United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2022 No. 183

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

O Lord, You give and You take away. Blessed be Your name. By Your grace, You have given us Your noble and humble servant, Representative Donald McEachin, and we have been privileged to enjoy this, Your generous gift, and we are witnesses to his response to Your claim on his life.

Representative McEachin lived into Your anointing, committing himself to bringing good news to the poor, proclaiming freedom for those imprisoned by the inequities that constrain, and working diligently to set the oppressed free. His compassionate manner and trusted counsel, so eagerly shared with all those graced to be in his sphere, are truly a blessing that we will cherish dearly.

O Lord, You give and You take away. Blessed be Your name. For even in the worst of his brave and valiant fight for his life, Representative McEachin held firm in his convictions that You gave him the strength to endure his sufferings. May this, his legacy of character and devotion, reveal the hope he found in You.

Then may all who grieve this day, his wife Colette, his dear family, his colleagues, and friends, find blessing in this same hope, that in his life and his death, Representative Donald McEachin will always bring glory to You.

It is in Your sacred name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. McEachin), the whole number of the House is 432.

REIMAGINING THE SOUTH SHORE OF ST. CROIX

(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, for decades, my island, my home, St. Croix, was the home of the largest refinery in the Western Hemisphere, an identity that largely shaped our economic makeup to the detriment, in some instances, of historic industries such as agriculture or at the detriment of our environment but provided thousands of jobs throughout the years to our residents. The recent failure of the refinery to restart successfully has been a disappointment to many, but in there lies a unique opportunity before us.

With the rapid changes taking place in our climate and the urgency that the Biden administration has placed on environmental reform and the much-needed transition to green energy and renewables, we have an opportunity to reimagine how the south shore of St. Croix can be redeveloped.

The green energy initiatives and the focus on historically disadvantaged communities contained in the Inflation Reduction Act, along with the incentives and funding included in the bipartisan infrastructure law, are not only timely but critical for us as a territory.

I ask my colleagues, I ask Virgin Islanders, I ask our Governor and our elected officials to all join in reimagining and getting to work on redefining what we look like.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1494

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Printed on recycled paper.

BIDEN ENERGY POLICIES ARE THE SOURCE OF INFLATION

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Biden administration's self-made energy crisis.

Since taking office, I have been vocal about my commitment to alternative forms of energy that bring revenue and flexibility to Iowa and allow Iowa to be a major energy exporter.

However, the Biden administration's policies have relied on foreign nations instead of prioritizing American energy independence.

Iowans have felt the effect of President Biden's policies. Grocery and energy prices continue to soar with inflation rates at historic highs. So while the temperatures drop into the teens, some are forced to choose between turning on their heat and buying groceries.

According to the National Energy Assistance Directors Association, diesel prices could top $6 per gallon this winter, but Iowa could fill the gap with biodiesel. Struggling families simply cannot afford President Biden's energy policies.

I want to reiterate my calls to President Biden to unleash domestic energy and look towards Iowa as a framework for an any-of-the-above approach to lower energy costs for Americans.

I also want to wish a very happy birthday to Andy Swanson.

IN MEMORY OF DONALD McEACHIN

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in shock and feeling an immense loss for the Member that will not be with us, Donald McEachin, the gentleman from Virginia, a dear friend.

The members of the Committee on Natural Resources extend to his family, his wife Colette, his children and his grandchildren, his loved ones, and his loyal and capable staff, our condolences, our sympathies, and our comfort.

This imposing man, Donald McEachin, was more than that. His strength came from his heart, his faith, his empathy, and his compassion for other people.

On this journey, I have had the privilege and pleasure to work with him for over 3 years to develop legislation that would assure every American had clean air, clean water, and a clean environment. That piece of legislation is historic, and it is the creation of great work on the part of Donald McEachin.

It is his legacy that I hope we address, but it is also his character and his strength, as he guided me and other Members through a process that is sometimes difficult, sometimes contentious, but a process that at the end of the day has produced something that will be part of the legacy of a man that served his community, served his country, served his family, and gave honor to all of us. This is a deep loss, an immense loss, and one that I share with everyone.

AMERICANS ARE EXPERIENCING INFLATION AT A 40-YEAR HIGH

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, families across America sat down to enjoy Thanksgiving meals. Unfortunately, this week, as a result of irresponsible policies of Biden and Democrats, families are paying massive costs.

Americans are experiencing inflation at a 40-year high with families in South Carolina paying nearly 15 percent more for goods and services in the last year.

Average national costs have increased. Turkey is up 21 percent. Pie crusts and whipping cream are up 26 percent. Dinner rolls are up 22 percent. Milk is up 16 percent.

According to the recent Morning Consult poll, 41 percent of Thanksgiving shoppers were planning to cut side dishes to save money.

Our country is in a crisis, and Americans need relief, which is why voters elected a House Republican majority. Republicans will fight inflation with fiscal sanity.

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.

RECOGNIZING JESSE PORRAS

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

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a servant leader in our community, Odessa native, Mr. Jesse Porras, a Marine veteran.

Mr. Porras has been cooking and serving a Thanksgiving meal to hundreds of Odessans in need every year since 2013 when he first felt called to provide a warm and comforting meal to anyone in need or struggling with homelessness in our community. Since then, it has grown into a community feast, with local businesses and others partnering with Jesse. Over the past 9 years, Mr. Porras' Thanksgiving meal has fed thousands and lifted the spirits of the entire community.

Jesse Porras is an inspiration to all of us. Not only was he willing to put his life on the line through his service to our country as a marine, but he continues that service through his generosity and philanthropic spirit today. This is something that we can all emulate, especially as we are approaching the holiday season.

I thank Mr. Porras personally for giving so much of his time, talent, and goodwill to share the blessings of Thanksgiving, which, in my opinion, should be celebrated every day. But on that particular day, he does a great job in Odessa. It is with heartfelt thanks that Texas' 11th Congressional District thanks him.

□ 1415

MOURNING THE TRAGEDY AT UVA AND HONORING THE BRAVERY OF MIKE HOLLINS

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the senseless and tragic loss of life at the University of Virginia on November 13, but I also rise to recognize and honor the bravery displayed by Mike Hollins during the recent shooting at the University of Virginia.

After getting off the bus and directing two students to run to safety, Mike Hollins, a running back on the Cavaliers football team, turned around and attempted to reboard the bus to help his teammates and others still trapped with the gunman.

Mike's bravery was met with evil, however, as he was shot while trying to protect those still in harm's way. Thankfully, Mike has been released from the hospital. I pray he will continue to have a full and complete recovery.

My prayers are also with the families of D'Sean Perry, Lavel Davis, Jr., and Devin Chandler, who are deeply hurting from the loss of their loved ones, along with the entire University of Virginia community.

We are always saddened in the face of tragedy, but bravery like Mike Hollins showed gives us hope. May God continue to heal our land.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

DELIVERING OPTIMALLY URGENT LABOR ACCESS FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS ACT OF 2022

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2521) to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to furnish doula services to veterans, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2521

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 ''Delivering Optimally Urgent Labor Access for Veterans Affairs Act of 2022'' or the ''DOULA for VA Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. FEASIBILITY AND ADVISABILITY STUDY ON DOULA SUPPORT FOR VETERANS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a study on the feasibility and advisability of furnishing doula services to covered vetearns. Such study shall include an analysis of—

(1) measures taken by other Federal, State, and local entities to ensure the appropriate certification of doulas; and

(2) the extent to which such measures, or similar measures, may be adequate for purposes of such furnishment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the findings of the study under subsection (a) that shall include a determination by the Secretary as to whether furnishing doula services to covered veterans is feasible and advisable.

(c) COVERED VETERAN DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''covered veteran'' means a pregnant veteran or a formerly pregnant veteran (with respect to doula services to be furnished post-partum) who is enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2521, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2521, as amended, the DOULA for VA Act of 2022. This bill, authored and long championed by Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE, would bring VA closer to providing the full scope of reproductive healthcare that our veterans and their newborns deserve. This bill would require VA conduct a feasibility and advisability study to determine whether to provide pregnant veterans access to doula support services.

The United States has a maternal mortality crisis, and our veterans are not protected from it. In fact, they are disproportionately more likely to experience severe maternal mental health outcomes than their civilian counterparts.

There is a growing body of research that shows that doula care is an effective tool in mitigating pre and postpartum mental health crises and can be a factor in reducing childbirth complications. The VA must investigate the ability to provide such holistic and effective care.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this bill. I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting Mrs. LAWRENCE's critical and commonsense legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2521, the Delivering Optimally Urgent Labor Access for Veterans Affairs Act of 2022, or the DOULA for VA Act of 2022.

Women are now our fastest growing group within the veteran community. More than 2 million women veterans live in the U.S. today. Many of them are within childbearing age.

In the last few years, the use of maternal services within the VHA has increased by 44 percent. The DOULA for VA Act would require VA to conduct a study to provide doula services for pregnant veterans enrolled in the VA healthcare system.

Mr. Speaker, a doula is a trained companion who provides physical and emotional support to women before, during, and after childbirth. They also offer guidance and educational support for new mothers. However, doulas are not medically trained professionals, and there are no certifying or licensing standards for doulas, which is why it is imperative that doulas meet the minimum quality and safety standards set forth by the VA.

This bill will provide VA and Congress with valuable insight into the trade, and I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2521.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), the author of H.R. 2521 and my good friend, who serves on the Appropriations Committee and the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his dedication and the efforts of his entire team in bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the ranking member for his support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the DOULA for VA Act.

Maternal mortality in the United States is a public health crisis. While maternal mortality rates have declined globally over the past three decades, the United States' maternal mortality rates have climbed.

As we work to address this serious public health issue, we have a responsibility to make sure that our pregnant veterans are included in the conversation. This is because veterans who have experienced pregnancy disproportionately experience mental health afflictions such as post-traumatic stress disorder and anxiety.

Studies have found that pregnant veterans were twice as likely to have a diagnosis of depression, anxiety, and stress disorder, and more than those who had not experienced a pregnancy.

We must provide veterans who have served our country optimal maternal and mental health care that takes into consideration their veteran-specific experiences.

Doulas have a proven positive effect on the health outcome of the mother and child. As the use of doula services continue to grow, we must look at ways to expand maternal health services for our women in the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the bipartisan Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues for supporting this effort, the House leadership and their hardworking staff, and the amazing committee staff for working to advance this bill to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage all my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I again ask my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 2521, as amended. With a heavy heart, I take this moment to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE). She has joined us on Veterans Affairs' codels and done factfinding on behalf of the committee for the betterment of our veterans. I thank her for that, and I wish her the best of the new opportunities that she will encounter after she leaves this body.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2521, DOULA for VA Act of 2021—to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to furnish doula services to veterans.

Doulas provide emotional and physical support to pregnant people during pregnancy, childbirth, and postpartum. A doula will assist during birth by providing a positive and safe birthing experience.

Studies show that when doulas are present in the birthing process labors are shorter, it is less likely that a C-section will be needed, there are less requests for pain medication, and there is a more positive childbirth experience.

In 2013, the Journal of Perinatal Education conducted a study which found that expectant mothers matched with a doula had better birth outcomes than did mothers who gave birth without involvement of a doula.

Doulas work to develop birthing plans, help the parent understand labor and delivery procedures, communicate preferences to the medical staff, and teach relaxation and breathing skills, along with many other non-clinical tasks that improve the birthing experience.

Currently, Veterans Affairs benefits do not cover doulas.

Improving the childbirth experience should be a priority for us all. Veterans and their family members deserve to have positive birthing experiences, just as all Amencans do.

Maternal mortality is an issue that continues to plague the United States health care system. In 2020, 861 women died of maternal causes in the United States. In the U.S., two-thirds of those pregnancy-related deaths are preventable and for every pregnancy-related death, there are 70 pregnancy-related near-death experiences. It's extremely important that we remove barriers in health care that may be contributing to these deaths.

Maternal mortality is caused by several issues such as cardiovascular problems, high blood pressure, blood clots, and complications of labor and delivery.

One step to removing health care barriers is to provide more services such as doulas who can advocate for the parent and provide positive birthing experiences.

From 2010 through 2015, the use of maternity services from the Veterans Health Administration increased by 44 percent.

If doula services are improving care for the general public, then veterans should be provided with the opportunity to utilize doula services as well.

A study in 2010 found that veterans returning from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom who experienced pregnancy were twice as likely to have a diagnosis of depression, anxiety, posttraumatic stress disorder, bipolar disorder, or schizophrenia as compared to those who had not experienced a pregnancy.

H.R. 2521, Doula for VA Act of 2021 is important because we should be working to improve the lives of women and children in the United States. This bill directly impacts the health of veterans and their families.

I know that this bill is important to my constituents in Houston. Over 282,000 Veterans live in the Houston area, and almost 25,000 Veterans in Houston are women. Improving the birthing experience for these women is a top priority to me.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this critical bill that will direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to furnish doula services to veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2521, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMITMENT TO VETERAN SUPPORT AND OUTREACH ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4601) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to States to improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4601

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 ''Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO AWARD GRANTS TO STATES AND INDIAN TRIBES TO IMPROVE OUTREACH TO VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 6307 and 6308 and sections 6308 and 6309, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 6306 the following new section 6307:

''§ 6307. Grants to States and Indian Tribes to improve outreach to veterans

''(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to provide for assistance by the Secretary to States and Indian Tribes to carry out programs that—

''(1) improve outreach and assistance to veterans and the spouses, children, and parents of veterans, to ensure that such individuals are fully informed about any veterans and veterans-related benefits and programs (including veterans programs of a State or Indian Tribe) for which they may be eligible; and

''(2) facilitate opportunities for such individuals to receive competent, qualified services in the preparation, presentation, and prosecution of veterans benefits claims.

''(b) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may award grants under this section to States and Indian Tribes—

''(1) to carry out, coordinate, improve, or otherwise enhance outreach activities;

''(2) to increase the number of county or Tribal veterans service officers serving in the State or Indian Tribe by hiring new, additional such officers; or

''(3) to expand, carry out, coordinate, improve, or otherwise enhance existing programs, activities, and services of the existing organization of the State or Indian Tribe that has been recognized by the Department of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 5902, in the preparation, presentation, and prosecution of claims for veterans benefits through representatives who hold positions as county or Tribal veterans service officers.

''(c) APPLICATION.—(1) To be eligible for a grant under this section, a State or Indian Tribe shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(2) Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) A detailed plan for the use of the grant.

''(B) A description of the programs through which the State or Indian Tribe will meet the outcome measures developed by the Secretary under subsection (i).

''(C) A description of how the State or Indian Tribe will distribute grant amounts equitably among counties (or Tribal lands, as the case may be) with varying levels of urbanization.

''(D) A plan for how the grant will be used to meet the unique needs of American Indian or Alaska Native veterans, elderly veterans, women veterans, and veterans from other underserved communities.

''(d) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary shall seek to ensure that grants awarded under this section are equitably distributed among States and Indian Tribes with varying levels of urbanization.

''(e) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall prioritize awarding grants under this section that will serve the following areas:

''(1) Areas with a critical shortage of county or Tribal veterans service officers.

''(2) Areas with high rates of—

''(A) suicide among veterans; or

''(B) referrals to the Veterans Crisis Line.

''(f) USE OF COUNTY OR TRIBAL VETERANS SERVICE OFFICERS.—A State or Indian Tribe that receives a grant under this section to carry out an activity described in subsection (b)(1) may only carry out the activity through—

''(1) a county or Tribal veterans service officer of the State or Indian Tribe; or

''(2) if the State or Indian Tribe does not have a county or Tribal veterans service officer, or if the county or Tribal veterans service officers of the State or Indian Tribe cover only a portion of that State or Indian Tribe, an appropriate entity of a State, local, or Tribal government, as determined by the Secretary.

''(g) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—Any grant awarded under this section shall be used—

''(1) to expand existing programs, activities, and services;

''(2) to hire and maintain new, additional county or Tribal veterans service officers; or

''(3) for travel and transportation to facilitate carrying out paragraph (1) or (2).

''(h) OTHER PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—A grant under this section may be used to provide education and training, including on-the-job training, for State, county, local, and Tribal government employees who provide (or when trained will provide) veterans outreach services in order for those employees to obtain and maintain accreditation in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary.

''(i) OUTCOME MEASURES.—(1) The Secretary shall develop and provide to each State or Indian Tribe that receives a grant under this section written guidance on the following:

''(A) Outcome measures.

''(B) Policies of the Department.

''(2) In developing outcome measures under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider the following goals:

''(A) Increasing the use of veterans and veterans-related benefits, particularly among vulnerable populations.

''(B) Increasing the number of county and Tribal veterans service officers recognized by the Secretary for the representation of veterans under chapter 59 of this title.

''(j) TRACKING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) With respect to each grant awarded under this section, the Secretary shall track the use of veterans benefits among the population served by the grant, including the average period of time between the date on which a veteran or other eligible claimant applies for such a benefit and the date on which the veteran or other eligible claimant receives the benefit, disaggregated by type of benefit.

''(2) Not less frequently than annually during the life of the grant program established under this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on—

''(A) the information tracked under paragraph (1);

''(B) how the grants awarded under this section serve the unique needs of American Indian or Alaska Native veterans, elderly veterans, women veterans, and veterans from other underserved communities; and

''(C) other information provided by States and Indian Tribes pursuant to the grant reporting requirements.

''(k) PERFORMANCE REVIEW.—(1) The Secretary shall—

''(A) review the performance of each State or Indian Tribe that receives a grant under this section; and

''(B) make information regarding such performance publicly available.

''(l) REMEDIATION PLAN.—(1) In the case of a State or Indian Tribe that receives a grant

under this section and does not meet the outcome measures developed by the Secretary under subsection (i), the Secretary shall require the State or Indian Tribe to submit a remediation plan under which the State or Indian Tribe shall describe how and when it plans to meet such outcome measures.

''(2) The Secretary may not award a subsequent grant under this section to a State or Indian Tribe described in paragraph (1) unless the Secretary approves the remediation plan submitted by the State of Indian Tribe.

''(m) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant awarded under this section may not exceed 10 percent of amounts made available for grants under this section for the fiscal year in which the grant is awarded.

''(n) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Any grant awarded under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant State and local funding that is otherwise available.

''(o) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'county or Tribal veterans service officer' includes a local equivalent veterans service officer.

''(2) The term 'Indian Tribe' has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

''(3) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.

''(4) The term 'Veterans Crisis Line' means the toll-free hotline for veterans established under section 1720F(h) of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 63 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 6307 and 6308 and inserting the following new items:

''6307. Grants to States and Indian Tribes to improve outreach to veterans.
''6308. Outreach for eligible dependents.
''6309. Biennial report to Congress.''.

(c) MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN HOUSING LOAN FEE.—The loan fee table in section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''January 14, 2031'' each place it appears and inserting ''February 10, 2031''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT EMPLOYEE.—During fiscal years 2024 through 2028, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may hire two or more additional full-time equivalent employees in the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as compared to the number of full-time equivalent employees that would otherwise be authorized for such office, to carry out duties under the accreditation, discipline, and fees program.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 4601, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4601, the Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act, as amended. This bill authorizes VA to provide grants to States, counties, and Tribes to implement programs that improve outreach and assistance to veterans and their families to ensure that such individuals are fully informed about veterans' benefits and programs.

Specifically, VA may provide grants to States, counties, and Tribal entities to implement or enhance outreach activities or activities to assist in the development and submittal of claims for veterans or increase the number of county or Tribal veteran service officers in the State.

Additionally, VA would be required to prioritize awarding grants in areas with a critical shortage of county or Tribal veterans service officers, areas with high rates of suicide among veterans, and areas with high rates of referrals to the veterans crisis line.

With high-profile, sweeping veterans' legislation like the PACT Act recently signed into law, the support and outreach offered by H.R. 4601 would greatly assist in implementing such new programs as smoothly as possible.

With enhanced communication outreach focused on explaining new benefits and services to a broader range of veterans and their families, the more opportunities we will have to connect with potential beneficiaries interacting with VA for the very first time.

With more accredited claims representatives available to assist with the preparation and submission of claim applications, the better positioned VA will be to decide these claims in a more timely and accurate manner.

With funds to recruit and train more county and Tribal veterans service officers, helpful skills and information related to life-changing benefits and other VA services will reach farther into our veteran communities that are so often and undeservedly overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this bill. I thank Representative LEVIN for crafting this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4601, as amended, the Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act.

This bill would provide VA the authority to award grants to States and Indian Tribes to improve outreach to veterans and their families about the benefits they may be eligible for.

H.R. 4601, as amended, would prioritize grants to the areas that have large populations of underserved veterans and high rates of suicide. Additionally, this bill would help county and Tribal VSOs assist veterans with preparing and presenting their disability compensation claims.

With the implementation of the PACT Act right around the corner, it is imperative that Congress provide local VSOs with the resources they need to assist veterans with their claims.

Every veteran deserves access to the same wraparound help with their benefits regardless of where they live. Congressman LEVIN and Congressman ROSENDALE's proposal would do exactly that.

I also want to point out that this bill has a mandatory cost because of toxic exposure funds created by the PACT Act. Now, I am happy to see the cost is now fully offset rather than swept under the rug.

Congress must find a permanent solution to the toxic exposure fund scoring problem before we use up all of our offsets and become unable to move additional legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to work toward that solution, and I urge all Members to support H.R. 4601, as amended.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, again, I ask all my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 4601, as amended. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand in strong support of H.R. 4601, the Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act, which will authorize the VA to provide grants to states to implement programs that improve outreach and assistance to veterans and their families to ensure that such individuals are fully informed about veterans' benefits and programs.

As our veterans have put their lives on the line for defense of our nation, we must do everything in our power to support them when they return home after their service.

This bill achieves this goal by increasing outreach to veterans and their families to ensure that they are fully informed about their benefits and can get the assistance they need to apply for and get the benefits to which they are entitled.

According to a report by the Department of Veterans Affairs, America has over 19 million veterans, of whom over 1,567,000 live in Texas, the second most of any state. Over 179,000 live in Harris County and about 29,000 live in my district.

Of the total veteran population, the VA reports that only 49% (9.8 million out of 20.0 million) used at least one VA benefit or service in FY 2017.

That percentage is far too low. Too few veterans are taking advantage of the programs and services available to them to cope with the ravages of war.

Their ailments include everything from respiratory problems caused by burn-pit toxic exposure to combat conditions such as Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

Prompt and easy access to services to address these problems determines a veteran's ability to recover from them.

For example, according to research conducted by the VA, veterans who received care soon after the end of their service had lower levels of PTSD upon a follow-up evaluation a year after they initiated care. According to the study, for each year that a veteran waited to initiate treatment, there was about a 5 percent increase in the odds of their PTSD either not improving or worsening.

In 2018, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine found that post-9/11 veterans who had not sought VA mental health care didn't know how to apply for benefits—or were unsure whether they were even eligible. Some didn't know what services the VA offered or felt that they didn't deserve care even if they could get it.

This bill addresses that problem by making grants available to states to help the thousands of veterans who need services for their conditions acquired or exacerbated by military service but who don't know how to access them.

This legislation will not only be key to assisting veterans to get over barriers to access their benefits but will also improve veteran mental health and help reduce the veteran suicide crisis.

This bill focuses on equity by prioritizing grants to areas with high suicide rates among veterans and high referrals to the Veterans Crisis Line. This approach will help save veterans' lives and ensure this funding is directed to areas most in need.

Smoother access to VA mental health care and suicide prevention has never been more important than it is today. A disproportionate number of veterans die by suicide following separation from military service.

Veterans ages 18 to 34 have the highest rate of suicide.

As reported by the Houston Chronicle, in 2020, the suicide rate for Texas veterans was 36.6 suicides per 100,000 veterans while the nationwide rate was 34.4, according to data from the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs. This rate is in stark contrast to the suicide rate among Texans overall, which is 13.3 per 100,000 people.

I am proud to support this legislation because it will reduce veteran suicide among Texans and nationwide, and it will enable states to better serve veterans who are in need of many types of assistance.

This is especially important because of the Texas governor's recent actions impacting troops and veterans in Texas with regard to the southern border.

Texas's governor has thrust our National Guard into a disastrous border operation, Operation Lone Star, by declaring a fictional "migrant invasion", and falsely claiming that activation of the National Guard is needed for what he describes as "secure our communities against record-breaking illegal border crossings and transnational criminal activity."

The result is that our National Guard troops are being forced to commit major human rights violations. The governor's use of the National Guard to police misdemeanor trespassing by migrants has sparked a civil rights probe by the Justice Department. According to Human Rights Watch, the operation results in arrests that target people based on race and national origin and disregard due process, including abuses in detention.

Black and Brown migrants, and even US citizens, are subjected to racially discriminatory arrests, prosecutions on flimsy pretexts, and detention with substandard food and inadequate or nonexistent health care, according to detainees cited in a complaint filed with the US Justice Department. Defendants have been forced to wait weeks or months in pretrial detention before they have an opportunity to see a judge.

Troops commanded to carry out this operation are so affected that at least four confirmed suicides have occurred since the operation began, while ten soldiers linked to the operation have died since September 2021, all via accident or suicide.

In addition to human rights abuses, Texas Guard troops have complained about pay problems, poor living conditions and inconsistent guidance from leaders since the operation expanded massively last Fall.

I strongly denounce the program, its abuses, and the trauma that it is inflicting on our troops who are charged to carry out the program's edicts.

This legislation, H.R. 4601, will help these veterans who struggle with the aftermath of the psychological and physical toil of serving on this operation, just as veterans of combat in Afghanistan and Iraq and elsewhere continue to wrestle with the aftereffects of their service.

We must help veterans access the benefits and services that they earned and so definitely deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4601, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1430

MARK O'BRIEN VA CLOTHING ALLOWANCE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4772) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the application and review process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for clothing allowance claims submitted by veterans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4772

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 "Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act".

SEC. 2. IMPROVEMENTS TO PROCESS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR CLOTHING ALLOWANCE CLAIMS.

(a) PROCESS FOR CLOTHING ALLOWANCE CLAIMS.—Section 1162 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary under" and inserting:

"(a) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary, under";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "which (A) a physician" and inserting: "which—"

"(A) a physician"; and

(B) by striking ", and (B) the Secretary" and inserting "; and"

"(B) the Secretary"; and

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

"(b) CONTINUOUS NATURE OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made to a veteran under subsection (a) shall continue on an automatically recurring annual basis until the earlier of the following:

"(1) The date on which the veteran elects to no longer receive such payments.

"(2) The date on which the Secretary determines the veteran no longer eligible pursuant to subsection (d).

"(c) REVIEWS OF CLAIM.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2)(B), the Secretary shall conduct reviews of the claim on which the clothing allowance is based to determine the continued eligibility of the veteran as follows:

"(A) Beginning not earlier than five years after the date on which a veteran initially receives a clothing allowance under this section and on a periodic basis thereafter.

"(B) Whenever the Secretary receives notice that the veteran no longer meets the requirements specified in subsection (a).

"(2)(A) The Secretary shall prescribe in regulations standards for determining whether a claim for clothing allowance is based on a circumstance that is not subject to change.

"(B) If the Secretary determines, pursuant to such standards, that a claim for clothing allowance is based on a circumstance that is not subject to change, paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply with respect to the claim.

"(d) DETERMINATION REGARDING CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY.—If the Secretary determines, as the result of a review of a claim conducted under subsection (c)(1), that the veteran who submitted such claim no longer meets the requirements specified in subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

"(1) provide to the veteran notice of such determination that includes a description of applicable actions that may be taken following the determination, including the actions specified in section 5104C of this title; and

"(2) discontinue the clothing allowance based on such claim.".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to—

(1) claims for clothing allowance submitted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) claims for clothing allowance submitted prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, if the veteran who submitted such claim is in receipt of the clothing allowance as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. ADJUSTMENTS OF CERTAIN LOAN FEES.

The loan fee table in section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "January 14, 2031" each place it appears and inserting "January 15, 2031".

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory

Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4772, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4772, as amended, the Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act.

As it stands today, under 38 U.S.C. 1162, the Secretary may pay an annual clothing allowance payment to a veteran with a service-connected disability that requires the use of a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance, including a wheelchair, which the Secretary determines tends to wear out or tear the clothing of the veteran, or medication which, A, a physician has prescribed for a skin condition, or, B, the Secretary determines causes irreparable damage to the veteran's outer garments.

Veterans who are entitled to a VA clothing allowance must reapply each year to receive the annual payment. This places the onus on veterans with what are, in most instances, permanent conditions to remember to reapply each year to receive the benefit they have already shown they are entitled to. Veterans must also remember to apply before August 1 or risk denial due to untimely application.

Mr. LEVIN's bill would change all of that. It would amend 38 U.S.C. 1162 to allow for the VA clothing allowance to be an automatic annual payment, subject to periodic review by VA to determine continued entitlement.

It would no longer force veterans to reapply each year and, instead, requires VA to complete periodic reviews to determine continued entitlement on its own initiation. This would require notice to the veteran if entitlement were no longer shown.

Approximately 40,000 veterans were approved for the clothing allowance benefit in fiscal year 2020 alone. This bill would ensure these veterans no longer have to reapply every year to maintain their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting Mr. LEVIN's beneficial and commonsense legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4772, as amended, the Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act.

The clothing allowance program was created to give veterans the financial means to replace clothes that have been damaged due to their service-connected disability. For example, a veteran who has a prosthetic or uses a wheelchair may wear out their clothes quickly and need to replace them often.

Yet, under current law, veterans who qualify for the clothing allowance must go through a tedious process of reapplying every year to receive their benefit, even if their condition is unlikely to change.

H.R. 4772, as amended, would streamline the process for veterans receiving a clothing allowance by making the renewal process automatic.

To ensure proper oversight of this program, VA would be required to reevaluate the veteran 5 years after they have received the benefit to determine eligibility for the clothing allowance. If a veteran has a more permanent condition, such as an amputation, VA would have the authority to exempt the veteran from regular reevaluations.

I support these commonsense changes, which would simplify the clothing allowance program and reduce the paperwork burden on our veterans, and I am glad to see the cost of the bill is also fully offset. I thank Congressman LEVIN and Congressman MOORE for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 4772, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 4772, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4772, the Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act.

This legislation would amend the VA's existing clothing allowance program by enabling automatic payments to continue being made to eligible veterans on a recurring basis until the veteran opts out of the program or is no longer eligible.

The bill will make it easier for veterans—especially veterans living with lifelong disabilities—to receive their earned clothing benefits which enables them to live with the dignity and comfort that they earned and so rightfully deserve.

Millions of veterans will live the rest of their lives with disabilities due to service-incurred injuries and physical impairments that resulted after they made the decision to protect our nation and safeguard our freedom.

Our courageous servicemembers have pledged that, on the battlefield, they will leave no soldier behind. In carrying out this sacred obligation, many have suffered life-altering injuries, including loss of limbs.

These injuries often result in loss of mobility or the need for a prosthetic which require specialized clothing and cause accelerated deterioration of standard garments.

In full appreciation of their devotion and the consequences they suffered from it, as a nation, let it be our pledge that when they return home, we leave no veteran behind.

H.R. 4772, the Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act will alleviate these veterans' burden of needing to reapply for clothing benefits every year for our 1.9 million veterans with a service-connected disability.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4772, the Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act.

Veterans have kept their promise to serve our nation; they have willingly risked their lives to protect the country we all love. We must now ensure that we keep our promises to our veterans.

Let us resolve together that we will provide returning veterans with the welcome, services, care, and compassion that they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4772, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LANCE CORPORAL DANA CORNELL DARNELL OUTPATIENT CLINIC

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5943) to designate the outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Greenville, South Carolina, as the ''Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell Outpatient Clinic,'' as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5943

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF LANCE CORPORAL DANA CORNELL DARNELL VA CLINIC.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Greenville, South Carolina, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the ''Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell VA Clinic''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell VA Clinic''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5943, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 5943, as amended, which will appropriately honor the memory of Lance Corporal Dana C. Darnell as one of the more than 58,000 names etched on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial just down the street on The National Mall.

Like so many of those who served our great Nation, Lance Corporal Darnell's life was tragically cut short. In April 1967, his Marine platoon was ambushed by enemy forces in the Quang Tri Province in north-central Vietnam.

Lance Corporal Darnell, at just 19 years old, displayed remarkable bravery and selflessness in the face of adversity. When his platoon's mortar gunner was knocked unconscious, Lance Corporal Darnell quickly retrieved the weapon and began firing it into the enemy's position.

After exhausting his ammunition, he moved from man to man, collecting additional mortar rounds to help silence the attack. In doing so, Lance Corporal Darnell undoubtedly saved the lives of others in his platoon.

Even after being temporarily blinded by enemy fire, Lance Corporal Darnell refused to be evacuated. Instead, he quickly began caring for his wounded comrades. Two days later, Lance Corporal Darnell was killed in action.

For his extraordinary heroism, Lance Corporal Darnell was posthumously awarded the Navy Cross by President Johnson. The Greenville, South Carolina, native also received a Purple Heart and National Defense, Vietnam Service, and Vietnam Campaign Medals for his meritorious service.

I thank my colleague, Representative TIMMONS, for introducing this bill, which will designate the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Greenville, South Carolina, the Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell Outpatient Clinic.

This bill has letters of support from The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans. Mr. Speaker, I include these letters in the RECORD.

[From the American Legion]

Whereas, The American Legion is always preserving the memories in incidents in all wars and to the men, women and families sacrifice to the country of The United States of America will never be forgotten; and

Whereas, The American Legion has paid homage to the courage and commitments from the United States military and the values they have brought to our great nation; and

Whereas, the United States is a grateful nation for the ultimate sacrifice of 58,220 United States Service members during the war with the North Vietnamese from 1955–1975; and

Whereas, one of those conflicts was the battle of Quang Tri Provence the northern provincial capital of The republic of South Vietnam involving Company B, First Battalion, 9th Marines, Third Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force April 24, 1967; and

Whereas, Greenville South Carolina's very own United States Marine Lance Corporal Dana Cornell was engaged in a search and destroy operation against the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese ambushed Cornell as they entered a field; and

Whereas, using heavy small arms Lance Corporal Dana Cornell was knocked unconscious while seeking cover and still managed to face extraordinary calmness in the face of enemy fire, Cornell retrieved the mortar, and was unable to set it up properly, due to the urgency of the situation, holding it between his legs and steadying it from his hands, began firing into enemy positions; and

Whereas, Cornell exhausted all of his ammunition and moved from man to man collecting mortars until the enemy fire was silenced and his platoon began to withdraw from the clearing Darnell, was dragging two wounded Marines from the clearing when he was temporary blinded; and

Whereas, Darnell showed exceptional courage staying in the field tending to the wounded. By his outstanding courage, exceptional fortitude, and valiant fighting spirit he served to inspire all who observed him and upheld the highest traditions of the United States Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service; and

Whereas, It has pleased almighty God, the Great Commander to summon his immortal and beloved comrade at arms Lance Corporal Dana Cornell while paying the ultimate sacrifice of his life at age 19 so that others could be free April 26, 1967; and be it finally

Resolved, That South Carolinas Largest Veterans organization the American Legion, Department of South Carolina Executive Committee at a specially called meeting assembled on this day in November 10, 2022 that it supports designating the outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Greenville, South Carolina, as the ''Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell Outpatient Clinic''.

JAMES KVAM,
Chairman, Internal Affairs.
JAMES JARVIS,
South Carolina Department Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

November 4, 2022.

Hon. MARK TAKANO,
Veterans Affairs Committee,
Washington, DC.

CHAIRMAN TAKANO: On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Department of South Carolina, it is my honor and privilege to pledge our support for HR 5943 naming the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) outpatient clinic in Greenville, SC after Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell.

Lance Corporal Darnell's service and sacrifice for our nation is truly worthy of this honor. The heroic deeds of this South Carolina native during action in Vietnam reflects great credit upon this organization, and all of America's combat veterans . . . past, present, and future.

This measure would bring about a fitting tribute to Lance Corporal Darnell in his native Greenville. We stand in solidarity with South Carolina's veterans' community and our elected representatives in support of this bill.

Yours in Comradeship,
ED STEFANAK, Jr.,
State Commander,
VFW Department of South Carolina.

Attested:
KEVIN L. JOY,
State Adjutant,
VFW Department of South Carolina.

DAV,
DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
West Columbia, SC, November 3, 2022.

Subject: Support for Bill, Naming Greenville CBOC

Congressman WILLIAM TIMMONS (SC–04),
Attn: Jessica Ridley.

The DAV Department of South Carolina, fully support Congressman William Timmons' Bill that would name the VA Greenville Community-Based Outpatient Clinic (CBOC) for a Vietnam Marine who was killed in 1967 at Khe Sanh during an action for which he received the Navy Cross.

We are honored to write this letter of recommendation for LCpl Dana Cornell Darnell, United States Marine Corps.

LCpl Darnell was born in Greenville, South Carolina on February 5, 1948. He joined the U.S. Marines on his 18th birthday, arriving at Parris Island, South Carolina on March 8, 1966. He received further training at Camp Pendleton, California before his assignment in Vietnam on August 20, 1966. On April 24, 1967, North Vietnam Army Forces ambushed his platoon and wounded this young Marine. He died April 26, 1967, at 19 years of age.

The Navy Cross was awarded, posthumously, to LCpl Darnell for his extraordinary heroism and for exhibiting sound judgement and calmness in the face of intense enemy fire.

The personal sacrifice and brave actions of LCpl Dana Darnell help preserve our nation's freedom for which we are profoundly grateful. We wholeheartedly support the recommendation that the VA Greenville CBOC be named in his honor.

Respectfully,
LARRY LONG,
Commander, DAV Dept. of South Carolina.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5943, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5943, as amended, a bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Greenville, South Carolina, as the Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell VA Clinic.

Lance Corporal Darnell was born in Greenville, South Carolina, and joined the United States Marine Corps on his 18th birthday. While he was deployed to the Republic of Vietnam in 1967, his unit was engaged in a mission against Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces in Quang Tri Province. His patrol was ambushed by enemy forces using heavy small arms and automatic weapons fire.

In the chaos that ensued, his mortar gunner was knocked unconscious. Displaying courage in the face of extreme danger, Lance Corporal Darnell quickly retrieved the mortar.

Despite being unable to set the mortar up properly, he continued to fire at the enemy. When he ran out of ammo,

he moved from man to man, collecting more ammo until the enemy guns fell silent.

When Lance Corporal Darnell's unit was ordered to withdraw from the area, he dragged two marines to safety and refused to evacuate himself. He stayed back to tend to the wounded.

Lance Corporal Darnell died 2 days later, on April 26, 1967, at the age of 19. He was awarded the Navy Cross for his selfless sacrifice and act of courage in combat.

Lance Corporal Darnell's service to our Nation is truly worthy of honor. Semper Fidelis.

Naming this VA facility after the Greenville native son and hero will serve as a reminder and an inspiration to all who seek care there. It will also ensure that his story of service is never forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5943, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. TIMMONS).

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BOST and Chairman TAKANO for supporting this bill and bringing it to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our bill, H.R. 5943, to designate the outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Greenville, South Carolina, as the Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell Outpatient Clinic.

A native of Greenville, South Carolina, Dana Cornell Darnell was a lance corporal in the United States Marine Corps during the Vietnam war. On April 24, 1967, his platoon was ambushed by North Vietnamese Army forces. He quickly worked to silence enemy fire. Even after being temporarily blinded, he refused to be evacuated and quickly began assisting in the care of the wounded.

For his extraordinary heroism, Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell was awarded the Navy Cross.

Renaming the Greenville VA clinic in honor of Lance Corporal Darnell will ensure we never forget the courage, service, and sacrifice of our fellow South Carolinian.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the entire South Carolina delegation for their support of this bill. We believe the Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell Outpatient Clinic will serve countless veterans throughout the upstate and uphold our promise to those who gave our country their all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5943.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill and honor the lance corporal by naming this facility after him.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 5943, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5943, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LONG-TERM CARE VETERANS CHOICE ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7158) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the payment of care in non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7158

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 ''Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act''.

SEC. 2. SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENT OF CARE FOR VETERANS IN NON-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL FOSTER HOMES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1720 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h)(1) During the five-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act, and subject to paragraph (3)—

''(A) at the request of a veteran for whom the Secretary is required to provide nursing home care under section 1710A of this title, the Secretary may place the veteran in a medical foster home that meets Department standards, at the expense of the United States, pursuant to a contract, agreement, or other arrangement entered into between the Secretary and the medical foster home for such purpose; and

''(B) the Secretary may pay for care of a veteran placed in a medical foster home before such date of enactment, if the home meets Department standards, pursuant to a contract, agreement, or other arrangement entered into between the Secretary and the medical foster home for such purpose.

''(2) A veteran on whose behalf the Secretary pays for care in a medical foster home under paragraph (1) shall agree, as a condition of such payment, to accept home health services furnished by the Secretary under section 1717 of this title.

''(3) In any year, not more than a daily average of 900 veterans receiving care in a medical foster home, whether placed before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act, may have their care covered at the expense of the United States under paragraph (1).

''(4) The prohibition under section 1730(b)(3) of this title shall not apply to a veteran whose care is covered at the expense of the United States under paragraph (1).

''(5) In this subsection, the term 'medical foster home' means a home designed to provide non-institutional, long-term, supportive care for veterans who are unable to live independently and prefer a family setting.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (h) of section 1720 of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ONGOING MONITORING OF MEDICAL FOSTER HOME PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall create a system to monitor and assess the workload for the Department of Veterans Affairs in carrying out the authority under section 1720(h) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), including by tracking—

(A) requests by veterans to be placed in a medical foster home under such section;

(B) denials of such requests, including the reasons for such denials;

(C) the total number of medical foster homes applying to participate under such section, disaggregated by those approved and those denied approval by the Department to participate;

(D) veterans receiving care at a medical foster home at the expense of the United States; and

(E) veterans receiving care at a medical foster home at their own expense.

(2) REPORT.—Based on the monitoring and assessments conducted under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall identify and submit to Congress a report on such modifications to implementing section 1720(h) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), as the Secretary considers necessary to ensure the authority under such section is functioning as intended and care is provided to veterans under such section as intended.

(3) MEDICAL FOSTER HOME DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''medical foster home'' has the meaning given that term in section 1720(h) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1).

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than each of three years and six years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) assessing the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section;

(2) assessing the impact of the monitoring and modifications under subsection (b) on care provided under section 1720(h) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1); and

(3) setting forth recommendations for improvements to the implementation of such section, as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN HOUSING LOAN FEE.—The loan fee table in section 3729(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''January 14, 2031'' each place it appears and inserting ''February 15, 2031''.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of

the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 7158, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7158, as amended, the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act.

This bill, authored and long championed by Congressman HIGGINS and Chairwoman BROWNLEY, would enable VA to better provide long-term services and support for our aging and disabled veterans.

□ 1445

The VA's medical foster homes are one of its most creative and effective initiatives. Veterans who have access to these care settings thrive and are able to remain a part of their community, even if their conditions do not allow them to remain independently in their homes.

Veterans who are not yet ready for institutional care but need the help and assistance of professional caregivers are able to live in a home setting among other veterans in their communities. Satisfaction with the program is very high, but veterans have to pay for the care themselves, which is a barrier for many veterans. Yet, VA is currently prohibited from paying a veteran's room and board. This legislation would change that.

Community-based programs like these are what veterans want and deserve. They also prevent veterans from being forced into much more expensive institutional care settings.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7158, the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act.

H.R. 7158 would give VA the authority to grant payments to non-VA entities for veterans who require long-term care in medical foster homes. A medical foster home is a private home, not an institutional facility, where trained caregivers provide wraparound care and service to patients.

VA inspects and approves medical foster homes and enrolls veterans in the VA Home Healthcare Program. But under current law, VA is not authorized to pay for veterans' medical foster home care. Veterans must cover the bill themselves, even if they would otherwise be eligible for a VA-run nursing home facility.

Now, medical foster homes are a more cost-effective alternative to nursing home care. They typically cost between $1,500 and $3,000 a month, compared to a typical $7,000-a-month cost in a nursing home.

Allowing veterans to age with dignity and being comfortable is something that I care deeply about, and this bill is a critical step towards helping us to do just that.

However, this is another bill that CBO gave a large mandatory score to because of the toxic exposure fund. We were able to fully offset this score, but we won't be able to do that for every piece of legislation. Our offsets are quickly running out, and we have to solve the scoring problem before the work of our committee grinds to a complete halt.

This bill is supported by the VA and numerous VSOs, and I thank Congressman HIGGINS for his tireless work on it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 7158, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member's desire to engage in talks regarding the toxic exposure fund. It is an important issue, which is the long-term implications of the Cost of War Toxic Exposures Fund, otherwise known as TEV, and it was created by the Honoring our PACT Act.

This fund is absolutely crucial to ensuring VA has the resources necessary to fully support our veterans and to deliver the new benefits available to them without having to sacrifice existing programs.

As I have said repeatedly, any potential change to this fund and how it operates must be considered very carefully and requires the input of other committees that have a stake in this issue, to include appropriations and budget in the House and Senate.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the chairman as we move forward to try to cure that problem that we were just talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), a great Member, who has worked hard on this bill.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act. The Department of Veterans Affairs has been running its medical foster homes initiative since the year 2000, and as of 2021, the Veterans Health Administration oversees about 600 medical foster home caregivers taking care of veterans in about 40 States.

Medical foster homes are private homes where a caregiver provides services to a small group of individuals who are unable to live without day-to-day assistance.

Currently, veterans enrolled in home-based primary care through the VA may elect to receive their care at medical foster homes. However, the VA does not cover the cost of medical foster homes for veterans that would otherwise be eligible for nursing home care through the VA. As has been noted by my colleagues, full nursing home traditional care is far more expensive than medical foster homes.

Veterans must pay for medical foster homes out of their pocket or through private insurance. This bill would fix that.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of the VA to enter into contracts and agreements for placement of up to 900 veterans a day in medical foster homes. These are veterans who are unable to live independently.

In addition, medical foster home caregivers would be required to pass a Federal background check and undergo VA screening. They would be required to participate in annual training, and they would have to permit the VA to make announced and unannounced home visits.

Finally, the VA would provide these veterans with full interdisciplinary home care that includes, physicians, nurses, rehabilitation therapists, medical healthcare providers, dietitians, and pharmacists.

My bill is supported by the American Legion, the VFW, Disabled American Veterans, and the Wounded Warrior Project.

In closing, I sincerely thank Chairman TAKANO and Ranking Member BOST for bringing this bill to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for his hard work. I feel his sincere words. I take them to heart, and I sincerely hope that we get this through the Senate so that we can see this signed into law before the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, as I have said before on the floor of this House, serving our veterans is not about red or blue. It is about red, white, and blue. I know that the ranking member stands with me in service of our veterans, and he stands with me right now in the optimism that Team USA is going to prevail today at the World Cup. They are ahead 1–0. I know the ranking member and I, and the gentleman from Louisiana, are all standing united with the hope of an American victory there.

Mr. Speaker, again, I ask all my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 7158,

as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7158, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROTECTING FIREFIGHTERS FROM ADVERSE SUBSTANCES ACT

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 231) to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on best practices to protect them from exposure to PFAS and to limit and prevent the release of PFAS into the environment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 231

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Protecting Firefighters from Adverse Substances Act'' or the ''PFAS Act''.

