold, reduce the amount or funding for, exclude, terminate, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, any Federal grant, contract, subcontract, cooperative agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, employment, or other similar position or status from or to such person;

(4) withhold, reduce, exclude, terminate, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, any entitlement or benefit under a Federal benefit program, including admission to, equal treatment in, or eligibility for a degree from an educational program, from or to such person; or

(5) withhold, reduce, exclude, terminate, or otherwise make unavailable or deny, access or an entitlement to Federal property, facilities, educational institutions, speech fora (including traditional, limited, and nonpublic fora), or charitable fundraising campaigns from or to such person.

(c) ACCREDITATION; LICENSURE; CERTIFICATION.—The Federal Government shall consider accredited, licensed, or certified for purposes of Federal law any person that would be accredited, licensed, or certified, respectively, for such purposes but for a determination against such person wholly or partially on the basis that the person speaks, or acts, in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief or moral conviction described in subsection (a).

SEC. 202. JUDICIAL RELIEF.

(a) CAUSE OF ACTION.—A person may assert an actual or threatened violation of this title as a claim or defense in a judicial or administrative proceeding and obtain compensatory damages, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, or any other appropriate relief against the Federal Government. Standing to assert a claim or defense under this section shall be governed by the general rules of standing under article III of the Constitution.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES NOT REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an action under this section may be commenced, and relief may be granted, in a district court of the United States without regard to whether the person commencing the action has sought or exhausted available administrative remedies.

(c) ATTORNEYS' FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended by inserting ''title II of the Respect for Marriage Act,'' after ''the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000,''.

(d) AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES TO ENFORCE THIS TITLE.—The Attorney General may bring an action for injunctive or declaratory relief against an independent establishment described in section 104(1) of title 5, United States Code, or an officer or employee of that independent establishment, to enforce compliance with this title. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General, the United States, or any agency, officer, or employee of the United States, acting under any law other than this subsection, to institute or intervene in any proceeding.

SEC. 203. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) NO PREEMPTION, REPEAL, OR NARROW CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to preempt State law, or repeal Federal law, that is equally or more protective of free exercise of religious beliefs and moral convictions. Nothing in this title shall be construed to narrow the meaning or application of any State or Federal law protecting free exercise of religious beliefs and moral convictions.

(b) NO PREVENTION OF PROVIDING BENEFITS OR SERVICES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent the Federal Government from providing, either directly or through a person not seeking protection under this title, any benefit or service authorized under Federal law.

(c) NO AFFIRMATION OR ENDORSEMENT OF VIEWS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to affirm or otherwise endorse a person's belief, speech, or action about marriage.

(d) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this title or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL BENEFIT PROGRAM.—The term ''Federal benefit program'' has the meaning given that term in section 552a of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FEDERAL; FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—The terms ''Federal'' and ''Federal Government'' relate to and include—

(A) any department, commission, board, or other agency of the Federal Government;

(B) any officer, employee, or agent of the Federal Government; and

(C) the District of Columbia and all Federal territories and possessions.

(3) PERSON.—The term ''person'' means a person as defined in section 1 of title 1, United States Code, except that such term shall not include—

(A) publicly traded for-profit entities;

(B) Federal employees acting within the scope of their employment;

(C) Federal for-profit contractors acting within the scope of their contract; or

(D) hospitals, clinics, hospices, nursing homes, or other medical or residential custodial facilities with respect to visitation, recognition of a designated representative for health care decisionmaking, or refusal to provide medical treatment necessary to cure an illness or injury.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have six 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 FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 16, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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 Wednesday, November 16, 2022, at 4:15 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 16, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 16, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 16, 2022, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, November 16, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following intern and fellow from my office be granted floor privileges until November 18, 2022. They are J.P. Cooper and Laura Hill.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 94–201, as amended by Public Law 105–275, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress: Natalie Anne Merchant of New York.

MEDICAL MARIJUANA AND CANNABIDIOL RESEARCH EXPANSION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 8454, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8454) to expand research on cannabidiol and marijuana, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bill, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 8454) was passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the

table with no intervening action or debate.

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

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, NOW KNOWN AS THE RESERVE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 820.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 820) honoring the 100th anniversary of the Reserve Officers Association, now known as the Reserve Organization of America.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 820) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 29, 2022, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 827 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 827) supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 827) was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 11, 2022, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

PERMITTING THE COLLECTION OF CLOTHING, TOYS, FOOD, AND HOUSEWARES DURING THE HOLIDAY SEASON FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES IN SENATE BUILDINGS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 836, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 836) permitting the collection of clothing, toys, food, and housewares during the holiday season for charitable purposes in Senate buildings.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 836) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, November 17; 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 the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 449, H.R. 8404, postcloture; further, that all time during adjournment, recess, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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 6:58 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, November 17, 2022, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING MATTHEW ROBINSON AND HIS SERVICE TO THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise along with my colleague, Rep. HENRY C. JOHNSON, Chair of the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet, to thank Matthew Robinson for his service to the Committee on the Judiciary,

Matthew came to the Committee after first entering public service as a Judiciary Clerk for Senator Russ Feingold, and then spending five years at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Don LLP. Matthew received his B.A. from Yale University and his J.D. from the New York University School of Law.

Matthew first joined the Committee in 2019 as a Counsel for the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet. For three years in this position, he played a critical role in reforming our courts system. Matthew spearheaded a courts agenda to promote transparency and accountability in the ''Third Branch'' of government with the goal of strengthening and supporting the rule of law and equal justice. Matthew also helped manage hearings that addressed the need for ethics reforms. Building off these hearings, he assisted in leading the passage of the Courthouse Ethics and Transparency Act, which became law in May 2022, Matthew also helped in the introduction of a comprehensive set of reforms for the Supreme Court in the Supreme Court Ethics, Recusai, and Transparency Act.

Matthew continued his dedication to reform in several additional efforts to create a courts system that truly works for all Americans. Matthew developed two hearings that highlighted the critical need for stronger workplace protections for courts employees, which led to the introduction of the Judiciary Accountability Act. He also worked on investigations on the state of the judiciary's information technology systems, and on the passage of the Open Courts Act, a bill aimed at overhauling the judiciary's electronic case management systems and making court records free to the public.

In addition to this portfolio, Matthew was always willing to go above and beyond by helping other efforts. In particular, he assisted the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law on bankruptcy matters, as well as on its 16-month investigation into the state of competition in the digital economy that focused on the challenges presented by the dominance of Amazon, Apple, Facebook, and Google. Lastly, Matthew worked diligently on the first impeachment of former President Donald J. Trump, including assisting in the compilation of the Committee's Report. Recognized for his dedicated service, Matthew was named as Senior Counsel to the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet in February 2022.

Throughout all of his work, Matthew brought his tireless worth ethic and commitment to excellence. Our Committee, Congress, and the American people greatly benefited from his service.

While we are sad to see Matthew go and he will certainly be missed, we are happy that he will continue to serve the public interest as senior counsel for oversight at the U.S. Department of Education.

We thank Matthew Robinson for his service to the Committee and wish him the best of luck with this new chapter.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL GREGORY T. LEE OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Greg Lee for his extraordinary service to his country and community. Lance Corporal Lee honorably served in the Vietnam War and continues to go above and beyond to serve North Country veterans.

Greg Lee was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on April 3, 1951. After moving to Virginia in 1955, Greg left school in eighth grade and supported himself by working three separate jobs. Utilizing this disciplined work ethic, Greg enlisted in the United States Marine Corps on May 2, 1968. Shortly after enlisting, Greg was deployed to Vietnam, where he conducted search and destroy missions throughout the Quang Nam Province. While engaging the enemy during Operation Oklahoma Hills on May 8, 1969, Lance Corporal Lee was seriously wounded in action by a mortar explosion. His right arm had to be amputated due to these injuries.

For this brave service in combat, Lance Corporal Lee was awarded the Purple Heart medal and Combat Action Ribbon. Due to his injuries, he was taken back to the United States. Greg moved to Peru, New York, where he immediately began helping other wounded veterans by driving them to and nom the VA hospital in Albany. After Greg was discharged, he tried to reenlist in the Marines. Lance Corporal Lee was not discouraged by his wounds saying, ''He could do with one arm what any man could do with two a arms.''

Despite his reenlistment application being denied, Greg continued to serve his country by working for the Plattsburgh Airforce Base in the Department of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation. Greg worked at this job serving his fellow veterans until his retirement in 1991. Once retired, Greg continued to support local veterans by organizing functions for the Disabled American Veterans Organization, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and American Legion posts. In addition to his work with these organizations, Greg has been an active member of the Honor Flights in Plattsburgh since 2013. During this time, Greg has given countless hours to organizing over forty Honor Flights for his fellow veterans.

Lance Corporal Lee has accomplished all of these incredible things while battling service-related cancers throughout the years. Despite these hardships, he continues to tirelessly serve his country and the North Country veteran community. On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, it is my honor to recognize and thank Lance Corporal Greg Lee for his steadfast commitment to service.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ROSE ANNE HOLMAN

HON. RICK W. ALLEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rose Anne Holman for her years of dedicated service to the people of Georgia's 12th Congressional District and offer my congratulations upon her retirement from public service.

A valued member of our team, Rose Anne has been with our office from the very beginning. In fact, she's been working for our constituents even longer than I have.

Having formerly served under my predecessor, Congressman Barrow, Rose Anne brought a wealth of experience to our office that has enabled us to provide the top-quality constituent services upon which we have come to pride ourselves.

Whenever one of our neighbors needed help, Rose Anne was there. Such was her commitment to our district and to the people who she dedicated lunch time and effort to serve. I heard so many stories, especially from our Vidalia onion farmers, that Rose Anne assisted them in navigating difficulties with the federal government and helped save the day.

Rose Anne has been an exemplary public servant, and, moreover, a cherished friend and colleague. On behalf of our entire team, I extend my best wishes to Rose Anne and her husband, Howard for all the blessings this new chapter will surely bring and thank her for her time and service on behalf of Georgia's 12th Congressional District.

CELEBRATING MR. TOM DIMAGGIO

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Tom DiMaggio of Monterey, California, as he celebrates his 100th birthday on November 18, 2022. Mr. DiMaggio is a stalwart of the Monterey Peninsula, and his efforts to lift up our community has already secured his legacy in Central Coast history.

In an effort to provide a better life for her son, Mr. DiMaggio's mother, Maria Radiatti, worked tirelessly to send him to the United States before he was conscripted into the fascist dictator Benito Mussolini's military. Leaving his home country of Italy behind, Mr. DiMaggio joined his extended family in Monterey and worked to turn the fishing hobby of his childhood into a career.

Mr. DiMaggio relocated to Alaska to pursue his fishing career, and for the next 50 years after returning home to Monterey, Mr. DiMaggio captained many vessels, including the *Tommy D*, the *Ronnie F*, the *Sockeye*, the *Swan*, and the *Sea Queen*. Throughout his career, Mr. DiMaggio was a well-known and respected figure in the Alaska and Monterey fishing communities.

Outside his distinguished fIshing career, Mr. DiMaggio is a dedicated family man and active community member. On April 24, 1949, Mr. DiMaggio and Eva DiMecurio married, and together, they raised three children: Tommy, Marilyn, and Sal, as well as one granddaughter, Meredith. In 2019, the couple celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary. Throughout their lifetime together, Tom and Eva have proven their dedication to our community by donating their time and talents to the Sanctuary Bible Church in Carmel Valley and as members of the ''Giovanottis,'' a charitable group that provides dinners to the community. Currently, Mr. DiMaggio is an active member of the Italian Catholic Federation, the Compare Club, the Elks Lodge, and Festa Italia, of which he was named the Grand Marshal for the 2010 parade.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Mr. Tom DiMaggio for his extraordinary and celebrated life. As he celebrates his 100th birthday, Mr. DiMaggio continues to inspire the Central Coast for generations to come. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him today.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REQUIRE THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TO INSTALL THE D.C. SEAL IN THE MAIN READING ROOM ON THE THOMAS JEFFERSON BUILDING

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce a bill to require the installation of the District of Columbia's seal on the stained-glass windows in the Main Reading Room of the Thomas Jefferson Building of the Library of Congress, where the seals of all the states and territories that existed when the building was constructed, except for the District, are depicted. D.C.'s seal was readily available at that time and should have been included.

The seals of Hawaii and Alaska are not included in the display because they were not states or territories when the building was constructed. This fact argues for the inclusion of the District, which, after all, was the nation's capital at the time of construction. The omission of D.C. was brought to my attention by a District resident, Luis Landau, a former docent at the Library.

The residents of the District have always had all the obligations of American citizenship, including paying federal taxes and serving in all the nation's wars, including the War of 1812, during which the Capitol building, which then housed the Library of Congress, was burned, prompting construction of the current Library building with the state and territory seals. It is, therefore, without question that the District and its residents should receive equal treatment among the stained-glass windows that portray the history of the United States. D.C. residents deserve to have their history and American citizenship recognized.

There is existing evidence that the D.C. seal should have been depicted. The Members of Congress room in the Jefferson Building, which is not open to the public, has a painted depiction of the D.C. seal included with state seals on its ceiling. This precedent reinforces our request to be represented among the stained-glass windows in the Main Reading Room, which is open to the public.

Congress already often includes D.C., or has corrected the omission of it, when honoring the states. For example, D.C. now has two statues in the Capitol alongside two statues from each of the 50 states. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 requires the armed services to display the District flag whenever the flags of the states are displayed. Legislation was also enacted to give D.C. a coin after it was omitted from legislation creating coins for the 50 states. We also successfully worked with the U.S. Postal Service to create a D.C. stamp, like the stamps for the 50 states, and worked with the National Park Service to add the D.C. flag alongside the state flags across from Union Station. It is long overdue to display the D.C. seal with the seals of the states in the Main Reading Room of the Library of Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING OF THE 98TH BIRTHDAY OF THOMAS CLEVELAND

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 98th birthday of Thomas Cleveland.

Thomas was born on October 6, 1923. He spent most of his life in Coosa County, Alabama, but was drafted in April of 1943 at the age of 18. He went to basic training at Camp Shelby, Mississippi. While there he was trained in demolition and experienced his first injury. The soldiers were training with TNT and a detonation cap exploded in his hand.

After Camp Shelby, he was off to Camp Kilby, New Jersey, where he boarded a troop ship and headed to Birmingham, England. The trip across the ocean was 14 days and he was seasick for seven of those days recalling the ship rocking back and forth sending him to the deck to hang his head.

Once across the English Channel, he landed on the beaches in Normandy, France, during the second wave of the invasion. It was there he was shot in the shoulder resulting in his first Purple Heart. When he went into the U.S. Army, his mother had given him a small Bible with a metal cover to carry with him. Even today, the Bible has blood stains from the shoulder wound. The bullet is still in his shoulder.

During the Battle of the Bulge, he received another injury and the second Purple Heart.

When asked what he remembers most about War World II, he tells of constantly advancing on the enemy and being separated from his unit when they encountered Germans. Once reunited with his unit, only four soldiers were left in his squad. This is when he received a battle-field promotion from the rank of private first class to sergeant.

Three years after being drafted, the war was over for Thomas and he went back to the United States at Fort Lewis, Washington, to be discharged. After a train ride from Washington to Birmingham, Alabama, he took a taxi back to Hanover, Alabama, where he continues to live today.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing Thomas and wishing him a very happy 98th birthday. I thank him for his service to our country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was not able to be present for Roll Call No. 479 on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 1464. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 479.

HONORING MICHELLE WAITE

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Michelle Waite for her lifetime of dedication to the Great State of Nebraska, the University of Nebraska—Lincoln, and our military and veteran community. After twenty-four remarkable years, Michelle is retiring after a career of incredible service to our university and the citizens of our state.

Michelle hails from Cody, a town in the beautiful Sand Hills of Nebraska and she completed her undergraduate education at Doane College in Crete. She also earned a Master of Legal Studies Degree from the University of Nebraska College of Law. In addition, Michelle is the proud mother of Cody and Logan, and we are grateful to Cody for his service in our Armed Forces.

Since 1998, Michelle Waite has served in the office of the chancellor where she currently works as the Assistant to the Chancellor for Government and Military Relations. In that role, she serves as the principal advisor to UNL Chancellor Ronnie Green. In 1987, Michelle went to work for former Speaker of the Legislator, Ron Withem of Papillion, serving as his Legislative Assistant until his retirement in 1997. Following Speaker Withem's retirement, Michelle went on to work for State Senator Ron Raikes until she was hired in

1998 as the Associate to UNL Chancellor James Moeser.

Michelle Waite has been an impactful and transformative leader during her tenure for our university and her work has changed the lives of people all over our state. She has worked for three different chancellors as their principal advisor, helping guide the University in its relationships with many different external constituencies, including federal, state, and local agencies. In that capacity, she has been responsible for the strategic management of the University's legislative agenda, and she has worked as the primary representative tasked with interfacing with our unique single house legislature, affectionately known by many as the Unicameral. I am also appreciative of the advice she has provided my team in the years since I first took office.

Considering that we just celebrated Veterans Day, I also want to highlight Michelle's outstanding contributions for our military and veteran community. As the school where General of the Armies John J. Pershing served as the Commandant of Cadets, the University of Nebraska—Lincoln has a proud and long military tradition that has produced countless men and women charged with leading our Armed Forces. During her tenure, Michelle Waite has been responsible for supervising the campus ROTC units and she has been liaison with all branches of the military, as well as with our veteran community. As a military parent, Michelle carries that unique perspective shared by countless military families and this has helped further inform her leadership over the course of many years.

From her efforts towards the adoption of academic regalia denoting military service to helming the Veterans Tribute to memorialize our veterans in the heart of campus, Michelle's impact on the campus military community will be long enduring. Michelle played a critical role in helping the University adopt a resident tuition program for non-resident service members and she has been a leader in the effort to provide enhanced benefits for disabled service members and their families. Under her guidance, UNL established the Military and Veteran Success Center in 2015 which has become a valuable resource providing professional, educational, and personal services for our entire student veteran population.

Nebraska's Memorial Stadium was built in honor of those Nebraskans who fought in the war to end all wars and originally the stadium displayed plaques recognizing those Nebraskans who paid the ultimate price. In order to ensure their memory never fades, Michelle led the effort to create replacements for the long-lost original plaques. Now, those new plaques honoring those Nebraskans who fought and died in World War I greet all visitors who enter this special monument for freedom. She also helped pave the way for veterans to be recognized during football games, with a video tribute for one veteran during the second quarter of every home game and she was the driving force behind the POW/MIA Chair now on display in Memorial Stadium. Finally, Michelle topped off her career by spearheading the multimillion-dollar Veterans Tribute monument dedicated on September 11th of this year in the heart of campus.

Whether it is working with the military or serving as an advisor to collegiate organizations like UNL's Innocents Society, Michelle Waite has had a positive impact on students, faculty, and citizens from every corner of our state. I thank Michelle for her faithful service and leadership for all of Nebraska and I congratulate her and her family on a well-earned retirement.

RECOGNIZING LISA KAPLAN, NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Lisa Kaplan as she retires as a member of the Natomas Unified School District Board of Trustees. Since she was first elected in 2002, Lisa has been an invaluable member of our community, especially as schools faced unprecedented challenges from the COVID–19 pandemic. Today, I ask my colleagues to stand with me to honor her legacy.

Lisa grew up in a small town in Oregon and regularly offered help to those in need throughout her life. Lisa's long history of volunteer work includes assisting in the children's ward at UC Davis Medical Center while attending law school as well as helping in local Natomas schools while working in the state legislature. Since 2010, ACC continues to operate Sacramento County's Meals on Wheels program. Not only do they provide meal delivery, but they have partnered with local restaurants and food trucks throughout the years to make diverse meals more accessible to seniors in our community, serving 2,000 homebound seniors and older adults each week.