SEC. 2. GUIDANCE ON HOW TO PREVENT EXPOSURE TO AND RELEASE OF PFAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and the heads of any other relevant agencies, shall—

(1) develop and publish guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on training, education programs, and best practices;

(2) make available a curriculum designed to—

(A) reduce and eliminate exposure to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (commonly referred to as ''PFAS'') from firefighting foam and personal protective equipment;

(B) prevent the release of PFAS from firefighting foam into the environment; and

(C) educate firefighters and other emergency response personnel on foams and non-foam alternatives, personal protective equipment, and other firefighting tools and equipment that do not contain PFAS; and

(3) create an online public repository, which shall be updated on a regular basis, on tools and best practices for firefighters and other emergency response personnel to reduce, limit, and prevent the release of and exposure to PFAS.

(b) CURRICULUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of developing the curriculum required under subsection (a)(2), the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration shall make recommendations to the Secretary of Homeland Security as to the content of the curriculum.

(2) CONSULTATION.—For the purpose of making recommendations under paragraph (1), the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration shall consult with interested entities, as appropriate, including—

(A) firefighters and other emergency response personnel, including national fire service and emergency response organizations;

(B) impacted communities dealing with PFAS contamination;

(C) scientists, including public and occupational health and safety experts, who are studying PFAS and PFAS alternatives in firefighting foam;

(D) voluntary standards organizations engaged in developing standards for firefighter and firefighting equipment;

(E) State fire training academies;

(F) State fire marshals;

(G) manufacturers of firefighting tools and equipment; and

(H) any other relevant entities, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration.

(c) REVIEW.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the guidance and curriculum required under subsection (a) is issued, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, shall review the guidance and curriculum and, as appropriate, issue updates to the guidance and curriculum.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to this Act.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to promulgate or enforce regulations under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'').

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 231, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 231, the Protecting Firefighters from Adverse Substances Act, or the PFAS Act, championed by my Michigan colleagues and dear friends, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL and Senator GARY PETERS.

I profoundly thank them for their steadfast and dedicated leadership on addressing PFAS contamination to protect our natural waters in the Great Lakes, our air, and beyond.

Exposure to PFAS chemicals continues to harm the health and well-being of families across America. My home State of Michigan has the most PFAS contaminated sites in the country, thus making it the State's biggest environmental crisis in half a century. But we also have been one of the very few States tracking it.

Although scientific knowledge regarding PFAS continues to develop, we know PFAS chemicals are linked to serious adverse health effects in human beings. The more we find out, the worse the picture appears.

Recently, the EPA sounded the alarm bell and asked its Science Advisory Board, the SAB, to review new analyses and data that suggests that two chemicals, which have been found in many drinking waters and surface waters in Michigan and around the country, are far more toxic than previously thought.

While officials in Michigan have taken steps to address this crisis, there is so much more to be done at every level of government.

Our efforts in Michigan need to be strengthened by Congressional action. In order to adequately address this threat, we need the Federal Government to step it up. That is why I am proud to cosponsor the bill we are considering today, Congresswoman DINGELL's and Senator PETERS' Protecting Firefighters from Adverse Substances Act.

PFAS are human-made chemicals that have been manufactured since the 1940s and can be found in a wide range of both consumer and industrial products, including firefighting foam and firefighter turnout gear.

While firefighters have dedicated their lives to protecting others in keeping our communities safe, they have, unfortunately, been exposed to these forever chemicals on the job.

The Department of Defense, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Federal Aviation Administration all conduct research on PFAS-free firefighting foam or PFAS-free firefighter gear.

This promising work across our Federal Government is vital to reducing exposure to PFAS, but more progress is needed. Until PFAS-free alternatives are widespread, we must do everything we can to protect firefighters, emergency medical responders, and the communities they serve from unnecessary PFAS exposure.

This bipartisan legislation directs the administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to offer resources to help protect firefighters, emergency response personnel, and the communities they serve from PFAS exposure.

□ 1500

The bill also directs the administrator to provide resources that identify PFAS-free alternatives for firefighting gear and equipment. This

guidance would be developed in consultation with other Federal agencies conducting research on PFAS-free alternatives, as well as a wide range of stakeholders, including firefighting and emergency response personnel, communities dealing with PFAS contamination, fire training academies, manufacturers of firefighting tools and equipment, and voluntary standards organizations.

This is America doing what America does best: innovating. This bill is an important step to protecting our first responders in the line of duty from exposure to harmful chemicals.

It has already passed the Senate with bipartisan support, and today I urge my colleagues to join me in passing the bill here in the House and sending it to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the PFAS Act.

PFAS refers to a large group of high-strength, high-durability chemicals used in industry and consumer products. They are critical to the reliable and safe function of essential products like cell phones, military aircraft, solar panels, wind turbines, and medical devices. But because of their durability, they don't break down easily and last a long time in the environment. In some cases, but not all, that creates hazards to human health.

There are more than 5,000 strands of PFAS in use, and their tremendous variation means we need to take a thoughtful and nuanced approach to regulating them. We absolutely need to protect the health and safety of firefighters, the military, and individuals exposed to harmful PFAS. That means preventing exposure to unsafe PFAS and addressing PFAS contamination now.

But not all PFAS are harmful, and some are indispensable for things like fighting fires and protecting our servicemen and women from chemical warfare. Others are used for lithium batteries and solar energy equipment. So my concern about some of the legislation on PFAS is that they would ban their use entirely, even when that might not be necessary.

The fact is that we don't fully understand the properties of all PFAS. Maybe a newly created strand has better fire suppression power and dissolves in a solution, or another has absolutely no human health effects and breaks down organically. We simply don't know yet, and we can't shut the door on innovation.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee is working hard to improve and expand our knowledge about PFAS so that we can make individual determinations about what is safe and what is not.

For example, this summer, the House passed our Federal PFAS Research Evaluation Act which directs the National Academies to study the toxicity, effects, and behavior of different strands of PFAS. It also will study emerging PFAS strands in hopes of finding more harmless strains with effective and useful properties.

This is groundbreaking research, and it can't be done overnight. So while the experts are working on it, my fellow Science, Space, and Technology Committee members and I urge the rest of this body to respect the scientific process.

Do not pass legislation that outright eliminates all 5,000-plus strands of PFAS without the scientific understanding to support that decision.

Here is the good news: The bill we are considering today isn't intended to put us on a path toward banning PFAS. While some of the language could be construed by a creative mind to be broadly anti-PFAS, I know that is not the intention of the sponsors of this bill from Michigan, nor is it the intention of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

To further support this, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) to engage in a colloquy on her intent related to this bill.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member LUCAS for yielding.

Ranking Member LUCAS, I thank you for all of your hard work on this. I agree with you. The scientific process should be respected and used to inform and direct policymaking to effectively protect human health and our environment.

While it may take time to continue to develop the science around many of the lesser known PFAS compounds, a great deal of science has already been completed and known for years on the most notorious PFAS compounds.

With respect to this bill, the PFAS Act would help protect the health and safety of firefighters, emergency responders, and the communities they serve from these harmful chemicals by developing guidance—not bans—for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on training, education programs, and best practices to protect them from exposure to harmful PFAS and to prevent its release into the environment.

Emergency response teams are frequently exposed to harmful PFAS in firefighting foams and personal protective equipment as they work to keep their communities safe. It is important that we act on behalf of our first responders to mitigate their exposure to these harmful PFAS chemicals and prevent environmental releases while the scientific work must continue, and we gain a full understanding of the effects of all PFAS compounds.

Again, I thank Ranking Member LUCAS for continuing to work with us on this important legislation. We wouldn't be here without the gentleman today. It will make a meaningful difference for long-term first responders, their families, and the communities they serve.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks in agreement. We both share the understanding that instead of banning PFAS, this bill focuses on education, understanding, and knowledge of these chemicals. Specifically, it will ensure that we are protecting our firefighters who rely on PFAS to extinguish fires.

There aren't many alternatives to PFAS when it comes to fighting fires, but firefighters put their lives at risk every day, and this bill will ensure they aren't facing long-term health risks simply because of the equipment and the tools they use daily.

We can mitigate harmful effects by carefully studying what chemicals first responders are exposed to and ensuring they are properly educated about safety procedures and risks.

The curriculum authorized by this bill is just that. We are focusing on education, understanding, and knowledge. I support its passage today. When the time comes, I have every intention of working with the gentlewoman from Michigan to make sure we are targeting the truly bad PFAS—those with health and environmental effects. But for now, I appreciate that my friends on the other side of the aisle are leaving the door open for future development and letting science determine the outcome, not politics.

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 231, the Protecting Firefighters From Adverse Substances Act, or the PFAS Act.

I am proud to stand here today in support of this important bipartisan legislation to protect our first responders from forever chemicals, which I am co-leading with my friend and colleague, Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK.

This is a significant bill that has already passed the Senate with unanimous consent and bipartisan support thanks to the leadership of Senator GARY PETERS.

The PFAS Act would simply direct the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and other Federal agencies to provide important guidance for Federal, State, and local firefighters on training and best practices to reduce, limit, and prevent exposure to PFAS from firefighting foam and turnout gear, as well as provide resources that identify alternatives for firefighting tools and equipment that do not contain harmful PFAS.

Today, by supporting this bill, the House can continue to take bold action, once again, to address the PFAS crisis—this time to protect our firefighters.

Forever chemicals are an urgent threat to public health and, specifically, our firefighters who are on the front line. Emergency response teams

are frequently exposed to harmful PFAS in firefighting foams and personal protective equipment as they work to keep our communities safe.

These manmade chemicals—but specifically the two most notoriously harmful chemicals, PFOA and PFOS—are extremely persistent in the environment, as well, as a result of its use during fire training exercises and real-world emergency response situations. PFAS chemicals are persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic. These chemicals have been linked to harmful human health effects, including cancer, reproductive and developmental harms, and weaken immune systems.

Nearly every American has some level of PFAS coursing through their blood today.

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Michigan an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. DINGELL. This important bill is supported by the International Association of Fire Fighters, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Volunteer Fire Council, and first responders all across this country.

We must get this important, commonsense, and bipartisan legislation to the President's desk without delay to protect our firefighters and the communities they serve.

Finally, I thank leadership for bringing the PFAS Act to the floor under suspension today. I express a special thanks to Chair EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and Ranking Member FRANK LUCAS—who has really worked with me closely on this—and each of their staff for continuing to work with me to advance this critically important bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this PFAS Act. This is an important bipartisan and meaningful bill to protect the health and safety of our first responders from harmful PFAS in the line of duty.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Protecting Firefighters From Adverse Substances Act. It has been a pleasure to work across the aisle on proposals to address the dangers posed by PFAS not just to firefighters but also to our environment.

It has been a pleasure to cosponsor the House companion to this bill and support its passage.

This bill will direct the Department of Homeland Security to provide training designed to reduce and eliminate exposure to PFAS from firefighting foam and personal protective equipment, to prevent PFAS from firefighting foam from being released into the environment, and to give firefighters and other emergency responders information on alternatives that do not contain PFAS.

This bill is another step we are taking together in a bipartisan spirit to address the consequences that we have learned far too late.

The firefighters' motto is ''Be Ready,'' and this bill helps better prepare our firefighters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for managing and her leadership and the gentleman from Oklahoma for his leadership.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee that has dealt with PFAS over the years, I am extremely grateful for this legislation that has come from the Senate and particularly grateful because I use as a backdrop having been on the Homeland Security Committee since its origins, on 9/11, when firefighters rushed in to save lives. Some, of course, tragically lost their lives along with other law enforcement as they were attempting to save people from the burning buildings.

But we do know that their long journey that was taken in order to get coverage and compensation for the terrible exposures that they had in the chemicals in the aftermath of 9/11.

This brings to mind the importance of this legislation having dealt with PFAS in many different forms, particularly in the agriculture arena, the Homeland Security Committee has looked at these chemicals and how they can be made safe, if you will, in the midst of the utilization that they have.

This legislation is extremely important because it works to develop guidance to firefighters and other emergency response personnel on training, education, and best practices to protect them from exposure from PFAS, these chemicals that they are bound to engage when they rush in to save lives and to save property from the terrors of fire.

I am excited about this legislation and hope that it gets to the President's desk because I have seen what chemicals can do in the midst of a 9/11 but also in the midst of an ordinary house fire or business fire.

I applaud the proponents of this bill. I am excited about it reducing and eliminating exposure to PFAS from firefighter foam, personal protective equipment, PPE, prevent the release of the PFAS from firefighting foam into the environment so that it provides for an environmentally safe pathway, and educating firefighters and other emergency response personnel on the foams and non-foam alternative.

□ 1515

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and continue to say that I think what we have here is an important directive for the Department of Homeland Security. Under their jurisdiction are the first responders, and we clearly know the wide range of needs that firefighters face. Look at the West and the series of wildfires that have spread from California to the far Northwest. Fires are never-ending; chemical exposures are never-ending; and firefighters never stop going into places where people are desperate or there is a need.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about this legislation because it is long overdue. I hope it gets to the President's desk as quickly as possible. I believe that once we pass this, we will give a new lifeline to the Nation's firefighters. As a member of the Fire Caucus, I know that this is a bill long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude my remarks celebrating the firefighters and supporting this legislation, let me say: Go USA against Iran.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of S. 231, the Protecting Firefighters from Adverse Substances Act.

Known as PFAS, for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, the chemicals in this class of approximately 5,000 substances have become notorious for their danger to human health.

Because the chemical bonds that hold the compounds together don't break down easily, they last a very long time. This has led to a commonly used name for the group: "Forever chemicals."

According to monitoring by the Environmental Protection Agency, millions of Americans are easily exposed to unsafe levels of PFAS through outlets as simple as drinking water.

PFAS chemicals have been associated with several health problems, including testicular and kidney cancers, reduced immunity, thyroid problems, and reproductive harms.

Our first responders are at the front lines of PFAS exposure. Firefighters have been shown to have a 14% higher risk of dying from cancer than the general U.S. population does.

This is a result of direct exposure to PFAS chemicals in firefighting foam and personal protective equipment.

It is time we do something to protect the brave men and women who, even in the face of danger, continue to put themselves at risk for our safety and protection.

Mr. Speaker, it is urgent that this Congress enact this legislation because agencies such as the Environmental Protection Administration have failed to address known threats presented by PFAS chemicals.

The EPA has known about the risks from PFAS chemicals for decades but failed to act to prevent the spread of this contamination.

Because of such negligence, the persistent and toxic effects of PFAS linger and firefighters are now forced to work around these "forever chemicals."

With S. 231, the Department of Homeland Security will be required to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on training and education programs to protect them from exposure to PFAS.

This curriculum would not only educate firefighters on how to protect themselves, but also educate them on how to prevent the release of PFAS into the environment.

Clear and swift action from Congress is needed to address the PFAS crisis, and we need an all-hands-on-deck effort to protect both the health of our first responders and our environment.

Backing our first responders should be a non-partisan issue, so I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for S. 231, the Protecting Firefighters from Adverse Substances Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, firefighters and emergency response personnel put themselves in harm's way daily with no questions asked. They do this to save lives and protect their communities. Therefore, it is only fitting that Congress does what we can to protect their lives in return.

The bill we are considering today, the PFAS Act, arms our first responders with knowledge and procedures to avoid long-term health effects from harmful chemicals.

This bill is also an example of strong bipartisan collaboration, with all the discussion and refinement that entails. My colleague from Michigan understood my concerns about not getting ahead of the science and banning all PFAS. I understood her desire to take immediate action for her constituents. We worked together to both walk away happy with the result.

My sincere thanks to Congresswoman DINGELL, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee staff, and everyone involved in these discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we stand here today in strong support of S. 231, the PFAS Act, and certainly recognize the leadership that has come from the Michigan delegation here in the House with Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL, who has been steadfast, dedicated, and dogged. You don't travel through Michigan without hearing Congresswoman DINGELL talk about PFAS.

We also appreciate the Senate leadership of Senator GARY PETERS, particularly in his chairmanship of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, in partnership with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) who just spoke, along with our full committee chair, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who has been a real role model for leadership and support in this body for bipartisan, collaborative legislation.

As I stand here with the last month of this term upon us in the 117th Congress, I can't help but thank Ranking Member LUCAS for his very dedicated and remarkable leadership. One might say it is an anchor of sorts as we move to be bipartisan. Over the course of this term, I have had the privilege of sitting next to him in committee, and I will take the time to let him know that he has taught me a few things this term, which I greatly appreciate.

As we move forward, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber to continue to showcase the best of what America can be, coming together to solve problems and deliver for the American people.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 231, the Protecting Firefighters from Adverse Substances Act or the PFAS Act.

PFAS are a group of human-made chemicals that have been manufactured since the 1940's and can be found in a wide range of both consumer and industrial products, including firefighting foam and firefighter turnout gear. These chemicals are sometimes known as "forever chemicals" due to their widespread use, persistence in the environment, and a molecular structure that makes them very difficult to break down. There is growing evidence that PFAS are linked to adverse health outcomes including liver damage, thyroid disease, and an increased risk of cancer.

While we still have much to learn about the health risks associated with prolonged exposure to PFAS, work is underway to better understand the exposure pathways of PFAS and to develop alternatives to these chemicals. The Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, and the Federal Aviation Administration all conduct research on PFAS-free firefighting foam or PFAS-free fighter gear.

This promising work is vital to reducing the release of and exposure to PFAS but more progress is needed. Until PFAS-free alternatives are widespread, we must do everything we can to protect those who are exposed to PFAS in the course of their job and to limit the release of PFAS into the environment. S. 231 directs the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on best practices to protect them from exposure to PFAS and to limit and prevent the release of PFAS into the environment as well provide resources that identify PFAS-free alternatives for firefighting gear and equipment. This guidance would be developed in consultation with other federal agencies conducting research on PFAS-alternatives as well as a wide range of stakeholders including firefighting and emergency response personnel, communities dealing with PFAS contamination, fire training academies, manufacturers of firefighting tools and equipment, and voluntary standards organizations.

This bill is an important step to protecting our first responders from exposure to harmful chemicals. It has already passed the Senate with bipartisan support and today I urge my colleagues to join me in passing the bill here in the House and sending it to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 231.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LAW ENFORCEMENT DE-ESCALATION TRAINING ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4003) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 4003

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 "Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. TRAINING ON ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 901(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (27), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (28), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(29) the term 'de-escalation' means taking action or communicating verbally or nonverbally during a potential force encounter in an attempt to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the threat so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force or with a reduction in the force necessary;

"(30) the term 'mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis'—

"(A) means a situation in which the behavior of a person—

"(i) puts the person at risk of hurting himself or herself or others; or

"(ii) impairs or prevents the person from being able to care for himself or herself or function effectively in the community; and

"(B) includes a situation in which a person—

"(i) is under the influence of a drug or alcohol, is suicidal, or experiences symptoms of a mental illness; or

"(ii) may exhibit symptoms, including emotional reactions (such as fear or anger), psychological impairments (such as inability to focus, confusion, or psychosis), and behavioral reactions (such as the trigger of a freeze, fight, or flight response);

"(31) the term 'disability' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

"(32) the term 'crisis intervention team' means a collaborative, interdisciplinary team that brings together specially trained law enforcement officers, mental health providers, and other community stakeholders to

respond to mental health-related calls, use appropriate de-escalation techniques, and assess if referral to services or transport for mental health evaluation is appropriate; and

''(33) the term 'covered mental health professional' means a mental health professional working on a crisis intervention team—

''(A) as an employee of a law enforcement agency; or

''(B) under a legal agreement with a law enforcement agency.''.

(b) COPS PROGRAM.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) TRAINING IN ALTERNATIVES TO USE OF FORCE, DE-ESCALATION TECHNIQUES, AND MENTAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CRISES.—

''(1) TRAINING CURRICULA.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall develop training curricula or identify effective existing training curricula for law enforcement officers and for covered mental health professionals regarding—

''(i) de-escalation tactics and alternatives to use of force;

''(ii) safely responding to an individual experiencing a mental or behavioral health or suicidal crisis or an individual with a disability, including techniques and strategies that are designed to protect the safety of that individual, law enforcement officers, mental health professionals, and the public;

''(iii) successfully participating on a crisis intervention team; and

''(iv) making referrals to community-based mental and behavioral health services and support, housing assistance programs, public benefits programs, the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and other services.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The training curricula developed or identified under this paragraph shall include—

''(i) scenario-based exercises;

''(ii) pre-training and post-training tests to assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula; and

''(iii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training.

''(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and identify training curricula under this paragraph in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups.

''(2) CERTIFIED PROGRAMS AND COURSES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall establish a process to—

''(i) certify training programs and courses offered by public and private entities to law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which may include certifying a training program or course that an entity began offering on or before the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process; and

''(ii) terminate the certification of a training program or course if the program or course fails to continue to meet the standards under the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1).

''(B) PARTNERSHIPS WITH MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which training curricula are developed or identified under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General shall develop criteria to ensure that public and private entities that offer training programs or courses that are certified under subparagraph (A) collaborate with local mental health organizations to—

''(i) enhance the training experience of law enforcement officers through consultation with and the participation of individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or disabilities, particularly such individuals who have interacted with law enforcement officers; and

''(ii) strengthen relationships between health care services and law enforcement agencies.

''(3) TRANSITIONAL REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY PERSONNEL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the period beginning on the date on which the Attorney General establishes the process required under paragraph (2)(A) and ending on the date that is 18 months after that date, the Attorney General shall, and thereafter the Attorney General may, provide, in collaboration with law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government as appropriate, regional training to equip personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government in a State to offer training programs or courses certified under paragraph (2)(A).

''(B) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—The Attorney General shall develop and implement continuing education requirements for personnel from law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government who receive training to offer training programs or courses under subparagraph (A).

''(4) LIST.—Not later than 1 year after the Attorney General completes the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall publish a list of law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government employing law enforcement officers or using covered mental health professionals who have successfully completed a course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under paragraph (1), or equivalents to such training curricula, which shall include—

''(A) the total number of law enforcement officers that are employed by the agency;

''(B) the number of such law enforcement officers who have completed such a course;

''(C) whether personnel from the law enforcement agency have been trained to offer training programs or courses under paragraph (3);

''(D) the total number of covered mental health professionals who work with the agency; and

''(E) the number of such covered mental health professionals who have completed such a course.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection—

''(A) $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2023;

''(B) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2024;

''(C) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

''(D) $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.''.

(c) BYRNE JAG PROGRAM.—Subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 508 as section 509; and

(2) by inserting after section 507 the following:

''SEC. 508. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'certified training program or course' means a program or course using 1 or more of the training curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1), or equivalents to such training curricula—

''(1) that is provided by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(3); or

''(2) that is—

''(A) provided by a public or private entity, including the personnel of a law enforcement agency or law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government who have been trained to offer training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(3); and

''(B) certified by the Attorney General under section 1701(n)(2).

''(b) AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the Attorney General completes the activities required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1701(n), the Attorney General shall, from amounts made available to fund training programs pursuant to subsection (h), make grants to States for use by the State or a unit of government located in the State to—

''(A) pay for—

''(i) costs associated with conducting a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education; and

''(ii) attendance by law enforcement officers or covered mental health professionals at a certified training program or course, including a course provided by a law enforcement training academy of a State or unit of local government;

''(B) procure a certified training program or course or, subject to paragraph (2), a certified training program or course that provides continuing education on 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

''(C) in the case of a law enforcement agency of a unit of local government that employs fewer than 50 employees (determined on a full-time equivalent basis), pay for the costs of overtime accrued as a result of the attendance of a law enforcement officer or covered mental health professional at a certified training program or course for which the costs associated with conducting the certified training program or course are paid using amounts provided under this section;

''(D) pay for the costs of developing mechanisms to comply with the reporting requirements established under subsection (d), in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award; and

''(E) pay for the costs associated with participation in the voluntary National Use-of-Force Data Collection of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in an amount not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award, if a law enforcement agency of the State or unit of local government is not already reporting to the National Use-of-Force Data Collection.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR USE FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'covered topic' means a topic covered under the curricula developed or identified under clause (i), (ii), or (iv) of section 1701(n)(1)(A).

''(B) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE INITIAL TRAINING.—A State or unit of local government shall ensure that all officers who have been employed with the State or unit of local government for at least 2 years have received training as part of a certified training program or course on all covered topics before the State or unit of local government uses amounts received under a grant under

paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to any covered topic.

''(C) START DATE OF AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), a State or unit of local government may not use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic until the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022.

''(ii) EXCEPTION.—A State or unit of local government may use amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1) for continuing education with respect to a covered topic during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022 if the State or unit of local government has complied with subparagraph (B) using amounts available to the State or unit of local government other than amounts received under a grant under paragraph (1).

''(3) MAINTAINING RELATIONSHIPS WITH LOCAL MENTAL HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS.—A State or unit of local government that receives funds under this section shall establish and maintain relationships between law enforcement officers and local mental health organizations and health care services.

''(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the total amount appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Attorney General shall allocate funds to each State in proportion to the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State, as compared to the total number of law enforcement officers in the United States.

''(2) RETENTION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROPORTIONAL TO NUMBER OF STATE OFFICERS.—Each fiscal year, each State may retain, for use for the purposes described in this section, from the total amount of funds provided to the State under paragraph (1) an amount that is not more than the amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount as the ratio of—

''(A) the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State; to

''(B) the total number of law enforcement officers in the State that are employed by the State or a unit of local government within the State.

''(3) PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR TRAINING FOR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State shall make available to units of local government in the State for the purposes described in this section the amounts remaining after a State retains funds under paragraph (2).

''(B) ADDITIONAL USES.—A State may, with the approval of a unit of local government, use the funds allocated to the unit of local government under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) to facilitate offering a certified training program or course or, subject to subsection (b)(2), a certified training program or course that provide continuing education in 1 or more of the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) to law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government; or

''(ii) for the costs of training local law enforcement officers, including through law enforcement training academies of States and units of local government, to conduct a certified training program or course.

''(C) CONSULTATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall develop criteria governing the allocation of funds to units of local government under this paragraph, which shall ensure that the funds are distributed as widely as practicable in terms of geographical location and to both large and small law enforcement agencies of units of local government.

''(D) ANNOUNCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a State receives an award under paragraph (1), the State shall announce the allocations of funds to units of local government under subparagraph (A). A State shall submit to the Attorney General a report explaining any delays in the announcement of allocations under this subparagraph.

''(d) REPORTING.—

''(1) UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Any unit of local government that receives funds from a State under subsection (c)(3) for a certified training program or course shall submit to the State or the Attorney General an annual report with respect to the first fiscal year during which the unit of local government receives such funds and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter that—

''(A) shall include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

''(B) may, at the election of the unit of local government, include the number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government that have completed a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic;

''(C) shall include the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government;

''(D) shall include a description of any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A);

''(E) shall include information gathered through—

''(i) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

''(ii) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training; and

''(F) shall include the amount of funds received by the unit of local government under subsection (c)(3) and a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the unit of local government using available and anticipated funds.

''(2) STATES.—A State receiving funds under this section shall submit to the Attorney General—

''(A) any report the State receives from a unit of local government under paragraph (1); and

''(B) if the State retains funds under subsection (c)(2) for a fiscal year, a report by the State for that fiscal year, and each of the 2 fiscal years thereafter—

''(i) indicating the number of law enforcement officers employed by the State that have completed a certified training program or course, including a certified training program or course provided on or before the date on which the Attorney General begins certifying training programs or courses under section 1701(n)(2), the topics covered in those courses, and the number of officers who received training in each topic, including, at the election of the State, a certified training program or course using funds provided from a source other than the grants described under subsection (b);

''(ii) indicating the total number of law enforcement officers employed by the State;

''(iii) providing information gathered through—

''(I) pre-training and post-training tests that assess relevant knowledge and skills covered in the training curricula, as specified in section 1701(n)(1); and

''(II) follow-up evaluative assessments to determine the degree to which participants in the training apply, in their jobs, the knowledge and skills gained in the training;

''(iv) discussing any barriers to providing training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A); and

''(v) indicating the amount of funding retained by the State under subsection (c)(2) and providing a tentative plan for training all law enforcement officers employed by the State using available and anticipated funds.

''(3) REPORTING TOOLS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall develop a portal through which the data required under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be collected and submitted.

''(4) REPORTS ON THE USE OF DE-ESCALATION TACTICS AND OTHER TECHNIQUES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, associations that represent individuals with mental or behavioral health diagnoses or individuals with disabilities, labor organizations, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor and representative organizations, law enforcement trade associations, mental health and suicide prevention organizations, family advocacy organizations, and civil rights and civil liberties groups, shall establish—

''(i) reporting requirements on interactions in which de-escalation tactics and other techniques in curricula developed or identified under section 1701(n)(1) are used by each law enforcement agency that receives funding under this section; and

''(ii) mechanisms for each law enforcement agency to submit such reports to the Department of Justice.

''(B) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements developed under subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) specify—

''(I) the circumstances under which an interaction shall be reported, considering—

''(aa) the cost of collecting and reporting the information; and

''(bb) the value of that information for determining whether—

''(AA) the objectives of the training have been met; and

''(BB) the training reduced or eliminated the risk of serious physical injury to officers, subjects, and third parties; and

''(II) the demographic and other relevant information about the officer and subjects involved in the interaction that shall be included in such a report; and

''(ii) require such reporting be done in a manner that—

''(I) is in compliance with all applicable Federal and State confidentiality laws; and

''(II) does not disclose the identities of law enforcement officers, subjects, or third parties.

''(C) REVIEW OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and every 2 years thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the entities specified under subparagraph (A), shall review and consider updates to the reporting requirements.

''(5) FAILURE TO REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity receiving funds under this section that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable and as determined by the Attorney General, shall not be eligible to receive funds under this section for a period of 2 fiscal years.

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit a State that fails to file a report as required under paragraph (2), and is not eligible to receive funds under this section, from making funding available to a unit of local government of the State under subsection (c)(3), if the unit of local government has complied with the reporting requirements.

''(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, and each year thereafter in which grants are made under this section, the Attorney General shall submit a report to Congress on the implementation of activities carried out under this section.

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, information on—

''(A) the number, amounts, and recipients of awards the Attorney General has made or intends to make using funds authorized under this section;

''(B) the selection criteria the Attorney General has used or intends to use to select recipients of awards using funds authorized under this section;

''(C) the number of law enforcement officers of a State or unit of local government who were not able to receive training on the topics described in section 1701(n)(1)(A) due to unavailability of funds and the amount of funds that would be required to complete the training; and

''(D) the nature, frequency, and amount of information that the Attorney General has collected or intends to collect under subsection (d).

''(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—A report under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

''(f) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE STUDY.—

''(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the National Institute of Justice shall conduct a study of the implementation of training under a certified training program or course in at least 6 jurisdictions representing an array of agency sizes and geographic locations, which shall include—

''(A) a process evaluation of training implementation, which shall include an analysis of the share of officers who participated in the training, the degree to which the training was administered in accordance with the curriculum, and the fidelity with which the training was applied in the field; and

''(B) an impact evaluation of the training, which shall include an analysis of the impact of the training on interactions between law enforcement officers and the public, any factors that prevent or preclude law enforcement officers from successfully de-escalating law enforcement interactions, and any recommendations on modifications to the training curricula and methods that could improve outcomes.

''(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the National Institute of Justice shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

''(3) PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.—The study under paragraph (1) shall not disclose the identities of individual law enforcement officers who received, or did not receive, training under a certified training program or course.

''(4) FUNDING.—Not more than 1 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out this section during any fiscal year shall be made available to conduct the study under paragraph (1).

''(g) GAO REPORT.—

''(1) STUDY AND REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the first grant award using funds authorized under this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the grant program under this section and submit to Congress a report assessing the grant program, including—

''(A) the process for developing and identifying curricula under section 1701(n)(1), including the effectiveness of the consultation by the Attorney General with the agencies, associations, and organizations identified under section 1701(n)(1)(C);

''(B) the certification of training programs and courses under section 1701(n)(2), including the development of the process for certification and its implementation;

''(C) the training of law enforcement personnel under section 1701(n)(3), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that employ the personnel receiving the training and the sizes of those agencies;

''(D) the allocation of funds under subsection (c), including the geographic distribution of the agencies that receive funds and the degree to which both large and small agencies receive funds; and

''(E) the amount of funding distributed to agencies compared with the amount appropriated under this section, the amount spent for training, and whether plans have been put in place by the recipient agencies to use unspent available funds.

''(2) GAO ACCESS TO PORTAL.—For the purposes of preparing the report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General of the United States shall have direct access to the portal developed under subsection (d)(3).

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

''(1) $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2025; and

''(2) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2026.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 4003.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 4003, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022, is bipartisan legislation that would improve training for law enforcement officers, including using alternatives to force and de-escalation tactics. It also includes training and support for officers working with mental health professionals and crisis intervention teams.

This bill would empower police and the mental health professionals working with them to link individuals to services in their community.

Law enforcement officers are often the first responders to individuals in crisis. While we have worked to develop and implement non-law-enforcement crisis response services, there continues to be a need to train and equip law enforcement officers to de-escalate interactions and divert individuals to appropriate mental and behavioral health services.

Additionally, there is a need to provide officers and crisis response teams the tools they need to understand and respond to individuals with disabilities. One study found that disabled individuals make up one-third to one-half of all people killed by law enforcement officers.

Reforms to law enforcement, including de-escalation training, both improve public safety and reduce crime. A study of the Louisville, Kentucky, police department found that de-escalation training reduced use-of-force incidents by 28 percent and community member injuries by 26 percent. Officer injuries were reduced by an even larger margin of 36 percent.

S. 4003 will require the Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to consult with a broad range of stakeholders in developing the training curriculum, including law enforcement and behavioral health groups, as well as civil rights and civil liberties groups and associations that represent individuals with disabilities.

This bill also requires the National Institute of Justice and the Government Accountability Office to evaluate the implementation of the program and the effect of the training to ensure that the curricula have a tangible impact on law enforcement encounters with people in crisis and to identify possible changes that would further improve outcomes.

This bipartisan bill improves public safety by developing and implementing evidence-based de-escalation training for law enforcement officers. I thank Senator CORNYN for introducing the bill and Congresswoman KAREN BASS for leading the House version of this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 4003 creates a new Federal grant program to provide training for law enforcement officers

on de-escalation techniques, participation in crisis intervention teams, making referrals to community-based service providers, safely responding to individuals in a behavioral or mental health crisis, and alternatives to use of force.

It requires the Department of Justice to develop training curriculum in collaboration with mental health providers, law enforcement agencies, civil rights organizations, and other stakeholders.

It also authorizes $133 million in new money over the next 4 years with no offsets.

There are several problems with this legislation.

First, the COPS Office at the Justice Department currently funds programs that already do what this bill purports to support. For instance, the COPS Office funds the Community Policing Development De-Escalation Training Program through two different mechanisms.

Through one mechanism, the COPS Office provides $3 million over the next 2 years for the expansion of a network of regional centers to provide nationally certified de-escalation training opportunities for law enforcement. The other mechanism, law enforcement agency de-escalation grants, provides nearly $12 million in grant funding over the next 2 years to support whole agency de-escalation, implicit bias, and duty-to-intervene training efforts.

These programs are appropriated and up and running as we speak. We should not be creating new programs that are duplicative of current programs without at least examining the efficacy of the currently funded programs.

Second, this legislation represents a departure from traditional law enforcement techniques, one that advances a soft-on-crime approach. In recent years, these kinds of approaches to fighting crime have been a boon to criminals and have led to our current crime epidemic.

We need to seriously address the crime epidemic, not fund duplicative programs that would keep cops in cars.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to counter my good friend and indicate that this is important legislation. It is documented to be important legislation, and the documentation is clear because of the widespread support of such a wide range of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor to support S. 4003. I thank my colleagues, Senator CORNYN from Texas and Congresswoman BASS.

As this legislation came out of the Judiciary Committee as well, this is legislation that fits very well under the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee, which I chair. Our responsibilities are to address the question of crime but also to address the question of social justice and reform.

We have heard over the last couple of months—many of us have been in the mode of campaigning—challenges against Democrats, as to whether or not we are tough on crime or whether or not we can work to protect our communities. One thing that protects our communities is strong law enforcement that knows how to engage with the community and is given the tools that will help them do so, and to help the community engage with law enforcement so that they can collectively solve crime.

This legislation is a bipartisan bill that would improve public safety and strengthen public trust in law enforcement, one of the first steps toward bringing down crime.

S. 4003 would require the Department of Justice to develop a de-escalation training curriculum in collaboration with mental health providers, law enforcement agencies, civil rights organizations, and associations representing individuals with mental health diagnoses.

□ 1530

How many times have mothers and fathers had to deal with the loss of a child because they were having a mental health episode?

This legislation continues to be a need to improve the practices that law enforcement officers can use to reduce use-of-force incidents and also protect themselves.

When individuals are in crisis, police are often the first to respond. We understand that is not their total responsibility, but because of our lack of access to mental health resources, they have been on the front lines; and so, without training necessary to recognize a mental health crisis, someone winds up injured or dead. Interactions between law enforcement and civilians can escalate to potentially deadly consequences.

As the country faces an epidemic of violence committed by officers and the disproportionate impact that this violence has on people of color, we remember the lives lost to police violence, including Nicolas Chavez, who was killed by law enforcement, among others in cities across the land.

Just this week, we learned that two Colorado deputies that killed Christian Glass in June have been indicted. That was a sad circumstance. We wish it had not happened, and it did not need to happen.

This legislation will give us the opportunity, again, to do what we want to do; to keep America safe; to bring down crime; and to protect our officers and to give them the training that helps them to be able to engage in de-escalation tactics.

Somewhat similar to the overall bill that I introduced, and John Conyers before me, I introduced the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act, which I hope to reintroduce again, and seeking bipartisan support; this would authorize $70 million in annual grant funding for training that includes improving community officer relations and engage in training on use of force or de-escalation scenario-based exercises.

In addition, this bill would provide support to law enforcement agencies to train and equip officers. This legislation, of course, is widely supported.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This legislation is widely supported. It is bipartisan; and I thank Mayor-Elect, Congresswoman KAREN BASS for her leadership on the companion bill.

I also thank my colleague, Senator CORNYN from Texas for his commitment and concern.

Mr. Speaker, I quickly want to acknowledge that the faith community is squarely in support of this, and they certainly care about law enforcement and bringing down crime.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by Catholic Charities USA, Catholic Prison Ministry Coalition, Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development, United Sates Conference of Catholic Bishops, Center for Public Justice, Jesuit Conference, Office of Justice and Ecology, National Association of Evangelicals, National Latino Evangelical Coalition, National Hispanic Christian Leadershp Coalition, and Prison Fellowship; a letter from CPAC; a letter from National Fraternal Order of Police; and a letter from Major Cities Chiefs Associations.

NOVEMBER 29, 2022.

Senator JOHN CORNYN,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.
Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS CORNYN AND WHITEHOUSE: Our faith-based organizations write to urge for broad co-sponsorship among your colleagues and the swift passage of the Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act of 2022 (S. 4003) as it would help police officers better serve vulnerable populations and keep our communities safe. Furthermore, this bill would promote a more restorative justice system that respects the God-given dignity of each person and promote safe communities for both law enforcement officers and residents. The bill would also provide law enforcement officers with the skills and tools needed to respond appropriately to the needs of the communities they protect and serve.

Police officers respond every day to calls for service for men and women grappling with grave mental and behavioral health challenges. However, they are not consistently trained to address these situations effectively. Inadequate training can undermine law enforcement officers' wellbeing and job satisfaction, and increase incidents of excessive use of force that erodes public trust. Policymakers must better equip law enforcement officers with evidence-based training for interactions with people in crisis that

fosters community partnership, promotes understanding of mental illness, and prioritizes the lowest level of force necessary to keep communities safe.

Several key provisions position the Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act (S. 4003) to be a catalyst for modernizing American policing. The legislation would create a new federal funding stream to provide training for law enforcement agencies on de-escalation techniques, on participation in crisis intervention teams, on making referrals to community-based service providers, on safely responding to individuals in a behavioral or mental health crisis, and on alternatives to use of force. Furthermore, the bill would advance transparency and accountability to best practices through strong reporting and evaluation requirements from the Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, and Government Accountability Office. To foster public trust, the Department of Justice will develop training curriculum in collaboration with mental health providers, law enforcement agencies, civil rights organizations, and other stakeholders. The legislation would provide funding for continuing education for law enforcement officers to further refine their knowledge and tactical skills beyond initial training requirements.

We support the passage of the Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act of 2022 as it would provide law enforcement officers the training needed to carefully respond to the needs of the community in a way that would promote human dignity and strengthen public trust.

Sincerely,

Catholic Charities USA, Catholic Prison Ministry Coalition, Committee on Domestic Justice and Human Development, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Center for Public Justice, Jesuit Conference Office of Justice and Ecology, National Association of Evangelicals, National Latino Evangelical Coalition, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Coalition, Prison Fellowship.

AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION,
CPAC,
September 29, 2022.

Re S. 4003—Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.
Hon. JIM JORDAN,
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER AND RANKING MEMBER JORDAN: The American Conservative Union (''ACU'') is the nation's oldest grassroots advocacy organization. Founded in 1964 by William F. Buckley, we have a 50-plus-year track record of advancing policies that reduce the size and scope of government, advance liberty, and reduce burdens on families. Criminal justice reform, if done properly, fits squarely within this rubric.

ACU also strongly supports law enforcement. We have asked our police officers to do more and more in recent years. Today, our men and women in blue are not only cops putting their lives on the line every day; they also serve as family, marriage and addiction counselors, mental health responders, and social workers, too. As a result, officers have day-to-day interactions with people in crisis, and this often escalates to the point that a use of force is necessary. De-escalation is an important skillset for officer safety as well as for those in crisis when they encounter law enforcement.

Accordingly, we support the efforts of Senators John Cornyn (R–TX) and Sheldon Whitehouse (D–RI) to ensure that funding for de-escalation training is expanded. S. 4003 establishes funding through the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (''JAG'') program totaling $90 million for two years to help state and local law enforcement obtain de-escalation crisis intervention training. This funding will be targeted to smaller law enforcement departments that would otherwise lack resources for this type of training.

It is notable that the curriculum will leverage the ''train the trainer'' model to allow a significant increase in training opportunities by having officers train their colleagues. Not only is this an efficient use of resources, it helps inculcate the lessons and values of de-escalation in the culture of the departments funded by this program.

Finally, S. 4003 includes strong reporting and evaluation requirements on grants for the Department of Justice, the National Institute of Justice, and the Government Accountability Agency. ACU believes the justice system must be accountable for a wise use of tax dollars, and these requirements will ensure that state and local law enforcement are effectively using their grants to serve their communities well.

We believe S. 4003 would be a prudent use of taxpayer resources and as such, urge you to take this important legislation up as soon as possible. Should S. 4003 come to the floor, we will recommend to our colleagues at our sister organization, the ACU Foundation's Center for Legislative Accountability, to score this bill positively.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully,

DAVID H. SAFAVIAN,
General Counsel.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
April 8, 2022.

Hon. JOHN CORNYN III,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS CORNYN AND WHITEHOUSE: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for S. 4003, the ''Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act.''

Law enforcement officers face numerous challenges when responding to threats against public safety, and not all of these threats are necessarily criminal in nature. Police are on the front lines and are often called to deal with individuals experiencing mental illness, substance abuse issues, or similar psychological impairments who may become dangerous to themselves or to the public. Recent studies found that as many as ten percent of all law enforcement encounters involve individuals experiencing these issues. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) has estimated that over 2 million individuals arrested each year are struggling with a serious mental illness.

Your legislation would address this issue by providing $70 million in annual grant funding from the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (Byrne-JAG) to State and local law enforcement agencies to train officers in de-escalation tactics and alternatives to the use of force. The U.S. Department of Justice's Office on Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), through consultation with State and local law enforcement agencies, would be required to develop a curriculum of relevant training topics, including de-escalation tactics, use of force alternatives, establishing and maintaining crisis intervention teams, as well as how to safely respond to mental and behavioral health crises using public benefits programs, housing assistance programs, and other relevant services. The funding from this bill will be used to cover the cost of training, attendance, overtime fees, and the procurement of certifications. Additionally, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) would study and evaluate the impacts of the training. This would ensure that the training has a meaningful, tangible impact on law enforcement encounters with individuals in crisis.

The implementation of de-escalation techniques would have a tremendous positive impact on public safety and the relationship between the public and law enforcement officers. Numerous studies have shown that civilians base their perceptions of law enforcement on their last encounter. Providing officers with the skills and training to avoid needless escalation of calls for service enable officers to protect the public more effectively. This improved communication will create a better police force and safer communities.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we thank you both for your leadership on this important issue. If I can provide any additional information about this bill, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in our Washington, DC office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

MAJOR CITIES CHIEFS ASSOCIATION,
April 5. 2022.

Hon. JOHN CORNYN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CORNYN AND SENATOR WHITEHOUSE: I'm writing on behalf of the Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA) to register our support for S. 4003, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act of 2022. The MCCA is a professional organization of law enforcement executives representing the largest cities in the United States and Canada.

The MCCA is a leader in national policy debates on policing reform and, in January 2021, released a comprehensive report that addressed a number of topics, including training. This report recommended that all law enforcement officers undergo training on de-escalation tactics.

De-escalation training is already a part of many MCCA members' standard training curriculums. Law enforcement training is quite expensive, however, and the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act will provide critical grant funding to help offset the costs associated with de-escalation training. Furthermore, MCCA members will also be able to use these resources for continuing education, which will help further enhance existing de-escalation training programs.

Thank you for your leadership on this issue and your continued support of law enforcement. Please do not hesitate to contact me if the MCCA can be of additional assistance.

Sincerely,

JERI WILLIAMS,
Chief, Phoenix Police Department, President, Major Cities Chiefs Association.

OCTOBER 14, 2022.

Hon. KAREN BASS,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DAVID TRONE,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Washington, DC.
Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES BASS, ISSA, TRONE, AND CHABOT: Thank you for championing America's mental health. The undersigned national organizations representing consumers, family members, mental health and substance use treatment providers, advocates, and payers committed to strengthening access to mental health care and substance use treatment write to voice our strong support for H.R. 8637, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act. We are grateful for your ongoing commitment to our country's public safety officers and to improving behavioral health crisis response.

This legislation comes at a moment of crisis in American life. According to CDC data from August 2020 to February of 2021, over 4 in 10 adults reported experiencing anxiety or depression. From 2009 to 2019, the number of high school students reporting feelings of sadness or hopelessness increased by 40%, the number of those seriously considering suicide increased by 36%, and the share of high school students creating a suicide plan increased by 44%. Nearly one in twenty American adults (4.9%) report having had serious thoughts of suicide in the last year. Providing law enforcement with tools and resources to handle these mental health crises is a common-sense solution to supporting our officers and first responders while they carry out their duty of protecting the public, as 6 to 10% of encounters with law enforcement involve individuals dealing with a mental illness.