During Lisa's tenure, Natomas Unified School District showed an increase in test scores that significantly narrowed the achievement gap, passed four school bonds to upgrade existing facilities and provide new tools for 21st century learning, and obtained the highest graduation rates in the county.

Madam Speaker, today we honor Lisa Kaplan for her commitment and dedication to the students of Natomas Unified School District.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DONALD O. ALLEN, SR.

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, friends and family are gathering to celebrate the life of Donald O. Allen, Sr. Born in Washington, D.C. in 1950, he made Buffalo his home after attending East High School, Bryant Stratton Business School, and SUNY Empire College. He began his 27-year career in public service in 1978 as the Assistant Director of the Summer Youth Program in the city of Buffalo. He also took on the role of Minority Recruiter, Human Resources Planner, and Senior Deputy Commissioner in 1978.

When he assumed these positions, he became an indispensable pillar within the Buffalo community, and he would remain as such for the rest of his life. His efforts will continue to be felt by countless members of the community for many years to come. After retiring from his career in public service in 2005, he continued to serve the community for an additional 16 years by joining the Erie County Sheriff's Department. Furthermore, as a Zone Leader and City Democratic Chairman for the Erie County Democratic Committee, Donald had 4 terms to make his voice heard as a political leader.

In his spare time, he never missed an opportunity to engage with the community. And due to this commitment, he was honored at several points in his life for his service on the Buffalo Youth Board, at the Pratt-Willert Revitalization Corporation, and as the Buffalo Handicapped Chairman.

Married for 23 years to his loving wife, Lynette, there is an abundance of their children, nieces, nephews, and grandchildren that can continue their legacy and honor their memory. Donald Allen, Sr. will forever be a cherished community leader. While the place he holds in everyone's hearts can never be replaced, his dedication to others will continue to serve as an inspiration to us all.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BARBARA WILLIAMS JENKINS

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a devoted librarian, avid researcher, and dedicated preservationist, as well as a longtime friend. Dr. Barbara Williams Jenkins transitioned from this life on October 27, 2022, in Sumter, South Carolina. Her work to preserve African American history in the state of South Carolina will have profound implications for generations to come.

Dr. Barbara Williams Jenkins was born on August 17, 1934, in Union, South Carolina to the late Ernest Nesbit Williams and Johncie Sartor Williams. She graduated from Wilkinson High School in Orangeburg, South Carolina in 1951. She attended Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina, and graduated in 1955 with her bachelor's degree in English Literature and minors in Library Science and French.

Dr. Jenkins then went on to get her Master of Science in Library Science at the University of Illinois in 1956. She later continued her studies at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, Atlanta University, and Clemson University, and received her Ph.D. in Library and Information Services from Rutgers University in 1980.

I knew Dr. Jenkins well through her transformational work in the state. She inherited her love of learning from her parents, who were both graduates of Claflin University. Despite facing adversity as a young Black woman in academia, she was unflinching in her pursuit of academic excellence.

Dr. Jenkins spent the first 40 years of her career at my alma mater, South Carolina State University, where she was a staunch advocate for the library science program and a mentor to many. She started as their Reserve and Circulation Librarian in 1956, and soon

transitioned to Reference and Documents Librarian. In 1962, she was elevated to the position of Library Director. She served in that position for 25 years. She concluded her tenure at South Carolina State University in 1997 after serving for 10 years as Dean of Library and Information Services.

Throughout her time there, she played a crucial part in the creation and oversight of the South Carolina State College Historical Collection and the South Carolina State College Historic District, and memorialized many significant historical structures and sites in Orangeburg. She became the first African American President of the South Carolina Library Association in 1986.

After her retirement from South Carolina State University, she went on to be a founding—member of the South Carolina African American Heritage Commission. Throughout the next 30 years, she would be a leader in the effort to document underrepresented sites in the state's archives related to African American History, adding an incredible 300 markers throughout her time with the Commission. Earlier this year, the South Carolina African American Heritage Commission released the "Green Book of South Carolina", which featured sites originally documented by Dr. Jenkins. Even after her retirement from the Commission, she remained involved in training and mentoring the next generation of librarians and historians to carry these efforts forward.

She was acknowledged as a giant both on campus and in the field of historical preservation, and she earned many awards and accolades for her work. These included the Land-Grant Director's Association Award (1978), "Boss of the Year" (1980) from the Orangeburg Chapter of Professional Secretaries, the President's Award from the South Carolina Library Association (1987), the South Carolina State College Distinguished Service Award (1991), the University's First President's Service Award (1997), the SOLINET Board of Directors Service Award (1992) and the University's first Emeritus Award (2000). In 2019, she was also awarded the Order of the Palmetto, the highest civilian honor in the state.

Throughout her life, Dr. Jenkins was an active member of several civil and social organizations. Some of the historical and library boards of which she was a part include the African American Heritage Council, the Palmetto Trust for Historic Preservation, the South Carolina Library Association, and the South Carolina Archives and History Commission. She was also a lifelong member of the NAACP, a member of The Links, and a member of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, for which she previously served as the Regional Director for the South Atlantic Region.

Dr. Jenkins, a woman of faith, was a longtime member of Williams Chapel AME Church. She was married to my high school baseball and football coach, the late Robert "Bobby" Alvah Jenkins. They raised two children, Ronald Robert and Pamela Ruth, and shared several grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in celebrating the life and legacy of Dr. Barbara Williams Jenkins. She dedicated her nearly 70-year long career to ensuring African American history was woven into the fabric of our state's history. She will be sorely missed and ought to be well-remembered.

RECOGNIZING JOHN B. BILLINGSLEY, JR.

HON. BETH VAN DUYNE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor John B. Billingsley, Jr., Founder and CEO of the recently launched JBB Advanced Technologies headquartered in the 24th Congressional District, which I proudly represent. Prior to launching JBB Advanced Technologies, Billingsley founded Tri Global Energy 13 years ago and built the Dallas-based company into one of America's top five renewable energy developers before its recent sale.

John has been widely recognized as a pioneer and industry leader for his vision and contributions to the development of renewable energy in Texas and the U.S., including by D CEO Magazine. Recently Billingsley was the recipient of its 2022 Renewable Energy Impact Award. In 2021, D CEO Magazine named Billingsley as their Renewable Energy Executive of the Year as a part of their annual Energy Awards. The awards honor excellence and innovation in oil and gas from North Texas to the Permian Basin and for only the second time, this award included the category of renewable energy. In addition to the designation for the Annual Energy Awards, D CEO magazine also named John Billingsley to its Dallas 500 list. The list features the Dallas/Fort Worth region's most influential leaders in more than fifty different industry categories.

Billingsley, a West Texas native and Texas Tech University graduate, has founded and operated more than 20 businesses in industries as diverse as accounting and banking to agriculture, real estate, and manufacturing. He founded Tri Global Energy based on a business model of involving local landowners and communities in wind power projects and led the company through more than a decade of growth and expansion. The story of Tri Global Energy is told in his 2020 book, Texas Wind Force. I wish him the best of luck in his newest venture JBB Advanced Technologies which delivers more profitable, environmentally friendly digital technologies by developing renewable energy sources to power blockchain and artificial intelligence-based innovations.

I want to express my appreciation and best wishes to John Billingsley upon his impressive recognitions by D CEO magazine. The great state of Texas was built by visionary leaders and entrepreneurs like Billingsley, and we are proud that he has chosen the 24th Congressional District as his company's headquarters.

HONORING VETERAN WILLIAM E. HELMAN FOR A LIFE OF SERVICE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. William E. Helman for his extraordinary service to our country.

Mr. Helman was born in 1923 to Edward and Sara Helman. He attended Ballston Spa Schools and enlisted in the United States Army at the age of 19. In the Army, Mr. Helman served with the Company B, 404th Engineer Combat Battalion as a Combat Engineer and a Jack Hammer Operator.

During his time in the Army, Mr. Helman courageously fought in World War II in the Italian Campaign. He was deployed across Italy to Sicily, Naples-Foggia, Anzio, Rome-Arno, North Apennines and the Po Valley. For his brave service in the war, Mr. Helman was awarded the European African Middle Eastern Campaign Medal and the Bronze Arrowhead. Additionally, he was awarded both the Good Conduct Medal and the WWII Victory Medal.

Upon his honorable discharge from the Army in October 1945, Mr. Helman worked in the automotive industry. He was a self-employed body and fender man and worked out of many garages in New York State. In 1946, Mr. Helman married Rachel and, together they raised their family of three children.

Throughout his life, Mr. Helman exemplified dedicated service to his country. I am proud to recognize him during the Saratoga County Veterans Association's Honor our Deceased Veterans Ceremony. On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to honor the life of Mr. William Helman and thank him for his brave service to our country.

HONORING AL DAVIS

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Adris Albert "Al" Davis Sr. of Fairlawn, Virginia, who passed away on September 13, 2022, at the age of 72. Mr. Davis was a patriot and veteran of the United States Armed Forces.

Mr. Davis was born on December 28, 1949, to Albert and Blanche Davis. He graduated from Bramwell High School in Bramwell, West Virginia. He served in the Marine Corps and the Army Reserve and earned two Purple Hearts in the Vietnam War. In the following years, he found purpose in helping his fellow veterans. He stayed active in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 1184 in Pulaski and the American Legion Post No. 58 in Dublin.

Mr. Davis was also a man of deep faith, belonging to First Missionary Baptist Church in Fairlawn and serving as an usher and trustee.

Mr. Davis was preceded in death by his wife Constance T. Banks-Davis. He is survived by his significant other Emily Doucette; sons Michael Kelly, Adris "Hootie" Davis Jr., and Andrew Primm; daughters Yonnie Stinson, Maria Davis-Harris (Tony), Somer Davis, Darnisha Primm, and Kendra "Kenny" Wright (Quentin); 16 grandchildren; and 10 great-grandchildren. I offer them my condolences on their loss. Mr. Davis was a kind man who never missed an opportunity to serve.

RECOGNIZING THE SOUTH FLORIDA HISPANIC CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 28 YEARS OF WORK

HON. CARLOS A. GIMENEZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. GIMENEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the South Florida Hispanic Chamber of Commerce for its 28 years of successful impact on South Florida's business community. Small business is the backbone of our country. The Chamber has supported small businesses and helped connect them to individuals in South Florida for almost three decades. It is my honor to recognize the South Florida Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and highlight the good work they have done.

Established in 1994, the South Florida Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is a nonprofit 501 (c)(6) that promotes business leadership and economic growth and provides legislative advocacy for the Hispanic business community in South Florida. Since more than two-thirds of Miami-Dade County residents are of Hispanic origin, organizations like the Hispanic Chamber are crucial to the health of our local economy and civil society. Miami-Dade County has seen incredible growth over the past several years, in no small part because of the welcoming business climate. As the Miami area continues to expand, the South Florida Hispanic Chamber of Commerce will keep playing a pivotal role in growing commerce and creating opportunity among the Hispanic community.

The South Florida Hispanic Chamber of Commerce has been an invaluable resource to the Hispanic community for close to 30 years. I am thankful to have attended many Chamber events and luncheons in my district, where I have seen firsthand how it develops business relationships among our Hispanic community. I look forward to another 28 years of continued business growth and excellence.

TRIBUTE TO MR. LAWRENCE BUTLER, JR.

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the almighty God has called to his eternal rest Mr. Lawrence Butler, Jr. Mr. Butler was the only son, one of three children, he had two sisters, Clara Butler Watts and Regina Butler Davis, and after attending Southern University in Baton Rouge Louisiana, he moved to Chicago, where he lived with his Uncle Harrison Shaw. Lawrence fell in love with Chicago and quickly went to work making a life for himself in the windy city. He went to work as a bus driver for the Chicago Transit Authority and was drafted into the Army where he served as a military policeman. After serving his country, he returned to Chicago and joined the Chicago Police Department. He wore the badge with pride and honor for 34 years and enjoyed protecting and giving back to the city that he so cherished.

Lawrence's life truly began when he met and fell in love with a beautiful young woman named Beverly. Lawrence and Beverly married September 21, 1975. Shortly afterwards, they purchased what would become their home, a beautiful Victorian in the historical Austin Shock District. Lawrence and Beverly have two daughters, Mary Ellen and Hilaree. Lawrence and Beverly and their daughters were neighbors of my family for many years, and I treasure their presence in our village and commend Lawrence for his service to our country, our city and our neighborhood where we live, work and pray.

RECOGNIZING JOHN KASSNER, JR.

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a remarkable man, John Kassner, Jr.

Born in 1925, John was the second oldest son in a family of 13, having three brothers and nine sisters. Moving to Manitowoc, Wisconsin at a very young age, John became known as a remarkable high school athlete and was involved in countless organizations, like the High School Dance Club. During John's senior year in high school, he answered the call to serve his country and enlisted in the U.S. Army during World War II. During his military service, John volunteered to become a paratrooper in the heralded 101st Airborne Division. On John's 19th birthday, he and his fellow soldiers parachuted into France behind German lines to evaluate strategic locations prior to the Allied invasion. I commend John for his commitment and selfless service to the United States of America.

Following John's career in the military, he moved back to the United States with the love of his life, Joan, to begin their life together. John began his business career as a door-to-door vacuum salesman, and eventually obtained his real-estate license and began his own brokerage company. Given John's knowledge and dedication to the industry, he soon became a leader among his peers. In the mid-1970's, John was elected President of the Brown County Home Builders Association. In the years to come, given John's success within the industry, he would become the State President of the Wisconsin Home Builders Association and Director of the National Home Builders Association. I commend John for his life-long dedication to his community and country and I offer my sincere condolences to his family during this time.

Madam Speaker, the people of Northeast Wisconsin thank John Kassner, Jr. for his extraordinary commitment and service to his country. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and to all of the lives he touched.

RECOGNIZING AND CONGRATULATING RICHMOND'S SEVEN HILLS SCHOOL'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. A. DONALD McEACHIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. McEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and congratulate the Seven Hills School on the 20th Anniversary of their founding. Seven Hills School has not only provided exceptional education to middle school boys in our Richmond community but has created a strong community that will support their students long after they graduate.

The Seven Hills School first opened its doors in 2001 and over the last twenty years has created an environment that equips their graduates to succeed both in the classroom and beyond. Staff and teachers at Seven Hills School establish strong relationships between students and fosters curiosity and enthusiasm in the classroom.

After two decades, Seven Hills' teachers and staff remain dedicated to their mission of cultivating keen intellect and emotional strength in their students, as well as establishing a strong community within. With three hundred and eighty-eight alumni, Seven Hills School has established itself to be an institution designed to help middle school boys succeed with new approaches that provide hands-on and experiential learning that will stick with their students for life.

Madam Speaker. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Seven Hills School and wishing them another twenty years of success educating bright young men.

HONORING MIRA YUSEF AS IOWAN OF THE WEEK

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Mira Yusef, co-founder of Monsoon Asians and Pacific Islanders in Solidarity, as our Iowan of the Week.

Mira Yusef was just 13 years old when her family immigrated here from the Philippines. Like many families who immigrate to the United States, Mira's family was fleeing an oppressive dictatorship. She witnessed first-hand the atrocities committed around her, particularly how the women around her were treated and abused. These formative memories have stayed with her, and they fuel her passion for helping and advocating for victims of gender-based violence.

When Mira's family came to the United States, they came to Iowa as her mother married an Iowan who was in the U.S. Navy. She attended Roosevelt High School, and later she decided to go out to the San Francisco Bay Area where she had relatives. There, Mira was exposed to many other immigrants fleeing the same circumstances, which caused her to get more involved in advocacy and political issues. She came back to Iowa and was involved with the Iowa Coalition Against Sexual Assault, where she realized there weren't any Asian activists. This inspired her to start organizing specifically around issues related to Asian communities.

Mira went on to study these issues more closely, studying areas like human trafficking in multiple different counties around southeast Asia. She eventually graduated from the University of Michigan with two Master's degrees in Southeast Asian Studies and Social Work. Her experiences and dedicated work moved

her to start her own organization, which is now called Monsoon Asians and Pacific Islanders in Solidarity.

Mira's non-profit organization provides direct services to victims and survivors of gender-based violence. She started her organization out of an office in Des Moines, and now has offices in Iowa City and Dubuque with roughly 20 employees. Mira credits the success of the non-profit to the employees they've brought in. All of them are experts in their communities and are multilingual, creating a direct, accessible experience to those who are seeking help. Not only does she credit her employees with the success they've had in Iowa, but she also highlights how their work has made it possible for the organization to grow to provide more services in a broader scale. Thanks to her employee's hard work, along with federal funding, Mira was able to have their organization provide national assistance through National Asians Pacific Islanders Ending Sexual Violence (NAPIESV). They grew their assistance even further in 2019 as well, as her non-profit received funding for transnational work. Monsoon Asians and Pacific Islanders in Solidarity now serves victims in the Philippines, Indonesia, Micronesia, and Guam. The non-profit also works with the Alaya Women's Center in the Philippines focusing on sex trade issues.

Mira and her extraordinary team have built her non-profit organization from the community level to a global collaborative aimed at addressing some of the most heinous acts of violence imaginable. Their tremendous work nationally and globally is honorable, and they are just as passionate about addressing these issues at the community level, along with broader issues in the Asian and Pacific Islander community.

Mira's favorite aspect of her work is engaging the Asian youth in our own communities. She teaches them to be confident and comfortable with their identity, and she encourages them to find ways to help others through advocacy and non-profit organizations. She's even more proud after seeing youth she's worked with before grow up and do amazing things for their communities.

Mira, her team, and the non-profit they've developed do so much to better our own communities, and they work tirelessly every day to address the evilest acts committed around the globe. Mira's journey on this path is one of incredible inspiration, and her organization has more planned for the future. In 2018, her organization was gifted a house that they have renovated and plan to use as a community health clinic focusing on mental health. The house would also serve as a community office meeting space, and Mira and her team have more plans for developing further community engagement resources. I am in awe of the work Mira and her team at Monsoon Asian and Pacific Islanders in Solidarity do every day, and I am very honored to name Mira Yusef as this week's Iowan of the Week.

HONORING NORIO UYEMATSU

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Korean War Veteran Norio Uyematsu.

Norio was born in Cupertino, California, the oldest of four children raised by parents Niroku and Shitsuyo Uyematsu, who immigrated to America from Hiroshima, Japan. Norio is a second-generation Japanese American, or Nisei, and he is now one of the few surviving Japanese American veterans who served in the Korean War.

During World War II, when he was age 11, Norio's family was imprisoned for three years in a Japanese American concentration camp in Heart Mountain, Wyoming. As they had no home to return to, the Uyematsu family relocated to Brigham City, Utah, in 1945. He graduated from Box Elder High School in Brigham City in 1948 and decided to enlist in the Army. He was only 17 and needed his parent's approval. His father signed his enlistment form immediately, but his mother would not sign until a month before his 18th birthday.

His service began January 3, 1949, when he went through basic and advanced training in Anti-Aircraft Artillery at Fort Bliss in El Paso, Texas. In April of 1950, his planned transfer to Okinawa, Japan, was abruptly changed with the invasion of North Korea into South Korea. Instead, he was transferred to Camp Drake in Japan and was assigned to guard Misawa Air Force Base in Northern Japan.

In July of 1951, his unit was sent to Korea to guard Kimpo Air Base. Norio was then assigned to the 521st Military Intelligence Service to interrogate prisoners of war.