As you know, the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act will direct the U.S. Attorney General to develop training curricula to help educate law enforcement officers and covered mental health professionals about how best to respond to behavioral health crises. Such curricula will be developed with the goal of promoting awareness of de-escalation tactics, alternatives to use of force, and best practices to safely respond to an individual experiencing a mental health or suicidal crisis.

Through the existing Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program, this legislation will help state and local law enforcement agencies train public safety officers to respond to mental health or suicidal crises. This training will place an emphasis on scenario-based exercises, testing, and follow-up evaluative assessments to ensure that officers have the simulated experiences needed to respond in real-life situations appropriately and effectively. It also encourages collaboration between law enforcement units, local mental health organizations, and healthcare services to better integrate and plan training programs, and establishes pathways for evaluating what works.

Law enforcement are a key partner in ensuring that every person experiencing a mental health or suicidal crisis is connected to the care they need. Training officers to identify and de-escalate crises while avoiding use of force will help improve outcomes for crisis situations. It is for these reasons that we give H.R. 8637 our strong support.

We respectfully urge the swift passage of H.R. 8637, and we look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues to improve public safety responses to behavioral health crises.

Sincerely,

2020 Mom, American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare, American Association for Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work, American Association of Psychiatric Pharmacists, American Association on Health and Disability, American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, American Group Psychotherapy Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association, Anxiety and Depression Association of America, Association for Ambulatory Behavioral Healthcare (AABH), Children and Adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder.

Depression and Bipolar Support Alliance, Maternal Mental Health Leadership Alliance, Meadows Mental Health Policy Institute, NAADAC, the Association for Addiction Professionals, National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), The National Alliance to Advance Adolescent Health, National Association for Children's Behavioral Health, National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC), National Council for Mental Wellbeing, National Eating Disorders Association, National Federation of Families, National Network of Depression Centers, RI International, Sandy Hook Promise.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 4003, the "Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act of 2022," a bipartisan bill that would improve public safety and strengthen public trust in law enforcement.

S. 4003 would require the Department of Justice to develop de-escalation training curriculum in consultation and collaboration with mental health providers, law enforcement agencies, civil rights organizations, and associations representing individuals with mental health diagnoses and with disabilities.

There continues to be a need to improve the practices of law enforcement officers and reduce use of force incidents. When individuals are in crisis, police are often the first to respond. Without the training necessary to recognize a mental health crisis, interactions between law enforcement and civilians can escalate to potentially deadly consequences.

As the country faces an epidemic of violence committed by officers and the disproportionate impact that this violence has on people of color, we remember the lives lost to police violence, including in my community of Houston, Nicholas Chavez, who was killed by law enforcement in 2020 while experiencing a mental health crisis.

Just this week we learned that two Colorado deputies who killed Christian Glass in June have been indicted. Christian was experiencing a mental health crisis when officers received a "motorist assist" call and is said to have posed no danger to the officers.

We must remember these lives and countless others as we stand ready to pass this legislation, which would reduce use of force incidents, keep our communities safe, and save the lives of civilians and law enforcement officers.

Law enforcement officers must be equipped with the skills necessary to interact with people with mental or behavioral health issues safely and with compassion.

The numerous officer-involved encounters that ended badly, which we know all too well, might have led to better outcomes if the officers involved had known: 1) how to recognize that the individuals were in crisis and suffering from the effects of mental health issues or disabilities; 2) how to communicate with such individuals; and 3) how to maximize officer and subject safety.

The Law Enforcement De-escalation Training Act would authorize $70 million in annual grant funding for training that includes improving community-officer relations, deescalation and use of force, scenario-based exercises, and follow-up evaluative assessments.

In addition, this bill would provide support to law enforcement agencies to train and equip officers to respond to individuals in crisis and connect them with the necessary mental and behavioral health services.

It would also promote transparency by requiring grantees to evaluate and provide reports on the application of deescalation tactics acquired through the training by officers in the field.

S. 4003 is bipartisan legislation that would take meaningful steps toward improving policing practices in America, increasing public safety, and restoring trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

I thank Representative (Mayor-elect) KAREN BASS for her leadership on the House companion—which I am proud to cosponsor along with a bipartisan coalition of members—and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

S. 4003 is bipartisan legislation that would improve training for law enforcement officers, including using alternatives to force and de-escalation tactics. This training will reduce use-of-force incidents and improve officer and community safety.

I cannot imagine how anybody can think this will somehow increase crime. Senator CORNYN, who is not known to be soft on crime, is the major Senate sponsor.

I urge all Members to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 4003.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH COLLABORATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3846) to reauthorize the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3846

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 "Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH COLLABORATION PROGRAM.

Section 2991(b)(5) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10651(b)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''teams and treatment accountability services for communities'' and inserting ''teams, treatment accountability services for communities, and training for State and local prosecutors relating to diversion programming and implementation'';

(B) in clause (v)—

(i) in subclause (III), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subclause (IV), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(V) coordinate, implement, and administer models to address mental health calls that include specially trained officers and mental health crisis workers responding to those calls together.''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) SUICIDE PREVENTION SERVICES.—Funds may be used to develop, promote, and implement comprehensive suicide prevention programs and services for incarcerated individuals that include ongoing risk assessment.

''(vii) CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES.—Funds may be used for case management services for preliminary qualified offenders and individuals who are released from any penal or correctional institution to—

''(I) reduce recidivism; and

''(II) assist those individuals with reentry into the community.

''(viii) ENHANCING COMMUNITY CAPACITY AND LINKS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE.—Funds may be used to support, administer, or develop treatment capacity and increase access to mental health care and substance use disorder services for preliminary qualified offenders and individuals who are released from any penal or correctional institution.

''(ix) IMPLEMENTING 988.—Funds may be used to support the efforts of State and local governments to implement and expand the integration of the 988 universal telephone number designated for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system under section 251(e)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e)(4)), including by hiring staff to support the implementation and expansion.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(K) TEAMS ADDRESSING MENTAL HEALTH CALLS.—With respect to a multidisciplinary team described in subparagraph (I)(v) that receives funds from a grant under this section, the multidisciplinary team—

''(i) shall, to the extent practicable, provide response capability 24 hours each day and 7 days each week to respond to crisis or mental health calls; and

''(ii) may place a part of the team in a 911 call center to facilitate the timely response to mental health crises.''.

SEC. 3. EXAMINATION AND REPORT ON PREVALENCE OF MENTALLY ILL OFFENDERS.

Section 5(d) of the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Reauthorization and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–416; 122 Stat. 4355) is amended by striking ''2009'' and inserting ''each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on S. 3846.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 3846, the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act of 2022, is bipartisan legislation that would reauthorize and make necessary improvements to the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, or JMHCP, within the Department of Justice.

Since the start of the COVID–19 pandemic, communities across the country have grappled with worsened mental health. There continues to be a need to adequately address the mental health needs of our communities and to redirect people in crisis away from the criminal justice system and into the healthcare system.

State and local governments use JMHCP grants for critical services to address the mental health needs of their communities, including by establishing diversion programs, creating or expanding community-based treatment programs, supporting the development of curricula for police academies and orientations, and providing in-jail treatment and transitional services.

Additionally, grant funds are used to train law enforcement on identifying and improving their responses to people experiencing a mental health crisis. This program, which was first created in 2004, was reauthorized in 2008 and again in 2016 with bipartisan support.

S. 3846 will make needed improvements to the grant program by strengthening support for mental health courts and crisis intervention teams; supporting diversion programming and training for State and local prosecutors; strengthen support for co-responder teams; and supporting the integration of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system into the existing public safety system.

This bill will also increase allowable uses for grant funds to include suicide prevention in jails and clarify that crisis intervention teams can be placed in 911 call centers.

This bipartisan bill improves the efficacy of the JMHCP grant program and is supported by a wide range of stakeholders, including the Addiction Policy Forum, the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, Major County Sheriffs of America, National Alliance on Mental Illness, and many others.

I thank Senator CORNYN for introducing the bill and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for introducing the House version of this important legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 3846 makes a number of changes to the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program.

The Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program is a Department of Justice program that assists States, local governments, and Indian Tribes with providing treatment to individuals with mental health problems and substance abuse disorders that come into contact with the criminal justice system.

This bill allows funds under this program to be used for crisis intervention team and co-responder teams made up of law enforcement officers and mental health professionals. These teams can be placed within 911 call centers to better respond to individuals facing mental health challenges.

It also allows funds under this program to help State and local governments implement the 988 universal telephone number, which is the national suicide prevention and mental health hotline.

This legislation also authorizes $2 million for each of the next 5 years for the Department of Justice to report on the prevalence of mentally ill offenders in the criminal justice system.

While this bill is well-intentioned, more needs to be done to address the surge of violent crime this Nation has seen over the past 3 years.

Violent crime is especially bad in Democrat-run cities with rogue leftist prosecutors who don't enforce the laws on the books and in cities that have demonized and defunded their police departments. I would point you to Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

It is no wonder that 27 of the 30 cities with the highest homicide rates have Democratic mayors. We need to keep violent criminals behind bars and put an end to soft-on-crime policies that are wreaking havoc on our communities.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise, first of all, to thank the chairman and to thank the sponsor, my friend from Virginia, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT.

As I think of my dear friend from Virginia, let me also acknowledge my deep sadness for the loss of our dear friend, Congressman McEachin, and acknowledge the beauty of his service and, of course, his compassion and his true spirit, a true American hero.

Mr. Speaker, I will quickly say that any of us who have been engaged in the criminal justice arena, who have engaged with police officers, whether they are local, State, or Federal, those of us who have served as judges, understand the value of this important legislation. It is bipartisan and will build on

the success of the JMHCP grant program and make necessary improvements to enable State and local governments to better serve their communities.

This reauthorization will make critical improvements to the JMHCP program which supports services for individuals with mental health issues who are involved in the criminal justice system, including expansions in suicide prevention in jails and prisons, co-responder programs that pair law enforcement with mental health professionals and, of course, recognizing that though we give them this responsibility, law enforcement needs to have wraparound services and those that have the expertise to work with those suffering from mental health crises.

With the continued impact of the COVID–19 pandemic, communities across the country have suffered increased challenges in addressing mental health. We, as Democrats, have consistently said that we need a holistic approach.

Again, I said that we take no back seat to fighting crime and being successful, but we understand public safety and civil rights.

I thank Chairman SCOTT for this work and for acknowledging where we are at a loss; that is, with people who are suffering mental health issues.

Now, we have had a series of mass murders, mass killings, of course using the weapon of choice for young men who espouse hatred, but many have been determined or assessed to have had mental health crisis issues, at least that has been the defense. We now need to really invest in this program and ensure that this is a national program.

In 2018, Harris County Jail, mental health division expanded as an alternative to jail, diverting individuals with mental health illnesses away from incarceration. I want to see this program grow. The updated diversion program allows law enforcement to direct individuals with mental illness over to these programs; those picked up for low-level, nonviolent offenses. Many of us know that these are sometimes homeless persons, and many of these persons are veterans. By the way, we have a veterans' court in Harris County.

So I am excited about this bipartisan legislation that would also support State implementation of the newly established 988 suicide crisis hotline. I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from the National Fraternal Order of Police, the Conference of Chief Justices Conference of State Court Administrators, among others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
April 29, 2022.

Hon. JOHN CORNYN III,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CORNYN: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our support for S. 3846, the ''Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act.''

According to recent studies, one in ten calls for service to law enforcement involve a person suffering from a mental illness. One in three people taken to a hospital emergency room for psychiatric reasons are transported there by law enforcement. Our officers respond to these calls for service with care, compassion, and professionalism. While we have come a long way in our ability to handle these incidents safely and effectively, law enforcement officers need the training and resources this legislation provides.

The legislation would reauthorize the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP) through 2026. First authorized in 2004, JMHCP grants have funded mental health courts, other court-based initiatives, diversion and deflection programs, crisis intervention teams, training for local police departments, and other programs to improve outcomes for people with mental illness and co-occurring substance use conditions who come into contact with the justice system. In addition to adding $10 million to program funding, this legislation would also expand the allowable uses of grants to include the funding of crisis response teams, suicide prevention in jails, and the hiring of community health workers.

Law enforcement officers have one of the toughest and most dangerous jobs in the United States. They are tasked with keeping our streets and neighborhoods safe from crime, ensuring that every citizen can live free and without fear. By putting funding and resources into improving mental health outcomes across the criminal justice system, this bill ensures that law enforcement officers will have a reduced risk of encountering dangerous situations on a day-to-day basis.

On behalf of the more than 364,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I am pleased to offer our support for this legislation. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or Executive Director Jim Pasco in our Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF JUSTICES,
CONFERENCE OF STATE COURT ADMINISTRATORS,
November 23, 2022.

Hon. JOHN CORNYN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. ROBERT C. SCOTT,
Washington, DC.
Hon. AMY KLOBUCHAR,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The Conference of Chief Justices (CCJ) and Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA) represents the highest judicial officer and court executive of each state, the U.S. Territories, and the District of Columbia. Together with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), the Conferences work to improve the administration of justice throughout the United States. State courts are our nation's primary court system handling over 95 percent of the nation's litigation. It is in this capacity that we write as the presidents of the Conference to express our support for your legislation, S. 3846/H.R. 8166. If enacted, this legislation would reauthorize and further expand the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP) to provide resources for mental health courts, veterans treatment courts, crisis intervention services, and other key interventions to improve the justice system's response to individuals with mental illness.

The prevalence of mental illness in the United States has an enormous impact on communities and a disproportionate impact on our state and local courts. According to the National Institute of Mental Health, nearly one in five U.S. adults live with a mental illness—over 50 million in 2020—and over 13 million adults live with serious mental illness. Individuals with mental illnesses in the U.S. are 10 times more likely to be incarcerated than they are to be hospitalized. On any given day, approximately 380,000 people with mental illnesses are in jail or prison across the U.S., and another 574,000 are under some form of correctional supervision. For too many individuals with serious mental illness, substance use disorder, or both, the justice system is the de facto provider of treatment services. Except for self-referral, state courts are the number one referrer in the nation for treatment services.

In March 2020, the CCJ, COSCA, and NCSC established the National Judicial Task Force to Examine State Courts' Response to Mental Illness to assist state courts in their efforts to respond to the needs of court-involved individuals with severe mental illness more effectively. The task force recently released its national report, which provides examples of successful programs from across the nation and shares recommendations for change that call for action by all state and local court leaders, behavioral health and other community partners, and other state and federal agencies to more effectively to meet the needs of justice-involved individuals with serious mental illness. The report can be found at: MHTF State Courts Leading Change.pdf (ncsc.org).

Recommendations from the Task Force include:

Examine the continuum of behavioral health deflection and diversion options available in each community to promote deflection and diversion to treatment options at the earliest point possible.

Convene justice and behavioral health system partners to identify opportunities to collaboratively improve our responses to individuals with behavioral health disorders.

Proactively promote processes to identify and divert individuals with behavioral health disorders at every stage of system involvement towards treatment and away from further penetration into the criminal justice system.

Examine current case management and calendaring practices for all types of cases and implement strategies to more quickly and effectively address issues presented in cases involving individuals with behavioral health needs.

Thank you for your continued leadership and commitment to helping each intercept point in the criminal justice system improve our response to individuals experiencing a mental health crisis. Please feel free to direct your staff to Chris Wu if there is any way we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

CHIEF JUSTICE LORETTA RUSH, PRESIDENT,
Conference of Chief Justices.
KARL HADE, PRESIDENT,
Conference of State Court Administrators.

NOVEMBER 10, 2022.

DEAR LEADERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We are writing today to strongly urge you to bring up and swiftly pass H.R. 8166/S. 3846, the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act of 2022 on suspension when the House of Representatives returns for the lame-duck session. This bipartisan legislation makes critical improvements to the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (JMHCP), which supports jurisdictions creating collaborative responses to people with mental illnesses or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders in the criminal justice system. We applaud the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which unanimously approved the bill in May. The Senate has already shown their strong support for the bill by passing it by unanimous consent in June. Now it is time for the House to show their support for state and local governments that are working on this complex issue by bringing the bill to the floor.

Since its inception, JMHCP has supported initiatives across the country to reduce contact with the criminal justice system and increase access to treatment and supports for people with behavioral health needs. JMHCP was created by the Bureau of Justice Assistance in 2006 as a critical way to support the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act (MIOTCRA), which was signed into law in 2004 by then-President George W. Bush. JMHCP's mission, then and now, has been to unify justice and health partners around a common goal: reducing criminal justice involvement for people with mental illness.

Collectively, state and local governments use JMHCP grants for a broad range of activities, including establishing diversion programs, creating or expanding community-based treatment programs, supporting the development of curricula for police academies and orientations, and providing in-jail treatment and transitional services, and training programs to teach criminal justice, law enforcement, corrections, mental health, and substance use personnel how to identify and appropriately respond to incidents involving veterans. Additionally, grant funds may be used to train law enforcement on identifying and improving their responses to people experiencing a mental health crisis. The program was reauthorized in 2008 and again in 2016 with bipartisan support.

The Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act of 2022 will:

Strengthen support for mental health courts and crisis intervention teams (CITs); Support diversion programming and training for state and local prosecutors; Strengthen support for co-responder teams; Support the integration of 988 into the existing public safety system;

Amend allowable uses for grant funds to include suicide prevention in jails and information-sharing between mental health systems and jails/prisons;

Amend allowable uses to include case management services and supports; and

Clarify that crisis intervention teams can be placed in 911 call centers.

The law enforcement, training and treatment components of JMHCP will help law enforcement better handle calls involving people with mental health and substance use challenges. Jurisdictions across the country are implementing strategies to improve the outcomes of these encounters, which includes providing specialized training and tools that can yield a response that prioritizes treatment over incarceration, when appropriate. CITs, along with other practices authorized under the legislation, have been proven to be effective in reducing recidivism, enhancing public safety, and freeing up criminal justice resources for traditional crime fighting purposes.

With the responsibility of treating people with mental illness often falling on an already strained criminal justice system, it is imperative that we provide resources to help law enforcement officers, judges, corrections officers, and mental health professionals develop more thoughtful and cost-effective programs. We strongly urge the House to support law enforcement and our communities better serve individuals with mental health disorders and to increase public safety by passing the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act in the lame-duck session.

Sincerely,

National Fraternal Order of Police; National Sheriffs Association (NSA); Major County Sheriffs of America; Conference of Chief Justices; Conference of State Court Administrators; Wounded Warrior Project; Addiction Policy Forum; National Association of Counties; National League of Cities; American Foundation for Suicide Prevention; National District Attorneys Association; National Alliance on Mental Illness; National Association of Police Organizations; American Jail Association.

National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors; National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors; The Council of State Governments Justice Center; Major Cities Chiefs Association; American Probation and Parole Association; Faith & Freedom Coalition; Meadows Mental Health Policy Institute; Leslie County Sheriffs Office; Elliot County Sheriffs Office; Union County Sheriffs Office; Grayson County Sheriffs Office; Knox County Sheriffs Office.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3846, the "Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act of 2022," a bipartisan bill that would build on the success of the JMHCP grant program and make necessary improvements to enable state and local governments to better serve their communities.

This reauthorization would make critical improvements to the JMHCP program—which supports services for individuals with mental health issues who are involved in the criminal justice system—including expansions in suicide prevention in jails and prisons; co-responder programs that pair law enforcement with mental health professionals; and crisis intervention teams within 911 call centers.

With the continued impact of the COVID–19 pandemic, communities across the country have suffered increased challenges in addressing mental health. We know that individuals suffering from mental illness belong in our health care system and not our criminal justice system.

Democrats have worked consistently throughout this Congress to address issues of public safety from a holistic approach, one that does not require us to choose between our rights and our safety. We know that public safety and respect for civil rights can coexist and that supporting interventions to respond to individuals in crisis with compassion rather than force builds stronger and safer communities.

This bill would improve existing programs within the Department of Justice that divert individuals with mental illness away from the criminal justice system towards treatment and health care.

Since 2006, JMHCP grants have funded 620 awardees across 49 states and territories. With these funds law enforcement agencies have established co-responder teams, mobile crisis teams, and crisis intervention teams to improve encounters with individuals in crisis and connect them with the services they need.

JMHCP supports 14 law enforcement mental health learning sites, including both the Harris County Sheriffs Department and the Houston Police Department, that serve as peer resources to grantees and communities throughout the country.

In 2018, the Harris County Mental Health Jail Diversion Program expanded as an alternative to jail—diverting individuals with mental illness away from incarceration and into the health care and treatment that they need. The updated diversion program allows law enforcement to direct individuals with mental illness, who have been picked up for low-level, nonviolent offenses, to more appropriate mental health interventions.

These initiatives at the state and local level have been successful and S. 3846 would provide an opportunity for the federal government to increase support to these programs and build on what we know works.

This bipartisan legislation would also support state implementation of the newly established 988 Suicide and Crisis hotline, which is a lifeline for individuals in suicidal crisis or emotional distress seeking help.

This bill would also provide additional resources for law enforcement as they work to keep communities safe and respond effectively and appropriately to individuals in mental health crisis.

S. 3846 is a common-sense bipartisan bill that would improve public safety and strengthen our communities. I thank Representative BOBBY SCOTT for taking the lead on the House companion, of which I cosponsored along with Representatives STEVE CHABOT and TOM EMMER. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act. The Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program is authorized through the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act, what we call MIOTCRA, legislation that I was proud to work on nearly 20 years ago as the then-ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee of Judiciary Committee.

This legislation has proven to successfully connect State and local governments with necessary resources to plan and implement initiatives designed to increase public safety, save tax dollars on ineffective or even counterproductive incarceration, and improve the lives of people with mental illness and their families.

These grants for States and localities allow for the development of programming that connects those with mental illness and substance use issues with evidence-based and comprehensive treatment within the criminal justice system. Each year there are about 2 million people with serious mental illnesses admitted to jails across the country.

In fact, according to the National Alliance of Mental Illness, 44 percent of those in jail and 37 percent of those in prisons have a history of mental illness.

□ 1545

Furthermore, once incarcerated, individuals with mental illness tend to stay in jail longer, and upon release are more likely to return to incarceration than those without mental illnesses.

These grants encourage collaboration between law enforcement and healthcare providers. The reforms to this program included in this reauthorization are centered on reducing suicide, increasing access to case management services, bolstering the roles of co-responder and crisis intervention teams, and continuing the strong support of mental health courts. This bill recognizes that prevention is the best investment in the criminal justice system for long-term success and cost savings.

This legislation is the result of the hard work of many, including State government organizations, mental health organizations, and law enforcement organizations. I thank all of those and my colleagues who have led this effort with me, including Representatives CHABOT, JACKSON LEE, and EMMER; the chairman of the committee, Mr. NADLER; as well as Senators CORNYN, KLOBUCHAR, MORAN, DURBIN, GRASSLEY, WHITEHOUSE, TILLIS, and CORTEZ MASTO.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the reauthorization of this legislation so we can get it to the President's desk before the end of the year.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program funds a variety of essential services to support the mental health needs of communities across the country and redirect people in crisis away from the criminal justice system and into the healthcare system.

This legislation would reauthorize and strengthen this important program so that it can continue to serve those in need of its services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3846, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PRO BONO WORK TO EMPOWER AND REPRESENT ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3115) to remove the 4-year sunset from the Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3115

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 ''Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2021'' or the ''POWER 2.0 Act''.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF SUNSET.

Section 3(a) of the Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–237; 132 Stat. 2448) is amended by striking ''for a period of 4 years''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 3115.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, nearly 25 percent of women suffer from domestic violence at some point in their lives. Domestic violence and related offenses destroy lives and shatter families. Among the many challenges that victims face is a lack of legal representation when seeking assistance from the court system.

According to the National Network to End Domestic Violence, in just one day in September 2014, domestic violence assistance programs received more than 10,000 requests for services, including legal representation, that were not met. The effect of this lack of representation is devastating. Research has shown that 83 percent of victims represented by counsel were able to obtain protective orders, while only 32 percent of unrepresented victims were able to do so.

That is why in 2018, Congress stepped in by enacting the POWER Act, which requires the chief judge of every judicial district to hold an annual public event, in partnership with a State, local, Tribal, or domestic violence service provider or volunteer attorney project, in promoting pro bono legal services as a critical way to empower survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. The act also requires that events be held every 2 years in areas with high numbers of Native Americans and Alaska Natives, with a focus on addressing the specific issues facing Native populations.

We recognize that pro bono legal assistance would not only provide critical representation in court, but it would also help provide survivors with access to services such as emergency shelter, transportation, and childcare. We also recognize that legal summits mandated by the act would raise awareness of the horrors of domestic violence and sexual assault while inspiring others to devote their efforts to helping survivors in their communities.

In addition to providing for these pro bono programs, the 2018 act requires the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to report to Congress about each public event conducted in the previous fiscal year.

The programs authorized under the original POWER Act have been extremely successful. In 2021, 73 pro bono legal summits were held across the Nation, reaching more than 11,000 attorneys. In the years since we passed the POWER Act, we have amassed an army of thousands of lawyers who are helping survivors, including children, get out of dangerous situations, giving them a measure of justice and a ray of hope.

But as effective as they have been, the programs created and authorized by the 2018 POWER Act are set to sunset at the end of this year. Meanwhile, the crisis of domestic and sexual violence continues.

S. 3115, the POWER 2.0 Act, would ensure the continuation of the critical programs we enacted in 2018 by removing the sunset date for these programs, helping to deliver essential legal services and to bring hope and healing to many more survivors across the country. We have already planted the seeds, and by removing the 4-year sunset provision from the original POWER Act, we will allow these pivotal programs to continue to grow and thrive, helping more and more survivors every year.

I thank Senator DAN SULLIVAN for introducing this important and time-sensitive legislation and the gentlewoman from Alaska (Ms. PELTOLA) for leading the House version of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the POWER 2.0 Act permanently authorizes the Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018, which is scheduled to sunset at the end of this year.

It requires the chief judge for each district to conduct public events to promote pro bono legal services for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

In addition, the bill requires the chief judge for a district that includes an Indian Tribe to conduct a public event to promote pro bono legal services for Indian or Alaska Native victims of these crimes every 2 years.

Research has shown that survivors of domestic abuse have significantly better outcomes, such as successfully obtaining a protective order, when represented by an attorney.

This bill will hopefully assist victims in accessing quality representation through pro bono services.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that my colleagues support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is an enormously important initiative, and I rise today to support the Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2021, or the POWER 2.0 Act. This has to be one of the more important bills on the floor, among many.

This is a bill that saves lives, and I certainly want to, at the very beginning, acknowledge certainly the Senator, but as well, I want to acknowledge our friend and colleague in the House and thank her so very much, Congresswoman PELTOLA, for her great work that has generated something that is very close to my heart.

The POWER Act will give a lifeline to domestic violence sufferers, those who have been abused by domestic violence.

As the author of the Violence Against Women Act in the House over a number of Congresses, I know how important any legislation is dealing with domestic violence and domestic abuse.

I speak to law enforcement and often say to them that domestic violence calls are the most dangerous that law enforcement engage in.

Remember, as I started on this floor, I indicated that as Democrats, we know how to bring down crime and also engage in social justice. We understand that it is extremely important that those in the criminal justice system deserve due process. But the victims of domestic violence, more often than not women, suffer greatly.

In Texas, 40.1 percent of women and 34 percent of men experience intimate partner physical violence, intimate partner rape, and/or intimate partner stalking in their lifetimes. Thousands of incidents are reported every day. On a single day in 2020, domestic violence hotlines across the country receive 21,321 calls.

The provision of legal services through the southern district or through the various Federal districts that train over 600,000 lawyers and then send them out to be able to give assistance to State and local governments is a lifeline. It is a lifesaver.

Less than one-third of domestic violence victims successfully obtain protective orders. Protective orders can be the cause of saving life, keeping a mother to protect her children, keeping an aunt or a grandmother. The POWER Act has an indelible impact on the lives of the most vulnerable Americans, and I stand here in grand support of this important effort.

As a former board member of the Houston Area Women's Center, I know what it means to get calls late into the night and calling the executive director and asking for relief for a woman who is running for her life.

Over this past Thanksgiving weekend, unfortunately, in my own community, there were a series of domestic violence killings of women who suffered at the hands of an ex.

It is important to eliminate the sunset of this provision and to be able to say that no one should be left alone without the idea or the help of ensuring that there is legal protection and that you have access to legal protection.

Again, I want to commend Congresswoman MARY SATTLER PELTOLA, a friend and someone who I appreciate her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following articles, The Justice in Government Project and HAWC.

[From the Justice in Government Project]

KEY STUDIES AND DATA ABOUT ABOUT HOW LEGAL AID ASSISTS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that in the U.S., 36.4 percent of women and 33.6 percent of men experience sexual or physical violence or stalking perpetrated by an intimate partner in their tifetimes. Individuals who have experienced domestic violence display a multitude of legal needs. They may require assistance with filing protection orders, custody issues, housing, identity theft, and employment (Lee & Backes, 2018; Allen et al., 2004).

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

Providing civil counsel in divorce, custody, and protective order proceedings can significantly improve outcomes for DV [domestic violence] and IPV [intimate partner violence] victims and their children as well as serve as a cost-effective strategy for reducing violence and generating positive social norms'' (Lee & Backes, 2018).

In a study of survivors of IPV, researchers concluded that ''[c]ivil legal services can most directly address economic self-sufficiency in two ways: by increasing income and decreasing economic liability'' (Hartley & Renner, 2016).

''83 percent of victims represented by an attorney successfully obtained a protective order, as compared to just 32 percent of victims without an attorney'' (Institute for Policy Integrity, 2015).

In custody matters, ''attorney representation, particularly representation by legal aid attorneys with expertise in IPV cases, resulted in greater protections being awarded to IPV victims and their children. Improved access of IPV victims to legal representation, particularly by attorneys with expertise in IPV, is indicated'' (Kernic, 2015).

''DV/SA [sexual assault] victims reported an aggregate total of 3,446 separate legal problems in areas identified in the survey instrument with an average of 19.69 legal problems per household/respondent. This is 2 times higher than an average of 9.3 problems per household/year documented for the general low-income population of Washington'' (Social & Economic Sciences Research Center, 2014).

''In 2003, for example, requests for restraining orders in Dane County were granted approximately 55 percent of the time. With the aid of a legal advocate provided by DAIS, however, that number increased to 69 percent'' (Elwart et al., 2006).

Women living in counties with shelters, hot-lines, safe homes, emergency transportation, programs for batterers, children's programs, and counseling are not significantly less likely to be victims of intimate partner abuse than women who live in counties without these services. However, women who live in counties with legal assistance programs to help battered women are significantly less likely to report abuse'' (Allen et al., 2004).

. . . [T]he overwhelming fraction of our study participants did not achieve the goal of terminating their marriages unless they had lawyers'' (Degnan et al.. 2019).

Most services provided to help battered women do not impact the likelihood of abuse, but the provision of legal services significantly lowers the incidence of domestic violence'' (Farmer & Tiefenthaler, 2003).

NARRATIVE OVERVIEW RE: ASSISTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS

Domestic violence (DV) is defined as violent, often aggressive, behavior used by one partner in a relationship that incites fear and intimidates the other partner or among family members. The U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics differentiates between DV (violence from family members and former or current partners) and IPV (violence only from current or former partners). Experiencing violence can leave a profound impact. Those who have been directly victimized report higher rates of depression, are at higher risk for repeat victimization, are at higher risk for perpetrating DV in their lifetime than those who have not experienced violence.

Experiencing IPV/DV is common: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that in the U.S., 36.4 percent of women and 33.6 percent of men experience sexual or physical violence or stalking perpetrated by an intimate partner in their lifetimes. In 2017, data from the National Crime Victimization Survey found that 1,237,960 Americans had experienced DV in the six months prior to the survey.

IPV/DV has disproportionate effects on elderly, disabled, LGBTQ, minority and low-income people due to increased social risks associated with violence and decreased access to services. One study found that, while 6 to 12 percent of older adults self-identify as being abused, the actual number of participants reporting indicators of abuse was about five times greater. A published review reported that, in comparison to non-Hispanic White women, Black, Latina, and Native American/Alaska Native women experienced higher lifetime rates of IPV associated with various mental health disorders, reproductive health outcomes, and barriers to services. These barriers are often the result of trauma, housing; instability, employment needs, and compounding mental and physical health needs experienced in historically marginalized communities. Additional evidence shows that even when survivors in vulnerable populations have access to legal interventions intended to reduce future risk of harm, they may be less protected from revictimization. For example, Benitez, McNiel & Binder (2010) found that Black women were at elevated risk of renewed abuse after legal intervention (i.e., obtaining a protection order or the arrest of their abusive partner following a DV incident) compared to white women.

DATA AND STUDIES SHOW LEGAL AID HELPS

Individuals who have experienced domestic violence often display a multitude of legal needs: from assistance with filing protection orders, custody issues. housing, identity

theft, and employment (Lee & Backes, 2018; Allen et al., 2004). Domestic violence survivors and sexual assault survivors are likely to report more legal needs than the average low-income household (Social & Economic Sciences Research Center, 2014). Studies show how access to legal aid can both reduce domestic violence and mitigate some of its collateral consequences. Kernic (2015) found that when DV survivors have access to legal representation in child custody cases, they are granted greater protections and visitation decisions when compared to those who are not represented. Another study agrees. The National Network to End Domestic Violence (2017) found in their survey of 1,762 shelters that DV survivors without legal representation are more likely to be later victimized than those without access to legal representation.

Having access to legal representation reduces the likelihood of future violence. In their seminal study, Farmer and Tiefenthaler (2003) found that increased access to legal representation and services is partly responsible for the decrease in domestic violence observed in the 1990s. More recently, Hartley and Renner found that with legal representation to obtain a protective order or on a family law issue, survivors of domestic violence in Iowa saw increases in monthly income and personal growth and support (2018). They also found that, while receiving free civil legal services for intimate partner violence, depression and PTSD decreased significantly over one year (Renner & Hartley, 2018),

The Institute for Policy Integrity (2015) also found that providing legal services to DV survivors reduced domestic violence, as well as the societal costs of domestic violence. Elwart and colleagues (2006) found that when state funding of domestic violence service providers was at $9.1 million, the maximum benefits were $27.3 million.

SEVEN REASONS WHY ABUSE VICTIMS NEED LEGAL SERVICES—HAWC

On average, survivors have multiple legal problems associated with their abusive situation, and many cannot afford the assistance of an attorney. Agencies like HAWC (Healing Abuse Working for Change) seek to ensure all abuse survivors can have access to the appropriate legal services they need to secure and maintain their utmost safety. Why legal assistance helps:

It dramatically increases the likelihood of obtaining a protective order Research from the Institute for Policy Integrity shows that 86 percent of abuse, or domestic violence, victims who were represented by an attorney were successful at obtaining a protective order. The rate for abuse survivors without legal representation was only 32 percent

Hundreds of thousands who need help are turned away every year Each year, hundreds-of-thousands of domestic violence victims and abuse survivors are turned away from help, including legal services. This often leads to victims feeling helpless and, in some cases, going back to their abuser. each day from various domestic violence services, including shelters. Lack of funding and donations are the primary cause for the decreasing lack of services for victims.

3. Fifty-eight percent of victims need additional and transitional services Legal representation doesn't end in the court room. Attorneys and legal advocates assist in everything from divorce proceedings to property protection, when related to the abuse.

4. Legal problems are complex A domestic violence survivor will, on average, have at least three legal problems to resolve after obtaining safety and during any criminal proceedings. In many instances, survivors don't realize how many separate legal issues will arise when initially trying to escape their abuser.

5. Without legal representation, a victim's voice often goes ignored Domestic violence victims without legal representation often report that police, hospital staff, and judges do not take their claims ''seriously,'' going as far as to ignore them completely.

6. Immigrants and adolescents are the most underserved Obtaining legal services is an uphill battle for all victims of abuse. However, immigrants, adolescents, and their family are at the highest risk of not obtaining the appropriate legal representation because of various barriers to service.

7. The likelihood of losing of custody of children increases without an attorney present Thousands of abuse victims lose custody of their children each year because they could not afford an attorney. The same research shows that, without an attorney, children may not receive the therapy and other psychological support they need during such a traumatic period.

HOW HAWC HELPS

Our trained legal advocates provide advice, assistance, and, depending on availability, representation for abuse survivors who seek a life free from fear and violence. Part of our mission is to make these services immediately available for everyone who needs them.

By supporting our legal service efforts you're giving thousands of domestic violence victims the chance to be safe from physical, emotional, and economic harm. Specifically, each donation goes towards:

Abuse and harassment prevention for survivors,

Access to clinics with our team of pro-bono attorneys,

Referrals for other services like individualized safety plans, and

Legal representation for high risk clients .

HAWC offers immediate, comprehensive support to those experiencing domestic violence. By expanding our legal service offerings, we can ensure that all victims of domestic violence get access to the legal support they need.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this bill must be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3115, the "Pro Bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2021," also known as the "POWER 2.0 Act," which extends the authorization of vital programs that help victims and survivors of domestic abuse and sexual violence receive free legal assistance—without which they would be unlikely to receive any semblance of justice, let alone safety and security.

No community is safe from domestic violence. It touches people of every socioeconomic status, race, and ethnicity—in red states and blue states

Nearly a quarter of women in this country experience domestic violence or sexual assault at some point in their lives. Many victims of domestic violence are poor, helpless, and living in underserved communities. Many are mere children.

In Texas, 40.1 percent of women and 34.9 percent of men experience intimate partner physical violence, intimate partner rape and/or intimate partner stalking in their lifetimes.

Thousands of incidents are reported daily. On a single day in 2020, domestic violence hotlines across the country received 21,321 calls—an average of almost 15 calls every minute.

The provision of legal services following the first occurrence of domestic violence can be a proactive solution that minimizes the likelihood of victims experiencing farther incidents of abuse. But without access to legal representation, those most in need of protection—which our courts can provide—are often unable to receive the help they need to escape the cycle of violence.

Unfortunately, less than one third of domestic violence victims successfully obtain protective orders if they seek one on their own, without the assistance of counsel.

That is why in 2018, Congress enacted the Power Act, which requires every judicial district within the United States and its territories to hold annual public pro-bono summits to recruit and encourage attorneys to provide free legal services to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault. It also requires targeted programs in areas with large populations of Native Americans and Alaska Natives.

The Power Act has had an indelible impact on the lives of the most vulnerable Americans. From 2019 to 2021, our courts have held nearly 250 pro bono summits, reaching more than 60,000 attorneys—educating them about the need for their services and letting them know how they can help,

While that is a promising start, it is only the beginning. An innumerable number of domestic and sexual violence victims still need legal assistance to survive. Yet the programs authorized under the Act are set to expire in just a few short weeks.

That is why it is imperative we pass the POWER 2.0 Act, which would remove the 4-year sunset provision from the original legislation and allow us to continue growing an army of capable, volunteer attorneys available to represent, protect, and provide a lifeline to victims and survivors, who so desperately need their help.

I commend Representative MARY SATTLER PELTOLA for her work on the POWER 2.0 Act, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alaska (Mrs. PELTOLA), the House sponsor of the bill and a worthy successor to our late colleague, DON YOUNG.

Mrs. PELTOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on S. 3115, the POWER 2.0 Act. This bill is the Senate companion to my bill of the same title, H.R. 9113.

Both bills address the same flaw in our system, that survivors of intimate partner-related violence and intimidation often lack the legal resources they need to protect themselves from future injury. In this paradigm, victims are too often unable to escape their perpetrators, often to devastating effect.

Thankfully, in 2018, Congress offered an avenue to relief. The Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act, sponsored by my Senate colleague, Senator SULLIVAN, authorized a pilot project calling for each district court to hold at least one event annually in concert with domestic violence service providers to promote pro bono legal services for victims of partner-related violence and intimidation.

Additionally, to address the appalling victimization rates among Alaska

Natives and American Indians in particular, the bill also mandates partnerships between district courts and Tribes and Tribal organizations.

Since its enactment, the POWER Act has brought together dozens of service organizations and tens of thousands of lawyers, all with the aim of combating our skyrocketing rates of violence and intimidation endemic across many parts of our country.

As one of my first legislative actions in Congress, I am proud to introduce the POWER 2.0 Act. This bill removes the sunset on the POWER Act and will ensure more victims have the ability to protect themselves from further violence and intimidation.

I am both grateful and filled with anticipation to see this body act so uniformly in favor of this bill, S. 3115, today.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are an untold number of victims of domestic and sexual violence in this country, including young children, who are without legal recourse to escape their abusers, to protect themselves and their families, and to obtain the services they need to rebuild their lives.

The POWER Act has started the hard work of incentivizing and encouraging thousands of lawyers to provide pro bono legal services to the victims and survivors that are most in need. But we need more attorneys to join the cause.

By removing the sunset date from the POWER Act, S. 3115 will allow us to continue and expand the critical programs we created in 2018, while ensuring that there is no gap in access to services for those who need them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this crucial legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHNEIDER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3115.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TERRY TECHNICAL CORRECTION ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5455) to amend the First Step Act of 2018 to permit defendants convicted of certain offenses to be eligible for reduced sentences, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5455

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 ''Terry Technical Correction Act''.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF FAIR SENTENCING ACT OF 2010.

Section 404 of the First Step Act of 2018 (21 U.S.C. 841 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking '' 'covered offense' means'' and inserting the following:

'' 'covered offense'—

''(1) means'';

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) includes a violation, involving cocaine base, of—

''(A) section 3113 of title 5, United States Code;

''(B) section 401(b)(1)(C) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)(C));

''(C) section 404(a) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 844(a));

''(D) section 406 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 846);

''(E) section 408 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 848);

''(F) subsection (b) or (c) of section 409 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 849);

''(G) subsection (a) or (b) of section 418 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 859);

''(H) subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 419 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 860);

''(I) section 420 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 861);

''(J) section 1010(b)(3) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)(3));

''(K) section 1010A of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960a);

''(L) section 90103 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12522);

''(M) section 70503 or 70506 of title 46, United States Code; or

''(N) any attempt, conspiracy or solicitation to commit an offense described in subparagraphs (A) through (M).''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by inserting ''A motion made under this section that was denied after a court determination that a violation described in subsection (a)(2) was not a covered offense shall not be considered a denial after a complete review of the motion on the merits within the meaning of this section.'' after the period at the end of the second sentence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5455.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5455, which would clarify that the retroactivity provision of section 404 of the First Step Act of 2018 is available to all offenders who were sentenced for a crack offense before the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 became effective, including individuals convicted of offenses involving small quantities of crack.

After decades of unfair sentences that swept too broadly, most often applied to low-level dealers and impacted minorities disproportionately, Congress has worked to right some of the wrongs of the misguided war on drugs, often on a bipartisan basis. This legislation continues that important effort.

In 1986, in response to a surge in the use of crack cocaine and several high-profile cocaine-related deaths, Congress passed the Anti-Drug Abuse Act, which created mandatory minimum penalties for drug offenses and introduced a 100–1 sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine offenses.

This meant that a person who distributed 5 grams of crack cocaine received the same 5-year mandatory minimum sentence as a person who distributed 500 grams of powder cocaine, and the person who distributed 50 grams of crack cocaine received the same 10-year mandatory minimum sentence as the person who distributed 5,000 grams of powder cocaine.

It soon became evident that this sentencing disparity had also created a significant racial disparity. Four years after Congress passed the Anti-Drug Abuse Act, the average Federal sentence for African-American defendants was 49 percent higher than the average for White defendants.

In 2010, Congress passed the Fair Sentencing Act, which did not eliminate the disparity but which significantly reduced the ratio from 100–1 to 18–1. Unfortunately, that legislation applied only to pending and future cases, leaving thousands of inmates without a path to petition for relief.

In 2018, the bipartisan First Step Act made the Fair Sentencing Act retroactive if an inmate received ''a sentence for a covered offense,'' as defined in section 404 of the Act, providing a pathway to relief for some but not all individuals affected by the sentencing disparity.

Three years later, after roughly 4,000 motions for sentence reductions had been granted, the Supreme Court, in Terry v. United States, limited the availability of sentence reductions under the Fair Sentencing Act, contrary to the intent of Congress.

Based on a narrow reading of the meaning of ''covered offense,'' the Court held that individuals convicted of crack offenses are only eligible for a sentence reduction under the First Step Act if their convictions triggered mandatory minimum penalties.

That means that individuals like Mr. Terry, who possessed less than 4 grams

of crack, are unable to seek sentence reductions, while individuals convicted of sentences involving much larger quantities of crack can seek a sentence reduction, and many have already done so, which is simply absurd and unfair.

The First Step Act was meant to make retroactive sentencing relief available to all individuals sentenced for crack cocaine offenses before the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 took effect.

As Justice Sotomayor's concurring opinion in Terry reminds us, Congress has numerous tools to correct this injustice, and H.R. 5455, the Terry Technical Correction Act, is one of these tools.

The bill provides a new, expanded definition of ''covered offense'' that includes a list of drug offenses in the criminal code that do not trigger mandatory minimum sentences.

The bill also ensures that no person seeking a sentencing reduction under section 404 will be barred from filing a new petition on the grounds that a judge had previously denied relief based on a determination that the offense of conviction was not a ''covered offense'' under the meaning provided in the First Step Act.

I thank Crime Subcommittee Chairwoman JACKSON LEE, Representatives CICILLINE, JEFFRIES, OWENS, MASSIE, and Delegate HOLMES NORTON for introducing this important bipartisan bill. I urge all of my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5455 responds to a Supreme Court ruling that held certain low-level drug offenders do not qualify for resentencing under the retroactive provisions of the First Step Act. That was not Congress' intent in adopting the First Step Act.

This problem dates back to the drug epidemic of the 1980s. At that time, Congress enacted harsh penalties for Federal drug offenses, including mandatory minimum sentences.

The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 created a 100–1 sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine, meaning an individual convicted of selling 5 grams of crack cocaine would receive the same sentence as someone convicted of selling 500 grams of powder cocaine.

In 2010, Congress passed the Fair Sentencing Act, which reduced the sentencing disparity between crack and powder from 100–1 to 18–1.

In 2018, Congress passed, and President Trump signed, the First Step Act into law. The First Step Act made the sentencing disparity provision retroactive, allowing individuals convicted of or sentenced for Federal drug offenses related to cocaine to move for a resentencing.

However, that law did not specifically address individuals whose crimes did not trigger the mandatory minimums. As a result, some of those individuals are serving longer sentences than those whose offenses triggered the mandatory minimums. This legislation today makes technical corrections and brings parity to crack-related offenses.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the full committee, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 5455, the Terry Technical Correction Act, which has widespread support from really the people who count that deal with these issues day after day, our law enforcement officers and attorneys general across America.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from several attorneys general, as well as the Major Cities Chiefs Association.

SEPTEMBER 2, 2021.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Senate Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER SCHUMER, LEADER MCCONNELL, SPEAKER PELOSI, AND LEADER MCCARTHY: As our jurisdictions' Attorneys General, we are responsible for protecting the health, safety, and well-being of our residents. Although our jurisdictions vary in size, geography, and political composition, we are united in our commitment to an effective criminal justice system that safeguards the communities of our states. To that end, a bipartisan coalition of Attorneys General supported the passage of the First Step Act of 2018—landmark legislation that brought common sense improvements to myriad aspects of the criminal justice system. Central to these reforms was retroactive relief for individuals sentenced under the discredited 100-to-1 crack-to-powder cocaine ratio that Congress abolished in 2010. Following the Supreme Court's recent opinion in Terry v. United States, however, the lowest level crack cocaine offenders remain categorically ineligible for resentencing. We write today to urge Congress to amend the First Step Act, and to clarify that its retroactive relief applies to all individuals sentenced under the prior regime.

Congress enacted the historic First Step Act of 2018 to modernize the criminal justice system, implementing comprehensive reform in areas such as corrections, criminal charging, community re-entry, and beyond. The product of a unique bipartisan consensus, the Act passed with overwhelming support from organizations across the ideological spectrum, including the Heritage Foundation, the American Civil Liberties Union, Freedomworks, the National Urban League, the American Conservative Union, the Public Defender Association, Americans for Prosperity, and the Center for American Progress, among many others. Over three dozen Attorneys General supported the Act as a critical tool for strengthening our criminal justice system and better serving the people of our states.

One of the First Step Act's key pillars was sentencing reform. This reform included Section 404, which provides retroactive relief for individuals sentenced under the discarded 100-to-1 crack cocaine-to-powder-cocaine ratio that Congress repudiated through the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010. That earlier legislation abolished the 100-to-1 ratio going forward, reflecting the overwhelming consensus that treating crack cocaine and powder cocaine radically differently exacerbated racial inequality in the criminal justice system and resulted in unjustly severe sentences for low-level crack cocaine users.

But the Fair Sentencing Act applied only to sentences imposed after the Act's passage. As Senator Cory Booker explained, it left thousands of ''people sitting in jail . . . for selling an amount of drugs equal to the size of a candy bar'' based solely on their sentencing date, underscoring the need, in Senator Mike Lee's words, to apply the law ''equally to all those convicted of cocaine and crack offenses regardless of when they were convicted.'' Congress therefore included Section 404 in the First Step Act, which allowed individuals sentenced under the discarded 100-to-1 ratio to seek discretionary resentencing.

Unfortunately, that critical work remains incomplete. In Terry v. United States, the Supreme Court concluded that while Section 404 clearly authorized certain mid- or high-level crack cocaine offenders to seek resentencing, it did not extend relief to the lowest-level offenders sentenced under the prior regime. Specifically, the Court relied on Section 404's definition of a covered offense as any ''violation of a Federal criminal statute, the statutory penalties for which were modified by'' the Fair Sentencing Act. The Court reasoned that because the Fair Sentencing Act did not formally change the elements or penalties for the lowest level era offensesg—it merely changed the quantities needed to trigger mid- and high-level charges—the Act failed to modify the ''statutory penalties'' for the lowest category of offenders. As a result, these individuals are now the only ones sentenced under the earlier crack cocaine quantities that remain categorically ineligible for the First Step Act's historic relief.

We urge Congress to close this gap. There is no reason why these individual—and these individuals alone—should continue to serve sentences informed by the now-discredited crack-to-powder ratio. Discretionary relief is unambiguously available to serious dealers and kingpins sentenced under the prior regime; extending Section 404's scope would simply allow individual users and other low-level crack cocaine offenders to have the same opportunity for a second chance. We therefore urge Congress to clarify that Section 404 of the First Step Act extends to all individuals convicted of crack cocaine offenses and sentenced under the 100-to-1 ratio—including the lowest level offenders.

We thank you for your leadership on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Karl A. Racine, District of Columbia Attorney General; Rob Bonta, California Attorney General; William Tong, Connecticut Attorney General; Leevin Taitano Camacho, Guam Attorney General; Tom Miller, Iowa Attorney General; Brian Frosh, Maryland Attorney General; Dana Nessel, Michigan Attorney General; Aaron D. Ford, Nevada Attorney General; Hector Balderas, New Mexico Attorney General; Sean D. Reyes, Utah Attorney General; Phil Weiser, Colorado Attorney General; Kathleen Jennings, Delaware Attorney General; Kwame Raoul, Illinois Attorney General; Aaron M. Frey, Main Attorney General; Maura Healey, Massachusetts Attorney General; Keith Ellison, Minnesota Attorney General; Andrew Buck, Acting New Jersey Attorney General; Letitia James, New York Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; Peter F. Neronha, Rhode Island Attorney General; Mark R. Herring, Virginia Attorney General; Joshua L. Kaul, Wisconsin Attorney General;

Josh Shapiro, Pennsylvania Attorney General; T.J. Donovan, Vermont Attorney General; Robert W. Ferguson, Washington Attorney General.

MAJOR CITIES CHIEFS ASSOCIATION,
October 20, 2021.

Hon. DICK DURBIN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CORY BOOKER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MIKE LEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DURBIN, RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY, SENATOR BOOKER, AND SENATOR LEE: I write on behalf of the Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA) to register our support for S. 2914, the Terry Technical Corrections Act. The MCCA is a professional organization of police executives representing the largest cities in the United States and Canada.

In 2010, Congress reduced the federal sentencing disparity for crack versus powder cocaine offenses. However, due to an unclear definition in statute, the Supreme Court recently held in Terry v. United States that individuals convicted of some of the least serious crack cocaine offenses are ineligible to be resentenced under the reduced disparity. The Terry Technical Corrections Ad will address this issue by clarifying that all offenders sentenced for a crack cocaine offense before the disparity was reduced are eligible to be resentenced. While the MCCA believes Congress should eliminate the federal sentencing disparity, until that happens, this legislation will help address inequities in our criminal justice system related to sentencing for crack cocaine offenses.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue. Please do not hesitate to contact me if the MCCA can be of any additional assistance.

Sincerely,

CHIEF JERI WILLIAMS,
Chief, Phoenix Police Department, President, Major Cities Chiefs Association.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As Justice Thomas noted in his opinion in Terry v. United States, citing my introduction of H.R. 4545, the Drug Sentencing Reform and Cocaine Kingpin Trafficking Act of 2007, I have long worked to address the sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine offenses, introducing legislation to eliminate the disparity completely.

Mr. Speaker, I include this opinion that cites this legislation, among others, for the RECORD.

141 S.Ct. 1858

Supreme Court of the United States

Tarahrick TERRY, Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES

No. 20–5904

Argued May 4, 2021

Decided June 14, 2021

THOMAS, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which ROBERTS, C.J., and BREYER, ALITO, KAGAN, GORSUCH, KAVANAUGH, and BARRETT, JJ., joined. SOTOMAYOR, J., filed an opinion concurring in part and concurring in the judgment.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

Attorneys and Law Firms

Elizabeth B. Prelogar, Acting Solicitor General, Counsel of Record, Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

Opinion

Justice THOMAS delivered the opinion of the Court.

In 1986, Congress established mandatory-minimum penalties for cocaine offenses. If the quantity of cocaine involved in an offense exceeded a minimum threshold, then courts were required to impose a heightened sentence. Congress set the quantity thresholds far lower for crack offenses than for powder offenses. But it has since narrowed the gap by increasing the thresholds for crack offenses more than fivefold. The First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. 115–391, 132 Stat. 5194, makes those changes retroactive and gives certain crack offenders an opportunity to receive a reduced sentence. The question here is whether crack offenders who did not trigger a mandatory minimum qualify. They do not.

I

In the mid-1980s, the United States witnessed a steep surge in the use of crack cocaine, and news of high-profile, cocaine-related deaths permeated the media. Witnesses before Congress, and Members of Congress themselves, believed that a ''crack epidemic'' was also fueling a crime wave. Crack, they said, was far more addictive and dangerous than powder cocaine; it was cheaper and thus easier to obtain; and these and other factors spurred violent crime.

In response to these concerns, Congress quickly passed a bill with near unanimity. The new law created mandatory-minimum penalties for various drug offenses, and it set much lower trigger thresholds for crack offenses. The Act included two base penalties that depended on drug quantity: a 5-year mandatory minimum (triggered by 5 grams of crack or 500 grams of powder) and a 10-year mandatory minimum (triggered by 50 grams of crack or 5 kilograms of powder). 100 Stat. 3207–2, 3207–3. The Act also created a third penalty—possession with intent to distribute an unspecified amount of a schedule I or II drug—that did not treat crack and powder offenses differently, did not depend on drug quantity, and did not include a mandatory minimum.

Petitioner was convicted under this Act and subjected to the third penalty. In exchange for the Government dropping two firearm charges, petitioner pleaded guilty in 2008 to possession with intent to distribute an unspecified amount of crack. At sentencing, the District Court determined that his offense involved about 4 grams of crack, a schedule II drug.

It also determined that petitioner was a career offender under the Sentencing Guidelines. The career-offender Guidelines controlled because they recommended a higher sentence than the drug-quantity Guidelines. The District Court sentenced petitioner to 188 months, the bottom of the career-offender Guidelines range.

All this occurred while Congress was considering whether to change the quantity thresholds for crack penalties. In 1995, the Sentencing Commission issued a report to Congress stating that it thought the 100-to-1 ratio was too high. In particular, it stressed that the then-mandatory Guidelines helped make the ratio excessive because the Guidelines, which were not yet in effect when Congress created the ratio, addressed some of Congress' concerns about crack. Addressing those concerns through both the ratio and the Guidelines, the Commission said, ''doubly punished'' offenders. United States Sentencing Commission, Special Report to the Congress: Cocaine and Federal Sentencing Policy 195–197 (Feb. 1995). Separately, although the Commission thought that it was reasonable to conclude that ''crack cocaine poses greater harms to society than does powder cocaine,'' it determined that the ratio overstated the difference in harm. Finally, the Commission noted that persons convicted of crack offenses were disproportionately black, so a ratio that was too high created a ''perception of unfairness'' even though there was no reason to believe ''that racial bias or animus undergirded the initiation of this federal sentencing law.'' Members of Congress responded to this and similar reports. For example, Senators Sessions and Hatch introduced legislation in 2001 to lower the ratio to 20 to 1. S. 1874, 107th Cong., 1st Sess. Representative Jackson-Lee led a similar effort in the House, but would have created a 1-to-1 ratio. H. R. 4545, 110th Cong., 1st Sess. (2007).

Two years after petitioner was sentenced, these attempts to change the ratio came to fruition. In the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010, 124 Stat. 2372, Congress reaffirmed its view that the triggering thresholds should be lower for crack offenses, but it reduced the 100-to-1 ratio to about 18 to 1. It did so by increasing the crack quantity thresholds from 5 grams to 28 for the 5-year mandatory minimum and from 50 grams to 280 for the 10-year mandatory minimum. §2(a), 124 Stat. 2372. These changes did not apply to those who had been sentenced before 2010.

The Sentencing Commission then altered the drug quantity table used to calculate Guidelines ranges. The Commission decreased the recommended sentence for crack offenders to track the statutory change Congress made. It then made the change retroactive, giving previous offenders an opportunity for resentencing. Courts were still constrained, however, by the statutory minimums in place before 2010. Many offenders thus remained sentenced to terms above what the Guidelines recommended. Congress addressed this issue in 2018 by enacting the First Step Act. This law made the 2010 statutory changes retroactive and gave courts authority to reduce the sentences of certain crack offenders.

Petitioner initially sought resentencing under the new, retroactive Guidelines. But because his sentence was based on his recidivism, not his drug quantity, his attempt was unsuccessful. After Congress enacted the First Step Act, petitioner again sought resentencing, this time contending that he falls within the category of crack offenders covered by that Act. The District Court denied his motion, and the Eleventh Circuit affirmed, holding that offenders are eligible for a sentence reduction only if they were convicted of a crack offense that triggered a mandatory minimum. 828 Fed.Appx. 563 (2020) (per curiam). We granted certiorari. 592 U.S.——, 141 S.Ct. 975. 208 L.Ed.2d 511 (2021).

On the day the Government's brief was due, the United States informed the Court that, after the change in administration, it would no longer defend the judgment. Because of the timeline, the Court rescheduled argument, compressed the briefing schedule, and appointed Adam K. Mortara as amicus curiae to argue in support of the judgment. He has ably discharged his responsibilities.

II

An offender is eligible for a sentence reduction under the First Step Act only if he previously received ''a sentence for a covered offense.'' §404(b), 132 Stat. 5222. The Act defines ''covered offense'' as ''a violation of a Federal criminal statute, the statutory penalties for which were modified by'' certain provisions in the Fair Sentencing Act.

§404(a), ibid. Here, ''statutory penalties'' references the entire, integrated phrase ''a violation of a Federal criminal statute.'' And that phrase means ''offense.'' Black's Law Dictionary 1300 (11th ed. 2019) (''A violation of the law''). We thus ask whether the Fair Sentencing Act modified the statutory penalties for petitioner's offense. It did not.

The elements of petitioner's offense are presented by two subsections of 21 U.S.C. §841. Subsection (a) makes it unlawful to knowingly or intentionally possess with intent to distribute any controlled substance. Subsection (b) lists additional facts that, if proved, trigger penalties.

Before 2010, §§841(a) and (b) together defined three crack offenses relevant here. The elements of the first offense were (1) knowing or intentional possession with intent to distribute, (2) crack, of (3) at least 50 grams. §§1841(a), (b)(1)(A)(iii). This subparagraph (A) offense was punishable by 10 years to life, in addition to financial penalties and supervised release. The elements of the second offense were (1) knowing or intentional possession with intent to distribute. (2) crack, of (3) at least 5 grams. §§841(a), (b)(1)(B)(iii). This subparagraph (B) offense was punishable by 5-to-40 years, in addition to financial penalties and supervised release. And the elements of the third offense were (1) knowing or intentional possession with intent to distribute, (2) some unspecified amount of a schedule I or II drug. §§841(a), (b)(1)(C).

Petitioner was convicted of the third offense—subparagraph (C). Before 2010, the statutory penalties for that offense were 0-to-20 years, up to a $1 million fine, or both, and a period of supervised release. After 2010, these statutory penalties remain exactly the same. The Fair Sentencing Act thus did not modify the statutory penalties for petitioner's offense.

Petitioner's offense is starkly different from the offenses that triggered mandatory minimums. The Fair Sentencing Act plainly ''modified'' the ''statutory penalties'' for those. It did so by increasing the triggering quantities from 50 grams to 280 in subparagraph (A) and from 5 grams to 28 in subparagraph (8). Before 2010, a person charged with the original elements of subparagraph (A)—knowing or intentional possession with intent to distribute at least 50 grams of crack—faced a prison range of between 10 years and life. But because the Act increased the trigger quantity under subparagraph (A) to 280 grams, a person charged with those original elements after 2010 is now subject to the more lenient prison range for subparagraph (B): 5-to-40 years. Similarly, the elements of an offense under subparagraph (B) before 2010 were knowing or intentional possession with intent to distribute at least 5 grams of crack. Originally punishable by 5-to-40 years, the offense defined by those elements is now punishable by 0-to-20 years—that is, the penalties under subparagraph (C). The statutory penalties thus changed for all subparagraph (A) and (B) offenders. But no statutory penalty changed for subparagraph (C) offenders. That is hardly surprising because the Fair Sentencing Act addressed ''cocaine sentencing disparity,'' §2, 124 Stat. 2372, and subparagraph (C) had never differentiated between crack and powder offenses.

To avoid this straightforward result, petitioner and the United States offer a sleight of hand. Petitioner says that the phrase ''statutory penalties'' in fact means ''penalty statute.'' The United States similarly asserts that petitioner is eligible for a sentence reduction if the Fair Sentencing Act changed the ''penalty scheme.''

But we will not convert nouns to adjectives and vice versa. As stated above, ''statutory penalties'' references the entire phrase ''a violation of a Federal criminal statute.'' It thus directs our focus to the statutory penalties for petitioner's offense, not the statute or statutory scheme.

Even if the ''penalty statute'' or ''penalty scheme'' were the proper focus, neither was modified for subparagraph (C) offenders. To ''modify'' means ''to change moderately.'' MCI Telecommunications Corp. v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co, 512 U.S. 218, 225, 114 S.Ct. 2223, 129 L.Ed.2d 182 (1994). The Fair Sentencing Act changed nothing in subparagraph (C). The United States notes that prosecutors before 2010 could charge offenders under subparagraph (B) if the offense involved between 5 and 28 grams of crack; now, prosecutors can charge those offenders only under subparagraph (C). But even before 2010, prosecutors could charge those offenders under subparagraph (C) because quantity has never been an element under that subparagraph. See, e.g., United States v. Birt, 966 ; F.3d 257, 259 (CA3 2020) (noting that an offender charged under subparagraph (C) had possessed 186 grams of crack). It also defies common parlance to say that altering a different provision modified subparagraph (C). If Congress abolished the crime of possession with intent to distribute, prosecutors then would have to bring charges under the lesser included offense of simple possession. But nobody would say that abolishing the first offense changed the second.

In light of the clear text, we hold that §2(a) of the Fair Sentencing Act modified the statutory penalties only for subparagraph (A) and (B) crack offenses—that is, the offenses that triggered mandatory-minimum penalties. The judgment of the Court of Appeals is affirmed.

It is so ordered.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. That is why I introduced H.R. 5455, the Terry Technical Correction Act, which reaffirms Congress' intent to provide retroactive sentencing relief to all individuals convicted of crack cocaine offenses before the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 took effect; and now I support Mr. JEFFRIES' EQUAL Act, which we hope will be on the President's desk.

With the declaration of the war on drugs in the early 1970s began a dramatic rise in the U.S. prison population. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was teeming over, fueled largely by excessive, unwarranted drug sentences, some for minimal drug sentences and actions, putting particularly young African-American men in incarceration for decades.

The Federal Government played a pivotal role in America's era of mass incarceration. During the 1980s and 1990s, Congress passed several pieces of legislation that moved away from rehabilitation toward excessive punishment.

One such example is the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, which created mandatory minimum penalties for most drug offenses and established the 100–1 cocaine to crack disparity. We have found that that does not bring down drug use. It does not bring down crime. What brings down crime is an effective rehabilitation system so that law enforcement officers do not have to confront recidivists ever again because we have given them a pathway to enter into society.

As Justice Sotomayor acknowledges in her concurring opinion in Terry, African Americans ''bore the brunt of the disparity.''

Between 1992 and 2006, roughly 80 to 90 percent of those convicted of crack offenses were African American. There were many who sounded the alarm during this time, including the U.S. Sentencing Commission, which repeatedly called upon Congress to revisit the mandatory minimum sentencing structure because of the racial disparities in cocaine versus crack sentencing. Sadly, Congress refused to listen for many years, and they did not see any strong impact on that approach.

Thankfully, Members of Congress, on an increasingly bipartisan manner, have worked hard to reduce the harmful impact of the failed policies of the war on drugs, including putting an end to the crack to powder sentencing disparities.

Those who are supporting us—law enforcement officers, attorneys general—are Republicans and Democrats alike. Through our efforts, we have learned that there is no greater danger to public safety from crack offenders than powder cocaine offenders, and that the 100–1 ratio overstated the relative harmfulness of the two forms of cocaine and diverted Federal resources away from prosecuting the highest level of traffickers.

In 2010, Congress began the process to eradicate the devastating consequences of the poorly conceived war on drugs and the punitive response to the crack epidemic.

We have had circumstances where false warrants were used to enter people's homes under the false premise that they were using drugs. That didn't bring down crime. That didn't help eliminate those who were doing ill to people. That was not the right approach.

The Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 reduced the sentencing disparity to 18–1, and the First Step Act of 2018 made the Fair Sentencing Act retroactive.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, although the Terry decision bars crack offenders convicted of offenses involving small amounts of crack—like the 3.9 grams of crack that the petitioner possessed—that do not trigger the mandatory minimum penalties, Congress can address this injustice.

H.R. 5455, aptly named the Terry Technical Correction Act, would guarantee the ability to seek a sentence reduction to all individuals who have unfairly lost years of freedom under the unfounded 100–1 disparity, including those whose requests for sentence reduction was previously denied based on the narrow interpretation of the First Step Act.

While I continue to look forward to the day that we will fully eliminate the powder-to-crack disparity, I thank Representatives CICILLINE, JEFFRIES,

OWENS, MASSIE, and Delegate HOLMES NORTON for working with me on this crucial bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this. It is long overdue. I also include for the RECORD a press release from the Maryland Attorney General.

[Press Release from Brian E. Frosh, Maryland Attorney General, Sept. 2, 2021]

ATTORNEY GENERAL FROSH CALLS ON CONGRESS TO CLARIFY FIRST STEP ACT AND APPLY FAIR SENTENCING REFORMS TO LOW-LEVEL DRUG OFFENSES

BALTIMORE, MD.—Attorney General Brian E. Frosh today joined a bipartisan coalition of 25 attorneys general urging Congress to amend the First Step Act and extend critical resentencing reforms to individuals convicted of the lowest-level crack cocaine offenses.

The coalition is calling on legislators to take this needed step in the wake of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Terry v. United States*, which held that certain mid-level and high-level crack cocaine offenders could seek resentencing under the law, but low-level offenders were not eligible.

''The intent of the First Step Act was to correct disproportionately harsh sentencing. Ironically, the does not apply to low-level offenders,'' said Attorney General Frosh. ''Congress needs to fix this oversight and ensure that the law provides relief to those who committed lower-level crimes and were subject to inequitable sentencing.''

The First Step Act, a landmark criminal justice reform law, passed Congress with strong bipartisan support in 2018. One key reform aimed to correct injustices caused by the earlier crack cocaine vs. powder cocaine sentencing regime. That now-discredited regime punished users and dealers of crack cocaine much more harshly than users and dealers of powder cocaine, which disproportionately harmed communities of color.

In 2010, Congress passed the Fair Sentencing Act to reduce the disparity between sentences for crack cocaine and powder cocaine. However, the law did not help the many people sentenced for crack cocaine offenses before 2010 who remained in prison. The First Step Act then included a provision that made previous drug sentencing reforms retroactive, allowing those serving harsh sentences imposed under the former federal law to seek relief.

U.S. Senators Richard J. Durbin, Charles E. Grassley, Cory A. Booker, and Mike Lee—the drafters of the First Step Act—confirmed in an *amicus* brief that the sentencing relief was intended to apply to all crack cocaine offenders sentenced before 2010. Nevertheless, in *Terry v. United States*, the Supreme Court concluded that while the First Step Act clearly authorized certain mid- or high-level crack cocaine offenders to seek resentencing, it failed to extend relief to the lowest-level offenders.

In today's letter, the attorneys general urge Congress to close that gap and clarify that the sentencing relief provided by the First Step Act extends to all individuals convicted of crack cocaine offenses under the earlier regime, including the lowest-level offenders. They argue that there is no reason that only these low-level offenders should continue to serve sentences informed by now-discredited standards, and that they should have an opportunity to seek a second chance.

Attorney General Frosh is joined in the letter by the attorneys general of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Guam, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5455, the "Terry Technical Correction Act."

As Justice Thomas noted in his opinion in Terry v. United States, citing my introduction of H.R. 4545, the "Drug Sentencing Reform and Cocaine Kingpin Trafficking Act of 2007," I have long worked to address the sentencing disparity between crack cocaine and powder cocaine offenses—introducing legislation to eliminate the disparity completely.

That is why I introduced H.R. 5455, the "Terry Technical Correction Act"—which reaffirms Congress's intent to provide retroactive sentencing relief to all individuals convicted of crack cocaine offenses before the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 took effect.

With the declaration of the "War on Drugs" in the early 1970's began a dramatic rise in the U.S. prison population—fueled largely by excessive, unwarranted drug sentences.

The federal government played a pivotal role in America's era of mass incarceration. During the 1980s and 1990s, Congress passed several pieces of legislation that moved away from rehabilitation toward excessive punishment.

One such example is the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, which created mandatory minimum penalties for most drug offenses, and established the 100-to-1, cocaine to crack disparity.

And, as Justice Sotomayor acknowledges in her concurring opinion in Terry, African Americans "bore the brunt of the disparity."

Between 1992 and 2006, roughly 80 to 90 percent of those convicted of crack offenses were African American.

There were many who sounded the alarm during this time, including the U.S. Sentencing Commission, which repeatedly called upon Congress to revisit the mandatory minimum sentencing structure because of the racial disparities in cocaine versus crack sentencing. Sadly, Congress refused to listen for many years.

Thankfully, members of Congress, on an increasingly bipartisan basis have worked hard to reduce the harmful impact of the failed policies of the War on Drugs, including putting an end to the crack to powder sentencing disparity.

Through our efforts, we have learned that there is no greater danger to public safety from crack offenders than powder cocaine offenders, and that the 100-to-1 ratio overstated the relative harmfulness of the two forms of cocaine and diverted federal resources away from prosecuting the highest-level traffickers.

In 2010, Congress began the process to eradicate the devastating consequences of the poorly conceived War on Drugs—and the punitive response to the crack epidemic.

The Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 reduced the sentencing disparity to 18-to-1, and the First Step Act of 2018 made the Fair Sentencing Act retroactive.

Although the Terry decision bars crack offenders convicted of offenses involving small amounts of crack—like the 3.9 grams of crack that the petitioner possessed that do not trigger the mandatory minimum penalties—Congress can correct this injustice.

H.R. 5455, aptly named the "Terry Technical Correction Act," would guarantee the ability to seek a sentence reduction to all individuals who have unfairly lost years of freedom under the unfounded 100 to 1 disparity, including those whose requests for sentence reductions were previously denied based on the narrow interpretation of the First Step Act.

While I continue to look forward to the day that we will fully eliminate the powder to crack disparity, I thank Representatives CICILLINE, JEFFRIES, OWENS, and MASSIE, and Delegate HOLMES NORTON for working with me on this crucial, bipartisan piece of legislation and ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5455, the Terry Technical Correction Act, is a straightforward bipartisan bill that advances our efforts to make our criminal justice system more fair. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5455, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1615

CONDEMNING THE USE OF HUNGER AS A WEAPON OF WAR AND RECOGNIZING THE EFFECT OF CONFLICT ON GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY AND FAMINE

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 922) condemning the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizing the effect of conflict on global food security and famine, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 922

Whereas, in 2021, 193,000,000 people experienced crisis levels of food insecurity, with nearly 139,000,000 people living in environments where conflict was the main driver of this crisis, and the COVID–19 pandemic has worsened rising global food insecurity;

Whereas conflict acutely impacts vulnerable populations such as women and children, persons with disabilities, refugees, and internally displaced persons;

Whereas armed conflict's impacts on food security can be direct, such as displacement from land, destruction of livestock grazing areas and fishing grounds, or destruction of food stocks and agricultural assets, or indirect, such as disruptions to food systems, leading to increased food prices, including water and fuel, and the breakdown of a government's ability to enforce regulations or perform its judiciary functions;

Whereas aerial bombing campaigns targeting agricultural heartlands, scorched earth methods of warfare, and the use of landmines and other explosive devices have direct impacts on the ability of vulnerable populations to feed themselves;

Whereas effective humanitarian response in armed conflict, including in the threat of conflict-induced famine and food insecurity in situations of armed conflict, requires respect for international humanitarian law by all parties to the conflict, and allowing and facilitating the rapid and unimpeded movement of humanitarian relief to all those in need;

Whereas efforts to restrict humanitarian aid and the operational integrity and impartiality of humanitarian aid works and distribution efforts, including through blockades, security impediments, or irregular bureaucratic requirements is another means by which combatants employ starvation and food deprivation as a weapon of war; and

Whereas the United States Government has the tools to fight global hunger, provide and protect lifesaving assistance, and promote the prevention of conflict, including through the Global Fragility Act of 2019 (title V of division J of Public Law 116–94), the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–195), and the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–334), and has the potential to hold accountable those using hunger as a weapon in conflict through the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328) and other means: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns—

(A) the use of starvation of civilians as a weapon of warfare;

(B) the intentional and reckless destruction, removing, looting, blocking, or rendering useless objects necessary for food production and distribution such as farmland, markets, mills, food processing and storage areas, such as ports and hubs containing grain terminals, foodstuffs, crops, livestock, agricultural assets, waterways, water systems, drinking water installations and supplies, and irrigation works;

(C) the denial of humanitarian access and the deprivation of objects indispensable to people's survival, such as food supplies and nutrition resources; and

(D) the willful interruption of market systems to affected populations in need in conflict environments by preventing travel and manipulating currency exchange;

(2) calls on the United States Government to—

(A) prioritize diplomatic efforts to call out and address instances where hunger and intentional deprivation of food is being utilized as a weapon of war, including efforts to ensure that security operations do not undermine livelihoods of local populations to minimize civilian harm;

(B) continue efforts to address severe food insecurity through humanitarian and development response efforts, including in-kind food assistance, vouchers, and other flexible modalities, and long-term programming focused on agriculture support and resilient livelihoods;

(C) ensure existing interagency strategies, crisis response efforts, and ongoing programs consider, integrate, and adapt to address conflict by utilizing crisis modifiers in United States Agency for International Development programming to respond to rapid shocks and stress such as the willful targeting of food systems; and

(D) ensure that the use of hunger as a weapon in conflict is considered within the employment of tools to hold individuals, governments, militias, or entities responsible such as the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 2656), where appropriate, and taking into consideration the need for humanitarian exemptions and the protection of lifesaving assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 922, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS)?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 922 to condemn the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognize the effect of conflict on global food security.

I thank Chair MEEKS for his support and my colleagues, Representatives PETER MEIJER, BOBBY RUSH, and TRACEY MANN, for co-leading this with me.

Even before the Russian invasion of Ukraine, we have seen how climate change, the pandemic, and conflict fuel food crises around the world in Yemen, Syria, Ethiopia, and South Sudan, and now this war has exacerbated all of these crises.

In Ukraine, Russia's unprovoked war has left one in three families without enough food and disrupted critical supply chains in the country and around the world.

But we also have to recognize that we shouldn't only sound the alarm and mobilize aid and attention when and where humanitarian crises affect people who look like us. Around the world, especially in some of the poorest countries, millions of people are hungry and suffering as a direct result of Putin's relentless crusade for power.

In the Horn of Africa, the combined effects of climate change, conflict, and rising food prices from Russia's invasion of Ukraine have all exacerbated the rising food crisis, with more than 37 million people, including 7 million children, on the verge of famine as the region endures the longest drought in more than 40 years.

Afghanistan continues to face an acute humanitarian crisis this upcoming winter, where over 95 percent of the population cannot afford to feed themselves or their families.

Haiti imports 70 percent of its food, mainly from Russia and Canada, and is experiencing catastrophic hunger levels, with 4.7 million of the population facing acute hunger.

In Ethiopia, over 20 million people in Tigray, Amhara, and Afar are in dire need of humanitarian assistance and rely on wheat imports from Ukraine and Russia.

In South Sudan, where I traveled earlier this year, 8.3 million people are experiencing severe food insecurity, the most extreme level of food insecurity in the country since it became independent in 2011.

But we have also seen the power of the U.N., diplomacy, and global cooperation in alleviating this crisis. The historic Black Sea Grain Initiative, which was recently extended, has facilitated the export of millions of tons of agricultural exports from Ukraine's Black Sea ports.

I commend Ukraine's new humanitarian initiative, Grain from Ukraine, that came out of the first International Summit on Food Security. It will ship grain to African countries most in need. Governments around the world have already contributed $150 million, with hopefully more to come.

The crisis in Ukraine has made clear why it is so important that we, as a body, recognize the consequences of war on food security, condemn starvation of civilians as a weapon of war, and call on the United States Government—here in Congress and in the administration—to continue addressing these crises and hold perpetrators accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to lead this important resolution today, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution authored by my colleagues, Congresswoman JACOBS and Congressman MEIJER. This resolution condemns the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizes the impact that conflict has on global food security and famine.

Around the world, over 300 million people are in urgent need of food assistance. Many are facing emergency food needs due to years of protracted conflict, whether in Syria, Yemen, the Sahel, Nigeria, or South Sudan.

But shockingly, we are also seeing the increasing use of hunger and starvation as a deliberate weapon of war, with worldwide effects. Ukraine just commemorated the solemn anniversary of the Holodomor famine, which killed millions of Ukrainians at Stalin's direction. Ninety years later, Putin is reviving this evil, targeting wheat fields and grain silos, deliberately seeking to destroy vital sources of food for the Ukrainian people and the world.

The Kremlin's propaganda machine is attempting to blame international sanctions for the worsening global food crisis, but that is a lie. In reality, this crisis is a direct result of Putin's unprovoked war of aggression against Ukraine.

Meanwhile, Russia uses its influence at the U.N. to exert control over the vital food aid that millions of Syrians rely on in an effort to bolster Bashar al-Assad's brutal grip on power.

In Yemen, Iran-backed Houthi rebels have weaponized food aid, using it for military gains and personal profit, while millions of Yemenis continue to face famine-like conditions.

These atrocities must be condemned by all people of goodwill. The administration should impose severe penalties on those responsible, including through sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representatives JACOBS and MEIJER, Chairman MEEKS, and Ranking Member MCCAUL for introducing this measure and bringing it to the floor. An identical text unanimously passed the Senate in July.

Deliberately starving innocent civilians as a weapon of war must be condemned wherever it occurs. This resolution also condemns the acts of looting, diversion, or other denials of humanitarian access that impede the delivery of lifesaving assistance to populations who need it the most.

Finally, I take this moment to commend the humanitarians who put their lives at risk every day to get food to vulnerable children, women, and men who need it just to stay alive. Their efforts deserve our support, and so does this resolution.

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

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 922 is an important piece of legislation to put this body on record as condemning the weaponization of hunger around the world and the impact conflict has on global food security.

As the world works together to alleviate multiple crises, this resolution serves as an important reminder of the cost of war and the need to hold perpetrators of starvation accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me and support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 922, "Condemning the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizing the effect of conflict on global food security and famine Act".

This resolution condemns the use of starvation of civilians as a weapon of warfare. It also calls on the U.S. government to prioritize diplomatic efforts to call out and address instances where hunger and intentional deprivation of food is being utilized as a weapon of war, including efforts to ensure that security operations do not undermine livelihoods of local populations to minimize civilian harm.

The United States has always been a nation that espouses human rights. That's a central tenet on which we were founded.

So when we see starvation being used as a weapon of warfare, it is reprehensible to us.

Global food insecurity is of great importance to me because, not only am I a longtime Member of the House Hunger Caucus, I represent the same Congressional District that had been represented by iconic leaders who fought to end hunger in the U.S. and globally.

I am proud to continue the historic legacy of Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who was a champion for human dignity and fought for the rights of all people regardless of race, gender, heritage, or economic status, and Congressman MICKEY LELAND, who worked tirelessly to raise awareness of, and fight for, policies to end food insecurity around the globe and who, tragically, died in a plane crash while working to end world hunger on a relief mission in Ethiopia.

Starvation is a brutal and inhumane way to force someone to surrender. It's a slow and agonizing death, used by the immoral to gain leverage in a war of attrition and aggression.

Starvation tactics typically target innocent, vulnerable civilians who are not directly a party to the conflict; instead they are merely caught in the crossfire of conflict.

That is why we must adopt this legislation.

The United States government must prioritize diplomatic efforts to call out and address instances where hunger and intentional deprivation of food is being utilized as a weapon.

We must show the world that we do not condone this type of behavior and that we will not stand for it.

The United States should prioritize diplomatic efforts to call out and address instances where hunger and intentional deprivation of food is being utilized as a weapon.

We must do everything in our power to protect innocent civilians from this barbaric practice.

Starvation is a terrible thing. It's something that nobody should have to go through. And yet, there are people in this world who are starving right now as a consequence of war, or, perhaps worse, as a tool of warfare.

The people of Ethiopia's Tigre Province are being subjected to a truly vile and malicious use of food deprivation in this way. The region was already suffering from drought, and when compounded by forced starvation from denial of access to food as a weapon of war, the effect is heinous and the consequences are unforgiveable.

In Pakistan, food deprivation is compounded by the human toll from recent floods and other natural disasters. Using drought to strategically exacerbate starvation is unacceptable.

Russia's aggression against Ukraine is a global food insecurity tragedy on multiple levels. As Putin wages his war against the people of Ukraine, he uses food as a weapon by destroying the food production and transportation capacity of the country he invaded. At the same time, since Ukraine grows grains and crops that feed much of the world, Putin's devastation of Ukraine's food production infrastructure and takeovers of Ukrainian food exports cause food insecure populations of countless countries to suffer, especially in Africa.

Finally, I condemn the use of government blockades as a weapon of war to deliberately increase starvation.

Government blockades are nothing more than collective punishment, and they're a violation of the human rights of the people who are suffering under them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 922, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN'S STATE-SPONSORED PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHA'I MINORITY AND ITS CONTINUED VIOLATION OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 744) condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 744

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2020, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i faith;

Whereas since 1979, Iranian authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs;

Whereas the Baha'i International Community documented a more than 50-percent increase in hate propaganda directed against the Baha'is in the 12-month period ending in August 2020, compared to prior years, with more than 9,500 such articles, videos, or web pages appearing in Iranian government-controlled or government-sponsored media;

Whereas, on December 16, 2021, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/C.3/76/L.28) criticizing Iran for human rights abuses and calling on Iran to carry out wide-ranging reforms, including—

(1) "ceasing use of the death penalty and commuting the sentences for child offenders on death row";

(2) "ensuring that no one is subjected to torture or other cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment";

(3) "ceasing the widespread and systematic use of arbitrary arrests and detention";

(4) "releasing persons detained for the exercise of their human rights and fundamental freedoms";

(5) "improving conditions inside prisons";

(6) "eliminating discrimination against women and girls"; and

(7) "eliminating discrimination against ethnic, linguistic, and other minorities";

Whereas in the 2022 Annual Report of the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom issued in April 2022, it is reported that the Government of Iran—

(1) "arrested scores of Baha'is across Iran, many of whom were held incommunicado or taken to undisclosed locations";

(2) "sent Ministry of Intelligence agents to search the home of a Baha'i citizen and confiscated her belongings";

(3) ''continued to deny university education to Baha'is on account of their faith'';

(4) ''closed six Baha'i businesses'';

(5) ''demolished the homes of three Baha'is without warning'';

(6) ''announced the auction of thirteen Baha'i farms''; and

(7) ''continued to deny Baha'is the right to bury their deceased in empty plots at the Golestan Javid cemetery outside Tehran which the community has used for decades. Instead, Baha'is are being forced to use the Khaveran mass grave site where victims of the 1988 prison massacres are buried'';

Whereas the Iran section of the Department of State's 2021 Report on International Religious Freedom issued in June 2022 provides, in part—

(1) ''Security forces in Shiraz and Mazandaran Province conducted multiple arrests of Baha'is in their homes or workplaces in the last week of September without providing reasons or charges.'';

(2) ''Authorities continued to confiscate Baha'i properties as part of an ongoing state-led campaign of economic persecution against Baha'is. Authorities issued an order in April denying Baha'is permission to bury their dead in empty plots at the Tehran-area cemetery designated for Baha'is, forcing them to bury them at a mass grave site.'';

(3) ''Authorities reportedly continued to deny the Baha'i, Sabean-Mandaean, and Yarsani religious communities, as well as members of other unrecognized religious minority groups, access to education and government employment unless they declared themselves as belonging to one of the country's recognized religions on their application forms.''; and

(4) ''Government officials continued to disseminate anti-Baha'i and antisemitic messages using traditional and social media.'';

Whereas, on July 4, 2022, the Baha'i International Community noted ''The Iranian government's systematic campaign to persecute the Baha'i religious minority accelerated again this past week with the arrest, court hearing or imprisonment of at least 18 more Baha'i citizens across the country, bringing the June total to 44 people. Hundreds of others, meanwhile, also await summonses to court or to prison.'';

Whereas, on July 21, 2022, the Baha'i International Community announced ''More than 20 Baha'is in Shiraz, Tehran, Yazd and Bojnourd, have been arrested, jailed or subjected to home searches and business closures since the beginning of July. Last month 44 Baha'is were arrested, arraigned or imprisoned, suggesting an escalating crisis in the Iranian government's systematic campaign against the country's largest non-Muslim religious minority. . .'';

Whereas Iran is a member of the United Nations and a signatory to both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, among other international human rights treaties, without reservation;

Whereas section 105 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514) authorizes the President to impose sanctions on individuals who are ''responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009''; and

Whereas the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–158) amends and expands the authorities established under the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–195) to sanction Iranian human rights abusers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR);

(2) calls on the Government of Iran—

(A) to immediately release the imprisoned or detained Baha'is and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(B) to end its state-sponsored campaign of hate propaganda against the Baha'is; and

(C) to reverse state-imposed policies denying Baha'is and members of other religious minorities equal opportunities to higher education, earning a livelihood, due process under the law, and the free exercise of religious practices;

(3) calls on the President and the Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran's continued violation of human rights, and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and the Secretary of State to utilize available authorities to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha'i community of Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 744, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS)?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 744.

I thank Ted Deutch, an esteemed former Member of this House and the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism Subcommittee, for reintroducing this important legislation that has passed the House multiple times.

I know that every member of our committee hopes the Iranian Government will immediately cease the abuse of its own people and specifically end its longtime persecution of the Baha'i people.

The last several years have been especially difficult for Iran's Baha'i community, as the regime in Tehran has ramped up its persecution of the community.

The resolution before us today calls on the Iranian Government to release all Baha'i prisoners, end its campaign of state-sponsored persecution, and stop discriminatory policies against the Baha'i community.

As many of us know, those who practice the Baha'i faith have been persecuted in Iran since the religion's founding but have suffered the most acute harassment since the Iranian revolution in 1979.

Hundreds of Baha'is have been executed and tortured. To this day, Iran denies Baha'is access to higher education, government jobs, and permits to work in 25 professions, and Iran subjects them to arbitrary harassment, arrest, and imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for this religious persecution to end, so I strongly urge all Members to vote in support of this critical resolution.

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan measure that condemns Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and calls for the release of all religious prisoners in Iran.

In recent months, the Iranian regime has responded to the Iranian people's peaceful demands for change with violent suppression. The world has been a witness to that brutality.

Sadly, Iran's Baha'i community is very familiar with the regime's cruelty. For years, the Baha'i have been subjected to a campaign of state-sponsored persecution. Baha'is across Iran face arbitrary arrest, forced disappearance, property expropriation, and economic discrimination every day.

The regime's deplorable treatment of the Baha'i shows how the Ayatollah denies Iranians access to basic human rights.

Persecution based on religious belief is abhorrent and warrants condemnation in the strongest possible terms. This resolution is a reminder of Congress' continued commitment to promoting and protecting human rights in Iran, including freedom of worship and belief.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our former colleague, Ted Deutch, for his longtime work to support the Baha'i in Iran and for his original authorship of this bipartisan measure.

The House of Representatives will continue to work tirelessly to protect and defend the human rights of the Iranian people.

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

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the Baha'i people of Iran have suffered enough at the hands of Iran's regime since the revolution. The brutality of Iran's Government has unfortunately been on display now for weeks for the entire world to see.

This body will always defend human rights in Iran and around the world, and we stand in solidarity with the people of Iran who are calling for justice, dignity, and respect. Women, Life, Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me and support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 744—Condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This resolution condemns Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the international covenants on human rights.

Further, the resolution calls on Iran to immediately release all imprisoned or detained Baha'is, and it urges the President and the Department of State to impose sanctions on Iranian officials and others who are responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against Iran's Baha'i community.

Persecution of religious minorities in Iran is rampant. For over 40 years, the Government of Iran has persecuted members of the Baha'i faith, killing over 200 Baha'i leaders, dismissing more than 10,000 from their government and university jobs, and using intimidation and violence to target them as enemies of the state.

The Iranian regime routinely arrests Baha'is and imposes lengthy prison sentences. Between 50 and 100 Baha'is were reported to be in prisons in Iran during 2020, despite the widespread prevalence of COVID–19.

Since 31 July 2022, Ministry of Intelligence agents have raided and confiscated dozens of Baha'i properties and arrested at least 30 members of the Baha'i community on account of their faith in various cities throughout Iran.

Iranian state-sponsored propaganda encourages citizens to avoid all dealings with Baha'is citing that they ''create anxiety in the minds of the public and those of the Iranian officials.''

The onslaught against the Baha'i community is yet another example of the Iranian government's brutal and degrading treatment of minorities and women and is a vivid reminder of the regime's extremist and intolerant foundation.

Iranians from all socioeconomic backgrounds are desperate for a democratic government that respects the universal rights of all humans, basic respect for human rights, and the rule of law.

The arrest and murder of Mahsa Amini, a 22-year-old woman arrested by ''morality police'' in Tehran on September 13, 2022, for allegedly violating Iran's strict rules requiring women to cover their hair with a hijab, or headscarf, sparked massive protests around Iran and the world.

For the past two months, since the day of Mahsa Amini's funeral, women and men have taken to the streets, risking their lives for a free and democratic Iran.

Since the protests started in September, more than 350 protesters have been killed, and thousands have been arrested.

Two weeks ago, an Iranian court issued the first death sentence linked to the protests, convicting an unnamed person of ''enmity against God'' and ''spreading corruption on Earth.'' Three more people have since been sentenced to death on the same charges, according to the Iranian government.

We are presented with evidence everyday of Iranians putting their lives at risk in pursuit of a better tomorrow.

To all the Iranian women, men, children, and protestors who are leading the fight for democracy, I say loud and clear that I stand with you.

The United States Congress will always support a democratic movement in Iran. We support the organized and peaceful resistance by women, students, and youth against this extremist regime.

Let us remain dedicated to advocating for a democratic secular government in Iran founded on universal respect for human rights, religious tolerance, and equality among all citizens.

I urge all my colleagues to support H. Res. 744—Condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

We must consistently demonstrate to the Iranian people and the entire world that we stand with them in solidarity for the atrocious injustices being committed by the Iranian Government, to give voice to the oppressed support human rights, and freedom in Iran, because freedom is a universal right.

I will always champion global democracy stand against human rights violations, and never shy away from speaking truth to power in the presence of oppression.

May the Iranian people soon enjoy all the rights and benefits of freedom and democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 744, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1630

UYGHUR POLICY ACT OF 2021

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4785) to support the human rights of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups residing in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region and safeguard their distinct identity, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4785

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 ''Uyghur Policy Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The People's Republic of China (PRC) continues to repress the distinct Islamic, Turkic identity of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups of the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR) in northwestern China and other areas of their habitual residence.

(2) Uyghurs, and other predominantly Muslim ethnic minorities historically making up the majority of the XUAR population, have maintained throughout their history a distinct religious and cultural identity.

(3) Human rights, including freedom of religion or belief, and respect for the Uyghurs' unique Muslim identity are legitimate interests of the international community.

(4) The People's Republic of China has ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights and is thereby bound by its provisions. The PRC has also signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Article One of both covenants state that all peoples have the right to self-determination.

(5) An official campaign to encourage Han Chinese migration into the XUAR has placed immense pressure on those who seek to preserve the ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic traditions of the Uyghur people. Chinese authorities have supported an influx of Han Chinese economic immigrants into the XUAR, implemented discrimination against Uyghurs in hiring practices, and provided unequal access to healthcare services.

(6) The authorities of the People's Republic of China have manipulated the strategic objectives of the international war on terror to mask their increasing cultural and religious oppression of the Muslim population residing in the XUAR.

(7) Following unrest in the region, in 2014, Chinese authorities launched their ''Strike Hard against Violent Extremism'' campaign, in which dubious allegations of widespread extremist activity were used as justification for gross human rights violations committed against members of the Uyghur community in the XUAR.