For his service, Norio, who achieved the rank of Corporal, was decorated with 10 medals. He was honorably discharged from the Army on July 27, 1952 and returned to Utah. From that day forward, Norio dedicated his life to remembering his fallen comrades and to keeping the Korean War veterans' memories alive

The Korean War, which began on June 25, 1950 and concluded on July 27, 1953, became known as the "Forgotten War." But Norio never forgot that 33,600 American soldiers were killed in action fighting to prevent the North Korean Communist regime from taking over South Korea.

Of the 33,600 men who lost their lives defending South Korea, 247 of those soldiers were Japanese Americans. Because of their selfless sacrifice, the tide of communism on the Korean Peninsula was halted and liberty triumphed over tyranny. Today, the Republic of Korea is a free democracy because of the service of the 5,000 Japanese Americans and other honorable soldiers who fought in the Korean War. Now, a few months short of age 92, he is still working to make sure the sacrifices made by his fellow soldiers are remembered. To fulfill his mission, Norio has served as an active member in several veterans organizations: the Japanese American Korean War Veterans. the Korean War Veterans Association, the Nisei Veterans Coordinating Council, the Disabled American Veterans Chapter 100, the American Legion, and the Japanese American Veterans Association, and the Kazuo Masuda VFW Memorial Post 3670, of which he was a three term commander. To continue his ties to his Utah roots, he is also a member of the Salt Lake Chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League.

Norio also continues his volunteer activism by supporting community projects and attending events, including the July 27, 2022 dedication of the Korean War Veterans Memorial "Wall of Remembrance" in Washington, DC.

Throughout his life, Norio was supported in his work by his wife of 63 years, Hanako Rose Fujikawa Uyematsu, also from Brigham City. They raised three boys, Michael, Ronald, and Thomas, who gave them eleven grand-children and two great grandchildren. Rose passed away in 2020 at home in Anaheim, California.

For many, Norio Uyematsu's contributions to his community are not well known since he preferred to humbly work in the shadows. But his spirit of service will continue by the foundation he set reminding others of what Korean War veterans did over 68 years ago to defend Democracy and Freedom. The people of America and the Republic of Korea will be forever grateful.

RECOGNIZING IAN WILSON

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ian Wilson, who was my legislative staffer, for his service to Kentucky's Second District.

The Acton, Massachusetts native first started working for Kentucky's Second District as an intern in my D.C. Congressional office in the summer of 2018. The following year he returned to Capitol Hill to intern for Congressman ADAM KINZINGER. In 2020, Ian graduated from the University of Massachusetts Amherst with degrees in political science and Middle Eastern studies.

Ian returned to my D.C. congressional office as a staff assistant in January 2022. In this role, he gave constituent tours, managed the U.S. flag order service, and communicated with constituents on policy being debated in Congress. Ian's team player attitude and strong work ethic made him a valuable member of the team. He was promoted to legislative correspondent and used his strong grasp on policy to assist me in responding to constituent inquiries quickly and thoroughly. I want to thank Ian for his work serving Kentucky's Second District as an intern, staff assistant, and legislative correspondent, and I wish him the best in the next chapter of his career.

CELEBRATING MR. DENNIS CAPRARA

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Dennis Caprara, who passed away on April 12, 2021. The Salad Bowl of the World lost a key ingredient with the passing of Mr. Caprara, a revered industry leader and farmer in the Salinas Valley. In his 74 years, Mr. Caprara contributed so much to our leading industry of agriculture and our fundamental identity in the Salinas Valley.

A true local boy, Dennis grew up in Gonzales, California, where he grew fond of farming and grew to appreciate the hard work and sound judgment necessary to succeed in agriculture. Founding RC Farms and RC

Packing, Mr. Caprara and his family became the definition of what it means to be a successful family farm.

But Dennis Caprara was not just a farmer, he was a leader. He served as Chairman of the Grower-Shipper Association, director of the Salinas Valley River Coalition, and as a distinguished fellow at a local college. Over the years, he received many honors and awards, such as: CSUMB Distinguished Fellow-Ag Businessman of the Year, Salinas Area Chamber of Commerce Agriculture Leadership Award, and Future Farmers of America Honorary Chapter Farmer.

Dennis also gave back to the community that gave him so much. He was a member of the Swiss Rifle Club and always attended the local livestock auctions where he and his wife, Janice, were active bidders, supporting the young leaders of 4H and Future Farmers of America.

Mr. Caprara was a friend and a mentor to many, including myself. He offered so much to those who knew him, who worked with him, who listened to him, and who loved him.

Madam Speaker, today we mourn the loss of Dennis Caprara. But because of Dennis, every day we realize that the Salad Bowl of life tastes so good, not just because of its products, but also because of its people.

RECOGNIZING THE DONOHO SCHOOL CLASS 2A STATE VOLLEYBALL TITLE

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Donoho School Lady Falcons for winning the AHSAA Class 2A state volleyball title.

Donoho beat Pleasant Valley to secure their third state title in the past four years. The game was played at Birmingham's Bill Harris Arena on October 26, 2022.

Securing this state title brings the volleyball program to 13 total state championships.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Coach Anna Taylor, the volleyball team, students, faculty and all the fans. Go Lady Falcons.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF VICE ADMIRAL BILL MERZ

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the service of Vice Admiral Bill Merz, who will retire from the U.S. Navy on December 1, 2022, after nearly 40 years in uniform. His long and distinguished service to our nation reflects an unwavering devotion to duty and great love of country.

Vice Admiral Merz earned his commission from the United States Naval Academy in 1986 and upon graduation entered the fleet as a newly minted submarine officer. Having first qualified aboard the attack submarine USS *Haddo* (*SSN 604*), he subsequently qualified in surface warfare while serving aboard the submarine tender USS *Proteus* (*AS 19*), which was the last remaining vessel in service that observed the end of World War II from Tokyo Bay. After commanding the nuclear deep-sea vessel "NR–1," the attack submarine USS *Memphis* (*SSN 691*), and Submarine Development Squadron Twelve, his sea-going career concluded aboard the USS *Blue Ridge* (*LCC 19*) as commander of the U.S. 7th Fleet.

Merz' service ashore reflected the same rigors he faced at sea, serving in prestigious and demanding roles as Director, Undersea Warfare Division (OPNAV N97); Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Warfighting Requirements (OPNAV N9); and in his final tour of duty, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Operations, Plans, and Strategy (OPNAV N3N5). During his time at the Pentagon, he had the duty to frequently appear as a witness before congressional committees, and to present budgets and policy. This can be an arduous experience at times, but Admiral Merz never lost his patience, composure, or civility. He treated every member with respect and showed a refreshing willingness to listen to suggestions. As Chair of the Seapower Subcommittee for the last four years, I had the opportunity to see up close the seriousness and authenticity with which he approached his job. He understood that Article one, Section eight, Clause thirteen of the U.S. Constitution vested in Congress the authority to 'provide and maintain a Navy.' As exasperating as that arrangement can sometimes be, Admiral Merz adhered to that edict and thus kept faith with his oath to the Constitution from the day he left Annapolis to his departure on 1 December, 2022.

Madam Speaker, as the proud Representative of Naval Submarine Base New London—the Submarine Capital of the World—I recognize the immense sacrifice Bill has made for this country. Few choose a life that takes them away from their family, but fewer still choose a life in the "Silent Service," where submariners endure deployments without the luxury of frequent communication with their loved ones. For this reason, I ask the Members to also recognize the service and sacrifice of the Men family—his wife Martha, his daughter Caroline, and his sons Thomas and Matthew—without whom these past 40 years could not have been possible. They have been an integral part of the admiral's long journey and deserve our nation's thanks.

As Bill brings to an end this chapter of his life and hangs up the uniform, I ask that we honor him today for his many years of leadership and service to our great Nation. To that end, it is most appropriate that my colleagues in the House join me in celebrating Vice Admiral Bill Merz and wishing him and his family all the best as they begin a new chapter in their lives.

HONORING THE WORK AND RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM "CHIP" R. MURRAY

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of William "Chip" R. Murray, for his retirement after a stunning 47-year career in service to two of our Nation's greatest resources: our forests and the millions of Americans who own and manage them.

After beginning his career at the U.S. Department of the Interior, Chip found his way into forestry in 1989. Chip focused on forestry issues for more than 20 years at the American Forest & Paper Association, where he served as Deputy General Counsel and Executive Director of Forestry. In that role, he oversaw forestry programs that helped forest owners manage their land to meet the objectives of the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act. Chip also spearheaded important improvements to various legislation impacting the forestry sector.

In 2010, Chip joined the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) as Vice President for Policy, and General Counsel. His work at NAFO over the last 12 years has focused on ensuring that policymakers understand and appreciate private forestry's deeply rooted culture of sustainability and the vast environmental benefits private working forests provide—from climate mitigation and clean air to clean water and wildlife habitat.

Chip's work on wildlife conservation is perhaps his most enduring legacy. Chip led the development of the Wildlife Conservation Initiative, a pioneering partnership between private landowners and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) to conserve at-risk and declining species on private forestlands. Under Chip's leadership, NAFO's Wildlife Conservation Initiative has become the gold standard of collaborative species conservation. Today, NAFO members and the USFWS are partnering on voluntary conservation projects in every legacy USFWS region in the country.

Throughout his career, Chip has led and participated in a wide variety of forestry sector organizations and coalitions. He is widely known for his encyclopedic knowledge of forestry, his rich institutional memory, and the passion he brings to any issue he touches. Chip is generous with his time, insights, and mentorship, to the great benefit of several generations of forestry professionals.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the outstanding career of Chip Murray, spent in service to our nation's abundant privately owned forests. Today we honor Chip and the lasting impact he has had on the forestry community, both inside and outside of government. We wish him and Ellen well as they start the next chapter of their lives—enjoying many adventures that undoubtedly will include time well spent in the forest.