(8) PRC authorities have made use of the legal system as a tool of repression, including for the imposition of arbitrary detentions and for torture against members of the Uyghur community and other populations.

(9) Uyghurs and Kazakhs who have secured citizenship or permanent residency outside of the PRC have attested to repeated threats, harassment, and surveillance by PRC officials.

(10) Reporting from international news organizations has found that over the past decade, family members of Uyghurs living outside of the PRC have gone missing or been detained to force Uyghur expatriates to return to the PRC or silence their dissent.

(11) Credible evidence from human rights organizations, think tanks, and journalists confirms that more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs and members of other Muslim ethnic minority groups have been imprisoned in ''political reeducation'' centers.

(12) Independent accounts from former detainees of ''political reeducation'' centers describe inhumane conditions and treatment including forced political indoctrination, torture, beatings, rape, forced sterilization, and food deprivation. Former detainees also confirmed that they were told by guards the only way to secure release was to demonstrate sufficient political loyalty to the PRC Government and the Chinese Communist Party.

(13) Popular discourse surrounding the ongoing atrocities in the XUAR and advocacy efforts to assist Uyghurs remains muted in most Muslim majority nations around the world.

(14) Both Secretary of State Antony Blinken and Former Secretary of State Michael Pompeo have stated that the PRC government has committed genocide and crimes

against humanity against Uyghurs and other ethnic and religious minorities in the XUAR.

(15) Government bodies of multiple nations have also declared that PRC government atrocities against such populations in the XUAR constitute genocide, including the parliaments of the United Kingdom, Belgium, Czechia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, and Canada.

SEC. 3. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

Congress—

(1) calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to open the XUAR to regular, transparent, and unmanipulated visits by members of the press, Members of Congress, congressional staff delegations, the United States Special Coordinator for Uyghur Issues under section 4, and members and staff of the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China;

(2) calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to recognize, and seek to ensure the preservation of, the distinct ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic identity of Uyghurs and members of other ethnic and religious minority groups in the XUAR;

(3) calls upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to cease all government-sponsored crackdowns, imprisonments, and detentions of people throughout the XUAR aimed at those involved in the peaceful expression of their ethnic, cultural, political, or religious identity;

(4) commends countries that have provided shelter and hospitality to Uyghurs in exile, including Turkey, Albania, and Germany; and

(5) urges countries with sizeable Muslim populations, given commonalities in their religious and cultural identities, to demonstrate concern over the plight of Uyghurs.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR UYGHUR ISSUES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be within the Department of State a United States Special Coordinator for Uyghur Issues (in this section referred to as the ''Special Coordinator''), to be designated by the Secretary of State in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Chairs and Ranking Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives prior to the designation of the Special Coordinator.

(c) CENTRAL OBJECTIVE.—The Special Coordinator should seek to promote the protection and preservation of the distinct ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic identities of the Uyghurs.

(d) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Special Coordinator should, as appropriate—

(1) coordinate United State Government policies, programs, and projects concerning the Uyghurs;

(2) vigorously promote the policy of seeking to protect the distinct ethnic, religious, cultural, and linguistic identity of the Uyghurs and seek improved respect for human rights in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR);

(3) maintain close contact with Uyghur religious, cultural, and political leaders, including seeking regular travel to the XUAR and to Uyghur populations in Central Asia, Turkey, Albania, Germany, and other parts of Europe;

(4) lead coordination efforts for the release of political prisoners in the XUAR who are being detained for exercising their human rights;

(5) consult with the United States Congress on policies relevant to the XUAR and the Uyghurs;

(6) coordinate with relevant Federal agencies to administer aid to Uyghur rights advocates; and

(7) make efforts to establish contacts with foreign ministries of other countries, especially in Europe, Central Asia, and members of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, to pursue a policy of promoting greater respect for human rights and religious freedom for Uyghurs and other ethnic and religious minority groups persecuted in the PRC.

(e) SUPPORT.—The Secretary of State shall ensure the Special Coordinator has adequate resources, staff, and administrative support to carry out this section.

(f) DEADLINE.—If the Secretary of State has not designated the Special Coordinator by the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report detailing the reasons for the delay.

(g) TERMINATION.—This section shall terminate on the date that is five years after the designation of the Special Coordinator.

SEC. 5. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN THE ISLAMIC WORLD ON THE UYGHUR SITUATION.

(a) FUNDING FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ADVOCATES.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the U.S. Speaker Program in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, $250,000 for each of fiscal years 2022, 2023, and 2024 is authorized to be available for human rights advocates on behalf of the Uyghurs and members of other ethnic and religious minority groups persecuted in the PRC, whose names may be provided by the Department of State and the United States Special Coordinator for Uyghur Issues in consultation with representatives of the global Uyghur community, to speak at public diplomacy forums in Organisation of Islamic Cooperation countries and other regions on issues regarding the human rights and religious freedom of Uyghurs and members of other ethnic and religious minority groups persecuted in the PRC.

(b) UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Agency for Global Media should facilitate the unhindered dissemination of information to Organisation of Islamic Cooperation countries on issues regarding the human rights and religious freedom of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups in the XUAR.

SEC. 6. ACCESS TO DETENTION FACILITIES AND PRISONS AND THE RELEASE OF PRISONERS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON POLITICAL REEDUCATION AND DETENTION FACILITIES.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should, in cooperation with other like-minded countries, develop a strategy to—

(1) pressure the People's Republic of China to immediately close all detention facilities and ''political reeducation'' camps housing Uyghurs and members of other ethnic minority groups in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR); and

(2) support the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights and numerous United Nations Special Rapporteurs' urgent calls for immediate and unhindered access to detention facilities and ''political reeducation'' camps in the XUAR by independent international organizations and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights for a comprehensive assessment of the human rights situation.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PRISON ACCESS AND PRISONER RELEASE.—It is the sense of Congress that the President and Secretary of State, in meetings with representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China, should—

(1) request the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners detained for their ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic identities, or for expressing their political or religious beliefs in the XUAR;

(2) seek access for international humanitarian organizations, including the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, to prisoners in the XUAR to ensure such prisoners are not being mistreated and are receiving necessary medical care; and

(3) seek the immediate release of all prisoners who have been arbitrarily detained and sentenced without due process, including Ekpar Asat, who participated in the Department of State's International Visitors Leadership Program in 2016, was incarcerated after returning to the XUAR, and is now serving a 15 year prison sentence on charges of ''inciting ethnic hatred and ethnic discrimination''.

SEC. 7. REQUIREMENT FOR UYGHUR LANGUAGE TRAINING.

The Secretary of State shall ensure that Uyghur language training is available to Foreign Service officers as appropriate, and that every effort is made to ensure that a Uyghur-speaking member of the Foreign Service (as such term is described in section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3903)) is assigned to United States diplomatic and consular missions in China.

SEC. 8. UYGHUR CONSIDERATIONS AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States Government should oppose any efforts to prevent consideration of the issues related to the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR) in any body of the United Nations;

(2) the United States Government should oppose any efforts to prevent the participation of any Uyghur human rights advocates in nongovernmental fora hosted by or otherwise organized under the auspices of any body of the United Nations; and

(3) the Secretary of State should instruct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to support the appointment of a special rapporteur or working group for the XUAR for the purposes of monitoring human rights violations and abuses in the XUAR, and for making reports available to the High Commissioner for Refugees, the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Human Rights Commission, the General Assembly, and other United Nations bodies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4785.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4785, the Uyghur Policy Act of 2021, sponsored by my committee colleague, Representative YOUNG KIM.

The world has watched in horror as the People's Republic of China has continued its genocide and crimes against humanity against Uyghurs and members of other religious and ethnic minorities in the Xinjiang region.

The size and scale of the PRC's human rights abuses is horrific. As many as 1.8 million people have been arbitrarily detained in mass internment camps, prisons, and detention centers. They have shown no limits to their cruelty and depravity—subjecting people to forced labor, torture, political indoctrination, suppression of religious practices, forced sterilizations and abortions, family separation, sexual abuse, and so much more.

While we have seen graphic images and heard testimony revealing the truth of these camps, the PRC continues to hide behind disinformation.

We know that the PRC is actively trying to stamp out the unique ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic traditions of minorities in the Xinjiang region.

Despite outrage from the global community, these gross atrocities have only increased in their severity and cruelty.

Evidence collected from journalists, human rights defenders, and scholars, as well as harrowing firsthand accounts from survivors and their families, point to the continued oppression of Uyghurs and Muslims.

During this Congress, this body has taken multiple steps to condemn these atrocities and hold the PRC accountable for perpetrating these heinous crimes. But we need to do more to protect the millions of Uyghurs and their way of life.

By passing this important bipartisan legislation, we would strengthen U.S. Government efforts to protect and promote the distinct ethnic, religious, cultural, and linguistic identity of the Uyghur people.

This legislation furthers a whole-of-government approach to combat the PRC's egregious human rights violations. It also takes steps to bolster international support towards promoting greater respect for human rights in the Xinjiang region.

Most importantly, this legislation signals that the U.S. Congress unequivocally stands with the Uyghur people and will continue speaking out until this genocide and crimes against humanity ends.

I thank Representative KIM for authoring this important bipartisan legislation, which I was proud to vote for in the Foreign Affairs committee.

I support swift passage of this timely and urgent bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of my bill, H.R. 4785, the Uyghur Policy Act.

I thank Chairman AMI BERA of the Subcommittee on Asia, The Pacific, Central Asia, and Nonproliferation for leading this with me, as well as the 79 bipartisan cosponsors—Ms. SARA JACOBS from California being one of them. They all made consideration of this important bill possible.

The Uyghur Policy Act comes at a critical time as the world is seeing past the Chinese Communist Party's censorship filters and sharing videos of thousands of people in China standing up and speaking out against strict lockdowns and against the CCP.

Since Xi Jinping solidified his rule during the Communist Party Congress last month, anti-lockdown protests have erupted all over China, including in Xinjiang, where at least 10 people under COVID lockdown were killed in an apartment fire with their doors locked from the outside.

The people of China are waking up to the CCP's oppression and are demanding basic freedoms. Whether it is lockdown of protestors in Shanghai, or Uyghurs and other ethnic minorities in Xinjiang, the United States must show through words and through actions that we will have their backs in their fight against the CCP's tyranny.

The People's Republic of China continues to deny carrying out genocide against the Uyghurs and other ethnic minorities, and we have verified reports of forced sterilization, forced labor, brainwashing, and gang rape in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

The Uyghur Policy Act will help us lead from a position of strength and will address several shortcomings in our existing approach to responding to these human rights abuses. It authorizes the State Department to appoint a special coordinator for Uyghur issues, which will consolidate the State Department's diplomatic strategy to ensure that department-wide resources being used to respond to the Uyghur genocide are better coordinated.

H.R. 4785 will also mandate Uyghur language instruction at the Foreign Service Institute and require the State Department to station a Uyghur-fluent officer at Mission China locations.

The bill also authorizes support for Uyghur human rights activists and directs the U.S. Agency for Global Media to disseminate news and information regarding Uyghur genocide.

We must act now to leverage U.S. soft power, garner international support for Uyghurs and other ethnic minorities in Xinjiang, and equip the State Department with the tools it needs to better respond to Xi Jinping's genocidal campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who is a champion for human rights around the world, including for Uyghurs in China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

I am especially grateful that she has introduced the Uyghur Policy Act, which is particularly timely given the mass spontaneous protests we see arising in China.

It is particularly pertinent, given that the spark for the popular demands for freedom was a horrific incident that occurred in Urumqi in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, where due to Xi Jinping's draconian zero-COVID lockdown policy, at least 10 people were burned to death with many, many more injured.

The bill follows, I would point out, upon an amendment that I had offered at the House Committee on Foreign Affairs markup on June 30, 2021, to the EGLE Act that called for the creation of a special envoy for the Xinjiang region. Such focus is particularly necessary, given the amount of repression directed by the Chinese Communist Party at the Uyghurs and other predominantly Muslim Central Asian people, including the Kazakhs and the people from Kyrgyzstan.

Xi's genocide—and it is Xi Jinping's genocide; he is directly responsible for this. We know that there are recordings of him saying, ''show no mercy,'' as people are being dragged into concentration camps, as my two previous colleagues pointed out. Forced abortion, forced sterilization, and a whole host of human rights abuses are being committed each and every day, right up to this very moment, and it shows no signs of abatement.

In short, this bill is timely. I believe it is necessary, and I urge my colleagues to give its strongest support.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and for her management of this very important legislation as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It is my honor to stand on this floor today in support of the Uyghur Policy Act and to join my colleague, Mr. SMITH. For decades, Mr. SMITH and I—as well as Frank Wolf and so many others—have been working together for human rights throughout the world. I thank him for his leadership and his remarks on this important legislation. Again, a strong step in our continued work to counter the genocide of the Uyghur people.

In Xinjiang and across China, millions of Uyghurs and other Muslim minorities are enduring outrageous and barbaric abuses, from mass surveillance and discriminatory policing to mass incarceration in forced labor camps to mass torture, including solitary confinement and sterilization.

In its latest Human Rights Report, our own State Department has unequivocally declared that the Chinese

Communist Party's persecution of the Uyghurs amounts to genocide and crimes against humanity.

It is often said that one of the most sinister and cruel forms of torture employed by authoritarian regimes is to tell the oppressed: ''Nobody even remembers you.'' They don't even know what the fuss is about.

This Congress remains bipartisan, bicameral, unbreakable in our commitment to shining a bright light on the persecution of the Uyghurs.

With this legislation, we send a powerful signal to the Uyghur people: America sees you; we stand with you; and we are fighting for you.

And we send a resounding message to Beijing: This genocide must end now.

My remarks go on to talk about the Uyghur Policy Act and what it does, in addition to what we passed in 2020, the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act; in 2021, the Uyghur Forced Labor Protection Act. It includes the establishment of a Special Coordinator at State to spearhead the effort, which will ensure a laser focus on the brutal conditions facing the Uyghurs.

For decades, the Chinese Communist Party has waged a campaign of cruelty, terror, and repression, from cracking down on the culture, religion, and language of Tibet, intimidating the people of Taiwan, to restricting basic freedoms in Hong Kong, to jailing journalists and dissidents; and more.

We support and salute the courageous citizens across mainland China who are in the streets today speaking out for their freedom.

I join freedom-loving people around the world supporting the Chinese people for exercising this Fundamental right to make their voices heard.

Yet let us not forget how the government of China has often responded to these demonstrations with a heavy hand: whether in Tiananmen in 1989 or more recently against those marching for their rights in Hong Kong.

The past must not be precendent for Beijing's response to this wave of peaceful protests.

As I always say: if we do not speak out for human rights in China because of commercial interests, we lose all moral authority to speak out for human rights anywhere.

This is America's moral imperative—and today, we take another step to honor this charge today with the legislation before us

I urge a strong, bipartisan yes vote on the Uyghur Policy Act.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of legislation, H.R. 9308, honoring a legendary leader in Congress, Susan Davis, my dear colleague from San Diego.

Susan Davis began her career in public service in her beloved San Diego: First in social work, then on the historic school board, then the State Assembly; and now, the Armed Services Committee, Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan ''yes'' for this bill honoring Susan Davis, and also for the Uyghur Policy Act.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank our colleagues for bringing these pieces of legislation to the floor, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on both.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, seeing no other Members on my side, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank Asia Subcommittee Chairman AMI BERA, Speaker PELOSI, my colleague, Representative SMITH, and the many cosponsors who helped bring this legislation to the floor.

I am pleased that the House of Representatives, in the spirit of bipartisanship, is taking a significant step in defending the human rights of Uyghurs and other ethnic minorities subject to the CCP's oppression and genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes,'' and I urge the Senate to immediately take up this critically important legislation.

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

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, passing H.R. 4785, the Uyghur Policy Act of 2021, would send a message loud and clear that the PRC's inhumane policies to dilute and destroy the identity of the Uyghur people have no place in today's world.

The United States stands firmly with the Uyghur people and we will continue pushing to end the PRC's horrific and inhumane behavior.

We need to show strong bipartisan House support to the administration to use its tools to help protect the Uyghur culture and identity and promote respect for human rights and religious freedom of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups in China.

The House also stands in strong solidarity with the Chinese people protesting all over China in recent days.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4785, the Uyghur Policy Act of 2021, a bill that addresses the human rights issues concerning the Uyghurs and other minority groups in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region in China.

The Uyghur Policy Act would authorize the establishment of a Special Coordinator for Uyghur Issues position within the Department of State.

The bill would also allow the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs make certain funds available to human rights advocates working on behalf of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups.

The funds, if made available, shall be used to facilitate the presence of such human rights advocates at public diplomacy forums to speak on issues related to the human rights and religious freedoms of minority groups in Xinjiang.

Mr. Speaker, in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China has, since 2017, arbitrarily detained as many as 1.8 million Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in a system of extrajudicial mass internment camps.

Additionally, the Chinese government has arbitrarily detained many in formal prisons and detention centers, and has subjected detainees to forced labor, torture, political indoctrination, and other severe human rights abuses.

Forced labor exists within the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region's system of mass internment camps, and throughout the region.

These assertions have been confirmed by the testimony of former camp detainees, satellite imagery, official media reports, publicly available documents, official statements, and official leaked documents from the Government of the People's Republic of China as part of a targeted campaign of repression of Muslim ethnic minorities.

These atrocious acts are indicative of a state sponsored systematic effort to eradicate the ethnic and cultural identity and religious beliefs of religious minorities in China.

Recent reports have also indicated that the Chinese Government is aiming to prevent the births of, Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, and members of religious minority groups.

Recent data has shown a significant drop in birth rates among Uyghurs due to enforced sterilization and enforced abortion.

Indeed, the birth rate in the Xinjiang region fell by 24 percent in 2019 compared to a 4.2 percent decline nationwide.

In addition, there are credible reports of the Peoples Republic of China's Government campaigns to promote marriages between Uyghurs and Han and to reduce birth rates among Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims.

It has also been reported that many Uyghurs have been assigned to factory employment under conditions that indicate forced labor, and some former detainees have reported food deprivation, beatings, suppression of religious practices, family separation, and sexual abuse.

Reporting from international news organizations has found that over the past decade, family members of Uyghurs living outside of China have gone missing or been detained to force their return to China or silence dissent.

Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 2021, the Department of State determined the Peoples Republic of China's Government, under the direction and control of the Chinese Communist Party, has committed crimes against humanity and genocide against Uyghurs and other ethnic and religious minority groups in Xinjiang.

The Chinese government must answer for the barbaric acts of terror they have afflicted on their own people.

H.R. 4785 the Uyghur Policy Act of 2021 call for the Government of the People's Republic of China to open the XUAR to regular visits by United States Members of Congress, Congressional staff delegations, the United States Special Coordinator for Uyghur Issues under section 4, and members and staff of the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China to monitor the human rights violations and abuses occurring in Xuar.

As members of the United States Congress, we must use our voice to condemn, monitor and oppose the atrocities occurring in China.

I and this chamber stand with the Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, and members of

other religious minority groups in China being terrorized by their own governments.

I encourage all my colleagues to support H.R. 4785—Uyghur Policy Act of 2021 to promote justice globally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4785, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1645

SUSAN A. DAVIS POST OFFICE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9308) 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''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9308

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

SECTION 1. SUSAN A. DAVIS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6401 El Cajon Boulevard in San Diego, California, shall be known and designated as the ''Susan A. Davis Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Susan A. Davis Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9308, 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.

Ms. Susan Davis was born in Cambridge, Massachusetts, but spent most of her life in California. She graduated from the University of California, Berkeley and went on to receive a master's degree in social work from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

She became active in politics through the local branch of the League of Women Voters. In 1994, she was elected to the California State Assembly where she chaired the Committee on Consumer Protection, Government Efficiency, and Economic Development.

In 2000, Ms. Davis was elected as a Member of Congress representing California's 53rd District, a position she held for 20 years. During her career, she became a prominent member of the Armed Services and Education and Workforce Committees. Throughout her tenure, she authored several bills and amendments which were enacted into law.

After years of public service, Ms. Davis announced that she would not seek reelection in 2020.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring former Representative Davis and her accomplishments by naming a Post Office in San Diego, California, after her, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9308 honors former Congresswoman Susan Davis who served in this House for 20 years from 2001 to 2021. She proudly represented San Diego's 53rd Congressional District and became a prominent member of the House of Representatives' Armed Services and Education and Workforce Committees.

She was only the second woman ever elected to Congress in San Diego County and the first to serve more than one term. Prior to her time in the House, she served as a member of the San Diego Unified Board of Education and in the California State Assembly.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JACOBS), who is the distinguished vice chair of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations and Global Corporate Social Impact.

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise to recognize my friend, mentor, and predecessor, Congresswoman Susan Davis, and her decades of public service to Rolando and the San Diego community.

From serving on the San Diego Unified Board of Education to the California State Assembly to the Halls of Congress, Congresswoman Davis worked tirelessly to advocate and deliver for her constituents.

As chairwoman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, she championed our servicemembers, leading the repeal of the discriminatory Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy, increasing military pay and benefits, expanding access to mental health care, and shining a light on military sexual assault. She didn't forget about military families. She fought to ensure they had housing that was safe and affordable and quality healthcare.

Everyone who knows Susan knows that she doesn't give up. Term after term, she re-introduced legislation to expand women's access to healthcare. Because of her unwavering dedication, women across the country no longer need prior approval or a referral to receive OB/GYN care. For young women like me, that is essential because for years, my OB/GYN was the only doctor I saw.

Susan cared so deeply about our Nation's children and introduced many bills to protect children and ensure they have every door open to them, so they have a successful, thriving future.

She pushed to address child hunger, expand access to childcare and early learning opportunities, and strengthened our education programs. Through her work on the Education and Labor Committee, she advocated for more registered apprenticeships and for making college more affordable and accessible.

For me, Susan has been one of my biggest cheerleaders. When I wasn't sure I was ready to run for Congress, she called me every day to convince me that I was. She has always strived to bring more people to the leadership table and make way for people with new voices and experiences to lead.

For all these reasons and so many more, I am proud to honor Congresswoman Susan Davis' decades of service to the Rolando community and all of San Diego by naming the Rolando post office after her.

I am so grateful to have the support of all of my California colleagues and many more who served with Susan. This is the culmination of a community-led effort, powered by the people of Rolando and Council President Sean Elo-Rivera's office.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman Davis for all she has done for San Diego and all she continues to do. Her kindness, selflessness, leadership, and service continue to be an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. In closing, I urge passage of H.R. 9308 to name a post office after Ms. Susan Davis, who is a very good friend and former colleague, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) that the House

suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9308.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MARTIN OLAV SABO POST OFFICE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8025) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 South 1st Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, as the ''Martin Olav Sabo Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8025

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

SECTION 1. MARTIN OLAV SABO POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 South 1st Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the ''Martin Olav Sabo Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Martin Olav Sabo Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on this matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8025, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 South 1st Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, as the Martin Olav Sabo Post Office.

Mr. Martin Olav Sabo was born in Crosby, North Dakota, to Norwegian immigrant parents. In 1959, he received a bachelor's degree from Augsburg College in Minneapolis and later pursued graduate studies at the University of Minnesota.

At the age of 22, Mr. Sabo was elected to the Minnesota House of Representatives where he later served as minority leader and was the first Democrat to serve as House Speaker from 1973 to 1978.

In November of 1978, he was elected to the House of Representatives and served for eight terms. During his tenure, he chaired the House Budget Committee where he guided the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 through the House.

During the 109th Congress, he was a member of the House Appropriations Committee and served as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

After retiring from Congress, Mr. Sabo was the cochair of the national transportation policy project at the Bipartisan Policy Center. In 2016, at the age of 78, Mr. Sabo passed away.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring former Representative Sabo and his accomplishments by naming a post office in Minneapolis, Minnesota, after him, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8025 honors former Congressman Martin Olav Sabo, a longtime Representative from Minnesota. The Congressman served 28 years in the House of Representatives, eventually becoming chair of the House Budget Committee.

One of his proudest achievements was putting together a Federal budget and a deficit reduction package in 1993 which later would result in budget surpluses. Prior to his election to Congress in 1978, he served 18 years in the Minnesota State Legislature including serving as house minority leader and speaker.

He passed away, sadly, in 2016 at the age of 78.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), who is the distinguished vice chair of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 8025, which designates a U.S. Post Office facility in Minneapolis as the Martin Olav Sabo Post Office.

I am proud to have the opportunity to honor the late Representative Martin Olav Sabo, a man who dedicated his life to public service and represented my district, the Fifth District of Minnesota, for nearly three decades.

Representative Sabo graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1960 and served in the Minnesota House of Representatives from 1960 until 1978, the year he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the great State of Minnesota and represented the people of the Fifth District.

Representative Sabo served 28 years in the House rising to chair of the House Budget Committee. He built a career standing up for low-income families and the middle class and invested in critical infrastructure and cared for our veterans.

He also delivered millions of dollars in housing and transportation projects to our district, including the Hiawatha Avenue light rail line and the Minneapolis Veterans Medical Center. After a long successful career, the Minneapolis Democrat announced his retirement in 2006 and was succeeded by my predecessor, Keith Ellison.

Sadly, Representative Sabo passed away in 2016 in his beloved home State after a lifetime of public service. I am honored to follow in the footsteps of Minnesotans like Martin Sabo who represented our State with honor and distinction.

This bill is supported by the whole Minnesota delegation and has bipartisan support, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge passage of H.R. 8025, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LAWRENCE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8025.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

BOB KRUEGER POST OFFICE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8203) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 651 Business Interstate Highway 35 North Suite 420 in New Braunfels, Texas, as the ''Bob Krueger Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8203

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

SECTION 1. BOB KRUEGER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 651 Business Interstate Highway 35 North Suite 420 in New Braunfels, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''Bob Krueger Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Bob Krueger Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8203 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 651 Business Interstate Highway 35 North Suite 420 in New Braunfels, Texas, as the Bob Krueger Post Office.

Mr. Robert Charles Krueger was born on September 19, 1935, in New Braunfels, Texas. He received a bachelor's degree from Southern Methodist University in 1957, a master's from Duke University in 1958, and a Ph.D. in English from the University of Oxford in 1964.

From 1975 to 1979, Mr. Krueger served two terms in the House of Representatives for the 21st Congressional District of Texas. Following his loss in a bid for the Senate, he served in President Jimmy Carter's administration as Ambassador-at-Large and Coordinator for Mexican Affairs in the State Department.

In 1993, he was selected by Governor Ann Richards to fill Lloyd Bentsen's vacated Senate seat. He served only 5 months after losing a special election to Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison.

Mr. Krueger was appointed by President Bill Clinton to serve as Ambassador to Burundi, and after 2 years, he became Ambassador to Botswana, serving until 1999.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Krueger's life of public service by naming a post office in New Braunfels, Texas, after him, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am opposed to this bill for procedural reasons. The House Oversight and Reform Committee's agreed-upon procedures for considering postal naming bills clearly dictate several requirements for such measures to advance through the House. Among those is the requirement that postal naming bills be cosponsored by the entire State delegation before it will be considered in the Oversight Committee, and then they proceed to the floor.

There are very good reasons for these requirements. This is to ensure that the State's collective representation agrees that such a local hero deserves this high honor and the attention of the full Congress.

Unfortunately, this bill is only cosponsored by 34 of the 36 Members of the Texas delegation, which means it is not ready for consideration here today.

Furthermore, this bill has not even been marked up by the committee of jurisdiction in the House Oversight Committee, which means it is bypassing regular order to come straight to the House floor. This is a departure from past precedent and procedure.

Following regular order and past practice on these measures prevents wasting valuable time and resources here on the House floor. There are dozens of other bills that have earned the support of their entire State delegations and have also been unanimously approved by the House Oversight Committee. We should be spending the valuable time on this floor that we have remaining in this Congress considering these other bills that are higher in the queue, some of which were introduced in the first half of last year.

For these reasons, I cannot support H.R. 8203, which breaks with our agreed-upon process.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the chairman of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a true Texas statesman, Bob Krueger. Decades ago, Bob and I were fierce political adversaries, but since then we have joined on behalf of our State and our Nation in common cause. Now I join so many of his former colleagues and many Texans in recognizing his remarkable contributions.

He is a proud native of New Braunfels, which remained his home in recent decades. He once served here in this House in a district that many parts of had more cattle than constituents that stretched from San Antonio to San Angelo and almost to El Paso.

After studying at Duke and Oxford, Bob served Duke as vice provost and dean before returning to Texas to win a rather improbable election and reelection as a Congressman. He was voted the most effective Member of his freshman class by colleagues here in the House.

He voted to prolong the life of the Voting Rights Act and extend its application to Texas, he supported the admission of women to the service academies, and supported an increase in the minimum wage, among other matters.

In those elections and a subsequent race for the U.S. Senate, he attracted talent like Land Commissioner Gary Mauro, media legend Roy Spence, and future Deputy Energy Secretary and Mayor of Houston, Bill White, among many others.

When the Senate race was unsuccessful, Bob was named by President Carter as Ambassador-at-Large and Coordinator for Mexican Affairs. In 1990, he won a statewide election to serve in the important position on the Texas Railroad Commission. A few years later, Governor Ann Richards appointed him to fill a Senate vacancy, but within a few months he was defeated by Kay Bailey Hutchison. Yet, Bob never let these setbacks get in the way of lifelong civic engagement and public service.

After Senator Hutchison's victory, President Clinton appointed him as Ambassador to Burundi, which he described as the most fulfilling period of his life. There he met with Rwandan refugees fleeing massacres, which he documented, putting him at personal risk, as one of the first Western voices to report the genocide.

He discovered villages where children were massacred and livestock was left alive. Even after the front pages of two local newspapers there in Burundi called for his death, he continued this mission: Sounding the alarm, documenting the genocide and the atrocities. He survived an assassination attempt, and only after it became too unsafe for his family to remain there, he was evacuated and then appointed as Ambassador to Botswana.

He cut a singular figure: a Shakespeare-quoting, former East Coast professor who connected with Texas ranchers, a busy public servant, who nevertheless valued a few days of daily meditation.

Throughout all his types of service, whether he was driving a pickup truck around West Texas or in an armored vehicle in Burundi, he always was driven by the same values, the same faith, and the same guiding light: his family.

His partner for almost four decades, Kathleen Tobin Krueger, meant the world to him, they traveled it together. Recently, she has been involved in continuing their work in advocating for their close friend and San Antonian, Paul Rusesabagina.

Paul, who inspired ''Hotel Rwanda,'' and who received the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his work in saving people in Rwanda, remains wrongly imprisoned in Rwanda today.

Bob's wonderful daughter, Mariana, an accomplished photographer, who shares his love of Duke as both an undergrad and graduate of Duke, and now lives in Austin, continues his legacy.

His daughter, Sarah, a double Duke alumna, works as a senior reporter for WRAL in Durham, living there with her husband Will and their son Brooks.

His son, Christian, who worked here in the House recently as a legislative assistant for Congressman JOAQUIN CASTRO, lives in Texas with his wife Marion.

At the memorial service this spring after Bob passed away at 86 years of life well-lived, former Ambassador Scott DeLisi, who worked with Bob in Botswana, said Krueger had ''the most finely tuned moral compass of any man

that I worked with in over four decades of public service.''

A true gentleman and a scholar, it is a mark of Bob's character that after completing such important public service, it was Bob, as a visiting professor at Texas State in San Marcos back in 2004, who, despite our previous personal differences, graciously presented me a public service award rather than the other way around.

Today, by authoring this bill, I recognize his truly award-worthy service.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, this legislation provides a modest way for us to honor one who did so much in so many ways to benefit so many people. So let's name the post office in the heart of the community that he called home, just a block away from a twist and turn of the great Guadalupe River, in honor of the great, late Bob Krueger, honoring his memory and make his rich legacy—his values, his grace, his kindness, his commitment to service—a part of our future.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership and for our Republican colleague, as well.

Madam Speaker, I would just address for the RECORD the comment that was made about the sponsorship. There were 34 of the 36 Members of the Texas delegation who have indeed cosponsored this bill. The other two Members who chose not to cosponsor have indicated they have no objection to the bill.

We are, by presenting this bill, applying the same standard that will apply to the next bill up honoring properly our former colleague, Mr. Wright, in legislation sponsored by Mr. CORNYN and by House Members here, treating them the same way. I think both are well-justified pieces of legislation, and I look forward to their approval.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, again, for procedural reasons, I encourage my colleagues to vote against this bill so we may return to regular order in consideration of postal naming in the naming measures going forward this year and into the 118th Congress.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 8203, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8203.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NEAL KENNETH TODD POST OFFICE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4899) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Broadway Street West, in Akeley, Minnesota, as the ''Neal Kenneth Todd Post Office''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4899

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

SECTION 1. NEAL KENNETH TODD POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Broadway Street West, in Akeley, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the ''Neal Kenneth Todd Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Neal Kenneth Todd Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material for this matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4899 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Broadway Street West, in Akeley, Minnesota, as the Neal Kenneth Todd Post Office.

Mr. Neal Kenneth Todd was born in Akeley, Minnesota. After graduating from high school in 1938, he joined seven of his brothers in the U.S. military.

At the age of 22, he was assigned to the USS *Oklahoma* as a Navy fireman first class. On December 7, 1941, while stationed at Pearl Harbor, the ship was attacked by the Japanese air force.

Mr. Todd was serving with his brother, Wesley, who was able to escape the ship. Unfortunately, months later, Neal Todd was pronounced dead and awarded the Purple Heart. He is honored at the USS Oklahoma Memorial and Honolulu Memorial of the Courts of the Missing.

On February 11, 2021, Mr. Todd's remains were successfully matched, and he was reunited with his brother in Akeley, Minnesota.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Todd and his service to our country by naming a Post Office in Akeley, Minnesota, after him.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4899, which honors Neal Kenneth Todd, a former World War II U.S. servicemember and Purple Heart recipient.

At the age of 22, Todd was assigned to the USS *Oklahoma* as a Navy Fireman First Class, where he was stationed on December 7, 1941, which President Roosevelt, standing right below where you are, Madam Speaker, said, a day which will live in infamy, when the ship was attacked by the Japanese Air Force at Pearl Harbor.

The USS *Oklahoma* capsized, and Todd's fate was unknown to his family for months. He was eventually pronounced dead. His remains, along with the remains of other servicemembers, were recovered in the months following the attack but did not begin to be identified by the U.S. Department of Defense until 2015.

At long last, on February 11, 2021, Todd's remains were successfully identified and reunited with his brother, Orville, and his sister, Karen.

Todd was laid to rest with full military honors alongside his younger brother, Alfred, who also served in the Navy.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill honoring an American servicemember and hero who made the ultimate sacrifice for our great Nation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 4899, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4899.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RON WRIGHT POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3825) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 Melear Drive in Arlington, Texas, as the ''Ron Wright Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3825

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

SECTION 1. RON WRIGHT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 Melear Drive in Arlington, Texas, shall be known and designated as the ''Ron Wright Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Ron Wright Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3825, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 Melear Drive in Arlington, Texas, as the Ron Wright Post Office Building.

Former Representative Ron Wright was born on April 8, 1953, in Jacksonville, Texas, and went on to attend the University of Texas at Arlington for 2 years, studying history, psychology, and political science.

From 2000 to 2008, he served on the Arlington City Council and as Mayor Pro-Tem of Arlington from 2004 to 2008. He then served as district director for Congressman Joe Barton for 9 years.

In 2018, Representative Wright ran for Texas' Sixth Congressional District. During his tenure, he served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House Committee on Education and Labor.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and service of Representative Wright by naming a Post Office in Arlington, Texas, after him.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 3825, which honors the late Congressman Ron Wright of Texas, a great American and a gentle soul. Many of us in the House of Representatives today served with Congressman Wright in the 116th and 117th Congresses.

A native Texan, Congressman Wright proudly represented Texas' Sixth Congressional District, stretching from Arlington down past Mansfield toward Corsicana. He kept up rigorous work schedules in D.C. and back in Texas, in his district, and he was fondly received; while simultaneously serving in Congress, he was being treated for lung cancer.

Prior to his election to Congress he served North Texans as the Tarrant County Tax Collector, Chief of Staff for Congressman Joe Barton, and Mayor Pro-Tem of the city of Arlington, Texas.

He was reelected to Congress for a second term in November of 2020 but, sadly, died February 7, 2021, just 1 month into this new Congress.

Congressman Wright was a true public servant, a good friend, and a loyal American. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ELLZEY), my good friend, a Naval aviator, a former Texas House member, a Southwest Airlines pilot, a great American, and one heck of a flag football player.

Mr. ELLZEY. Madam Speaker, I thank Madam Chair for the kind remarks, as well as my friend, Congressman FALLON, for those kind remarks about my predecessor.

It is with a great deal of pride that I get to hear Ron Wright's name spoken on the floor in order to support this renaming. So I rise to address the House in support of S. 3825, designating the United States Postal Service facility located at 3903 Melear Drive in Arlington, Texas, as the Ron Wright Post Office Building.

I thank Senator CORNYN for authoring this bill, as well as my friend, Senator CRUZ, for cosponsoring.

Congressman Ron Wright dedicated his life to the people of Texas. While starting his career working for Ceramic Cooling, it did not take him long to begin serving his community.

In 2000, he was elected to the city council in Arlington, Texas. During that time, he served as Congressman Joe Barton's district director and later, as his Chief of Staff. From there, he was appointed Tarrant County Tax Assessor Collector, where he served from 2011 to 2018, before beating me and getting elected to Congress.

Congressman Wright was a pillar in the community that he served, and there is not an event in Tarrant County in which his name is not mentioned today.

So I thank Ron for all that he has done for the people of Texas and for the people of the United States. We will all miss Ron; and I hope that Susan, his bride, and his children and grandchildren will take a great deal of pride in the fact that this will be named after him. He was a gentleman and a gentle man, and we will all miss him.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Madam Speaker, I encourage all of our colleagues to support this bill honoring a loyal, public servant, and as Representative ELLZEY just said, a gentleman and a gentle man, Ron Wright.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of S. 3825, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3825, led by Senator CORNYN in the Senate, to name a Post Office in Arlington in honor of my dear friend, former Congressman Ron Wright, who was sadly taken from us last year as he served his second term as a member of this body.

Congressman Wright had a passion for public service. He served as the District Director and Chief of Staff to another dear friend of mine, former Congressman Joe Barton, before stepping into the spotlight and utilizing the valuable experience he gained in local government to be the face of the federal government to hundreds of thousands of North Texans residing in Tarrant, Ellis, and Navarro Counties. He worked hard as a staffer and member to be a positive force and ensure bills passed in Congress that he believed would benefit the constituents of the Sixth Congressional district of Texas, regardless of politics or party affiliation.

Having a Post Office named after Congressman Wright in Arlington, where he's spent so much of his life, from attending the University of Texas at Arlington to serving on the Arlington City Council, is a fitting way to honor the life and legacy of a public servant who has meant and done so much for his community. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so President Biden can sign this into law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3825.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5:26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). Proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 4003;

S. 3846; and

H.R. 5455.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

LAW ENFORCEMENT DE-ESCALATION TRAINING ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4003) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 160, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—247

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bucshon
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly
Conway
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellzey
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Womack

NAYS—160

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Flores
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gimenez
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Latta
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClain
McClintock
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Owens
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sempolinski
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Tlaib
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zeldin

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Issa

NOT VOTING—23

Brady
Cheney
Cohen
Feenstra
Finstad
Gibbs
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Kildee
Kinzinger
Lamborn
LaTurner
McHenry
McKinley
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Palazzo
Pence
Rice (NY)
Slotkin
Stauber
Yarmuth

□ 1912

Messrs. GIMENEZ, OWENS, Mrs. McCLAIN, Messrs. HUDSON, FERGUSON, GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WALTZ, Mrs. FLORES, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. LETLOW, Messrs. MOORE of Utah, CARTER of Texas, CRAWFORD, PFLUGER, WILSON of South Carolina, and JOHNSON of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''present.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Wild)
Bass (Cicilline)
Blumenauer (Thompson (CA))
Bonamici (Neguse)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brown (MD) (Evans)
Cárdenas (Correa)
Clyburn (Butterfield)
Conway (Valadao)
Craig (Stevens)
Curtis (Stewart)
DeFazio (Pallone)
DelBene (Schneider)
DeSaulnier (Thompson (CA))
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Gaetz (Bishop (NC))
Garbarino (Miller-Meeks)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Gooden (Miller-Meeks)
Gosar (Weber (TX))
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Horsford (Kelly (IL))
Jacobs (NY) (Sempolinski)
Jayapal (Pallone)
Johnson (GA) (Pallone)
Johnson (TX) (Pallone)
Keating (Neguse)
Khanna (Neguse)
Kilmer (Neguse)
Kind (Schneider)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Smucker)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lowenthal (Huffman)
Luria (Wexton)
Newman (Correa)
Peltola (Stevens)
Phillips (Neguse)
Pocan (Cicilline)
Pressley (Neguse)
Rodgers (WA) (Armstrong)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Rush (Evans)
Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Schrier (Schneider)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Simpson (Fulcher)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (WA) (Correa)
Strickland (Butterfield)
Welch (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

□ 1915

HONORING CONGRESSMAN DONALD McEACHIN

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as dean of the Virginia congressional delegation, I am joined by Members of the delegation from the House and Senate. It is with a heavy heart that I announce to the House the

passing of our colleague, Congressman A. Donald McEachin.

Throughout his life of public service, Donald was a relentless champion for all Virginians, serving in the House of Delegates, the Senate of Virginia, and then here in the House of Representatives. He was the son of an Army veteran and a public schoolteacher. Donald graduated from American University, earned his law degree from the University of Virginia, and received his Master of Divinity from the Virginia Union University.

As many in this Chamber know, Donald was a thoughtful and principled legislator respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. He was also a trailblazing figure in Virginia politics. He was the first African-American nominee of a major party for Virginia Attorney General and only the third African American elected to Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Donald was resolute in pushing Virginia to lead the way in climate policy. He recognized the climate crisis as a moral issue and was a champion for environmental justice, using his skills as a trial lawyer to fight to ensure that the voices of our most vulnerable communities were heard and heeded. May we all seek to honor Donald's life and legacy by working to build a future in which everyone has access to clean air, water, and soil.

Madam Speaker, this body has lost one of its most dedicated public servants and fiercest advocates for justice and equality, and he will be deeply missed. I want to offer my deepest condolences to his wife, Colette, their three children, his beloved grandchildren, his friends, his staff, and the countless individuals positively impacted by his life of service.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. SCOTT for yielding and join him in our condolences in the passing of Donald McEachin. I would like to thank our colleagues today for joining us in this remembrance.

Donald was indeed an incredible leader. He was a dedicated father, a dedicated husband, and he loved serving others. He truly was passionate about his job. He was passionate about the people of the Fourth District.

I got to know Donald actually from our years when we were young, when we were in high school. We were in rival high schools in Richmond. I met him in passing there and got to serve with him in the Virginia General Assembly.

What an individual, a person of integrity, a person of passion, dedicated to the people that he served. He loved being a legislator. He loved solving problems for people. He loved interacting with people. He loved the whole idea of giving of himself and putting others first. That truly was what Donald was about. I know we all dealt with him through the years, and he was a person of the utmost integrity and the utmost passion. He really wanted to get things done.

While there were political differences among the different members of our Virginia delegation, for Donald it was always about getting things done, and you could always depend that Donald would be very thoughtful and forthright with you. He was looking for solutions to problems. That is what legislating is about. Donald was indeed the quintessential public servant, the quintessential leader, an example for all of us in the Virginia delegation.

It is with a heavy heart today that we mourn his passing, but let's all remember his legacy, his legacy of service, what he has done to uplift all of us, to make us all better as Members of this legislative body.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LATE HONORABLE A. DONALD MCEACHIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all of those present in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to please rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the late Honorable A. Donald McEachin of Virginia.

JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH COLLABORATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3846) to reauthorize the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 22, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

YEAS—389

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Conway
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sempolinski
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone

Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zeldin

NAYS—22

Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brooks
Buck
Clyde
Duncan
Gaetz
Gohmert
Gosar
Greene (GA)
Hice (GA)
Massie
McClintock
Miller (IL)
Moore (AL)
Norman
Perry
Rosendale
Roy
Taylor
Van Drew

NOT VOTING—20

Brady
Cheney
Cohen
Feenstra
Finstad
Gibbs
Grijalva
Kinzinger
Lamborn
LaTurner
McHenry
McKinley
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Palazzo
Pence
Rice (NY)
Stauber
Yarmuth

□ 1933

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Wild)
Bass (Cicilline)
Blumenauer (Thompson (CA))
Bonamici (Neguse)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brown (MD) (Evans)
Cárdenas (Correa)
Clyburn (Butterfield)
Conway (Valadao)
Craig (Stevens)
Curtis (Stewart)
DeFazio (Pallone)
DeSaulnier (Thompson (CA))
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Gaetz (Bishop (NC))
Garbarino (Miller-Meeks)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Gooden (Miller-Meeks)
Gosar (Weber (TX))
Herrera Beutler (Moore (UT))
Horsford (Kelly (IL))
Jacobs (NY) (Sempolinski)
Jayapal (Pallone)
Johnson (GA) (Pallone)
Johnson (TX) (Pallone)
Keating (Neguse)
Khanna (Neguse)
Kind (Schneider)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Smucker)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lowenthal (Huffman)
Luria (Wexton)
Newman (Correa)
Peltola (Stevens)
Phillips (Neguse)
Pocan (Cicilline)
Pressley (Neguse)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Rush (Evans)
Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Schrier (Schneider)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Simpson (Fulcher)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (WA) (Correa)
Strickland (Butterfield)
Welch (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

TERRY TECHNICAL CORRECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5455) to amend the First Step Act of 2018 to permit defendants convicted of certain offenses to be eligible for reduced sentences, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 307, nays 101, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

YEAS—307

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carey
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly
Conway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
García (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
LaHood
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Peltola
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (NY)
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sempolinski
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—101

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Boebert
Brooks
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Comer
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fleischmann
Flood
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gimenez
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaMalfa
Letlow
Long
Luetkemeyer
Malliotakis
Mann
Mast
McClain
Miller (IL)
Moolenaar
Nehls
Norman
Palazzo
Palmer
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Rice (SC)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Steube
Tenney
Timmons
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym

NOT VOTING—23

Brady
Cheney
Cohen
Cooper
Feenstra
Finstad
Gibbs
Granger
Grijalva
Herrera Beutler
Kinzinger
Lamborn
LaTurner
McHenry
McKinley
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Pence
Rice (NY)
Salazar
Stauber
Yarmuth

□ 1945

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Axne (Wild)
Bass (Cicilline)
Blumenauer (Thompson (CA))
Bonamici (Neguse)
Brooks (Moore (AL))
Brown (MD) (Evans)
Cárdenas (Correa)
Clyburn (Butterfield)
Conway (Valadao)
Craig (Stevens)
Curtis (Stewart)
DeFazio (Pallone)
DeSaulnier (Thompson (CA))
Doyle, Michael F. (Pallone)
Gaetz (Bishop (NC))
Garbarino (Miller-Meeks)
Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)
Gooden (Miller-Meeks)
Gosar (Weber (TX))
Horsford (Kelly (IL))
Jacobs (NY) (Sempolinski)
Jayapal (Pallone)
Johnson (GA) (Pallone)
Johnson (TX) (Pallone)
Keating (Neguse)
Khanna (Neguse)
Kind (Schneider)

Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
LaHood (Smucker)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lowenthal (Huffman)
Luria (Wexton)
Newman (Correa)
Palazzo (Bilirakis)
Peltola (Stevens)
Phillips (Neguse)
Pocan (Cicilline)
Pressley (Neguse)
Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Rush (Evans)
Ryan (OH) (Correa)
Schrier (Schneider)
Sewell (Cicilline)
Simpson (Fulcher)
Sires (Pallone)
Smith (WA) (Correa)
Strickland (Butterfield)
Welch (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPONSOR OF H. RES. 744

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered as the primary sponsor of H. Res. 744, a resolution originally introduced by Representative Ted Deutch of Florida, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WEXTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND SORROW OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE A. DONALD MCEACHIN

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1496

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable A. Donald McEachin, a Representative from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4524—An act to limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1 of House Resolution 1230 and House Resolution 1496, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late A. Donald McEachin.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 30, 2022, at 9 a.m., as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late A. Donald McEachin.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 4601, the Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 4772, the Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 4772

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2023–2027	2023–2032
Statutory Pas-As-You-Go Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	−2	0	0	−1

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 7158, the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 7158

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2023–2027	2023–2032
Statutory Pas-As-You-Go Impact	8	12	14	17	19	2	0	0	−84	0	70	−12

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–5972. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Prohibition on Award to Contractors That Require Certain Nondisclosure Agreements (DFARS Case 2021-D018) [Docket DARS-2022-0013] (RIN: 0750-AL36) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5973. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Reporting Tax Information on Certain Foreign Procurements (DFARS Case 2021-D029) [Docket DARS-2022-0014] (RIN: 0750-AL51) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5974. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Requirement for Firms Used To Support Department of Defense Audits (DFARS Case 2019-D010) [Docket DARS-2021-0021] (RIN: 0750-AK47) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5975. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Removal of Pilot Program for Acquisition of Military-Purpose Nondevelopmental Items

(DFARS Case 2022-D022) [Docket DARS-2022-0027] (RIN: 0750-AL71) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5976. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Removal of Passive Radio Frequency Requirements (DFARS Case 2022-D020) [Docket DARS-2022-0024] (RIN: 0750-AL73) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5977. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Major final regulations — Pell Grants for Prison Education Programs; Determining the Amount of Federal Education Assistance Funds received by Institutions of Higher Education (90/10); Change in Ownership and Change in Control [Docket ID: ED-2022-OPE-0062] (RIN: 1840-AD54, 1840-AD55, 1840-AD66, 1840-AD69) received November 14, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC–5978. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627) and 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5979. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5980. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic that was declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under section 7071 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2022, pursuant to Public Law 117-103, div. K, title VII, Sec. 7071; (136 Stat. 682); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5982. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination under section 7071 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2022, pursuant to Public Law 117-103, div. K, title VII, Sec. 7071; (136 Stat. 682); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–5983. A letter from the Treasurer, National Gallery of Art, transmitting the National Gallery of Art's Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act) report for FY 2022, including audits, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC–5984. A letter from the Senior Policy Advisor, National Wildlife Refuge System, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2022-2023 Station-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-NWRS-2022-0055; FXRS12610900000-223-FF09R20000] (RIN: 1018-BF66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–5985. A letter from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Self-Regulation of Class II Gaming (RIN: 3141-AA72) received November 16, 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–5986. A letter from the Supervisory Fishery Management Specialist, International Affairs, Trade, and Commerce, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Modification of Deadlines Under the Fish and Fish Product Import Provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act [Docket No.: 221017-0216] (RIN: 0648-BK06) received November 16, 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–5987. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Flight Attendant Duty Period Limitations and Rest Requirements [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0770; Amdt. No.: 121-386] (RIN: 2120-AL41) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5988. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Establishment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; South Central United States [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0436; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ASW-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5989. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Report for Fiscal Year 2019; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5990. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31452; Amdt. No.: 4030] received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5991. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31451; Amdt. No.: 4029] received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5992. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31449; Amdt. No.: 4027] received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5993. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31450; Amdt. No.: 4028] received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5994. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update to Investigative and Enforcement Procedures and General Rulemaking Procedures; Technical Amendments [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1051; Amdt. No.: 13-40A] (RIN: 2120-AK85) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5995. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31453; Amdt. No.: 568] received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5996. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Norway and Oxford, ME [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0903; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ANE-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5997. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-278; Sisters Island, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1153; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-76] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5998. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-26 and V-63; Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-464; and Revocation of the Wausau, WI, Low Altitude Reporting Point; in the Vicinity of Wausau, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0243; Airspace Docket No.: 22-AGL-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–5999. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-380; Emmonak, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0245; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-49] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6000. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-377; Sitka, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0231; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-46] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6001. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-24, V-78, V-181, and V-398; and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-462; in the Vicinity of Watertown, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0248; Airspace Docket No.: 22-AGL-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6002. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Chicago/Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0167; Airspace Docket No.: 22-AGL-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6003. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-266; Juneau, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1106; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-70] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6004. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-371; Kodiak, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0230; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-40] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6005. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-269; Yakutat, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1152; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-72] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6006. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ellsworth, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0132; Airspace Docket No.: 22-ACE-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6007. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Jet Route J-591; Bellingham, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0416; Airspace Docket No.: 21-ANM-30] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6008. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-374; Kotzebue, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0852; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-43] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6009. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T-241; Level Island, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2021-1132; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AAL-66] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6010. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-36; Northcentral United States [Docket No.: FAA-2022-0333; Airspace Docket No.: 22-AGL-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received November 10, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–6011. A letter from the Branch Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Determination Letter Program for Individually Designed Qualified and Section 403(b) Plans (Rev. Proc. 2022-40) received November 16, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. House Resolutions 1378. Resolution 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, adversely; with an amendment (Rept. 117–585). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. Nadler: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5455. A bill to amend the First Step Act of 2018 to permit defendants convicted of certain offenses to be eligible for reduced sentences, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–586). 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. MANN:

H.R. 9357. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require congressional approval of certain actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 9358. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide a review process for adverse national coverage determinations with respect to drug coverage under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 9359. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States more flexibility with respect to using contractors to make eligibility determinations on behalf of the State Medicaid plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 9360. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to certain members of the Armed Forces eligibility to transfer unused Post-9/11 educational assistance to family members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 9361. A bill to establish criminal penalties for failing to inform and warn of serious dangers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCANLON (for herself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 9362. A bill to direct the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics to establish a database with respect to corporate offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEMPOLINSKI:

H.R. 9363. A bill to revise the composition of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution so that all members are individuals appointed by the President from a list of nominees submitted by the leadership of the Congress, to amend the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act to apply the requirements of such Acts to the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.J. Res. 100. A joint resolution to provide for a resolution with respect to the unresolved disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PELOSI:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present Congressional Gold Medals to the United States Capitol Police and others who protected the Capitol on January 6, 2021; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 100; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. AGUILAR:

H. Res. 1494. A resolution permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker; to the Committee on House Administration. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H. Res. 1495. A resolution designating the caucus room in the Cannon House Office Building as the ''Speaker Nancy Pelosi Caucus Room''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H. Res. 1496. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable A. Donald McEachin; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Ms. DEAN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H. Res. 1497. A resolution recognizing the contributions of the Women In Military Service For America Memorial (''the Military Women's Memorial''); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. COLE, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mrs. PELTOLA):

H. Res. 1498. A resolution recognizing National Native American Heritage Month and celebrating the heritages and cultures of Native Americans and the contributions of Native Americans to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

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. MANN:

H.R. 9357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 9358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 9359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 9360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 Clause 14

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 9361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 9362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. SEMPOLINSKI:

H.R. 9363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 1 of article I, and clause 18, section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.J. Res. 100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: ''The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 917: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1111: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 1309: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1379: Ms. ROSS, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1551: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1945: Mr. RYAN of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1959: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2126: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2252: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2489: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 2521: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 2549: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2565: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MANNING, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 2923: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 2974: Mr. MOORE of Utah and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3172: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 3259: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 3425: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3555: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3587: Mrs. PELTOLA.
H.R. 3941: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4185: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.
H.R. 4239: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4277: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4379: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4422: Ms. SEWELL and Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 4601: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4612: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 5008: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 5029: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 5227: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 5232: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 5631: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 5874: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 5888: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5905: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 6008: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 6152: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 6160: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 6161: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 6402: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 6421: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 6492: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 6532: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6544: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 6687: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 6759: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 6852: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6934: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 7079: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 7158: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 7213: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 7249: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 7346: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 7394: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 7474: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 7513: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 7580: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 7687: Mr. JONES and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 7896: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 7902: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 8229: Mr. LIEU, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 8246: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 8352: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 8433: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 8494: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 8524: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 8581: Mr. KATKO, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 8596: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 8616: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. PELTOLA.
H.R. 8637: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CROW, Mr. CASE, and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 8643: Mr. MORELLE and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 8685: Ms. WEXTON and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 8800: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 8868: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 8906: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 8918: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 8943: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 8948: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 8972: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 9020: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 9021: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 9049: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 9059: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 9069: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 9104: Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 9164: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 9202: Mr. TONKO and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 9223: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 9245: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 9247: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 9282: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 9291: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 9314: Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 9334: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 9348: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H. Con. Res. 81: Ms. NORTON.
H. Con. Res. 110: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 174: Ms. STEVENS and Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 404: Mr. TONKO and Mr. STEWART.
H. Res. 922: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H. Res. 1199: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 1390: Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 1397: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 1474: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MAST, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H. Res. 1481: Ms. TITUS and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 1488: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. JONES, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Res. 1493: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 19 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in H.J. Res 100 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2022 No. 183

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon 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, in whom is calmness, peace, and harmony, thank You for flourishing faith and growing love. Keep us from dissension and bring us to the unity of Your power.

Lord, give us the grace to stay on the road of virtuous and godly living. Bring us into an ever deeper understanding of Your will. Give our Senators Your peace and an awareness of Your abiding presence. May they exercise self-control and be faithful in everything they do.

Lord, empower them to cling tightly to their faith in You and to keep their consciences clear. We trust in You and know that You will lead us by Your truth.

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—Resumed

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 8404, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer (for Baldwin) amendment No. 6487, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 6488 (to amendment No. 6487), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 6489 (to amendment No. 6488), to add an effective date.

Mr. LUJÁN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

H.R. 8404

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for millions and millions of Americans, today is a very good day, an important day, a day that has been a long time coming: We are voting to pass the Respect for Marriage Act. Later this afternoon, with a little more bipartisan cooperation, the Senate will vote to pass the Respect for Marriage Act, putting it on the brink of reaching the President's desk.

In many ways, the story of America has been a difficult but inexorable march toward greater equality. Sometimes we have taken steps forward. Other times, unfortunately, we have taken disturbing steps backward. But, today, after months of hard work, after many rounds of bipartisan talks, and after many doubts that we could even reach this point, we are taking a momentous step forward for greater justice for LGBTQ Americans.

Let me summarize how today will proceed. Later this afternoon, per an agreement between both parties, the Senate will hold three rollcall votes on amendments presented by Senators LEE, LANKFORD, and RUBIO. A vote on final passage for the Respect for Marriage Act will be held after that.

Standing here today, with the passage of this legislation, it is impossible not to think of my family. Today, I am wearing the tie I wore at my daughter's wedding, one of the happiest moments in my life. But I also cannot help but recall the harrowing conversation I had with her and her wife a little more than 2 years ago.

In September of 2020, I was in the middle of a family dinner when we received the news that Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg had passed away. I remember that awful feeling around the dinner table, and I distinctly remember the question my daughter and her wife asked: ''Could our right to marry be undone?''

Millions of Americans in same-sex marriages go about their day with this terrible question lurking in the back of their minds. It is scary. It is a scary, but necessary, acknowledgement that, despite all the progress we have made, the constitutional right to same-sex marriage is not even a decade old and exists only by the virtue of a very narrow 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision.

And we all know the Court has changed since that decision. As we have already seen this year, what the Court has decided in the past can be easily taken away in the future.

So today's vote is deeply personal for many of us in this Chamber. It is personal for me, of course. It is personal

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

Printed on recycled paper.

to many of my colleagues and their staff and their families. And while we still have a few more votes to take, today is certainly an occasion for joy and relief.

But as important as today is, let's remember that nothing about this process was certain. Remember—remember—it was our original plan to act on the Respect for Marriage Act in September, shortly after the House voted to pass this bill over the summer with a surprising 47 Republicans voting for the act. We knew this bill was popular.

We knew it was the right thing to do, but what we did not know is whether or not we had enough support, 60 votes, to pass this bill through the Senate. Maybe the votes would materialize if we forced a vote on the floor, but that was highly unlikely. And for a great number of us, for so much of America, this bill was too important to risk failure.

So back in September, when I met with the leaders of this bill in my office—Senators SINEMA and BALDWIN and COLLINS and TILLIS and PORTMAN—they recommended I hold off on a vote because they believed they could secure enough support for this bill.

Many questioned if it was the right thing to do. Many on my side of the aisle felt: Put everyone on record right now. And sometimes, they say, that is the way to go. But at the end of the day, my No. 1 priority is always to get legislation passed through the Senate. So I made the decision to take the risk and to wait.

Today, we have vindication that the wait was well worth it. Pushing Respect for Marriage over the finish line required patience and persistence, and, today, it is paying off.

I want to thank the Senators who brought us this far—Senators SINEMA and BALDWIN, as well as COLLINS and TILLIS and PORTMAN—for their outstanding and relentless work. Their work has been magnificent, and I am so thankful they stayed the course even when success may have seemed elusive.

I also want to acknowledge my Republican colleagues who voted in favor of advancing this legislation. Because of our work together, the rights of tens of millions of Americans will be strengthened under Federal law. That is an accomplishment we should all be proud of.

And, of course, I want to thank all of the advocates, volunteers, and organizers not just for supporting this bill but for everything they have done over the years to make the United States a fairer, more accepting nation for LGBTQ Americans.

Finally, let me finish where I started. Two years after my daughter and her wife questioned if their marriage could be undone, they are now expecting a baby next spring. I want them to raise their child with all the love and security that every child deserves, and the bill we are passing today will ensure their rights won't be trampled upon simply because they are in a same-sex marriage. After this bill passes, they will be the very first people I call.

So thank you to my colleagues who spearheaded this bill. Thank you to my colleagues who have supported this bill. Thank you to the staff and members who worked day and night to find a path forward. And, maybe above all, thank you to the American people, the vast majority of whom have understood that the inexorable march toward equality is what America is all about.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, on a different subject, the omnibus, earlier this morning, I joined with congressional leaders in a meeting with President Biden at the White House in order to discuss the things we must accomplish before the end of the year. We covered a lot of different topics, but there is one I want to focus on right now—passing an omnibus.

Leader MCCONNELL and I have agreed to try and work together to make sure we get a yearlong funding bill done. We hope it can be done this year, and we know that each side is going to have to give in order to send an omnibus to the President's desk as, of course, it needs 60 votes.

Government funding is scheduled to run out on December 16 at midnight. If we don't take action, the results will be a pointless and painful government shutdown. The best option, by far, is for both parties to come to the table and work on a yearlong funding bill, not a continuing resolution. Lurching from one short-term continuing resolution to the next is a terrible and chaotic way to keep the government open, and ultimately it is average Americans who get a raw deal if the government is forced to function with one hand tied behind its back.

And maybe worst of all, a CR is terrible news for our troops in uniform. It will throw their families into great uncertainty and prevent our security force from conducting crucial operations that will keep us safe, particularly in the Indo-Pacific. So unless we want adversaries like the Chinese Communist Party to outmaneuver us militarily, we must pass an omnibus for the sake of our troops and the sake of our national security.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

CHINESE PROTESTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the world's eyes are trained this week on the people of China who appear to be engaged in the largest and most widespread protests against the country's repressive Communist Party government since 1989 and the events of Tiananmen Square.

While most of the rest of the world has learned how to adapt to the coronavirus, mitigate its worst effects, and get on with living our lives, the people of China, where the whole crisis began, are still trapped in a ''Groundhog Day'' of permanent pandemic measures.

Chairman Xi's so-called Zero COVID policy is managing to be both horribly repressive and totally ineffective at the very same time—horribly repressive and totally ineffective at the very same time. They have had unending cycles of punishing lockdowns, repressive quarantines, and mass testing.

Reports and social media posts are flying around the country—like allegations that the government let people burn up in an apartment building fire rather than break quarantine and that a 4-month-old baby girl died because the COVID rules did not allow her to get proper medical treatment. Of course, sadly, none of this is new or an aberration. This is actually perfectly in line with the CCP's long and brutal history.

As in the past, the CCP is failing their citizens and lying about it. When the rest of the world tunes in to World Cup matches, they see cheering crowds. But in China, the broadcasts censor views of the stands to prevent their citizens from seeing unmasked foreigners enjoying actually a normal life.

The people of China have put up with this dystopian state of affairs for nearly 3 years now, and now their patience has ended. Across China's major cities, residents are taking to the streets and speaking out. Local, civil protests are not uncommon in China, but these protests appear to have a different character—more widespread, more bold and brave, more fed up.

Unsurprisingly, demonstrators have received harsh treatment from the authorities who reportedly have beaten protesters and detained a foreign journalist covering the events.

The state media keeps parroting propaganda, but video evidence of the protests and the heavyhanded response is getting through the CCP's ''Great Firewall.'' Thus far, the people have not backed down.

Now, you hear some people suggesting that if a clumsy authoritarian nation is facing such troubles at home, it must pose less of an international threat than we thought. Ah, but this is precisely wrong. Vladimir Putin's previous aggressions against Georgia and Ukraine, its operations in Chechnya and Syria, and now this latest brutal war show exactly how even clumsy and dysfunctional regimes can inflict a terrible toll on free nations and free peoples. Iran, North Korea, and Syria have spent decades proving the very same thing. Of course, China isn't declining; it is continuing to expand and modernize its military power. And Xi and

his CCP constantly show us that their view of denying their own people's freedom at home and disrupting other countries' freedom through the Indo-Pacific has two goals that actually go hand in hand. For thugs and dictators, repression at home and aggression abroad are two sides of the same coin.

So when we see the mismanagement and dysfunction from regimes like Putin's and Xi's, the answer is not—not—for America and our allies to relax our vigilance, pull inward, or pay less attention to our global interests; the answer is to increase our vigilance, redouble our strength, and keep our friends and partners even closer.

The Biden administration's statement yesterday on the Chinese people's protest was actually too tepid. But what we need are not just stronger short-term words but stronger long-term actions and strategies.

The support that America and our friends have provided to Ukraine has not just been an act of philanthropy to an innocent people who deserve help fighting off the invaders; it is also bringing major benefits to the United States and our partners in the most practical terms.

In the course of fighting for their homes and families, the brave people of Ukraine are seriously degrading the abilities of one of the free world's greatest self-appointed adversaries to deal out violence. Putin and other wannabe tyrants the world over are learning that the cost-benefit calculus to bullying and bloodshed doesn't look like they thought it would.

The importance of this deterrence goes beyond just Europe. China has spent decades investing steadily in military technologies that increase threats to U.S. forces and our allies in the region. The CCP has steadily built military installations in the South China Sea, like a bully standing on a street corner, trying to grab control over international waters and shipping lanes. China has spent years methodically building up the very capabilities it would need to seize Taiwan by force if its people refuse to bend the knee, as we have already seen them do in Hong Kong.

So clearly we need to invest in our own strength, in our own alliances, in our own military modernization and defense industrial base.

The United States needs a strong, well-equipped military capable of preserving the strategic advantage and projecting power anywhere in the world. We need allies and partners willing to invest in their own capabilities. We need our private sector and our partners to understand that free peoples ought to be doing more trading among ourselves but be a lot more careful locating their capital and their employees in a repressed country that disregards basic freedoms and steals intellectual property on an industrial scale.

We need a sufficient military industrial base to keep ourselves safe and remain the free world's arsenal—a win-win for our security and for our economy. Among other things, that means rebuilding munitions stockpiles and weapons inventories that have been allowed to atrophy since the end of the Cold War. It means not waiting to arm and train our partners until a bad actor has already started a war. It means not wasting American strength and credibility, as this administration has done by desperately chasing sweetheart deals with Iran and abandoning Afghanistan with no strategy.

Providing for the common defense is one of our basic duties here in Congress. The Democratic leader should have prioritized the National Defense Authorization Act months ago. I am glad we will finally be turning to this essential bill shortly. Strong funding and strong authorization for our national security should never have to be a partisan issue. I know our Democratic friends have internal disagreements about what level of funding our Armed Forces deserve, but Republicans can guarantee this much: Our side will keep standing strong for American security and American strength.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

CLUB Q SHOOTING

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, before the Thanksgiving break, I planned to use my time today to talk about the Respect for Marriage Act, with which the Presiding Officer has had such an important role playing, and I want to congratulate her on the incredible work that she has done to get this over the finish line, because we are on the verge of passing the Respect for Marriage Act in the U.S. Senate. It is a historic piece of legislation to ensure that if a same-sex or interracial couple marries in one State, that every State has to honor that marriage. The Federal Government has to honor that marriage as well.

There may be no right closer to the heart than marrying the one that you love, and Colorado understands that. And I was going to come down here to talk about how, over decades, my State has led the way on equality. We recognized civil unions in 2013. We banned conversion therapy in my State. We passed our own version of the Equality Act in Colorado.

I was going to come down here and tell you about how Colorado understands what equality has come to mean in America in 2022, but in the last week, I have been reminded again just how far we have to go.

Last Sunday, Coloradans woke up to the news that Club Q—a loving, accepting, 20-year old LGBTQ club in Colorado Springs—had been the target of a mass shooting. Five Coloradans were killed, and at least 22 were injured.

In the days since, Coloradans have described Club Q as a center of community building, a place where everyone could be their true selves and live without fear.

Club Q's owner, Nic Grzecka, said he founded the club to ''be that safe place for people to come and feel and understand that they are normal—that the way they feel is normal and there are people just like them.''

As a father, that is what I hope for my three daughters, and, as a former school superintendent, that is what I wish for the children that I worked for. We want our kids to feel normal and loved and like they belong.

But on November 19, these feelings of safety and acceptance that Club Q had built over two decades were shattered. On the same day that we recognized Trans Day of Remembrance, we added more names to the solemn toll in this country, when a violent young man, radicalized by hateful and divisive rhetoric, killed five people and forever changed a community, forever changed my State.

In minutes, he robbed from us brothers and sisters and daughters and sons, friends, and loved ones, who were there just being themselves, not bothering anybody.

He took from us Derrick Rump, a 38-year-old bartender and co-owner of Club Q, who bought groceries for others during the hardest 2 months of the pandemic; Daniel David Aston, 28 years old, a bar supervisor known as the ''master of silliness'' because of his contagious happiness and joy; Kelly Loving, 40 years old, who had just moved to Colorado and was trying to enjoy a weekend trip to Colorado Springs; Ashley Paugh, 35 years old, a devoted mother and nonprofit worker, who loved hunting and fishing, like so many other Coloradans, and was there to support the community; and Raymond Green Vance, 22 years old—22 years old—who grew up in Colorado Springs and had just started a new job and was saving up for his own apartment.

I am thinking of them and their families and all of those who survived this terrible tragedy in Colorado—people who imagined that there was one space that you could go to feel safe, and then this happens.

It fills me with rage that it happened. It fills me with sadness. It should fill the entire Senate with rage and sadness.

And if it weren't for the courage of people like Richard Fierro and Thomas James, the list of names I read, already too long, would have been longer.

Thomas James, a petty officer second class in the Navy, used his military crisis training to help subdue the

attacker. He said he jumped into action because he ''simply wanted to save the family [he] found'' at Club Q.

And Richard Fierro. Richard Fierro, an Iraq and Afghanistan combat veteran, was watching a friend's performance with his wife, daughter, and friends inside the club when the gunfire started, and his protective instincts—Richard's protective instincts from four combat deployments—kicked in. He said he went ''into combat mode.''

No one enjoying a night with their friends and their family should have to go ''into combat mode'' in the United States of America. That is not the country that I grew up in.

It is our country today. It is the country that the pages in this institution are inheriting from us. My daughter's generation and the children I used to work for in the Denver Public Schools, they bear a burden that I never bore growing up in the United States. They have grown up living with a reasonable fear that they could be shot in their classrooms or in their churches or in a grocery store or in a bar that is the one safe place in their community that they could go to.

In 2020—the pages that are here may not know this. In 2020, the leading cause of death for kids in America was guns—guns—not car accidents, not drugs, but guns.

In one study of 29 industrialized countries, the United States accounted for 97 percent of firearm deaths among children 4 years old and younger. That is almost 100 percent of the kids who are dying on planet Earth from gunfire who are 4 years old and younger. What a disgrace. What a disgrace.

We shouldn't need to count on a stranger's bravery when we go to a birthday party. We shouldn't need to count on a stranger's bravery when we go to the grocery store.

It was just last year when I spoke on this floor to remember the lives we lost in Colorado at a King Soopers in Boulder, and it is with unimaginable pain that I am here once again on this floor with a list of names of people who have lost their lives senselessly.

Colorado is hurting. We are tired of this. For more than two decades, we have had to grieve over one incident after another.

So while we stand here on the verge of taking a historic step toward equality—a vitally important step toward equality—we are reminded once again of just how much work is left to do to give our children the safe and accepting future that they deserve, that they want to have, that we are obligated to give them. We haven't finished that work in the U.S. Senate.

Earlier this year, the Supreme Court stripped away the first fundamental right since Reconstruction by overturning a 50-year precedent in Roe v. Wade, and in that decision, the majority took aim at the fundamental right of privacy and, with it, the right of every single American to marry whom they love.

It is a profound reminder—once again, a reminder—to everybody in this body and to the country, that our history has been from the very beginning a battle between the highest ideals that humans have ever written down on the page—the words in the Constitution of the United States—and the worst impulses in human history.

And when a Justice of the Supreme Court writes that if it wasn't a freedom in 1868, it is not a freedom today, we are in that struggle today.

When a 22-year-old can walk into a club and kill 5 people and wound more than 20 people, we are in that struggle today.

The reason we are here today doing the important work that we are doing in the marriage act that we are passing today is that Americans understand that no good comes from hoarding freedoms and equality. They know that when we take the opposite view, we act against our best traditions, against our highest ideals. As a nation, we will never flourish if we choose to depend on a permanent underclass, deprived of some or all of the rights and freedoms others enjoy.

Free people do not remain free by denying freedom to others. Today, the Senate of the United States stands on the precipice of advancing freedom, of advancing equality, of moving us closer to our highest ideals.

But, tomorrow, we have more work to do to live up to the words of our Constitution and to realize the promise of equality for all of our citizens.

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. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6482 TO AMENDMENT NO. 6487

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 6482, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 6482 to amendment No. 6487.

The amendment (No. 6482) is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

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.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, today, as popular winds blow against the man and woman of faith, we should look to the Constitution and remember that ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof . . . '' We do a disservice to all Americans if we elevate the rights of one group at the expense of another.

On the one hand, there is no existing threat to same-sex marriage. It is and will remain legal nationwide regardless of the outcome of this legislation before us, the Respect for Marriage Act. On the other hand, we have current, real, sustained ongoing assaults on religious freedom.

How we proceed today will do nothing to the status quo of same-sex marriage in this country. It is legal and will remain legal regardless of the outcome of this legislation. It will, however, if enacted, have profound consequences for people of faith.

In the wake of the Dobbs decision, proponents of this legislation have conjured up a series of hypothetical scenarios, resulting in an imagined threat to the ability of same-sex couples to marry and enjoy the privileges of marriage.

The rhetorical slippery slope goes something like this: First, they claim that some unknown, unnamed State is on the verge of passing an unknown, yet-to-be-proposed or imagined law prohibiting same-sex marriage. Next, they imagine that Federal district courts will uphold this hypothetical State law despite the crystal-clear direction within the Dobbs and Obergefell opinions from the Supreme Court.

Should that adventure of unlikely hypotheticals transpire, they envision a case making its way all the way up to the Supreme Court of the United States. All of this despite the lack of political will anywhere in the United States to prohibit same-sex marriage.

Should that happen, proponents of this bill contend that there is a nonzero chance that one Justice could decide to analyze the right to marry not through the prism of substantive due process, as it has been since Obergefell was decided in 2015, but rather through the lens of the 14th Amendment's privileges or immunities clause.

Proponents of the bill cite a single line within Justice Thomas's concurring opinion and suggest that one Justice could effectively destroy legal recognition of same-sex marriage not just prospectively but undoing currently legal same-sex marriage.

Now, this is a complete fantasy. I am not aware of a single State in the United States threatening to pass any law infringing the ability of any same-sex couples to marry or enjoy privileges associated with marriage; nor am I aware of a single State threatening to invalidate, within their borders, marriages entered into in other States; nor is it at all clear that Justice Thomas himself was suggesting that Obergefell be overturned. He was suggesting that it be analyzed, like all substantive due process juris prudence, to figure out whether there might be another provision of the Constitution under which it might be more appropriate.

They are attributing to him statements he didn't make. They are attributing to him analysis he didn't even undertake in that one statement regarding the doctrine of stare decisis, and then they are attributing to States intentions they do not have and have not expressed.

My colleagues have yet to offer even a single example of a same-sex marriage threatened by any current or pending State legislation—not one, not a single one—and they intentionally misinterpret Justice Thomas's concurring opinion in Dobbs and claim that the sky is falling. But it is just not happening.

Unfortunately, we are aware of case after case where individuals, charities, small businesses, religious schools, and religious institutions are being hauled into courts to defend themselves for living out their faith. These people are not committing hate crimes against their neighbors. No, they are not abusing peers for their personal choices either.

No, they are being hauled into courts across this country for serving the poor, the needy, and the refugee in compliance with their sincerely held religious beliefs. In Texas, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops is currently being sued for operating in accordance with Catholic beliefs regarding marriage while providing foster homes for unaccompanied minor children.

Now, proponents of this bill claim that these charities will be free to continue to operate. However, in that case, the question is whether, because the Conference of Catholic Bishops receives Federal funding to help with its work, it might be operating under color of law. If accepting grants and licenses from the government makes you an actor under color of law, then many of our religious charities and schools will be threatened by this legislation, which relies on that unnarrowed, undefined phrase. Either the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops can cease operating according to its religious tenets or abandon its God-given mission to care for the refugee.

In at least three other cases, religious childcare service agencies deemed to be acting under color of law are being shut out of foster care and adoption. These religious ministries can either abandon and cease to act according to their convictions, their religious convictions about marriage, or they can abandon the orphan.

This Nation and our orphans rely on these charities. We cannot and must not force that decision on them. That isn't who we are. From the very moment of our founding, we have been a nation that has welcomed people of all beliefs and of no belief at all.

In recent years, the Obama administration, through the U.S. Department of Education, compiled a so-called shame list outlining more than 200 faith-based colleges and universities seeking religious exemptions from title IX guidance on transgender and sex discrimination. It is highly likely that these organizations could also risk losing their 501(c)(3) status.

Considering that we are in the process of hiring 87,000 new agents within the Internal Revenue Service, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that some of these new IRS agents will be deployed specifically to review the tax-

exempt status of some of these traditionally exempt religious schools. These colleges and universities can either cease operating according to their religious convictions or run the risk of losing their ability to provide quality education at reduced prices. We may well find that they will not be able to do both, and that would be a tragedy.

Dr. Andrew Fox created a chaplaincy program at the Austin Fire Department, where he served as the lead chaplain in a volunteer capacity for 8 years, earning the trust and respect of local firefighters. In a personal blog—nothing connected to his work, just a personal blog—Dr. Fox shared his religious views, his religious views specifically regarding marriage.

City officials demanded he recant his statements and apologize for the harm that his blog post allegedly caused. He explained that he intended only to foster discussion and not cause offense, and he apologized if anyone was offended. His apology apparently wasn't enough for city officials who demanded total compliance with their preferred views on marriage, views that didn't embrace his own religious beliefs. They forced Dr. Fox to hand in his uniform. He could keep his job or his beliefs but not both.

We should not be surprised by the current state of affairs. After all, it was abundantly clear during the Obergefell oral argument before the Supreme Court that this threat to religious nonprofits would be forthcoming. The prescient exchange between Justice Alito and then-Solicitor General Donald Verrilli forecasted the present hostility and the corresponding threats to religious organizations.

Justice Alito asked whether, should States be required to recognize same-sex marriages, religious universities could lose their tax-exempt status. His response, the response from Solicitor General Verrilli, was chilling. He said:

> [I]t's certainly going to be an issue. I don't deny that. I don't deny that, Justice Alito. It is going to be an issue.

It is an issue today, and under this legislation it will only get worse tomorrow unless we take affirmative steps to prevent that from happening. And we have the opportunity to do so here, and we shouldn't miss it.

Unlike the hypothetical but entirely nonexistent marriages being threatened or discriminated against, these religious organizations are currently, right now, in court fighting for their God-given and constitutionally protected rights to live and operate according to their beliefs and conscience. They are being targeted and harassed by those who would force them to abandon their convictions and embrace the convictions preferred by the government.

Sadly, the hostages at risk in this standoff are those who have benefited from the charitable work of these institutions: the poor, the hungry, the refugee, the student, and the orphan. Instead of resolving the concern posed by Justice Alito, this legislation will put the weighty thumb of government on the scale against religious organizations and individuals.

Now, they say: Don't worry; you can still believe as you wish. But if, in living out your faith, you offend the views sanctioned by the government, you will suffer the consequences.

What do we get for this heavy sacrifice of religious freedom? Are we alleviating the suffering of same-sex families about to be destroyed by government interference? No. As I have said, we haven't heard of even one potential threat to same-sex marriage, not one. The only outcome we can expect from this legislation is for religious individuals, businesses, and institutions to spend more time and more money defending their God-given rights in court.

In our pluralistic society, we must be willing to compromise and adapt so that we might live peacefully, peaceably with one another. In that spirit of compromise, let us ensure that we are protecting families—both traditional and same-sex families—and that we are protecting the right to believe as we wish and live out those beliefs without government interference. I believe we can do both. In fact, I know we can do both.

Now, the Collins-Baldwin amendment takes a step in the right direction, and I am grateful for that. Rabbis, imams, and pastors should never be forced to perform a marriage contrary to their beliefs. But religious liberty is so much more than marriage. It entails so much more than what might go on within the four walls of a mosque, a synagogue, or a church. It certainly entails and must include the ability of people to practice their faith not only at church but at home and in the public square.

In the hope that we can come to a place where we respect each other, I have offered an amendment to this legislation that would explicitly minimize the threats to these religious organizations and individuals. I am at the table. I am willing to compromise. In the spirit of compromise, I have publicly stated—and I reiterate here again today—that I will support the legislation if my amendment is adopted.

My amendment simply prohibits the Federal Government from discriminating against schools, businesses, and organizations based on their religious beliefs about same-sex marriage. That is all it does. It is very simple, and I am grateful that we are going to have the chance to vote on it later today.

I am also grateful for the work of my friend and colleague Senator DAN SULLIVAN from Alaska, who, working together with several of my other Republican colleagues, helped secure and schedule this vote. I am grateful to him for that effort.

My amendment prevents the Internal Revenue Service, among other things, from revoking the tax-exempt status of these charities and organizations simply because they act according to their beliefs about the divine purpose of marriage. It prevents the Department of Education from targeting schools with honor codes based on the fact that they have got provisions in their honor codes based on religious beliefs.

It protects individuals from being denied business licenses or grants or other statuses based on their views about marriage. It protects Americans who wish to act according to their religious beliefs from being forced to abandon their God-given mandates to love, serve, and care for the poor, the orphan, and the refugee.

If we allow the government to threaten their ability to do so, then the religious liberty of every American is in peril. That is why I would ask those who have doubts about this to reconsider their doubts about my amendment. If they object to my amendment and are inclined to vote against it based on the fact that they regard it as unnecessary, then why not pass it.

This is a legitimate concern—some may argue this—I have been told by many of the bill's sponsors that my amendment is unnecessary because, according to them, the Collins substitute amendment contains protections that already accommodate this concern.

Now, the Collins substitute amendment does, in fact, contain some protections. I am grateful that those were included, and that is a meaningful step in the right direction. I must point out, however, that it doesn't do what my amendment does and therefore doesn't do what many of its proponents are claiming.

Nowhere in that legislation is a statement prohibiting the Federal Government from taking adverse action against an individual or an entity based on a sincere religious belief about same-sex marriage, whether that religious belief is one that embraces or does not embrace same-sex marriage. It does not do that. It instead says that nothing in this act shall be construed to alter or deny any status or benefit of any group. Those are two very different things.

That language does not do what my amendment does. You see, the threat is not and never was based on what the act itself would do. The act doesn't purport to itself deny or alter any status or benefit or right. So by taking that away, they are paying lipservice to the need for my amendment, but they are not actually addressing it.

The threat has been present at least since Obergefell itself was decided for the reasons that prompted Justice Alito to ask then-Solicitor General Verrilli a question about it and the same reasons that prompted Solicitor General Verrilli to acknowledge that it was going to be an issue. Those same reasons exist today. They don't go away because of this legislation. If anything, they are enhanced. The risk is enhanced as a result of this legislation.

That is why this is the perfect opportunity, it is the right opportunity, it may very well be the only opportunity

to make sure that, as we are undertaking a legislative effort to codify rights for one group of Americans, we don't do so in a particularly un-American way; that is, enhance the rights of some at the expense of others. That is not how we roll. That is not how we do things in this country. We can protect both of these interests at the same time, just as we can walk and chew gum.

So for those who would say the Lee amendment isn't necessary because the Collins amendment already takes care of it, that is just not true. And even if it were true, why not accept the Lee amendment anyway? Which begs the question: Why wouldn't anyone want to deny the Federal Government the authority to retaliate against individuals, nonprofits, and other entities based on their sincerely held religious beliefs? Think about that for a minute. Why wouldn't they want to deny that very power from a government that may wield it in a way that is categorically abusive?

For my Republican friends who are sympathetic to the need for my amendment and are going to support it, I would ask that if they support it and if the amendment fails, that you not support the underlying bill, because if you support my amendment, hopefully, presumably, that means it is because you agree that it does something—that it does something necessary. It certainly doesn't counteract, contradict, or undermine the stated purpose of this bill in any way. So if you believe that it is necessary and you are going to vote for it, if it fails, you should oppose passage of this bill unless or until the Lee amendment is adopted.

We could get this done. I understand that it is not going to happen as long as there are at least 10 Republicans willing to join with every Democrat in order to support this legislation. But if even 3 of the 12 Republicans considering support for this legislation in the end—if even 3 of them supporting my amendment would decide not to support the bill unless or until the Lee amendment was added, I am confident—indeed, I am certain—that it could and would ultimately be adopted.

As I said, we must be willing to compromise to protect the interests of all. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which would ensure that all Americans would have certain rights and that their religious beliefs and their moral convictions will be explicitly protected and provide some comfort that Congress is not purposely passing laws that restrict the free exercise of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 6493 TO AMENDMENT NO. 6487

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, on behalf of Senator RUBIO, I call up amendment No. 6493 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), for Mr. RUBIO, proposes an amendment numbered 6493 to amendment No. 6487.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate a private right of action)

Section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 4, is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

''(c) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'State' has the meaning given such term under section 7 of title 1.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 6496 TO AMENDMENT NO. 6487

Mr. LANKFORD. I would like to also call up amendment No. 6496 and ask that it also be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LANKFORD] proposes an amendment numbered 6946 to Amendment No. 6487.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 3, beginning on line 3, strike ''No person acting under color of State law'' and insert ''No State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''

On page 3, line 17, strike ''person'' and insert ''State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''.

On page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

On page 5, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) NO IMPACT ON BENEFITS, STATUS, OR RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to deny or alter any benefit, status, or right (including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense) of any entity or person—

(1) if such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage; or

(2) if such potential denial or alteration would be based in whole or in part on the belief, practice, or observance, of the entity or person about marriage.

On page 6, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(c) NO IMPACT FROM PARTNERSHIPS.—For purposes of this Act, and any amendment made by this Act, no faith-based organization shall be considered to be acting under color of State law on the basis of any partnership the organization entered into with a government.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, in 2015, after the Obergefell decision came down from the Supreme Court, putting same-sex marriage as the law of the land, President Obama made a statement to the country. He came and spoke to the country when there was a lot of heat and a lot of emotion going on around the country around that particular decision. He was supportive of the Obergefell decision, but he made this statement. At that time, President Obama said:

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 [religious] 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.

That is a wise statement from President Obama during that time period to be able to say: There are going to be a lot of views. We as Americans need to have a wide set of conversations about same-sex marriage and about how we revere marriage in general. There are different religious views, different perspectives.

Now we are approaching a bill that will be voted on in just about 2 hours. This bill has a section in it dealing with marriage, and it says it has certain religious protections in it.

As I read the bill initially to be able to check the religious protections that are in it, I was surprised at some things that were in it, and I was surprised at some of the things that were left out. So our team went to work writing an amendment to address the specific issues in this bill. We narrowly tailored this bill for our amendment, and we addressed it. Why? Because we were the only ones who thought there was a problem? Actually, no, we weren't the only ones who saw this bill as a problem dealing with religious liberty. In fact, religious liberty groups all over the country and religious institutions started contacting our office and putting out their own statements in opposition to this bill, saying the bill as currently written, even with the ''religious protections'' in it, does not actually protect the religious liberty of all Americans.

This is just a short list of groups who are in strong opposition to this bill: the Alliance Defending Freedom, the American Association of Christians Schools, CatholicVote, the Center for Urban Renewal and Education, the Centennial Institute, the Christian Employers Alliance, Concerned Women for America, Eagle Forum, the Ethics and Public Policy Center, the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, the Faith and Freedom Coalition, the Family Research Council, the Family Policy Alliance, Focus on the Family, Heritage Foundation, Liberty Counsel, Lifeline Children's Services, the National Religious Broadcasters, the Religious Freedom Institute, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, Samaritan's Purse. The list goes on and on and on of organizations and entities that read through this bill and said there are major concerns with the religious liberty portions of this bill.

Now, I am well aware that there are also groups who have put out a statement and said that they are comfortable with it, that it would protect them, but other organizations are putting out statements and saying: Yeah, that is nice for you, but it actually wouldn't protect us and our members.

There are three major concerns that are in the bill itself under the issue of religious liberty, and if these three things are not changed in this bill, it will put the issue of religious liberty at great risk for millions of Americans who, as President Obama said, hold sincerely held beliefs that are different.

The first is this: There is a section in the very beginning of the bill where it

says any entity that is acting under the color of State law, and then it puts all the restrictions there on them. That is a broadening, actually, of what Obergefell actually did. This says any entity, actually, or individual who is acting under color of state law. What does that mean? Most people don't live in that legal kind of counsel. Well, this would be an entity that a State actually hires to fulfill something for them on behalf of the State.

Let me give you a for-instance on this. A private prison may be one of those examples, but it could also be adoption agencies, foster care agencies. It could be an entity that actually does housing for immigrant and migrant families. It could be a homeless shelter that is contracted by the State to be able to provide services. It could be any number of entities. Many of these entities are actually done by religious organizations that the State actually contracts with them to be able to do those services. In this new statute, if this passes in 2 hours, there would be a new restriction on those religious entities that formally held contracts that then would very well be pushed out from providing those services.

Let me remind you, our Nation functions under not just government operations but cooperation with families and with faith-based entities and nonprofit entities around the country. Our safety net, I talk about often—our first safety net is the families, the second safety net is nonprofit entities, and the third safety net is government. Many governments partner with nonprofit—including faith-based—entities to be able to carry out social services. For those entities, they would now have a target on them because they are functioning under the color of State law, and they would have new restrictions. So their choice would be either not to provide those services or to abandon their faith.

Now, what are the challenges to them in particular in this? Well, the first challenge is that they would face litigation from the Attorney General's Office. The second challenge would be they now face a new what is called a private right of action. That is what the second area my amendment specifically deals with. First, it corrects this looping into lots of new faith-based entities and saying: You are now a State actor; you are under new restrictions. The second one would be this private right of action.

The private right of action would now be—anyone who is functioning ''under the color of State law'' would now be a target from an individual who senses that they have been harmed by the entity. Now, it is not defined—what ''harmed'' means—in this new statute; it just says that if someone feels they have been harmed by it, they would now have the opportunity to be able to sue someone else because of that.

It is not hard for me to be able to say something that is fairly obvious; that is, if Congress creates a new right to sue people, there will be a lot more lawsuits, and there will be new tests and evaluations on that. For anyone who believes that this new right to be able to sue people won't be used and won't be used quickly by lawyers and outside groups all around the country, you are kidding yourself. What will happen in the days ahead, there will be—who knows?—countless numbers of lawsuits testing every new definition of what, under the color of State law, what a partnership with government might look like. Whether that is a vendor who is at an official State event or whether that is an entity that is providing something like a private prison or adoption services, they will all face lawsuits and challenges in the days ahead by entrepreneurial attorneys testing out the limits of this new law.

We don't know what those limits will be determined by the courts. We have no idea because it is not defined what it means when they say they have been harmed and what that definition might mean to different courts around the country. But we do know this is going to be a major issue.

My first question is, Why is this even included in this bill at all? There is already a protection that the State has the opportunity to be able to make sure they are enforcing the law within their State. This new private right of action, though, goes above and beyond that and gives the opportunity for entrepreneurial lawyers to be able to practice their craft at the detriment of entities all over the country.

What it really does is it silences any individual who may disagree and discourages any faith-based entity from cooperating with government; to say, if you want to be able to partner with the State in the area, you probably aren't welcome here because you don't share the same beliefs.

The third big issue that we try to correct in this that is a major problem in this bill is, in the bill, if you actually read from the text 7(a)—now, 7(a) probably means nothing to many people outside this room, but the 7(a) section is designed to be able to protect the rights of individuals or entities not to be able to lose their nonprofit status or grants or contracts or whatever it may be, but it has very specific language that is built into this. The specific language is, if that benefit or right does not arise from a marriage. It is very carefully written.

When I passed it around to different attorneys to say what does it mean, it has been fascinating to me to learn different interpretations of this statute. This particular section 7(a) is written so vague that it is very difficult to understand what it does mean, but it is very clear what it doesn't mean.

When it says all these different rights that have been granted based on does not arise from a marriage, it doesn't include your belief about marriage. It just says does not rise from a marriage.

Why do I say that? Our amendment actually includes the belief about marriage included into it to make it very, very clear that if you have a different belief about marriage, you won't lose your nonprofit status, you won't lose your opportunity to have grants or contracts, but that is not included in this statute.

What is included in the statute is just does not arise from a marriage. That will be a problem in the courts and, unfortunately, that will have to be litigated until that is actually determined what it would mean.

What we could do instead is pass my amendment. The amendment makes it very clear. What I hear from even some of the bill's sponsors is they say: No, this is what it is intended to mean. I look at it and say: That is not what it actually says.

So let's have that section say what you actually intended for that to say to make it clear. Let's take away the private right of action so that people around the country aren't perpetually worried about a lawsuit coming at them constantly. Let's take away this under the color of law section so that there is not a fear of faith-based nonprofits not partnering with their own government for fear government would step in and say: Oh, if you are going to partner with us, then you have to surrender these different beliefs.

Again, I have had individuals who are sponsors of this bill say none of those things are what we intend. But courts don't rule on intentions of Congress; they rule on the text that we actually put out.

Those are three major problems in this text. If they are not corrected and if they are not corrected today, my fear is President Obama's statement of just 7 years ago that we would not ''recognize different viewpoints [and] revere our deep commitment to religious freedom'' would today be ignored.

I encourage the adoption of my amendment, and I encourage everyone in this body to ask a very simple question of themselves: Is today about respecting the rights of all or is it about silencing some and respecting others?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of the Respect for Marriage Act. I want to summarize my remarks, though, and ask unanimous consent that my full remarks be printed in today's RECORD.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. The Supreme Court declared same-sex marriage as a constitutional right way back in 2015, and the overwhelming majority of Americans support that group. According to Gallup, over 70 percent of Americans believe same-sex marriage should be recognized as valid under law, including a majority of Republicans.

Despite this strong support, the U.S. Code does not reflect that consensus in America. Current legislation allows States and the Federal Government to

refuse to recognize valid same-sex marriages. While it is true the Supreme Court has held this law is not enforceable, it still represents Congress's last word on the subject. The American people rightly expect their elected representatives to bring our laws in line with their beliefs. That is part of what this legislation does.

It is time for the Senate to settle the issue. The Respect for Marriage Act, which passed the House with overwhelming partisanship support, including the support of 46 Republicans on the House side, 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 other States if they move. This is all in accordance with well-established Supreme Court precedence.

Settling this issue is well within the constitutional authority of us here in Congress. After all, the full faith and credit clause is part of our Constitution.

Since the bipartisan passage of this bill by the House of Representatives earlier this year, in response to concerns over religious liberty, this already narrow bill has been significantly amended in the Senate to include robust religious liberty protections. By working collaboratively on a bipartisan basis with religious liberty scholars; faith organizations; Senate colleagues, including some I see on the floor here today; and other stakeholders, we have developed a substitute amendment that contains important protections for people of faith. It has five key changes to the underlying bill.

Remember, this is a bill that already passed the House with 46 Republican supporters, but these are religious liberty provisions that we have added to it.

First, it has an express acknowledgement that decent and honorable people hold diverse views about the role of gender and marriage and that such people and their beliefs are due respect. This is an important statement that has implications that protect religious liberty.

Second, it explicitly protects all existing religious liberty and conscience protections under the First Amendment and Federal laws including the powerful protections provided by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

Third, it guarantees that this bill cannot be used to target or deny benefits, including tax-exempt status, grants, contracts, educational funding, licenses, accreditation, certification, and many others because a person or organization holds a traditional belief about marriage. This protects everything from the tax status of religious nonprofits to the accreditation of religious schools, to the contracts between faith-based adoption providers and the government from being attacked using this bill.

Fourth, it ensures that nonprofit religious organizations, including churches, mosques, synagogues, religious schools, and others cannot be required to provide facilities, goods, or services for marriage ceremonies or celebrations against their will.

Fifth, it has an explicit prohibition on the recognition of polygamous marriages.

These religious liberty provisions are significant and they are meaningful and they have earned the endorsement of important faith groups. In a joint letter to the Senate, eight different faith-based organizations, including the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, also known as the Mormon Church; the Seventh-Day Adventist Church; the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities; the Center for Public Justice; the AND Campaign; the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance; and the 1st Amendment Partnership—all of them concluded that our religious liberty amendments ''[protect] 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.'' And they said: ''If passed, it would continue to build on the congressional wisdom represented by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993.'' So that is what these religious groups—that is what they say about it. They helped write the language.

A group of leading religious liberty scholars and advocates for religious liberty have analyzed the bill, and they have reached the same conclusion. These scholars include, by the way, Professor Doug Laycock, who argued on behalf of faith groups and won two foundational religious liberty cases before the U.S. Supreme Court. On balance, a group of these distinguished professors determined that this bill is an ''advance for religious liberty'' because, as they say, the ''protections are important.''

Notwithstanding these important protections and the opinion of leading experts in the field, the critics of this bill continue to level accusations about what this bill does that are simply not accurate.

First, some critics claim this bill provides grounds for the IRS or other government bodies to revoke the tax-exempt status or other benefits from religious organizations that adhere to traditional views on marriage. This couldn't be further from the truth. Section 7(a) of our amendment actually expressly forbids the outcome that these critics are warning of. It prohibits the use of the bill to target the tax-exempt status, certification, accreditation, grant, funding, loan, license, or any other nonmarital status, right, or benefit of religious organizations. To quote Professor Laycock's analysis:

> 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.

In addition to the statutory prohibition, this amendment contains a clear statement from Congress, again, that diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage, including the belief that marriage is between one man and one woman, come from decent and honorable premises and are due respect. This congressional statement distinguishes the belief that marriage should be between a man and a woman from the belief that interracial marriage is wrong. This distinction is important, and rather than portraying those who believe in traditional marriage as bigots, reflects a national policy that respects diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage, while also protecting the rights of same-sex married couples, and that is the key.

Second, some critics argue that this bill will lead to more litigation between ''institutions and individuals trying to live according to their sincerely held religious beliefs.'' This is also false. The bill only governs the conduct of State actors and contains no litigation tools that would be used against private religious entities acting in a private capacity, even the ones that receive the majority of their funding from the State. To quote, again, from Professor Laycock's analysis, the Respect for Marriage Act and our bipartisan substitute amendment ''poses little or no new risk to religious liberty beyond those that already exist.''

Third, some critics continue to make the bewildering argument that this bill will lead to legalized and recognized polygamy. Again, this has no grounding in reality. No State allows bigamy or polygamy, and this bill does not change this. Moreover, our amendment explicitly says now:

> Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to require or authorize Federal recognition of marriages between more than 2 individuals.

Finally, some critics argue this bill is deficient because it does not contain new enforceable rights for private businesses and other entities beyond the scope of this bill. This bill, as legal scholars and many faith groups agree, poses no new risks to religious organizations, while containing significant benefits and protections for people of faith.

Of course, this bill does not cover or address every lawsuit or dispute that may arise between LGBTQ and religious interests, but it does address the disputes that could arise because of this bill.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to look carefully at the new religious liberty provisions. Take a look at it. I hope you will be able to support the Respect for Marriage Act. The substitute amendment is a carefully negotiated, well-crafted piece of legislation that protects people of faith as well as same-sex married couples. A statement in a recent letter from the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities accurately states that our amendment

''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.''

I think that is the major point here. They can coexist. That is what our legislation proves. That is why it deserves the support, in my view, of our colleagues.

So I urge them to join me in taking this path forward to pass this bill with the same overwhelming bipartisan support we saw in the House of Representatives. The American people want us to settle this issue and millions of American couples who are married, including many in Ohio, are counting on us to recognize and protect their marriage and give them the peace of mind that they deserve.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of the Respect for Marriage Act. I hope the Senate will pass this important legislation today.

The Supreme Court declared that same-sex marriage is a constitutional right in 2015 and the overwhelming majority of Americans support this view. According to Gallup, over 70 percent of Americans believe that same-sex marriage should be recognized as valid by the law, including a majority of Republicans.

Despite this vast support, the U.S. Code does not reflect the American consensus. Current legislation allows States and the Federal Government to refuse to recognize valid same-sex marriages. While it is true that the Supreme Court has held that this law is not enforceable, it still represents Congress's last word on the subject. The American people rightly expect their elected representatives to bring our laws in line with their beliefs.

It is time for the Senate to settle the issue. The Respect for Marriage Act, which passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support, simply allows interracial or same-sex couples who were validly married under the laws of one State, to know their marriage will be recognized by the Federal Government and by other States if they move in accordance with established Supreme Court precedent.

This short, narrow bill has two main effects, both of which are well within the constitutional authority of Congress.

First, it ensures that marriages legally performed in one State are recognized as valid in other States, regardless of sex or race. This is a straightforward application of the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution.

Under this clause, States are required to recognize things like court judgments and public records from other States. This bill will simply clarify that marriage is one of the 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 marriage and leaves that decision to the States, where it properly belongs.

As you can see, this bill is extremely narrow, it is constitutional, and it does not infringe on State sovereignty. This is a bill that simply ensures, as a matter of statutory law, that interracial and same-sex marriages that were legal in the State they were performed will be recognized if the couple moves to a different State.

In response to concerns over religious liberty, since the bipartisan passage by the House of Representatives earlier this year, this already narrow bill has been significantly amended in the Senate to include robust religious liberty protections. By working collaboratively on a bipartisan basis with religious liberty scholars, faith organizations, colleagues, and other stakeholders, we have developed a substitute amendment that contains important protections for people of faith. This amendment contains five key changes to the underlying bill.

First, it contains an express acknowledgment that decent and honorable people hold diverse views about the role of gender in marriage and that such people and their beliefs are due respect.

Second, it explicitly protects all existing religious liberty and conscience protections under the First Amendment and Federal laws, including the powerful protections provided by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

Third, it guarantees that this bill cannot be used to target or deny benefits—including tax-exempt status, grants, contracts, educational funding, licenses, accreditation, certification, and many others—because a person or organization holds a traditional belief about marriage. This protects everything from the tax status of religious nonprofits, to the accreditation of religious schools, to the contracts between faith-based adoption providers and governments from being attacked using this bill.

Fourth, it ensures that nonprofit religious organizations, including churches, mosques, synagogues, religious schools, and others cannot be required to provide facilities, goods, or services for marriage ceremonies or celebrations against their will.

Fifth, it contains an explicit prohibition on the recognition of polygamous marriages.

These religious liberty provisions are significant, they are meaningful, and they have earned the endorsement of important faith groups that hold to an understanding that marriage is between one man and one woman. In a joint letter to the Senate, eight different faith-based organizations—including the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, otherwise known as the Mormon Church; the Seventh-Day Adventist Church; the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; the Council for Christian Colleges & Universities; the Center for Public Justice; the AND Campaign; the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance; and the 1st Amendment Partnership—concluded that the religious liberty amendment ''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'' and that, ''if passed, it would continue to build on the congressional wisdom represented by the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993.''

This view is not limited to faith groups. A group of leading religious liberty scholars have analyzed the bill and reached the same conclusion. These scholars include Professor Doug Laycock, who argued and won two foundational religious liberty cases before the Supreme Court. He argued on behalf of faith groups in the case Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, the premier case on unconstitutional religious targeting, and Hosanna-Tabor, the leading case on the hiring rights of religious organizations. He won both unanimously.

Professor Laycock was joined by Professor Thomas Berg, Professor Carl Esbeck, and Professor Robin Fretwell Wilson in his analysis of the bill. Professor Berg has advocated for religious liberty in briefings before the Supreme Court, including in Fulton v. City of Philadelphia to defend the rights of faith-based adoption agencies. Professors Esbeck and Wilson have themselves authored briefs and influential texts on religious liberty. On balance, these distinguished professors determined that this bill is an ''advance for religious liberty'' because the ''protections are important and [] any new risks it creates are quite limited.''

Notwithstanding these important protections and the opinion of leading experts on the issues, the critics of this bill continue to level incorrect accusations about what this bill does. I want to take a moment to respond to three arguments that opponents have made.

First, some critics claim that this bill provides grounds for the IRS or other government bodies to revoke the tax-exempt status or other benefits from religious organizations that adhere to traditional views on marriage. This couldn't be more wrong. Section 7(a) of the amendment expressly forbids the outcomes that the critics are warning of. It prohibits the use of this bill to target the tax-exempt status, certification, accreditation, grant, funding, loan, license or any other nonmarital status, right, or benefit of religious organizations. To quote Professor Laycock's analysis: ''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.''

In addition to this statutory prohibition, this amendment contains a clear

statement from Congress that diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage—including the belief that marriage is between one man and one woman—come from decent and honorable premises and are due respect. This congressional statement distinguishes the belief that marriage should be between a man and a woman from the belief that interracial marriage is wrong. This distinction is important, and rather than portraying those who believe in traditional marriage as bigots, reflects a national policy that respects diverse beliefs about the role of gender in marriage, while also protecting the rights of same-sex married couples.

Second, some critics argue that this bill will lead to more litigation against ''institutions and individuals trying to live according to their sincerely held religious beliefs.'' This is also false. This bill only governs the conduct of State actors and contains no new litigation tools that could be used against private religious entities acting in a private capacity, even ones receiving the majority of their funding from the State. To quote again from Professor Laycock's analysis, the Respect for Marriage Act and our bipartisan substitute amendment ''poses little or no new risk to religious liberty beyond those that already exist.''

Third, some critics continue to make the bewildering argument that this bill could lead to legalized and recognized polygamy. This has no grounding in reality. No State allows bigamy or polygamy, and this bill does nothing to change this. Moreover, our amendment explicitly says that ''Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to require or authorize Federal recognition of marriages between more than 2 individuals.'' No court would entertain the fanciful arguments suggested by critics that a man married to multiple women is somehow not engaged in polygamous marriage.

Finally, some critics argue that this bill is deficient because it does not contain new enforceable rights for private business or other entities that apply beyond the scope of this bill. This is not a fair criticism. This bill—as legal scholars and many faith groups agree—poses no new risks to religious organizations, while containing significant benefits and protections for people of faith. Of course, this bill does not cover or address every lawsuit or dispute that may arise between LGBT and religious interests, but it does address the disputes that could arise because of the bill.

Having addressed these erroneous arguments and criticisms, I also want to take a moment to address the three amendments that we will vote on today. None of the amendments that we are voting on solve perceived problems created by this bill. As I just described, this bill is narrow, it provides no new risks to religious organizations, and it contains important protections for people of faith.

Senator LEE's amendment provides new affirmative rights that allow people to sue the government—including lawsuits for money damages—if the government discriminates against their beliefs about marriage in any number of ways. Now, because of the significant protections and prohibitions that we have added, none of the discrimination contemplated by Senator LEE could occur because of the Respect for Marriage Act. In other words, this new right proposed by the Lee amendment goes far beyond the scope of the bill before us and seeks to address harms and resolve disputes that are not created by the Respect for Marriage Act. Although I disagree with Senator LEE that his amendment solves any potential problem created by the Respect for Marriage Act, I support the overall goal of providing a defense to discrimination in other contexts. I, therefore, will vote in favor of this amendment.

Senator LANKFORD and Senator RUBIO have proposed separate amendments, both which remove the private right of action from this bill. I do not support this change. It does not fix any alleged problem created by this bill or improve it in any way. A private right of action is a common way for Congress to allow Americans to enforce their statutory rights. It simply allows someone to go to court and to receive a judgment if they have been harmed. To illustrate just how common it is, Senator LEE's amendment that I just discussed—and will support—also provides a cause of action.

There is no reason to strip the private right of action from this bill because it is extremely narrow and cannot be used against anyone acting in a private capacity. It also cannot be used to obtain money damages. This provision simply allows someone to get a court order requiring a State actor to recognize their valid marriage. Contrary to the claims of some critics, it absolutely does not allow lawsuits against private parties simply because they contract or receive funding from the government.

The right of action is a necessary enforcement mechanism for this bill and removing it could leave those who have their rights under this law violated without a remedy. In other words, it undermines the very purpose of this bill. I will not support the Lankford or Rubio amendments for this reason.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to look carefully at the new religious liberty provisions and to support the Respect for Marriage Act. The substitute amendment is a carefully negotiated, well-crafted piece of legislation that protects people of faith as well as same-sex married couples. A statement in a recent letter from the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities captures my views precisely, and so I will directly quote from it: This amendment ''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.''

I urge my colleagues to join me in taking this path forward and to pass this bill with the same overwhelming bipartisan support that we saw in the House of Representatives. The American people want us to settle this issue once and for all. Millions of American married couples, including many in Ohio, are counting on us to recognize and protect their marriage to give them the peace of mind they deserve. We shouldn't let them down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. My days since the first cloture vote on the Respect for Marriage Act, as amended, have involved a painful exercise in accepting admonishment and fairly brutal self-soul-searching—entirely avoidable, I might add, had I simply chosen to vote no.

The Bible teaches that marriage is between one man and one woman. I accept God's Word, including God's Word as to the definition of marriage. I support my church's adherence to that Biblical pronouncement. I support Wyoming statute which codifies that definition. I find solace in people and organizations that share my beliefs.

I, and many like me, have been vilified and despised by some who disagree with our beliefs. They do not withhold bitter invective. They use their own hateful speech to make sure that I and others who believe as I do know that we are hated and despised by them. Americans on the other side of this issue can relate to ill treatment as well.

So why have I strayed with such anguish from a path that conforms to my beliefs, my instruction, my faith, to vote for the Respect for Marriage Act? The answer to that question lies in our history, in how we got here as a nation and as a people, and in where we are as a nation and as a people today.

In the 1600s, colonizers Roger Williams of Rhode Island and William Penn of Pennsylvania cited Scripture and the Protestant reformers to defer to God as the judge of conscience.

Williams referred to religious liberty as ''liberty of the soul.'' The charter of the Colony of Rhode Island required religious tolerance, ''that all may . . . freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments.''

George Whitefield's groundbreaking message, without which these United States never would have come into being, emphasized an individual's personal relationship with God, where previously the individual deferred to the church. These became foundational for our current American approach to the relationship between church and state.

In 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court, in its Obergefell decision, established a constitutional right to same-sex unions, using the term ''marriage.''

Tens of thousands of same-sex American couples have married in reliance on that Supreme Court decision.

The term ''marriage'' now has two meanings: the Biblical and the secular. The Respect for Marriage Act, by design, references neither definition. It uses the term ''individuals.'' The act recognizes that both definitions exist and codifies that a marriage legally entered in one State will be legally accepted by the others. Further, the act provides protection from persecution by a government authority toward a church and its organizations of religious instruction that adhere only to the Biblical definition.

These are turbulent times for our Nation. Americans address each other in more crude and cruel terms than ever in my lifetime. It is jarring and unbecoming of us as human beings. It is highly intolerant, and, frequently, the most so when expressed by those who advocate for tolerance. Many of us ask ourselves: Our Nation is so divided. When will this end, and how will it end?

Just as when our Nation was founded, when the New World tore itself from the old, people of diverse faiths, beliefs, and backgrounds had to come to terms with each other, had to tolerate the seemingly intolerable about each other's views, and had to respect each other's rights, even before the Constitution enumerated those rights. They had to tolerate each other in order to survive as a nation. Somehow, most certainly with divine guidance, they did.

For the sake of our Nation today and its survival, we do well by taking this step, not embracing or validating each other's devoutly held views but by the simple act of tolerating them. And that explains my vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, before I begin my remarks, let me commend the Senator from Wyoming for her very moving and perceptive comments. I was very glad to be here on the Senate floor to witness her speech, which I think imparts valuable lessons for all of us to follow.

I rise today in support of the Respect for Marriage Act, which would ensure that all married couples—including same-sex and interracial couples—are entitled to the rights and responsibilities of marriage, regardless of the State in which they live.

Let us remember that we are talking about our family members, our neighbors, our coworkers, our friends. I am proud to have stood—and I will continue to stand—with them in the efforts to secure their rights, while also steadfastly protecting and respecting religious liberty.

With regard to marriage equality, the Respect for Marriage Act accomplishes two primary goals. First, it would guarantee that a valid marriage between two individuals in one State is recognized by other States, regardless of the couple's sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin.

Second, it would require the Federal Government to recognize valid marriages between two individuals.

Our bill is also noteworthy, however, for the way that it advances the cause of religious liberty. Indeed, the substitute amendment that Senator BALDWIN and I introduced with Senators PORTMAN, SINEMA, and TILLIS, unambiguously adds significant religious liberty and conscience protections to the legislation.

These protections were developed in consultation with and have been endorsed by a wide array of faith-based groups. These include the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the National Association of Evangelicals, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, the AND Campaign, the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance, the Center for Public Justice, and the 1st Amendment Partnership.

Every single one of these entities believes that marriage is between a man and a woman—every single one of them. They support the religious liberty provisions in the substitute because these provisions provide important safeguards against government retaliation, as well as meaningful recognition of their beliefs embodied in public policy.

Prominent constitutional scholars agree. In a letter led by Professor Douglas Laycock of the University of Virginia School of Law, four constitutional scholars who have long advocated for religious liberty have concluded that the substitute amendment is ''an advance for religious liberty.'' They call it a ''good and important step for the liberty of believers to follow their traditional views of marriage.''

Now, let me address some of the unfounded criticisms of our amendment. It has been suggested by some that the amended Respect for Marriage Act would somehow demean individuals who have traditional views on marriage. To the contrary, this legislation would explicitly recognize in Federal law, for the first time, that such views and the people who hold them are ''due proper respect.'' It reads:

> 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. Therefore, Congress affirms that such people and their diverse beliefs are due proper respect.

This finding directly rebuts the claim that the bill can be construed to establish a public policy against people of faith. It does precisely the opposite.

Opponents point to the example of an institution that lost its tax-exempt status on the basis of racially discriminatory policies that were contrary to public policy. That analogy ignores the important finding in our bill.

As Professor Laycock and his colleagues explained, ''explicit congressional affirmation that the traditional male-female definition of marriage is 'reasonable' and 'honorable' would counter the analogy to racism and weaken the grounds for relying on Bob Jones''—that is a Supreme Court case—''to justify rejecting traditionalist believers' religious-freedom claims.''

Despite this strong policy statement, some have continued to argue that the Respect for Marriage Act, with the substitute amendment, could still somehow be used to deprive religious organizations of their tax-exempt status. We have heard that on the floor today. This is simply false.

To avoid any ambiguity, the amendment states in section 7(a) that this bill cannot be used to deny or alter such status, as well as the ''tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense.''

In light of these provisions, the constitutional scholars concluded that ''those who claim that the bill would be used as a ground for denying tax-exempt status to organizations adhering to male-female marriage . . . are disregarding the statutory text.'' The very text of our bill would prohibit that.

Opponents of this legislation are also mistaken in asserting that it would provide new grounds on which to sue churches, nonprofit religious organizations, and people of faith based on their religious beliefs. This, too, is inaccurate.

The bill simply requires government actors to recognize valid marriages and provide marriage-based rights to which married couples are entitled, and it provides a way to pursue claims against those government actors only in instances where that recognition is denied. Government actors are already required to recognize same-sex marriages under the Supreme Court's decision in Obergefell, and the enforcement provisions in our amendment do not apply to individuals or religious organizations who are not government actors.

As the 1st Amendment Partnership, an organization dedicated to protecting religious freedom for Americans of all faiths, wrote in its analysis, ''if you cannot be sued now under Obergefell, then you still can't be sued under the'' Respect for Marriage Act.

Of course, providing a way to pursue rights in court when those rights are unlawfully denied is not unusual. Indeed, other amendments filed to this legislation contain private causes of action. The amendment offered by our colleague from Utah, Senator LEE, ironically would empower individuals to bring lawsuits even on the basis of ''threatened violation[s].''

Notably, not only would the amended Respect for Marriage Act not diminish or abrogate any religious liberty or

conscience protection, it also would provide affirmative protections and litigation defenses for people and organizations of faith that do not exist under current law.

For instance, the amendment contains an affirmative protection that prohibits any religious nonprofit organization—including churches, synagogues, temples, mosques, religious schools, and faith-based social agencies—from being forced to provide goods, services, or accommodations in connection with the solemnization or celebration of a marriage against their beliefs. Moreover, the legislation flatly prohibits any litigation for such a denial.

The leader of one religious group recently wrote that our legislation, as amended, ''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.''

I agree, and that is what our bill does. It advances the rights of couples—same-sex and interracial couples—who are married to one another, and it advances religious liberty.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important and historic step forward for religious liberty and for ensuring the dignity and respect for all Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes before the rollcall begins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am glad that I am on the floor today to hear the previous speakers. I think Senator COLLINS of Maine gave a thoughtful presentation about the substance of this bill and addressed many of the worries and criticisms that were raised on the floor earlier.

I think one thing stuck with me: If there is a protection under Obergefell, it is the same protection under this bill. It is not an expansion of rights.

But I also want to thank the Senator from Wyoming. That was an outstanding statement. It really was, and I join Senator COLLINS in commending her for saying it. I am sure her position has not been an easy one at home, but it reflects some thoughtful consideration on her part. Most importantly, it reflects her appeal to us in this Chamber and to the Nation to really seize this opportunity for tolerance. If there was ever a time when we needed more of that in this Nation, I can't imagine when it was. We need it now more than ever.

It wasn't but just a few days ago that there was a mass shooting involving those who were at a gay nightclub, and innocent people were killed. Now, more than ever, we need to stand up and say there needs to be tolerance in America, and her statement really touched my heart. I thank her so much for coming to the floor and delivering it.

I take a look at this and say many times I have been critical of Supreme Court Justices, particularly Supreme Court Justice Thomas. We disagree more than we agree. But I, in a way, have to be grateful to him for bringing us to this moment because it was his statement in the Hobbs decision about the possibility of raising questions on other Supreme Court decisions that led us to the introduction of this Respect for Marriage Act.

I thank the Senators who led in that effort. I want to make sure that the RECORD reflects Senator BALDWIN, Senator COLLINS, Senator PORTMAN, who spoke on the floor earlier, and Senator SINEMA and Senator TILLIS, the original cosponsors—bipartisan cosponsors—of the Respect for Marriage Act.

What we are considering here is very fundamental. I went back to read Obergefell, and what Justice Kennedy wrote in that majority opinion was the acknowledgement that there is a constitutional protection based on due process and equal protection under the laws for same-sex marriage—fundamental. He said we don't have to wait on the legislature to spell this out; it already exists. And that, to me, says how powerful this issue is.

My wife and I are blessed to have so many friends who are in same-sex marriages and are wonderful people in so many respects. It has really opened our eyes to the reality of life for so many good Americans who simply want to have the opportunity under the law to marry the people they love.

The vast majority of Americans believe in that. I do, and I think what we are trying to do today is to protect that right as best we can. Maybe what we are doing is not as expansive as Obergefell, but it is a genuine good-faith effort.

Senator LEE, in his amendment, claims that it is necessary for his amendment to protect religious liberty. But he ignores the robust protections for religious liberty already in the Respect for Marriage Act.

The bipartisan substitute has been quoted over and over, but it bears repeating:

> 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.

Of course, the free exercise of religion must be protected. No one disputes that, and that is why the bipartisan substitute amendment makes clear that this bill does not override existing religious freedom protections.

I commend those religious organizations that have stepped forward, read this bill carefully, and supported it publicly. It is across the political spectrum and religious spectrum of America. I think they understand the lengths that we went—those of us who supported it, as well as those who wrote it—in putting in provisions to protect the free exercise of religion.

But we must remember that this critical First Amendment right is a shield, not a sword. It cannot and must not be wielded to discriminate against individuals solely based on whom they love. We have seen too many who have tried to turn this crusade the wrong way. I hope today's vote on the U.S. Senate floor makes it clear that we are here to protect civil rights and not enable civil rights violations. We need to protect LGBTQ families and ensure that same-sex marriages are offered the same stability and dignity that all marriages are entitled to.

For these reasons, I oppose Senator LEE's amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 6482

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 6482, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

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

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 6482.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 359 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Casey	Hassan
Bennet	Collins	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Coons	Hickenlooper
Booker	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Brown	Duckworth	Kaine
Cantwell	Durbin	Kelly
Cardin	Feinstein	King
Carper	Gillibrand	Klobuchar

Leahy	Peters	Stabenow
Luján	Reed	Tester
Markey	Rosen	Van Hollen
Menendez	Sanders	Warner
Merkley	Schatz	Warren
Murphy	Schumer	Whitehouse
Murray	Shaheen	Wyden
Ossoff	Sinema	
Padilla	Smith	

NOT VOTING—3

Sasse	Toomey	Warnock

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 49. The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 6482) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 6496

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 6496, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this amendment is very, very narrowly tailored. It is in response to the bill. I have talked to several of the bill's sponsors, and they have told me their intent is to be able to protect religious liberty, which I appreciate that to be able to have a balanced perspective in this particular bill because people of good will on both sides have disagreements in this area.

The problem is, there are three certain areas of the text that do not actually meet that standard of being a balanced protection. So this amendment goes into those three areas and corrects the text to make sure it actually says it is going to protect religious liberty. It is three areas.

One is a very wide perspective of operating under the color of State law. That has a very broad net on it. We tried to be able to correct that one.

The second one deals with striking the private right of action on this, which will dramatically increase the number of lawsuits. I can assure you, if Congress passes a law that opens up a new lane for lawsuits, there will be lots of new lawsuits in that area.

The third area is in 7(a), where it talks about protecting all these rights if it does arise from a marriage, not from a belief in a marriage. So we are trying to correct that text to make sure it is not just the action of marriage but also the belief of marriage.

That is what this amendment does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Senator LANKFORD's amendment would eliminate the only practical recourse for same-sex and interracial couples to protect their marriages under the Respect for Marriage Act. It would create an exemption far beyond current law for partnerships between government and faith-based organizations, the latter of which continue to enjoy robust religious liberty and conscience protections that remain intact under the Respect for Marriage Act.

This amendment would upend a carefully negotiated, bipartisan compromise that protects the interests of religious organizations and individuals while affording the dignity of marriage recognition to same-sex and interracial couples. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

I yield back.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 6496

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 6496.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 360 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—52

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

NOT VOTING—3

Sasse	Toomey	Warnock

The amendment (No. 6496) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 6493

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Under the previous order, there is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 6493, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD, for the Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time.

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

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 6493.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 361 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—52

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

NOT VOTING—3

Sasse	Toomey	Warnock

The amendment (No. 6493) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendment Nos. 6488 and 6489 are withdrawn, amendment No. 6487 is agreed to, the cloture motion with respect to H.R. 8404 is withdrawn, and the bill is considered read a third time.

The amendments (No. 6488 and 6489) were withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 6487) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on passage of H.R. 8404, as amended.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8404, the Respect

for Marriage Act. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Senate companion version of this measure, S. 4556, which has been introduced by Senator FEINSTEIN.

The House passed this legislation by a bipartisan vote of 267 to 157 in July 2022, and the Senate is now poised to pass this legislation with a strong bipartisan vote as well.

In 2010, Maryland began to recognize out-of-state same-sex marriages that were legally performed in other States. And in 2012, Governor Martin O'Malley signed a law guaranteeing Marylanders the freedom to marry regardless of their gender, which was later upheld and confirmed by the voters of Maryland in a statewide referendum.

In 2015, the Supreme Court held in the case of Obergefell v. Hodges that the Constitution protected the right of same-sex couples to marry and therefore granting this right nationwide. Let me quote just a few passages from this historic decision, written by Justice Anthony Kennedy more than seven years ago: ''Especially against a long history of disapproval of their relationships, this denial to same-sex couples of the right to marry works a grave and continuing harm. The imposition of this disability on gays and lesbians serves to disrespect and subordinate them. And the Equal Protection Clause, like the Due Process Clause, prohibits this unjustified infringement of the fundamental right to marry.''

Justice Kennedy concluded in part that: ''No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family. In forming a marital union, two people become something greater than once they were. As some of the petitioners in these cases demonstrate, marriage embodies a love that may endure even past death. It would misunderstand these men and women to say they disrespect the idea of marriage. Their plea is that they do respect it, respect it so deeply that they seek to find its fulfillment for themselves. Their hope is not to be condemned to live in loneliness, excluded from one of civilization's oldest institutions. They ask for equal dignity in the eyes of the law. The Constitution grants them that right.''

So why are we here today, if Obergefell is still the law of the land? We are here because the Supreme Court of the United States decided to strip away a woman's fundamental reproductive rights this summer. The Court overturned its Roe v. Wade decision—and a half century of associated precedents—in its radical Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization decision.

In that decision, Justice Thomas wrote a concurrence which warned that the Court should ''reconsider, [in future cases], all of this Court's substantive due process precedents, including Griswold, Lawrence, and Obergefell.'' These decisions protected the right to access contraception, the right to have same-sex relations, and the right to enter into a same-sex marriage, respectively. Do most Americans really want to turn back the clock on these civil rights, in terms of being able to responsibly plan the size of their family, make personal medical and healthcare decision with their doctors, and fall in love and marry their partner of their choosing, regardless of their gender? I don't think so.

The dissent in Dobbs correctly pointed out: ''The lone rationale for what the majority does today is that the right to elect an abortion is not 'deeply rooted in history': Not until Roe, the majority argues, did people think abortion fell within the Constitution's guarantee of liberty. The same could be said, though, of most of the rights the majority claims it is not tampering with.''

The dissent continued: ''The majority could write just as long an opinion showing, for example, that until the mid-20th century, 'there was no support in American law for a constitutional right to obtain [contraceptives].' So one of two things must be true. Either the majority does not really believe in its own reasoning. Or if it does, all rights that have no history stretching back to the mid-19th century are insecure. Either the mass of the majority's opinion is hypocrisy, or additional constitutional rights are under threat. It is one or the other.''

I am therefore pleased that the Senate came together in its best traditions to form a bipartisan working group—led by Senators BALDWIN and COLLINS—to codify the right to be married regardless of your gender and to rescind Federal laws to the contrary that are still on the books. I thank Leader SCHUMER for giving this working group additional time after the mid-term elections to reach compromise language that enjoys broad bipartisan support in the Senate, which can overcome a filibuster.

According to the Human Rights Campaign and a recent Gallup poll, 71 percent of Americans now support marriage equality, compared to only about 27 percent in 1996, when President Clinton signed the Defense of Marriage Act—DOMA.

As Senators BALDWIN and COLLINS recently wrote in a compelling op-ed: ''Individuals in same-sex and interracial marriages need, and should have, the confidence that their marriages are legal. These loving couples should be guaranteed the same rights and freedoms of every other marriage . . . This legislation has earned bipartisan support in Congress because it grants same-sex and interracial couples the certainty that they will continue to enjoy the same equal treatment under federal law as all other married couples. . . . [W]e should be able to agree that same-sex and interracial couples, regardless of where they live, both need and deserve the assurance that their marriage will be recognized by the federal government and that they will continue to enjoy freedoms, rights and responsibilities that come with all other marriages.''

This legislation has three major components. First, this legislation would formally repeal the Defense of Marriage Act—DOMA—of 1996. Section 2 of DOMA purports to allow States to refuse to recognize valid civil marriages of same-sex couples. Section 3 of the law carved out all same-sex couples, regardless of their marital status, from benefitting from any Federal statutes, regulations and rulings applicable to all other married people. This provision denied same-sex couples roughly 1,100 Federal benefits and protections.

Second, the legislation establishes that ''place of celebration'' is the standard of recognition for Federal benefits of a same-sex marriage, in terms of recognizing a marriage as legal if valid in the State it was performed. The legislation would also guarantee Federal marriage benefits if a State rescinded same-sex marriage recognition.

Third, this legislation guarantees that legal marriages are given full faith and credit by every other State. Article IV, section 1 of the Constitution provides that ''full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state, and the Congress may be general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.'' This section of the legislation additionally gives the Attorney General enforcement authority to carry out its provisions and creates a private right of action for any harmed individual.

The compromise language in the Senate measure clarifies that it will have no adverse impact on religious liberty and conscience protections. The revised legislation would explicitly protect all religious liberty and conscience protections available under the Constitution or Federal law, including but not limited to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The amendment clarifies that nonprofit religious organizations will not be required to provide any services, facilities, or goods for the solemnization or celebration of a marriage.

President Biden is absolutely correct when he stated: ''The right to marriage confers vital legal protections, dignity, and full participation in our society. No person should face discrimination because of who they are or whom they love, and every married couple in the United States deserves the security of knowing that their marriage will be defended and respected.''

The Biden administration supports passage of this legislation, stating that ''H.R. 8404 would repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, an unconstitutional and discriminatory law, and would enshrine the right to Federal recognition of marriage for same-sex and interracial couples. This legislation would strengthen civil rights, and ensure that the promise of equality is not denied to families across the country.''

The Senate should pass this legislation and send it to the House for its consideration and

passage in December. I am hopeful that President Biden will sign this legislation into law before the 117th Congress adjourns sine die. This would be another major bipartisan accomplishment for this Congress and mark an important step forward on our unfinished march for civil rights, as we strive to form a more perfect union, establish justice, and guarantee equal rights and equal justice under the law for all Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, shortly, we will have the opportunity to make history by passing important legislation that will advance two goals: one, the goal of marriage equality for same-sex and interracial couples, and second, the goal of strengthening religious liberty and conscience protections.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard on this legislation, and I also want to thank the broad array of faith-based groups who worked with us on the religious liberty provisions of our bill.

I want to thank Senator BALDWIN, who has been the lead on this bill; Senator SINEMA, who has worked so hard; Senator PORTMAN, who has poured his heart and soul into it; and Senator TILLIS in particular. But I also want to thank all of the Republicans who have supported this. I know that it has not been easy, but they have done the right thing.

I urge a vote in favor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate be extended an additional minute so that I might recognize the leader after my remarks.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I want to express, as did my colleague Senator COLLINS, that there are many thanks to go around. I thank the leader. I want to thank the original bill sponsors in the House and Senate—Congressman NADLER and Senator FEINSTEIN—and the team of Senators COLLINS, PORTMAN, SINEMA, and TILLIS for your unrelenting commitment that has brought us to this final vote to pass the Respect for Marriage Act.

I want to thank the advocates who have been fighting for marriage equality for decades, and I want to recognize the millions of same-sex and interracial couples who have truly made this moment possible by living their true selves and changing the hearts and minds of people around this country.

Many of these same-sex and interracial couples are fearful. They are worried that the rights, responsibilities, and freedoms they enjoy through civil marriage could be stripped away. Right now, the Senate has the opportunity to put those fears to rest and give millions of people in same-sex and interracial marriages the certainty, dignity, and respect they need and deserve. By passing this bill, we are showing that the American Government and people see them and respect them.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote yes on the Respect for Marriage Act and move our country forward.

I yield to our leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, for millions of Americans, today is a very good day, an important day, a day that has been a long time in coming. The Senate is passing the Respect for Marriage Act.

Today, the long but inexorable march toward greater equality advances forward. By passing this bill, the Senate is sending a message that every American needs to hear: No matter who you are or whom you love, you, too, deserve dignity and equal treatment under the law.

As the Chamber knows, this is personal to me, and the first people I will call when this bill passes will be my daughter and her wife.

I want to thank my colleagues, joining the others, for making this legislation possible—and especially the teams of Senators BALDWIN and SINEMA and COLLINS, TILLIS, and PORTMAN. To all of you, I say: Bravo, a job well done. And to all who make the choice to support this bill, thank you. None of this was inevitable.

At the urging of my colleagues, we took the calculated risk of holding off on a vote back in September because they believed, with more time, we could build enough bipartisan support to push this bill over the finish line. Today, we have vindication that the wait was well worth it. I thank my colleagues for their work.

Above all, I want to thank the American people, the vast majority of whom understand deep in their hearts that the inexorable march toward equality is what America is all about.

I yield the floor.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

VOTE ON H.R. 8404, AS AMENDED

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 362 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Baldwin	Blunt	Burr
Bennet	Booker	Cantwell
Blumenthal	Brown	Capito
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
Feinstein	Murphy	Tillis
Gillibrand	Murray	Van Hollen
Hassan	Ossoff	Warner
Heinrich	Padilla	Warren
Hickenlooper	Peters	Whitehouse
Hirono	Portman	Wyden
Kaine	Reed	Young
Kelly	Romney	
King	Rosen	

NAYS—36

Barrasso	Graham	McConnell
Blackburn	Grassley	Moran
Boozman	Hagerty	Paul
Braun	Hawley	Risch
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rounds
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Kennedy	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Sasse	Toomey	Warnock

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The yeas are 61; the nays are 36.

The bill (H.R. 8404), as amended, was passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, what a great day. What a great day.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, and now, moving forward, as we always try to do in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 1133; and that the cloture motions with respect to Calendar Nos. 1133, 1147, 1148, and 1129 ripen at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, November 30; further, that at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate vote on motions to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 1133 and 1147; that if cloture is invoked on the nomination, all postcloture time be considered expired at 2:15 on Wednesday.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Camille L. Velez-Rive, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleague, Senator LUMMIS from Wyoming.

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

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today to underscore the crucial importance of the religious liberty provisions in the Respect for Marriage Act, which was just passed by the Senate, and to ensure the legislative intent behind these provisions is crystal clear.

As you know, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Obergefell v. Hodges from 2015 established a constitutional right to same-sex marriage.

When Obergefell was argued, then-Solicitor General Verrilli was asked whether recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage would lead to churches, religious organizations, and other not-for-profits potentially having their tax-exempt status reconsidered in light of the Supreme Court's decision in Bob Jones University v. United States. Solicitor General Verrilli responded that ''it's certainly going to be an issue.''

In recognizing a constitutional right to same-sex marriage in 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court did not reconsider the Bob Jones University precedent, leaving this issue unresolved.

The Respect for Marriage Act, with the substitute amendment that I cosponsored with Senators SINEMA, COLLINS, BALDWIN, PORTMAN, and TILLIS, answers this question and a number of others, providing strong protections for religious liberty, especially when combined with the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

I want to thank my friend, the Senator from Arizona, for her hard work on this bill and her willingness to address key questions around religious liberty in a thoughtful and bipartisan way.

It is my understanding that section 2 of the Respect for Marriage Act, in light of the Supreme Court's Bob Jones v. United States decision in 1983, would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from successfully arguing that the United States now has a ''national policy'' favoring same-sex marriage and would prevent the IRS from using this national policy argument to deny tax-exempt status to religious organizations.

I want to ask my friend, the Senator from Arizona, is this your understanding, as well?

Ms. SINEMA. I thank my friend, the Senator from Wyoming. Yes, this is my understanding. Section 2 of the bill states that a variety of reasonable views on the role of gender in marriage exists today, based on both decent and honorable religious and philosophical beliefs. The bill states that all views are due proper respect by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, section 2 of this bill states the Federal Government recognizes religious liberty as an integral component of our national policy regarding marriage. Section 2 of this bill was explicitly included to ensure that the provisions of the Bob Jones case relating to the tax-exempt status of organizations are not applicable to this bill.

Bob Jones University v. United States, decided in 1983 before Congress enacted the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, upheld the IRS's decision to rescind Bob Jones University's tax exemption on the basis of a ''firm and unyielding'' national policy against racial discrimination. Section 2 affirms 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. This finding preempts an analogy between the Court's analysis in the Bob Jones University case about race and beliefs about marriage and is a statement of policy respecting diverse views about the role of gender in marriage.

I would like to discuss another provision which is central to this bill: section 4, which grants ''full faith and credit'' under article IV, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution to marriages performed in each of our States, strengthening federalism and making our constitutional structure work.

Section 4 of the bill states that no person ''acting under color of State law'' may deny full faith and credit to any ''public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State pertaining to a marriage between two individuals, on the basis of sex, race, ethnicity, or national origin of those individuals.'' The phrase ''acting under the color of State law'' is also used in our civil rights statutes to refer to the actions of State and local government officers and employees with respect to rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and Federal law.

Senator, is it your understanding this phrase is intended to incorporate the U.S. Supreme Court's interpretation of the meaning of ''acting under color of State law''?

Ms. LUMMIS. Yes, it is my understanding that use of this phrase in section 4 of the bill is intended to incorporate the U.S. Supreme Court's interpretation of this term, including, but not limited to, the case Rendell-Baker v. Kohn and NCAA v. Tarkanian cases.

I would like to now turn to section 6 of the bill, which provides that no church or religious nonprofit will be forced to solemnize or conduct a marriage ceremony under this bill.

Is it your understanding that section 6(b) bars ''any civil claim or cause of action,'' without exception, relating to a church or religious organization's refusal to solemnize or celebrate a marriage under this section, and the text does not state that it can be overruled by a court in finding a ''compelling governmental interest''?

Ms. SINEMA. Yes, it is my understanding section 6(b) bars any civil claim or cause of action relating to a nonprofit religious organization's refusal under that section to solemnize or celebrate a marriage and that such a refusal cannot create a civil claim or cause of action.

The text of section 7 also makes no reference to ''compelling governmental interests.'' Section 7 provides nothing in this bill should be construed to deny or alter the benefit, status, or right of an otherwise eligible individual or legal entity in relation to tax-exempt status, tax treatment, contracts, loans, scholarships, licenses, and other agreements not arising from a marriage.

In conjunction with section 2 of this bill, which eliminates a successful analogy to the Bob Jones case, is it your understanding, Senator, that section 7 would prevent the Internal Revenue Service from using the Respect for Marriage Act to alter or remove the tax-exempt status of an entity for expressing beliefs in opposition or support of same-sex marriage?

Ms. LUMMIS. Yes, that is my understanding, as well, regarding the scope of section 7.

This bill is intended to enshrine a national policy of respect for all views surrounding marriage and to enact some of the strongest religious liberty protections since the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in 1993. This legislation also ensures that religious liberty will have more of a central role in future debates in our courts and in the Halls of Congress.

I would like to thank my friend from Arizona for her tireless work on these issues and her willingness to work together, as always.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

SAFEGUARD TRIBAL OBJECTS OF PATRIMONY ACT OF 2021

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise today to ask the Senate to send H.R. 2930, the Safeguard Tribal Objects of Patrimony Act, to the President's desk for his signature.

The need for this legislation is pretty straightforward.

In 2016, the Governor of the Pueblo of Acoma learned that a sacred ceremonial shield had been stolen and was about to be sold to the highest bidder in Paris. When Governor Riley informed me about this robbery of the Pueblo's cultural patrimony, I called on the State Department to take all possible action to halt the auction. Thankfully, intense public outcry and diplomatic pressure were enough to halt the illegal sale of a Tribe's cultural patrimony.

Finally, in November 2019, more than 3 years after the shield was put on the auction block, it was voluntarily returned to the Pueblo. However, this only happened because of intense public outcry and notoriety. In most cases like this, the item has been sold or simply disappears into a private collection.

Under current Federal law, it is a crime to sell certain protected Native American cultural objects, things like the Acoma shield, here in the United States. But there is still no Federal law prohibiting the export of stolen cultural items and requiring the cooperation of foreign governments in recovering them.

In many cases, Tribes in New Mexico and across our Nation have been forced to effectively pay a ransom to recover their sacred items or had to stand by and watch the sale of their priceless religious and cultural items in international markets.

The lack of an explicit ban on trafficking these items to foreign countries was actually cited by the French Government when they initially declined to stop the auction of the Acoma shield.

Grave robbing is illegal in every single State in the United States, and yet we allow Tribal religious objects, many of which were stolen literally from grave sites, to be exported and sold in foreign auction houses. We cannot let this loophole that allows foreign trade in Native religious heritage to go on for even one more day, and I would urge my colleagues to pass this bill today and end this awful practice.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2930, which was received from the House and is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Reserving the right to object, I would like to begin my brief comments here this evening by acknowledging the Senator from New Mexico and agreeing so much with him on this very, very important issue as we seek to protect objects of patrimony, whether in New Mexico or in my State of Alaska or in the home State of the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee. It has been a travesty and it has been a crime that we have seen many of these objects that have been taken as art collections, that have been taken with no appreciation of the heritage, of the richness, of the tradition, and the respect to the Native people to whom they belong.