HONORING LAURA TUCKER

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Laura Tucker of Salem, Virginia, upon receiving the Charles Brown Award from Roanoke College. The award recognizes citizens of Salem who have made significant contributions to the well-being of the City and its people, and Ms. Tucker is certainly deserving of the honor.

Ms. Tucker works for the Salem Water Department and as an instructional assistant in

Salem City Schools, but she dedicates so much more of her time and her effort to the City. Through Junior Achievement of Southwest Virginia, she mentors elementary school students through programs on financial literacy, good citizenship, entrepreneurship, and career paths. JA named her its volunteer of the year in 2018.

For Salem's 215th birthday, Ms. Tucker cofounded a grassroots social media group, Salem215, to celebrate the City and share news about its cultural, economic, and governmental activities. She is also a staunch patron of Roanoke College's Toy Like Me program to modify toys for children with disabilities, donating to it, referring children to it, and assisting with its activities.

I would like to offer Laura my sincerest congratulations on receiving the Charles Brown Award, a recognition of all the good that she has done and continues to do for our hometown.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, as the Chairman of the Ways and Means Worker and Family Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Supplemental Security Income Program—or SSI, it is an honor and privilege to recognize the 50th Anniversary of this essential program that serves as our nation's fundamental safety net for low-income seniors and people with disabilities.

The charge that a humane society should care for its vulnerable is long-standing. The Chinese philosopher Confucius said: ''In a country well governed, poverty is something to be ashamed of. In a country badly governed, wealth is something to be ashamed of.'' The Jewish teaching of tzedakah advocates treating every person with righteousness and justice. In the book of Matthew, Jesus said, ''As you did it to one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it to me.'' And, Mahatma Gandhi indicated that ''the true measure of any society can be found in how it treats its most vulnerable members.''

In the 20th century, our country established and improved programs that created the foundation of a system to care for vulnerable Americans—such as FDR's New Deal, LBJ's Great Society, and the hundreds of laws to strengthen these programs. Fifty years ago, many low-income Americans with significant disabilities experienced painful hardship because they lacked the monthly income to support themselves. No federal program met their needs; rather, each state had separate rules for who could receive benefits, for how long, and for how much.

In 1972, a Democratic Congress and a Republican President recognized the challenges faced by low-income people with severe disabilities and amended the Social Security Act to replace the inadequate, inconsistent, state support system with a permanent, national benefits program that offers a minimum, monthly income. As a federal program, SSI consolidated several state and federal elderly anti-poverty and disability programs into one program to support the most vulnerable.

Today, SSI provides food, shelter, heat in the winter, and dignity to more than 7.6 million American seniors and those with severe disabilities. In Cook County, Illinois, which includes my Congressional District, over 140,000 people rely on SSI to help buy food, pay rent, keep the lights on, and pay out-of-pocket health care costs. Importantly, SSI eligibility often increases eligibility for other important benefits—such as state public assistance, Medicaid, and SNAP—to also assist with critical expenses, like hospital stays, doctors' bills, and prescriptions.

In addition to supporting seniors and adults with disabilities, SSI benefits also help many children with disabilities and health conditions access the specialized care and treatment they need. Further, SSI helps compensate for the loss of income that is common for parents managing their children's complex care. Over 33,000 Illinois children receive these vital supports each month.

As we reflect on the strengths of SSI, we also must recognize the need for improvement. Given that SSI represents the only income for more than half of SSI recipients, we have a responsibility to ensure that the program truly protects disabled and elderly Americans from poverty and hardship. Further due to our country's history of systemic racism, including in employment and health care, people of color disproportionately experience poverty and disability compared to their peers. Consequently, policymakers need to modernize the SSI program to promote stability for the most vulnerable Americans.

We must improve monthly benefits to protect the elderly and disabled from suffering in poverty. We must adjust the asset limits for inflation. Currently, the program caps monthly savings at $2,000 and $3,000 for participating individuals and couples. If we adjusted asset limits for inflation since 1972, the asset cap for individuals would be $9,000. Raising assets limits would allow millions of beneficiaries to appropriately save for emergencies, rather than having to make immoral choices between food or shelter or health. Additionally, we need to increase the outdated income limits that remain the same as they were 50 years ago. In short, we must modernize the SSI program so that it effectively supports the poorest Americans, bolstering dignity and well-being.

I am especially proud that, as we mark the 50th anniversary of SSI, my colleagues and I at the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Worker and Family Support continue working closely with the Social Security Administration to improve outreach to those missing seniors and people with disabilities as they reopen their field offices, but there is much more we need to do to help reconnect those whom the pandemic disconnected from SSI, either from applying for initial benefits or being separated from current benefits.

As we celebrate five decades of the SSI program, I would like to recognize the amazing local disability advocates who tirelessly provide the on-going, vital help for vulnerable individuals in Chicago. These organizations serve as points of access for long-term supports and services, including home health care and assistive technology. They help expand and defend people's rights, including supporting self-advocacy groups and legal assistance. A few of these wonderful organizations are:

Access Living
The Arc of Illinois
Chicago ADAPT
Chicago Health Advocates
Equip for Equality
Health and Disability Advocates
Ilinois Council on Developmental Disabilities
Illinois Department of Aging
Legal Counsel for Health Justice
Mayor's Office for People with Disabilities
Voices for Illinois Children

In closing, I celebrate the first 50 years of the Supplemental Security Income program, and I promise to continue to fight for dignity for our most vulnerable citizens to make SSI's impact even bigger over the next 50 years.

RECOGNIZING MS. ANAMARIA LABAO CABATO, OUTSTANDING VOLUNTEER IN THE 51ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Anamaria Labao Cabato, an outstanding arts and culture advocate and community member in the 51st Congressional District.

Ms. Cabato is being honored for her longtime commitment to advancing multicultural arts through various programs and initiatives. She is the Executive Director of PASACAT Philippine Performing Arts Company and has been involved with the organization since its inception 52 years ago in 1970. PASACAT is comprised of dancers, instrumentalists, and ''harana'' singers. As many as thirty performances are given yearly to various educational, cultural, religious, and social organizations in the region.

Ms. Cabato serves as a board member of the San Diego Area Dance Alliance, was a founding partner of VOCAL, (Voices of Community at All Levels) and is a member of the City of San Diego Cultural Diversity Committee.

Most recently, Ms. Cabato was the co-chair of the new Filipinos of South Bay Exhibit (FOSBE) at the Chula Vista Library, which shares stories of Filipinos of the South Bay in San Diego County.

Ms. Cabato is being honored as the 51st District Constituent of the Month in October 2022, during Filipino American History Month. She is recognized for her work preserving and promoting Asian Pacific culture through the arts and contributing to the overall cultural vitality of the 51st Congressional District. She has vast experience as an arts administrator and holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration with an emphasis in Accounting from San Diego State University.

RECOGNIZING BOXING WORLD CHAMPION AND LAREDO NATIVE ORLANDO CANIZALES

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Orlando Canizales, a former boxing world champion and native son of Laredo, Texas.

Born in Laredo in 1965, Mr. Canizales began boxing at the age of ten at the local Boys and Girls Club. After going 108–12 as an amateur, he turned professional in 1984. He would become one of the world's best fighters in the late 1980s to early 1990s.

In 1988, Mr. Canizales became a world champion after winning the International Boxing Federation bantamweight title, knocking out the defending titlist in the fifteenth round. He would go on to make a division record 16 title defenses. Mr. Canizales continued fighting until 1999, until he decided to hang up his gloves. He retired with a record of 50–5–1 with 37 knockouts.

Mr. Canizales was inducted into the International Boxing Hall of Fame in 2009. He gave a rousing speech in which he spoke about the life lessons that boxing had given him. ''Boxing has taught me a lot in life.'' he said. ''That dedication, discipline and determination will pay off in the long run and not to be easily swayed by obstacles and bumps in the road.''

His brother, Gaby, was also a world champion. A boxing gym on Guadalupe Street in my hometown of Laredo now bears both of their names. Today, Mr. Canizales spends much of his days working with young boxers, continuing the South Texas tradition of producing some of America's finest fighters.

On behalf of the 28th District of Texas, I would like to again invite my colleagues to recognize Mr. Canizales, a truly legendary Laredoan, and celebrate all his accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING ''FIU IN WASHINGTON, D.C.'' OPENING A NEW STUDENT AND RESEARCH SHOWCASE CENTER IN OUR NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. CARLOS A. GIMENEZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. GIMENEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the opening of Florida International University's new student and research showcase center in Washington, D.C. Over the last four decades, FIU has grown exponentially to become one of the top universities in the state of Florida. It is now one of the fastest-rising universities in the nation. Today's opening ceremony is yet another example of how the university continues to invest in its students well beyond South Florida.

This new facility—a first-of-its-kind academic and briefing center—is part of an integrated advocacy approach called ''FIU in Washington, D.C.'' It aims at both further developing FIU's national reputation and expanding federal support for the university's preeminent programs. The 5,000 square foot space will give FIU students studying and interning in D.C. access to federal research programs and other resources. It will also allow FIU faculty to collaborate with federal partners and showcase the impact of their research on several areas of study that especially pertain to South Floridians—including environmental and coastal resilience, population health, Latin America and the Caribbean, defense-related engineering technologies, and STEM research.

In addition, the research center will allow students, faculty, and alumni to host national workshops and conferences tailored towards federal policy initiatives. Its proximity to the United States Capitol will give FIU student-interns a better grasp of current legislation, as well as the chance to meet with elected officials. This new center will push the university further to the forefront of national excellence. I am proud to represent Florida International University and look forward to seeing it continue to expand and excel in our Nation's capital. Go Panthers.

HONORING NEW YORK AGRICULTURE LEADER RICHARD MCGUIRE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate Richard ''Dick'' McGuire for his dedication and service to the New York State agricultural community.

Dick was born in 1922 and raised on his family farm in Jackson, New York. Given his family's deep agricultural roots and his interest in football, Dick attended SUNY Morrisville and studied animal science while playing college football. Despite his passion for sports, Dick turned down an offer to try out for the Philadelphia Eagles, instead choosing to work on a farm throughout college.

Upon graduating, Dick fully dedicated his time to working on his family's farm. In just a short period, he expanded it from 65 acres to 440 acres. He soon became involved in local affairs, leading to him become the President of the New York State Farm Bureau from 1970 to 1984.

In 1988, he was appointed by the Governor to serve as New York Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets, where he served for seven years. He later advised numerous national leaders and Presidents, including Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, and Ronald Reagan on issues important to farmers and agriculture. For his exceptional service to New York State and the country, Dick was named Outstanding Commissioner of Agriculture by the National Biotech Industry and given the Distinguished Service to Agriculture Award by the American Farm Bureau.

Dick and his wife, Polly, currently operate the Penope Farm in New York. Their farm includes twelve museum collections of farming equipment and tools dating back to the 1800s. His efforts have been instrumental in educating New Yorkers about the history and importance of farming. Dick still collects items, each one meticulously documented and arranged, and regularly hosts visitors.

Dick has been an instrumental leader in the Upstate New York agricultural community, a dedicated public servant, a true historian, and a farmer at heart. His work on behalf of New York farmers and agriculture has made significant impact on his community, state, and country. He continues to inspire generations through his important documentation and collection of historical objects to tell the story of the evolution of American agriculture and rural life. On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I would like to congratulate Dick on his 100th birthday, wish him well in his years to come, and thank him for his continued leadership and inspiration.

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY COMER MUSEUM

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 40th Anniversary of Comer Museum in the heart of Sylacauga, Alabama.

The Comer Museum has been home to the Third Congressional District Art Competition for years and I appreciate their partnership with us to help recognize our great young artists across East Alabama.

A celebration will be held on October 22nd to honor the 40 years of art the museum has brought to the area.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing my friends at the Comer Museum and wishing them a happy 40th anniversary.

HONORING JOHN CLAUSER

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize John Clauser for receiving the Nobel Prize in Physics.

John Clauser was born in Pasadena, California and obtained his Bachelor of Science in Physics at the California Institute of Technology. John then went to Columbia University in New York City, where he received both a Master of Arts and a Doctor of Philosophy in Physics. He then came back to the Bay Area to work at the University of California, Berkeley, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. He is current a resident of California's 11th Congressional District.

While at UC Berkeley, John carried out the first experimental test of the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt Bell Theorem predictions, which was the first experimental observation of a violation of a Bell Inequality. The Bell Inequalities was a mathematical relationship that would be satisfied by a hidden variable theory in which measurement of one particle would not instantly affect the properties of the other particle, which John became interested in as he began experimental testing. John worked with Stuart Freedman to publish the first experimental test of the Bell Inequalities in 1972, and their results showed a clear violation of

the Bell Inequality in accordance with those predicted by quantum mechanics.

In 1991, John came back to UC Berkeley as a research scientist for the physics department while he was a faculty scientist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, where he carried out further tests of Bell's Theorem. John teamed up with three other physicists—Michael Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard Hold—to further propose an experimental test of Bell's Theorem.

John was named one of the recipients of the Reality Foundation Prize in 1982 and the Wolf Prize in 2010 and was named the Thompson-Reuters Citation Laureate in Physics in 2011. Dr. Clauser was honored with the Nobel Prize in Physics on October 4, 2022, for the initial Bell Inequality experiment and the research that stemmed from it. The original groundbreaking experiment in 1972 along with the more recent research confirmed that quantum mechanics is correct and paved the way for quantum computers, quantum networks, and quantum encrypted communication.

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Clauser on this incredible accomplishment and his contributions to Physics.

REMEMBERING MR. BILLY F. DEBERRY

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Mr. Billy F. DeBerry, who passed away on September 17, 2022. A local legend and inspiration to our community, Mr. DeBerry's life and enduring contributions made a positive impact to many of my constituents across the Monterey Peninsula. Born on February 7, 1939, in Denmark, Tennessee, Mr. DeBerry spent most of his life in Seaside, California. While working at Alabama State College, Mr. DeBerry and his wife were recruited by Mr. Charlie Knight, marking the beginning of a 32-year-long, influential career with the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District.

Mr. DeBerry's prolific career with Monterey Peninsula Unified School District began when he was hired as a professional school counselor for Martin Luther King, Jr. High School in 1968. Two years later, he was promoted to Assistant Principal at Monterey High School, and four years later, he was promoted to Principal. In 1987, Billy joined the Central Office of MPUSD as Director of Personnel and Assistant Superintendent of Personnel. In 1991, he was promoted to Associate Superintendent and would eventually become Superintendent of Schools in 1994. It was this position that Mr. DeBerry would hold until his retirement in 2000.

Throughout Billy's career, he exemplified high standards of integrity, discipline, inclusiveness, and most importantly, compassion. Most notably, Mr. DeBerry worked diligently and tirelessly to become the first and only African American Superintendent of the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District.

These high standards extended beyond his role as Superintendent. Mr. DeBerry worked to lift up the Central Coast through his important and influential positions on the Advisory Board for California State University Monterey Bay Institute for Community Collaborative Studies, the City of Seaside's Mayor's Advisory Committee on Government Efficiency, the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Community Development Program, the Monterey County Civil Grand Jury, the Monterey County Equal Opportunity Advisory Commission, the Monterey County Sheriff's Office Commission, and the Monterey County Economic Development Commission.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Billy DeBerry was the type of dedicated community member, leader, and educator we should all strive to be. His legacy is a shining example and inspiration to us all to become more involved in our communities. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, November 17, 2022 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

NOVEMBER 30

9 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To receive a closed briefing on electronic warfare.

SVC–217

10 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine putting the Bipartisan Infrastructure law to work, focusing on the private sector perspective.

SD–406

DECEMBER 7

2:30 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the Civil Society Campaign to improve the lethality and survivability of the Ukrainian military.

SD–562

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity for October 2022.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6715–S6747

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 5099–5114, and S. Res. 835–836. **Pages S6739–40**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 5343, To direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to Congress on case management personnel turnover of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 117–199) **Page S6739**

Measures Passed:

Medical Marijuana and Cannabidiol Research Expansion: Senate passed H.R. 8454, to expand research on cannabidiol and marijuana. **Pages S6746–47**

Reserve Organization of America: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 820, honoring the 100th anniversary of the Reserve Officers Association, now known as the Reserve Organization of America, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6747**

National Domestic Violence Awareness Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 827, supporting the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6747**

Toys for Tots: Senate agreed to S. Res. 836, permitting the collection of clothing, toys, food, and housewares during the holiday season for charitable purposes in Senate buildings. **Page S6747**

Measures Considered:

Respect for Marriage Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage. **Pages S6715–36**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 62 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 356), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S6725**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, November 17, 2022; and that all time during adjournment, recess, morning business, and Leader remarks count post-cloture. **Page S6747**

Appointments:

Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 94–201, as amended by Public Law 105–275, appointed the following individual to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress: Natalie Anne Merchant of New York. **Page S6746**

Vote Change—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Schumer be permitted to change his vote on Roll Call Vote 355 from yea to nay since it will not affect the outcome. **Page S6736**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6737–39**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6739**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6740–41**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6742–44**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6736–37**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6744–46**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S6746**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S6746**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—356) **Page S6725**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 1:45 p.m. and adjourned at 6:58 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, November 17, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6747.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

U.S. POLICY IN THE CAUCASUS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States policy in the Caucasus, after receiving testimony from Karen Donfried, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, and Philip Reeker, Senior Advisor for Caucasus Negotiations, both of the Department of State.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

H.R. 3175, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 135 Main Street in Biloxi, Mississippi, as the "Robert S. McKeithen Post Office Building"; and

The nominations of Robert Harley Shriver III, of Virginia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and Richard L. Revesz, of New York, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 3168, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to modify the enforceability date for certain provisions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3308, to authorize the Colorado River Indian Tribes to enter into lease or exchange agreements and storage agreements relating to water of the Colorado River allocated to the Colorado River Indian Tribes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4104, to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Hualapai Tribe and certain allottees in the State of Arizona, to authorize construction of a water project relating to those water rights claims, with an amendment; and

S. 5087, to amend the Not Invisible Act of 2019 to extend, and provide additional support for, the activities of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice Joint Commission on Reducing Violent Crime Against Indians.

LEGISLATIVE HEARING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 4870, to approve the settlement of the water right claims of the Tule River Tribe, S. 4896, to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Pueblos of Jemez and Zia in the State of New Mexico, and S. 4898, to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Pueblos of Acoma and Laguna in the Rio San Jose Stream System in the State of New Mexico, after receiving testimony from Bryan Newland, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs; Neil Peyron, Tule River Indian Tribe of California, Porterville; Raymond Loretto, Pueblo of Jemez, Jemez Pueblo, New Mexico; Gabriel Galvan, Pueblo of Zia, Zia Pueblo, New Mexico; Randall Vicente, Pueblo of Acoma, Acoma, New Mexico; and Martin Kowemy, Jr., Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, New Mexico.

SFC HEATH ROBINSON HONORING OUR PACT ACT

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Veterans Affairs implementation of the SFC Heath Robinson Honoring our PACT Act, after receiving testimony from Shereef Elnahal, Under Secretary for Health, Joshua Jacobs, Senior Advisor for Policy, performing the delegable duties of the Under Secretary for Benefits, Guy T. Kiyokawa, Assistant Secretary for Enterprise Integration, John W. Boerstler, Chief Veterans Experience Officer, Patricia R. Hastings, Chief Consultant, Health Outcomes Military Exposures, Veterans Health Administration, Robert T. Reynolds, Deputy Under Secretary for Disability Assistance, Veterans Benefits Administration, and Tracey Therit, Chief Human Capital Officer, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 19 public bills, H.R. 9305–9323; and 9 resolutions, H. Res. 1473–1481, were introduced. **Pages H8540–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H8542–43**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 404, to improve the management of driftnet fishing, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–561);

H.R. 570, to require operators of offshore oil and gas facilities to report failures of critical systems to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–562);

H.R. 667, to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Indian Health Service, to acquire private land to facilitate access to the Desert Sage Youth Wellness Center in Hemet, California, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–563, Part 1);

H.R. 1415, to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to authorize grants to Indian Tribes to further achievement of Tribal coastal zone objectives, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–564);

H.R. 1733, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to provide funds to States and Indian tribes for the purpose of promoting economic revitalization, diversification, and development in economically distressed communities through the reclamation and restoration of land and water resources adversely affected by coal mining carried out before August 3, 1977, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–565);

H.R. 1734, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to allow the Secretary of the Interior to delegate certain emergency reclamation activities to the States and Tribes, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–566, Part 1);

H.R. 2026, to assist in the conservation of highly endangered amphibian species in foreign countries, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–567);

H.R. 2444, to establish Fort San Gerónimo del Boquerón in Puerto Rico as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–568);

H.R. 2512, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Chisholm National Historic Trail and the Western National Historic Trail, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–569);

H.R. 2551, to designate and adjust certain lands in the State of Utah as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–570);

H.R. 2872, to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and Tribal Governments and other entities, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–571);

H.R. 3228, to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to improve science, data, and services that enable sound decision making in response to coastal flood risk, including impacts of sea level rise, storm events, changing Great Lakes water levels, and land subsidence, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–572, Part 1);

H.R. 3540, to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–573);

H.R. 4458, to establish a grant program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to award grants to eligible entities for the purpose of carrying out projects on the conservation, restoration, or management of kelp forest ecosystems, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–574);

H.R. 4494, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land in Frederick County, Maryland, for the Historic Preservation Training Center of the National Park Service, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–575);

H.R. 4677, to direct restoration and protection of the New York-New Jersey watersheds and estuaries hydrologically connected to New York-New Jersey Harbor, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–576);

H.R. 5345, to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to establish a regional program to assess, monitor, and benefit the hydrology of saline lakes in the Great Basin and the migratory birds and other wildlife dependent on those habitats, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–577);

H.R. 6142, to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating the Buckeye Trail as a national scenic trail, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–578);

H.R. 6199, to revise the boundary of the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park in the State of

Missouri, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 117–579);

S. 2923, to improve the Fishery Resource Disaster Relief program of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–580); and

Committee on Rules. Ending Hunger in America: Challenges, Opportunities and the Political Will to Succeed (H. Rept. 117–581). **Page H8540**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H8509**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:56 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H8515**

Speak Out Act: The House passed S. 4524, to limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 315 yeas to 109 nays, Roll No. 480. **Pages H8518–25**

H. Res. 1464, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (S. 4524) was agreed to yesterday, November 15th.

Senate Referrals: S.J. Res. 63 was held at the desk. S. 4834 was held at the desk. **Page H8536**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today and message received from the Senate today appear on pages H8517–18 and H8536.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8524–25.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Committee Meetings

OVERSIGHT OF PRUDENTIAL REGULATORS: ENSURING THE SAFETY, SOUNDNESS, DIVERSITY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of Prudential Regulators: Ensuring the Safety, Soundness, Diversity, and Accountability of Depository Institutions''. Testimony was heard from Michael Barr, Vice Chairman of Supervision, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Martin Gruenberg, Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Todd Harper, Chairman, National Credit Union Administration; and Michael Hsu, Acting Comptroller of the Currency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

RUSSIA'S WANING GLOBAL INFLUENCE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment and Cyber held a hearing entitled ''Russia's Waning Global Influence''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 1378, of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to Resolution Copper mine. H. Res. 1378 was ordered reported, as amended.

JROTC: PROTECTING CADETS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE AND INSTRUCTOR MISCONDUCT

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled ''JROTC: Protecting Cadets from Sexual Abuse and Instructor Misconduct''. Testimony was heard from Thomas A. Constable, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense; Yvette K. Bourcicot, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Army; Alex Wagner, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Air Force; and Robert D. Hogue, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of the Navy.

THE HOLIDAY RUSH: IS THE POSTAL SERVICE READY?

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled ''The Holiday Rush: Is the Postal Service Ready?''. Testimony was heard from Tammy W. Hull, Inspector General, U.S. Postal Service; Gregory T. White, Executive Manager of Strategic Initiatives, U.S. Postal Service; and public witnesses.

LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL FACTORS RELATED TO SEATING A CHEROKEE NATION DELEGATE IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Legal and Procedural Factors Related to Seating a Cherokee Nation Delegate in the U.S. House of Representatives''. Testimony was heard from Mainon A. Schwartz, Legislative Attorney, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

UNFOLDING THE UNIVERSE: INITIAL SCIENCE RESULTS FROM THE JAMES WEBB SPACE TELESCOPE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing entitled ''Unfolding the Universe: Initial Science Results from the James Webb Space Telescope''. Testimony was heard from Mark Clampin, Astrophysics Division Director, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 1379, of inquiry to the President and directing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to wait times for veterans to receive primary care, mental health care, and specialty care appointments at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and H.R. 4722, the ''Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act''. H.R. 4772 was ordered reported, without amendment. H. Res. 1379 was ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of David Crane, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary, Jeffrey Matthew Marootian, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy), and Gene Rodrigues, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability), all of the Department of Energy, 11 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Chemical Safety, Waste Management, Environmental Justice, and Regulatory Oversight, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stephen A. Owens, of Arizona, to be Chairperson, and Catherine J.K. Sandoval, of California, to be a Member, both of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine threats to the homeland, 10:15 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 2773, to amend the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to address satellite offices of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and the nominations of Anthony Devos Johnstone, of Montana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Maria Araujo Kahn, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Julie Rikelman, of Massachusetts, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Daniel J. Calabretta, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, Matthew L. Garcia, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico, Margaret R. Guzman, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, Jeffery Paul Hopkins, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, Lindsay C. Jenkins, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Araceli Martinez-Olguin, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Adrienne C. Nelson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, Jamar K. Walker, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, Jamal N. Whitehead, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, and McLain J. Schneider, to be United States Attorney for the District of North Dakota, David C. Davis, of Illinois, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Illinois, Peter D. Leary, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia, and Leigha Simonton, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Texas, all of the Department of Justice, 9 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, business meeting to approve new subcommittee assignments, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn and Zoom.

Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled ''Unsafe and Untenable: Examining Workplace Protections for Warehouse Workers'', 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Assessing the Biden Administration's U.S. Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa'', 10 a.m., HVC–210 and Webex.

Committee on Natural Resources, Office of Insular Affairs Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Puerto Rico's Post-Disaster Reconstruction and Power Grid Development'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, business meeting on H.R. 1283, the ''CONTRACT Act of 2021''; H.R. 1307, the ''Vote by Mail Tracking Act''; H. Res. 1412, of inquiry directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the projected inflationary impact of the implementation of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, the Build Back Better Act, and the Infrastructure and Jobs Act in conjunction with the Build Back Better Act; and several postal naming measures, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled ''Accessible Air Travel: Addressing Challenges for Passengers with Disabilities'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn and Zoom.

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress, Full Committee, business meeting on proposed recommendations, 11 a.m., 2359 Rayburn and Zoom.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

SECOND SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SEVENTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through October 31, 2022

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	148	134	..
Time in session	791 hrs, 22′	522 hrs, 50′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	6,627	8,423	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,100	..
Public bills enacted into law	64	69	133
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	1	1	..
Measures passed, total	419	460	879
Senate bills	110	65	..
House bills	71	306	..
Senate joint resolutions	5	..	..
House joint resolutions	1	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	8	5	..
House concurrent resolutions	4	9	..
Simple resolutions	220	74	..
Measures reported, total	*233	315	548
Senate bills	157	..	..
House bills	49	236	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	2	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	..	..
Simple resolutions	24	79	..
Special reports	3	10	..
Conference reports	..	..	..
Measures pending on calendar	330	108	..
Measures introduced, total	2,038	3,581	5,619
Bills	1,638	2,908	..
Joint resolutions	30	32	..
Concurrent resolutions	24	47	..
Simple resolutions	346	594	..
Quorum calls	..	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	352	460	..
Recorded votes	..	16	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 138 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 325 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through October 31, 2022

Civilian nominees, totaling 661 (including 181 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	352
Unconfirmed	279
Withdrawn	30
Returned to White House	0
Other Civilian nominees, totaling 1,249 (including 291 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	901
Unconfirmed	348
Air Force nominees, totaling 6,118 (including 5 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	5,276
Unconfirmed	842
Army nominees, totaling 5,936 (including 1,992 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	5,924
Unconfirmed	12
Navy nominees, totaling 4,470 (including 1 nominee carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	4,464
Unconfirmed	6
Marine Corps nominees, totaling 432 (including 321 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	429
Unconfirmed	3
Space Force nominees, totaling 471 (including 2 nominees carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	469
Unconfirmed	2

Summary

Total nominees carried over from the First Session	2,793
Total nominees received this Session	16,544
Total confirmed	17,815
Total unconfirmed	1,492
Total withdrawn	30
Total returned to the White House	0

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, November 17

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 8404, Respect for Marriage Act, post-cloture.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, November 17

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Allen, Rick W., Ga., E1149
Axne, Cynthia, Iowa, E1153
Bacon, Don, Nebr., E1150
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1151
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E1154
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1155
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1157
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1153, E1156
DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E1157
Gallagher, Mike, Wisc., E1153
Gimenez, Carlos A., Fla., E1153, E1157
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1152, E1155
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E1154
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1151
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1151
McEachin, A. Donald, Va., E1153
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E1149
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1150
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E1149, E1154, E1158
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1150, E1155, E1157
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1149, E1152, E1157
Van Duyne, Beth, Tex., E1152
Vargas, Juan, Calif., E1156
Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E1155
Wexton, Jennifer, Va., E1150

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.