And so the STOP Act, or the Safeguard Tribal Objects of Patrimony Act of 2021, is significant. I am proud to be the lead Republican cosponsor, along with Senator HEINRICH, on this. It is an issue that many in my State have been urging action on.

So I do not rise this evening to object to passage of the STOP Act, but at the same time I am acknowledging the significance of this, I also want to raise another bill that is also very important to my State, H.R. 441. We call it the Don Young Alaska Native Health Care Land Transfers Act.

This is something that I have been working on for several Congresses now, with my friend the late Congressman Young. We took three land transfer bills. We consolidated them into one. We thought it was a pretty simple effort. All we are asking to do is to convey IHS land to two of our Alaska Native Tribal health consortia, as well as the Tanana Tribe in the interior part of the State.

We passed stand-alone legislation on these three IHS bills earlier this Congress, but instead of passing that legislation, the House did what the House often does. They amended it with technical amendments. They sent it back here as one consolidated bill. That is H.R. 441.

But, again, it is about public health, delivery of healthcare to Alaska Native people in rural and underserved villages, many of which are off the road system. But these simple land transfers would enable construction projects to move forward, to reconstruct and to construct, in some cases, new healthcare facilities to provide care to Alaska Native people, and to also ramp up the delivery of clean, safe drinking water and sanitation facilities in rural villages, which are so key to improving public health.

I think we all would agree that basic services such as water sanitation are pretty important—so everything we can do to help facilitate that. I have pushed the urgent button on these land conveyance issues because time is running out. Construction seasons are very, very limited in Alaska, and so I have been trying to help facilitate that.

I have good commitments from my colleagues who are here on the floor this evening to help us move through this process on our side, or certainly on the House side as well, so that we can see final resolution on the Don Young Alaska Native Health Care Land Transfers Act, and I look forward to working with them on that. And so having said this, I will not object to unanimous consent to advance the STOP Act this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. With your permission, through the Chair, far be it from me to delay the passage of this law, which I know has been worked on by Native people and staffers for many, many years, but I just wanted to make my private commitment to the Senator from Alaska, the vice chair of the Indian Affairs Committee, public.

We are absolutely committed, one way or another, to passing the Don Young lands act, and I just wanted to make that clear on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, through the Chair, I just want to take a moment to articulate the same commitment publicly, and we look forward to working with my colleague from Alaska, who has been so helpful in putting the STOP Act to a successful resolution. I look forward to working with her to get the Don Young package moved as well.

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

The bill (H.R. 2930) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Hawaii.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, on behalf of Vermonters, today I was proud to vote for the final passage of the Respect for Marriage Act. Today, we became a slightly more perfect union by recognizing the sanctity of marriage between two individuals, regardless of gender or race.

In August of this year, Marcelle and I celebrated our 60th wedding anniversary. Marrying each other was the most important decision of our lives—not a decision taken lightly, but a deeply personal commitment. A decision such as who to spend your life with should not be determined by a State, local, or Federal government. It is regrettable that throughout our history, too many Americans have been denied the right to marry who they love based on their gender or race.

In 2012, I was proud to cosponsor an earlier version of the Respect for Marriage Act to codify the right for all Americans to marry who they love. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I also convened the first ever hearing to examine the harmful consequences the Defense of Marriage Act had, and still has, on American families.

I am a proud cosponsor of this version of the Respect for Marriage Act. This bill—as most bills are—is far from perfect, but is a product of a bipartisan compromise. I want to acknowledge my friend from Wisconsin, Senator BALDWIN, whose steadfast resolve is the reason why this bill passed the Senate today. In the face of Supreme Court Justices determined to turn back the clock on basic rights, a group of bipartisan Senators remained committed to the principle that all legally valid marriages between two people who love and care for each other deserve equal treatment under the law everywhere in our country.

My home State of Vermont is no stranger to making history. Vermont has been a pioneer in the movement for LGBTQ rights. In 2000, Vermont became the first State to introduce civil unions and the first to offer a civil union status encompassing the same legal rights and responsibilities as marriage. The State again made history in 2009 when it was the first State to allow same-sex marriage without being required to do so through a court

decision. Just last year, I was so proud when former Vermont Supreme Court Justice Beth Robinson became the first openly gay woman to ascend to our Federal circuit courts, on the Second Circuit.

Over the years, I have heard from Vermonters, colleagues, my staff, friends, and family on this issue. They have told me what I already know from my marriage to Marcelle. The right to marriage—the right to love someone and build a life with them—should be equally available to all Americans.

As I have said before, when common ground is fertile, we must plant the seeds of progress. And I believe that the Senate did that today by passing the Respect for Marriage Act.

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2022.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN2274, the nomination of Moshe Z. Marvit, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, having been referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, the Committee, with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

On the question of reporting the nomination without recommendation, 11 ayes to 11 noes.

In accordance with section 3, paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote, and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the resolution.

PATTY MURRAY,
Chair.

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2022.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN 1832, the nomination of Joseph Goffman, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation, at the Environmental Protection Agency, having been referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed 10 ayes to 10 noes.

In accordance with section 3, paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee on Environment and Public Works has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote, and ask that this notice be printed in the Record pursuant to the resolution.

THOMAS R. CARPER,
Chair.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DEVLIN BIRNIE

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Devlin for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Devlin is a native of Oregon. He attends George Mason University, where he is pursuing a master's in international security. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Devlin for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.•

TRIBUTE TO KATY FOLEY

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Katy for her hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican Conference. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Katy is a native of Florida. She is a graduate of the University of Alabama, where she studied political science. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Katy for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.•

TRIBUTE TO COREY GONZALES

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Corey for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Corey is a native of Cheyenne. He attends the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Corey for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.•

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER LORANGER

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Christopher for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Christopher is a native of Rhode Island. He attends George Washington University, where he studies history and political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Christopher for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.•

TRIBUTE TO JASMINE SLUSSER

• Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jasmine for her hard work as an intern in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jasmine is a native of Pennsylvania. She is a student at George Washington University, where she studies public health. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Jasmine for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.•

TRIBUTE TO AMY GRANT

• Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Mr. HAGERTY, I ask unanimous consent that the following remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to honor our fellow Tennessean, Amy Grant.

Each year, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts selects a handful of cultural luminaries to receive the Kennedy Center Honors for their lifetime artistic achievements. On behalf of the entire Tennessee congressional delegation and all Tennesseans, we want to congratulate contemporary Christian and pop singer-

songwriter Amy Grant on her inclusion in the 45th annual honoree class.

A quick glance at Amy's more than 40 years in the spotlight reveals an iconic popstar, songwriter, television personality, and philanthropist who never forgot her gospel roots. The thing that makes Amy special, though, isn't her long list of accolades, but how she used her personal faith in Christ to build bridges between the welcoming contemporary Christian genre and the secular confines of popular music.

All artist-songwriters find success when they strike at the very center of what makes the human heart ache, whether it be for a love found, a life lost, or the infinite potential of what could be. These emotions are humanity's great equalizers. But for gospel artist-songwriters, faith, and not emotion, is the touchstone. For these brave and gifted individuals, assurance comes not from an endless cycle of love, hurt, and healing, but from a far more enduring source of hope.

We could not be more pleased to see the Kennedy Center recognize the importance of Amy's work in helping new generations embrace that hope, and we join the artistic community in thanking her for sharing her gifts with the world.●

TRIBUTE TO BRENDA LEE

● Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, every year, Music City luminaries gather to celebrate entertainers and other giants in the arts with the Cecil Scaife Visionary Award. While statuettes do have their charms, this award highlights true champions of creativity whose life and work have made it possible for future generations to realize careers in the music industry. This year, I have the privilege of congratulating the oft imitated, never duplicated, positively incomparable Brenda Lee as she accepts this special honor.

Even in today's strange world of social media sensations and cross-discipline collaborations, success in the entertainment industry is hard to come by. And if mainstream popularity is a pipe dream, it is safe to consider crossover success on a global scale almost impossible to achieve.

Still, for many of Nashville's rising stars, this pinnacle of artistic achievement is the only measure of professional success worth striving for. But who is to mentor these dreamers? Who sets the standard? If you ask them, they will surely point to Brenda Lee.

Brenda Lee's stunning vocal talent put her on stage at 6, in the studio at 12, and on the international tour circuit by her early teens. Her third single climbed both the pop and country charts, and over the next 20 years, she achieved pop stardom, pop-to-country crossover success, and international fame. That she did this at all is remarkable; but how she did it is what makes Brenda Lee a phenomenon. Her career was not the product of clever gimmicks, but the manifestation of her own personal tastes, desires, and instincts in song. In a world of mimics, Brenda Lee dismissed convention and created something new.

I have always believed that there is no secret sauce that separates the successful from the legendary, but if there is, its main ingredient is surely the spark of captivating individualism that Brenda embraced over the course of her more than 60 years in the spotlight. And while young artists could never hope to replicate her career, her legacy serves as a reminder that, yes, you can conquer this industry, if only you have the courage to do it on your own terms.●

TRIBUTE TO RAY STEVENS

● Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, today I rise to honor a true Music City legend. For more than 50 years, Ray Stevens has delighted audiences with his talents as a comedian, an actor, a musician, and a songwriter. His unique vision for the future of entertainment allowed him to blaze trails no other artists would dare tread alone.

As a fellow Tennessean, and one of Ray's biggest fans, you can believe me when I say that you have never seen anything like Ray Stevens. It would have been easy for him to justify resting on his laurels while Music City grew around him, but if you know Ray, you know that was never a possibility. Although he achieved fame for his work in the creative arts, he is best known for leading with laughter, kindness, and an unfailing desire to encourage fellow artists.

In 1971, Ray and a group of fellow Music Row luminaries led by Cecil Scaife came together to create a music business program at Belmont University, where aspiring entertainers could exercise both their talents and their business acumen. This tremendous effort changed the industry for the better and set an example for the city's rising stars. Today, the Cecil Scaife Visionary Award is given annually to those whose life and work have made it possible for future generations to realize careers in the music industry, and I could not have been happier when I learned that Ray is one of this year's recipients.

Ray, on behalf of all Tennesseans, I thank you for your devotion to the arts, your zest for life, and for going above and beyond on behalf all who hope to walk in your footsteps.●

TRIBUTE TO LAUREN CAULFIELD AND RONDA CHRYSTAL

● Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I am honored to recognize Lauren Caulfield and Ronda Chrystal of Brookline as November's Granite Staters of the Month. The pair founded Pink Revolution in order to support cancer patients with chemo care packages and financial support.

When Lauren was being treated for breast cancer, she noticed that not every patient had the same level of support that she did during this difficult time. Some were arriving to chemotherapy sessions alone or had to skip sessions because they couldn't afford it. After her recovery, Lauren decided she wanted to take action, and alongside her longtime friend Ronda, she founded Pink Revolution Breast Cancer Alliance of NH to support patients with all types of cancer.

Lauren and Ronda started by reaching out to friends and family touched by cancer and ultimately built a network of volunteers to put together 1,500 chemo care packages a year to deliver to 25 oncology centers in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts. The care packages contain essential items such as blankets, tissues, and lip balm, as well as some items with personal touches, such as hats knitted by residents at nursing homes. In addition, the nonprofit fundraises to provide chemo patients—some of whom struggle with costs during their treatment—with gas and grocery cards.

After undergoing chemotherapy, Lauren decided to find the silver lining in her experience by helping others. With their hard work over the past 4 years, Lauren and Ronda have made a true difference in many Granite Staters' lives as they face serious medical hardship. Lauren and Ronda's work leading Pink Revolution exemplifies the Granite State spirit of generosity, and I commend them and their large network of volunteers.●

REMEMBERING FELIPE VALLS, SENIOR

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I pay tribute to the life and legacy of Cuban-American businessman and icon, Felipe Valls, Sr., who unfortunately passed away. Many know Valls Sr. as the founder of world-renowned Versailles Cuban Restaurant, but many more know of the indelible mark he left on the Cuban exile community throughout south Florida. His life was a true testament to the American dream and he demonstrated a well-lived life in a nation that welcomed him and gave him the opportunity to create a culinary landmark in my home State of Florida. Felipe's legacy will live on through his beloved family and friends. Jeanette and I unite in prayer for the repose of the soul of this great Cuban-American entrepreneur.●

TRIBUTE TO OSVALDO DE LA PEDRAJA

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I recognize Dr. Osvaldo De La Pedraja on his more than 60-year career in the medical field and for celebrating his 92nd birthday on November 19, 2022.

Osvaldo graduated as a doctor of medicine from the Medical School of the University of Havana, Cuba in 1960. Three years later, he was expelled from

the Hospital Clinico Quirurgico Comandante Fajardo due to his opposition to Castro's communist regime.

In 1968, Osvaldo arrived in the United States with his family. Committed to helping those in need of medical assistance in his new country, Osvaldo completed an internship at Mount Sinai Hospital in Miami Beach, FL, and completed his specialty in radiology at Jackson Memorial Hospital. In 1972, Osvaldo opened his own private practice specializing in diagnostic radiology in Coral Gables, FL. For more than 50 years, it has remained in the same location and has helped countless Floridians in need of consulting doctors and seeking medical treatment.

Osvaldo is also a member of the Latin American Society of Radiology, is the president of the Physicians' Assistant Hospital and Annexes Association, and has been a volunteer doctor of La Liga Contra El Cancer for 35 years. Previously, he served as president of the Cuban Revolutionary Forum.

Osvaldo's medical work over the years has undoubtedly saved countless lives in Florida. I am grateful for his decades of service to the people of Florida and for his fight against communism in Cuba. I extend my best wishes on his 92nd birthday.●

TRIBUTE TO GREG GERRITT

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I rise today to honor an important advocate for environmental preservation and addressing climate change, Greg Gerritt. Mr. Gerritt has worked for the past 20 years for the Environmental Council of Rhode Island, retiring in January of this year. He served as the coordinator for the Compost Initiative, which earned a 2012 EPA Region 1 Merit Award, and founded the Rhode Island Compost Conference. Last year, the Environmental Protection Agency awarded him an Environmental Merit for Lifetime Achievement.

Mr. Gerritt grew up in New York City before earning a bachelor's degree in anthropology from University of Maine. He organized his high school's first Earth Day and has since continuously engaged across communities to support a sustainable green economy in Rhode Island. He founded and served on the board of the Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island, began the Buy Nothing Day Winter Coat Exchange, which has occurred on the day after Thanksgiving for over 20 years, and ran for mayor of Providence as a Green Party candidate. Mr. Gerritt also founded and is the watershed steward for Friends of the Moshassuck, an organization dedicated to preservation, restoration, and revitalization of the Moshassuck River. He created a wetland habitat by restoring a small stormwater drain in the North Burial Ground in Providence and, for over a decade, has produced about 1,500 videos documenting wildlife in this urban landscape and at locations around the Seekonk River.

I am pleased to recognize Mr. Gerritt's accomplishments in environmental advocacy, justice, and preservation of natural resources and extend my appreciation for his work for our State and environment.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional Award Board: Ms. Diane Dewhirst of Washington, DC.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:35 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 4524. An act to limit the judicial enforceability of predispute nondisclosure and nondisparagement contract clauses relating to disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 7240. An act to reauthorize the READ Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 5068. A bill to amend the Northwestern New Mexico Rural Water Projects Act to make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes.

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–5474. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting legislative proposals relative to combating human trafficking, assisting its victims, and prosecuting its perpetrators; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5475. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Activities and Operations of the Public Integrity Section for 2021''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5476. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a legislative proposal relative to the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013 and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5477. A communication from the Supervisory Workforce Analyst, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Agricultural Employment of H–2A Nonimmigrants in the United States'' (RIN1205–AB89) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5478. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Immigration Law Division, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Professional Conduct for Practitioners - Rules and Procedures, and Representation and Appearances'' (RIN1125–AA83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5479. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Trademark Classification Changes'' (RIN0651–AD61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5480. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Implement Provisions of the Trademark Modernization Act of 2020; Delay of Effective Date and Correction'' (RIN0651–AD55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 27, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5481. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2022 and 2023 cost estimate for the Public Wireless Supply Chain Innovation Fund; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5482. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Part 11 of the Commission's Rules Regarding the Emergency Alert Systems''

((PS Docket No. 15–94) (FCC 22–75)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 7, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5483. A communication from the Chief of Staff, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''In the Matter of Amendment of Parts 2 and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Enable GSO Fixed-Satellite Service (Space-to-Earth) Operations in the 17.3–17.8 GHz Band, to Modernize Certain Rules Applicable to 17/24 GHz BSS Space Stations, and to Establish Off-Axis Uplink Power Limits for Extended Ka-Band FSS Operations'' ((IB Docket Nos. 20–330, 22–273) (FCC 22–63)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 7, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5484. A communication from the Acting Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Administration's annual Aeronautics and Space Report of the President; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5485. A communication from the Chief of Direct Investment Division, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Direct Investment Surveys: BE–13, Survey of New Foreign Direct Investment in the United States'' (RIN0691–AA92) 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–5486. A communication from the Chief of Direct Investment Division, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Direct Investment Surveys: BE–12, Benchmark Survey of Foreign Direct Investment in the United States'' (RIN0691–AA93) 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–5487. A communication from the Supervisory Fishery Managment Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Deadlines Under the Fish and Fish Product Import Provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act'' (RIN0648–BK06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5488. A communication from the Chief of the Balance of Payments Division, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''International Services Surveys: Renewal of and Changes to BE–120 Benchmark Survey of Transactions in Selected Services and Intellectual Property with Foreign Persons, and Clarifying When BE–140 and BE–180 Benchmark Surveys are Conducted'' (RIN0691–AA91) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5489. A communication from the Program Manager of the Strategic Management Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protected Communications; Prohibition of Retaliatory Personnel Actions'' (RIN0648–BL23) 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–5490. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94 to 97 Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0333)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5491. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Oregon Inlet Channel, Marc Basnight Bridge, Dare County, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0466)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5492. 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 and Safety Zone; Back River, Baltimore County, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0374)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5493. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zones; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0787)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5494. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zones; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0787)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5495. 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; Tennessee River Mile 643–652, Knoxville, TN'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0596)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5496. 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; Cumberland River, Nashville, TN'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0512)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5497. 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; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Morehead City, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0467)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5498. 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; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Morehead City, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0467)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5499. 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; Tennessee River 255 - 257, Florence, AL'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0756)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5500. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Grand Canal, Indian Harbour Beach, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0015)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5501. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Erie Canal, Part of the New York State Canal System, Albion, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0465)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5502. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Bayou Sara, Saraland, AL'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0910)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5503. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Mobile River, Hurricane, AL'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2019–0911)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5504. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Potomac River. National Harbor, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0733)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5505. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Swim, Columbia River, Cascade Locks, OR'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0623)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5506. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kanawha River Mile Marker 58 to Mile Marker 59, Charleston, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0740)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5507. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Marker 317.5 to Mile Marker 318.5, Catlettsburg, KY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0687)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5508. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Homewood Wedding Fireworks Display, Homewood, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0552)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5509. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; MM. 190–192, Cumberland River, Nashville, TN'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0591)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5510. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Cumberland River, Nashville, TN'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0275)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5511. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0568)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5512. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Military Exercise, Sinclair Inlet, Bremerton, W'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0594)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5513. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Spokane Street Bridge; Duwamish Waterway, Seattle, WA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0587)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5514. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Pacific Gas and Electric Radiological Barrier Maintenance, Eureka, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0553)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5515. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Susquehanna River, Havre de Grace, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0695)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5516. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Cumberland River, Nashville, TN'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0638)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5517. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, ONset Bay, Onset, MA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0778)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5518. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Firework Event, Willamette River, Portland, OR'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0626)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5519. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Tennessee River, Ohio River and Cumberland River; Paducah and Smithland; Kentucky'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0463)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5520. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Corpus Christi Shipping Channel, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0798)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5521. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Boothbay Harbor, Boothbay, ME'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0525)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5522. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; KE Electric Party Firework Show; Detroit River; Detroit, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0674)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5523. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Black River, South of East Erie Avenue Bridge in Front of Black River'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0273)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5524. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ironman Michigan, Frankfort Harbor, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0595)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5525. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Steve Hamburger Wedding Fireworks , Bay Harbor, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0671)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5526. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lake Erie; Sandusky, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0464)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5527. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Thunder on the Niagara Fireworks; Niagara River; North Tonawanda, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0564)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5528. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Henderson Harbor, Henderson Harbor, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0500)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5529. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fairport Harbor, Fairport, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0616)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5530. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Jon Cotton Wedding Firworks, Round Island Channel, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0366)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5531. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flight Attendant Duty Period Limitations and Rest Requirements; Amdt. No. 121–386'' ((RIN2120–AL41) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0770)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5532. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5533. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of the Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Tehran Flight Information Region (FIR) (OIIX)'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0874)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5534. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recognition of Pilot in Command Experience in the Military and Air Carrier Operations'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2017–1106)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5535. 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 and Revocation of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0827)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5536. 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 and Removal of VOR Federal Airways in the Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0646)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5537. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of VOR Federal Airways in the Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0823)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5538. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Restricted Areas R–6501A and R–6501B; Underhill, VT'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1116)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5539. 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 and Revocation of Class E Airspace; La Crosse, WI'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0774)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5540. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''CORRECTION: Amendment 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 October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5541. 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 Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Northeastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0475)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5542. 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 and Revocation of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Southeastern and Northeastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0824)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5543. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4026'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31448)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5544. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4025'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31447)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5545. 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 39–22157'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0516)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5546. 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; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes; Amendment 39–22172'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0153)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5547. 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 39–22170'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0587)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5548. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22175'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1156)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5549. 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 Helicopters; Amendment 39–22177'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1157)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5550. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22163'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0391)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5551. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22165'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0591)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5552. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22160'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0689)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5553. 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; Bombardier, inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–22161'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0687)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5554. 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 39–22140'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0515)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5555. 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; Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam S.P.A. Airplanes; Amendment 39–22180'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1162)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5556. 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; Robinson Helicopter Company Helicopters; Amendment 39–22181'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0872)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5557. 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 39–22138'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1168)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5558. 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 39–22141'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0520)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5559. 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; Bombardier, inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–22085'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0398)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5560. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22159'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0801)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5561. 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 Helicopters; Amendment 39–22158'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0804)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5562. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22156'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0675)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5563. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22146'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0680)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5564. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22145'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0686)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5565. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22174'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1069)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5566. 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 39–22155'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0514)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5567. 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 39–22110'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0148)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5568. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22152'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0601)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5569. 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; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22168'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0592)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5570. 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; Piaggio Aero Industries S.p.A. Airplanes; Amendment 39–22151'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0397)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5571. 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; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22075'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0155)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5572. 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; Piaggio Aero Industries S.p.A. Airplanes; Amendment 39–22176'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0452)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5573. 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; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22142'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0287)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5574. 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 39–22110'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0148)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5575. 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 39–22148'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0604)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5576. 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 39–22173'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1153)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5577. 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 39–22164'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0093)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5578. 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 39–22162'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0154)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5579. 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 Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes;

Amendment 39–22178'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1076)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5580. 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 Helicopters; Amendment 39–22182'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0805)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5581. 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 SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22190'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–1169)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5582. 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; Bombardier, inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–22149'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0681)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Alvin Holsey, to be Vice Admiral.

*Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Thomas A. Bussiere, to be General.

*Space Force nomination of Maj. Gen. DeAnna M. Burt, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Lisa M. Ahaesy and ending with Col. Kristof K. Sills, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Steven A. Breitfelder and ending with Col. Jason S. Christman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Denise M. Donnell and ending with Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Harris II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Troy T. Daniels and ending with Brig. Gen. Terrence L. Koudelka, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Konata A. Crumbly and ending with Brig. Gen. Bryan J. Teff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Paul M. Bishop and ending with Col. Keith C. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Christopher G. Batterton and ending with Col. Trace N. Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Christopher A. Eason and ending with Col. Justin T. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Kenneth A. Borchers and ending with Col. Todd E. Swass, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. John A. Conley and ending with Col. Brian J. Tollefson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

*Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. James C. Slife, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Christopher A. Brown, to be Brigadier General.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Antonio A. Aguto, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Warren L. Wells, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. William E. Crane and ending with Brig. Gen. Shawn P. Manke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Levon E. Cumpton and ending with Brig. Gen. Gregory C. Knight, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Miguel Aguilar and ending with Brig. Gen. Richard D. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022. (minus 3 nominees: Brig. Gen. Anthony H. Adrian; Brig. Gen. Ronald A. Cupples; Brig. Gen. Diane L. Dunn)

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Farin D. Schwartz, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Jerry E. Baird, Jr. and ending with Col. Richard J. Zeigler III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Matthew M. Bacon and ending with Col. Sally F. Petty, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. John F. Kelliher III and ending with Brig. Gen. William E. Souza III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Raymond L. Adams and ending with Col. John K. Jarrard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 14, 2022.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. Kevin S. Woodard, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. John F. Wade, to be Vice Admiral.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Christopher O. Mohan, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Allen Seth Abrams and ending with Thomas Benjamin Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Air Force nominations beginning with Romi R. Abouzedan and ending with Timothy J. Zerwic, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2022.

Air Force nomination of Christopher D. Coulson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Michael A. Hyland, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Stephanie L. M. Croyle, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Richard R. Burges, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Ronald B. Bellamy and ending with Lena S. Freienmuth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2022.

Air Force nomination of Michael S. Pontius, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with William James Acostatrejo and ending with John Andre Zolan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2022.

Air Force nomination of Duane G. McCrory, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Nicholas E. Park, to be Major.

Army nomination of Wilfredo P. Salada, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Diego A. Rincon, to be Major.

Army nomination of David L. Gutierrez, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jeffrey Thompson, Jr., to be Major.

Army nomination of Phillip S. Stone, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Meghann E. Sullivan, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Joseph T. Scholz, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Tracie D. Thornton, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Thomas L. Husted, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher L. Andersen and ending with Robert P. Venton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2022.

Army nomination of James A. Silsby III, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Peter J. Van Howe, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Patricia J. Oelschlager, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael D. Valletta, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Matthew F. Cohen, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Anece L. Baxterwhite and ending with Patrick M. Walsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2022.

Army nomination of William D. Ward III, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Bryan R. Gibby, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Eugene J. Gregory, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Eden E. Coelho, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Adam L. Sanders, to be Major.

Army nomination of Sarah B. Snyder, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Erik D. Masick, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jillian R. Guy, to be Major.

Army nomination of Ayodele O. Lawson, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Michael E. Bahm and ending with D016157, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2022.

Army nomination of Daniel P. Morgan, to be Major.

Army nomination of Thomas J. Souza, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jose A. Quintero, to be Major.

Army nomination of Javier J. Hernandez, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Jennifer M. Farina, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Thomas J. Watts II, to be Major.

Navy nomination of Luke J. Patterson, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with William J. Uffmann III and ending with Geoffrey S. Raynor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 29, 2022.

Navy nomination of Rama K. Mutyala, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Lashaundra S. Collins, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Andrew P. Gorie, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Daniel W. Rhodeback, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Michael J. Arnold, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Paul T. Hill, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Taibatu E. Obasi, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jenniffer M. Rajner, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Jose A. Aranda and ending with Daniel J. Wilkinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 17, 2022.

Navy nomination of Patric C. Jang, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Charles J. Osier, Jr., to be Captain.

Navy nomination of James C. Hanlon, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jarrett C. Walke, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Amy M. Respondek, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Andrew S. Gibbons, to be Captain.

Space Force nomination of Kirsten N. Pecua, to be Major.

By Mr. CARPER for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Beth Pritchard Geer, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2026.

*Shailen P. Bhatt, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

*Juan Eduardo Sanchez, of Texas, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Southwest Border Regional Commission.

By Mrs. MURRAY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Karla Ann Gilbride, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of four years.

*Jessica Looman, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 5136. A bill to protect employees from discrimination based on family caregiver responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 5137. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to reauthorize and improve the ReConnect loan and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 5138. A bill to establish the Office of High-Risk AFO Disaster Mitigation and Enforcement in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 5139. A bill to establish criminal penalties for failing to inform and warn of serious dangers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 5140. A bill to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 5141. A bill to direct the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics to establish a database with respect to corporate offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 5142. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate certain health care charges for members of the Selected Reserve eligible for TRICARE Reserve Select, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 5143. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the assignment of patient advocates at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 5144. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the mileage rate offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs through their Beneficiary Travel program for health related travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. THUNE, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 5145. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid Vapor Pressure under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 5146. A bill to provide for the sealing of records relating to Federal nonviolent criminal offenses related to substance use disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. Res. 851. A resolution celebrating the 45th anniversary of the Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus and its achievements in the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 190

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 190, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 634

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to support and expand civic engagement and political leadership of adolescent girls around the world, and other purposes.

S. 736

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include veterans of World War II.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) 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. 1408

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors 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 Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) 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. 1942

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1942, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 2202

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2202, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property.

S. 2256

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2256, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the charitable deduction for certain qualified conservation contributions.

S. 2306

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2306, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to support upgrades at existing hydroelectric dams and the removal of obsolete river obstructions to improve the health of the Nation's rivers and associated wildlife habitat and increase clean energy production, public safety, and for other purposes.

S. 2422

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2422, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program supporting trauma center violence intervention and violence prevention programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3199

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3199, a bill to promote peace and democracy in Ethiopia, and for other purposes.

S. 3386

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3386, a bill to prevent, treat, and cure tuberculosis globally.

S. 3451

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3451, a bill to include certain computer-related projects in the Federal permitting program under title XLI of the FAST Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3472

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3472, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 3508

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3508, a bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley.

S. 3607

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3607, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 3667

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3667, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the United States African-American Burial Grounds Preservation Program, and for other purposes.

S. 3957

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3957, a bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to make certain activities eligible for grants from the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 4009

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4009, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to rebase the calculation of payments for sole community hospitals and Medicare-dependent hospitals, and for other purposes.

S. 4168

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4168, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to reauthorize the National Park Foundation.

S. 4188

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4188, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 4416

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4416, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students.

S. 4473

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4473, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the authorization of use of depot working capital funds for unspecified minor military construction projects for the revitalization and recapitalization of defense industrial base facilities.

S. 4587

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4587, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Benjamin Berell Ferencz, in recognition of his service to the United States and international community during the post-World War II Nuremberg trials and lifelong advocacy for international criminal justice and rule of law.

S. 4592

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4592, a bill to encourage the migration of Federal Government information technology systems to quantum-resistant cryptography, and for other purposes.

S. 4649

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from California

(Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4649, a bill to amend the Global Food Security Act of 2016 to improve the comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 4756

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4756, a bill to amend the disclosures of foreign gifts under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide special rules relating to China-affiliated organizations.

S. 4851

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 4851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a national project to prevent and cure Parkinson's, to be known as the National Parkinson's Project, and for other purposes.

S. 4859

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4859, a bill to reauthorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act of 2018, and for other purposes.

S. 4877

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4877, a bill to amend Public Law 91–378 to authorize activities relating to Civilian Conservation Centers, and for other purposes.

S. 4974

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4974, a bill to amend section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to render available to certain long-term residents of the United States the benefit under that section.

S. 5037

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5037, a bill to prohibit funding for the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer until China is no longer defined a developing country.

S. 5070

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5070, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants to States to address contamination by perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances on farms, and for other purposes.

S. 5089

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5089, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees relating to claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 5098

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5098, a bill to ensure that significantly more students graduate college with the international knowledge and experience essential for success in today's global economy through the establishment of the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Program in the Department of State.

S. 5130

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 5130, a bill to amend the Camp Lejeune Justice Act of 2022 to appropriately limit attorney's fees.

S. RES. 579

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 579, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Big Bertha, one of the largest bass drums in use by a university in the United States and located at The University of Texas at Austin.

S. RES. 838

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 838, a resolution expressing concern about the spreading problem of book banning and the proliferation of threats to freedom of expression in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 6254

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 6254 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. LUJÁN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 5137. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to reauthorize and improve the ReConnect loan and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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. 5137

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 ''Rural Internet Improvement Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. STREAMLINING BROADBAND AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting ''**RECONNECT PROGRAM**'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

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

''(3) RECONNECT PROGRAM.—The term 'ReConnect Program' means the program established under this section.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) in subclause (I), by striking ''10-Mbps'' and inserting ''25-Mbps''; and

(II) in subclause (II), by striking ''1-Mbps'' and inserting ''3-Mbps''; and

(ii) by striking clause (iv) and inserting the following:

''(iv) give priority to applications from applicants that have demonstrated the technical and financial experience required to construct and operate broadband networks.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall establish an application process for grants, loans, and loan guarantees under this section that—

''(A) reduces the amount of data required to apply by limiting the required data to only—

''(i) the entity applying, excluding any parent or affiliate entity that is not a party to the application, to the greatest extent practicable; and

''(ii) the geographic area affected by the application, if a parent or affiliate is not a party to the application;

''(B) simplifies the data interfaces for submission to the greatest extent practicable; and

''(C) allows all applicants, regardless of whether an applicant is publicly traded, to rely on a bond rating of at least investment grade (when bond ratings are available) in place of financial documentation.'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''subsection (j)'' and inserting ''subsection (l)''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) GRANT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary—

''(i) shall not restrict the eligibility of an entity for a grant under this section based on the legal structure of the entity;

''(ii) shall allow entities to apply for a grant under this section without regard to, or preference for, the legal structure of an entity;

''(iii) in determining the financial ability of an entity to carry out a project using a grant under this section, shall allow the entity to demonstrate that financial ability by methods that—

''(I) the Secretary determines to be the least burdensome; and

''(II) subject to clause (v), are not limited to providing the Federal Government an exclusive first lien on all grant-funded assets during the service obligation of the grant;

''(iv) subject to clause (v), in determining the required collateral to secure grant funds or to secure performance during the service obligation of a grant, shall allow an awardee to offer alternative security, such as a letter of credit, in lieu of providing the Federal Government an exclusive first lien on all grant-funded assets; and

''(v) if the Secretary reasonably determines that alternative methods or alternative security established under clause (iii)(II) or (iv) are insufficient to secure performance with respect to a project under this section—

''(I) may require an entity to provide the Federal Government an exclusive first lien all grant-funded assets during the service obligation of the grant; and

''(II) shall release that lien after the Secretary determines that the entity is performing to the satisfaction of the Secretary.''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''50'' and inserting ''90''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) OBLIGATIONS TO PROVIDE BROADBAND SERVICE IN THE SAME SERVICE TERRITORY.—

''(i) DEFINITION OF BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In this subparagraph, the term 'broadband infrastructure' means any cables, fiber optics, wiring, or other permanent infrastructure that is integral to the structure, including fixed wireless infrastructure, that—

''(I) is capable of providing access to internet connections in individual locations; and

''(II) offers an advanced telecommunications capability (as defined in section 706(d) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (47 U.S.C. 1302(d))).

''(ii) OTHER PROVIDERS.—The Secretary shall consider a proposed service territory with respect to which an eligible entity submits an application to carry out a project under this section to be served by broadband service if a broadband service provider other than that eligible entity is subject to an obligation by a Federal, State, or local government entity to build broadband infrastructure and offer broadband service in that service territory, subject to conditions—

''(I) under a Federal, State, or local funding award program; or

''(II) otherwise required by the Federal, State, or local government entity.

''(iii) OTHER FUNDING.—Subject to clause (iv), the Secretary shall not be required to consider a proposed service territory with respect to which an eligible entity submits an application to carry out a project under this section to be served by broadband service if that eligible entity has accepted an obligation under a Federal, State, or local funding award program to build broadband infrastructure and offer broadband service in that service territory, if the proposed project under this section—

''(I) would not be duplicative of the obligation under the other award program; and

''(II) would build broadband infrastructure that results in faster speeds or expedited milestones of deployment of broadband infrastructure in that service territory, as compared to the obligation under the other award program.

''(iv) OTHER OBLIGATIONS FOR LOWER TRANSMISSION CAPACITY.—The Secretary shall consider a proposed service territory with respect to which an eligible entity submits an application to carry out a project under this section to be unserved by broadband service if an obligation under another award program described in clause (iii) would not provide broadband service of at least—

''(I) a 25-Mbps downstream transmission capacity; and

''(II) a 3-Mbps upstream transmission capacity.

''(E) REQUIREMENTS FOR FUNDING.—

''(i) AFFILIATE OWNED AND OPERATED NETWORKS.—A grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section may be used to construct networks that will be owned and operated by an affiliate of the eligible entity receiving the grant, loan, or loan guarantee, subject to the condition that the eligible entity, the affiliate, or both, as the Secretary determines to be necessary, shall provide adequate security for the grant, loan, or loan guarantee.

''(ii) NEGATIVE COVENANTS AND CONDITIONS.—To the greatest extent practicable, a project carried out using a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section shall not add any new negative covenants or conditions to the grant, loan, or loan guarantee agreement that were not previously disclosed to the eligible entity at the time of application for the grant, loan, or loan guarantee.

''(iii) OWNERSHIP OF SYSTEMS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A network constructed with a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section may be transferred to an unaffiliated provider that agrees—

''(aa) to assume the service obligation; and

''(bb) to provide appropriate and sufficient security for that network.

''(II) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall not unreasonably withhold consent to enter into an appropriate agreement described in subclause (I) with the transferee based on an evaluation by the Secretary of the ability of the transferee to assume the agreement and provide security described in item (bb) of that subclause.

''(iv) REPORTING AND AUDITING.—The Secretary shall—

''(I) simplify, to the maximum extent practicable, ongoing reporting and auditing requirements for recipients of a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section; and

''(II) allow a recipient described in subclause (I) whose financial information is consolidated with the financial information of a parent entity to rely on that consolidated financial information in complying with the requirements described in that subclause if the parent entity is providing a guarantee on behalf of a subsidiary of the parent entity with respect to the grant, loan, or loan guarantee.

''(v) PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTING.—The Secretary—

''(I) shall simplify, to the maximum extent practicable, requirements for recipients of a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under this section relating to the procurement of materials and retention of contractors; and

''(II) shall not unreasonably restrict the ability of a recipient described in subclause (I) to obtain goods and services from affiliated entities.'';

(5) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''25-Mbps'' and inserting ''100-Mbps''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''3-Mbps'' and inserting ''20-Mbps'';

(6) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (l) and (m), respectively;

(7) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

''(j) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this section in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

''(k) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the Rural Internet Improvement Act of 2022, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary shall—

''(1) publish a report describing—

''(A) the distribution of amounts made available under the ReConnect Program for the preceding year;

''(B) the number of locations at which broadband service was made available using amounts under the ReConnect Program for the preceding year;

''(C) the number of locations described in subparagraph (B) at which broadband service was used; and

''(D) the highest level of broadband service made available at each location described in subparagraph (B); and

''(2) submit the report described in paragraph (1) to—

''(A) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

''(B) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

''(C) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

''(D) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.''; and

(8) in subsection (l) (as so redesignated), in paragraph (1), by striking ''$350,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023'' and inserting ''such sums as are necessary for each fiscal year''.

(b) SUNSET.—Beginning on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, section 779 of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141; 132 Stat. 399), shall have no force or effect.

(c) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS.—The unobligated balance, as of the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, of any amounts made available to carry out the pilot program described in section 779 of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141; 132 Stat. 399)—

(1) is transferred to, and merged with, amounts made available to carry out section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb); and

(2) shall remain available, until expended, and without further appropriation, to carry out the ReConnect Program established under that section.

(d) EFFECT.—Title VI of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 607. EFFECT.

''Nothing in this title authorizes the Secretary to regulate rates charged for broadband service.''.

(e) PUBLIC NOTICE, ASSESSMENTS, AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 701 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950cc) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting '', including a complete shapefile map'' after ''applicant''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking ''(c)'' and inserting ''(d)'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) CHALLENGE PROCESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a transparent, evidence based, and expeditious process for challenging, with respect to any area for which assistance is sought under an application described in subsection (a)(1), whether that area has access to broadband service.

''(2) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall make publicly available on the website of the Department of Agriculture a written notice describing—

''(A) the decision of the Secretary on each challenge submitted under paragraph (1); and

''(B) the reasons for each decision described in subparagraph (A).''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(g) PUBLIC NOTICE OF ELIGIBLE FUNDING AREAS.—Prior to making available to the public the database under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make available to the public a fully searchable database on the website of the Rural Utilities Service that contains information on areas eligible for assistance under retail broadband projects that are administered by the Secretary in accordance with the maps created by the Federal Communications Commission under section 802(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 642(c)(1)).''.

(f) FEDERAL BROADBAND PROGRAM COORDINATION.—Section 6212 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (7 U.S.C. 950bb–6) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (b), (c), (e), and (a), respectively, and moving the subsections so as to appear in alphabetical order;

(2) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated), in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 601(b)(3) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936'' and inserting ''section 601(b) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(b))'';

(3) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated), in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) RECONNECT PROGRAM.—On awarding a grant, loan, or loan guarantee under the ReConnect Program established under section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb), the Secretary shall notify the Commission of that award.''; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(d) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING RELATING TO OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Assistant Secretary and the Commission to facilitate outreach to residents and businesses in rural areas, including—

''(1) to evaluate the broadband service needs in rural areas;

''(2) to inform residents and businesses in rural areas of available Federal programs that promote broadband access, broadband affordability, and broadband inclusion; and

''(3) for such additional goals as the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and the Commission determine to be appropriate.''.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 5141. A bill to direct the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics to establish a database with respect to corporate offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 5141

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 ''Corporate Crime Database Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. CORPORATE CRIME DATABASE AT THE BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part C of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10131 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 305. CORPORATE CRIME DATABASE.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term 'business entity' means a corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

''(2) CORPORATE OFFENSE.—The term 'corporate offense' means—

''(A) a violation or alleged violation of Federal law committed by—

''(i) a business entity; or

''(ii) an individual employed by a business entity within the conduct of the individual's occupational role; and

''(B) any other violation determined by the Director to be a corporate offense.

''(3) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Bureau.

''(4) ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—The term 'enforcement action' includes any concluded administrative, civil, or criminal enforcement action or any declination, settlement, deferred prosecution agreement, or non-prosecution agreement entered into by a Federal agency to enforce a law or regulation.

''(5) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term 'Federal agency' has the meaning given the term 'agency' in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Corporate Crime Database Act of 2022, the Director shall—

''(1) collect, aggregate, and analyze information regarding enforcement actions taken with respect to corporate offenses; and

''(2) publish on the internet website of the Bureau a database of the enforcement actions described in paragraph (1).

''(c) INFORMATION INCLUDED.—The database established under subsection (b) shall include the following information on an enforcement action with respect to corporate offenses:

''(1) Each business entity or individual identified by the enforcement action.

''(2) The employer of an individual identified under paragraph (1), as determined relevant by the Director.

''(3) The parent company of a business entity identified under paragraph (1) or the parent company of any employer identified under paragraph (2), as determined relevant by the Director.

''(4) The type of offense or alleged offense committed by the business entity or individual.

''(5) Any relevant statute or regulation violated by the business entity or individual.

''(6) Each Federal agency bringing the enforcement action.

''(7) The outcome of the enforcement action, if any, including all documentation relevant to the outcome.

''(8) An unique identifier for each business entity, individual, employer, or parent company identified by the enforcement action.

''(9) Any additional information the Director determines necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

''(d) INFORMATION COLLECTION BY DIRECTOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Corporate Crime Database Act of 2022, the Director shall establish guidance for the collection of information from each Federal agency that carries out an enforcement action with respect to corporate offenses, including identification of each Federal agency that shall submit information to the Director and the manner in which, time at which, and frequency with which the information shall be submitted.

''(2) TIMING OF INFORMATION INCLUDED.—To the extent to which information is available, the database established under subsection (b) shall include the information described in subsection (c) on each enforcement action with respect to corporate offenses taken by a Federal agency before, on, or after the date of enactment of the Corporate Crime Database Act of 2022.

''(e) PUBLICATION DETAILS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Corporate Crime Database Act of 2022, the Director shall publish on the internet website of the Bureau the database established under subsection (b) in a format that is searchable, downloadable, and accessible to the public.

''(2) UPDATE OF INFORMATION.—The Director shall update the information included in the database established under subsection (b) each time the information is collected under subsection (d).

''(f) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the publication of the database established under subsection (b), and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress a report including—

''(1) a description of the data collected and analyzed under this section related to corporate offenses, including an analysis of recidivism, offenses and alleged offenses, and enforcement actions;

''(2) an estimate of the impact of corporate offenses on victims and the public; and

''(3) recommendations, developed in consultation with the Attorney General, for legislative or administrative actions to improve the ability of Federal agencies to monitor, respond to, and deter instances of corporate offenses.''.

(b) CHIEF DATA OFFICER COUNCIL.—Section 3520A(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) identify ways in which a Federal agency (as defined in section 305 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968) that carries out an enforcement action (as defined in that section) with respect to a corporate offense (as defined in that section) can improve the collection, digitalization, tabulation, sharing, and publishing of information under that section, and the standardization of those processes, in order to carry out that section.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 851—CELEBRATING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SENATE BLACK LEGISLATIVE STAFF CAUCUS AND ITS ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE SENATE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 851

Whereas, in 1977, Jackie Parker and Ralph Everett had the vision and courage to improve the working conditions of Black Senate staffers;

Whereas the Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus continues to promote diversity and inclusion within the Senate;

Whereas the Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus recognizes each of the 11 current or former Senators of African-American descent;

Whereas the Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus celebrates and commemorates the dedicated efforts of its members to promote a more diverse and representative government; and

Whereas the Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus continues to fight for the justice and equality that started during the civil rights movement of the 1960s: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the Senate Black Legislative Staff Caucus for its many contributions and commitment to enrich the Senate community.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I have five 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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPETITION POLICY, ANTITRUST, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

The Subcommittee on Competition Policy, Antitrust, and Consumer Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JAMES M. INHOFE

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I understand the Chair has an announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication regarding the resignation of Senator INHOFE.

Without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD and spread upon the Journal, as follows:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2022.

Hon. KAMALA D. HARRIS,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR VICE PRESIDENT HARRIS: Please find the attached document dated February 28, 2022 officially notifying Oklahoma Secretary of State Brian Bingman of my intent to resign my Senate seat on January 3, 2023. I further note that my resignation will be effective at 11:59AM on that date.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. Senate.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2022.

Secretary of State BRIAN BINGMAN,
Oklahoma City, OK.

DEAR SECRETARY BINGMAN: It has been the greatest honor to serve the people of Oklahoma since I first entered public service in 1967, but after much prayer and consideration, Kay and I feel the time has come to stand aside and support the next generation of Oklahoma leaders.

Accordingly, pursuant to 26 O.S. §12–119, I am writing to inform you of my intention to retire from the United States Senate on January 3, 2023. Under state law 26 O.S. §12–101, this constitutes my irrevocable pledge to retire at the end of the 117th Congress, which allows the special election to be held concurrent with the existing election schedule.

I am excited to announce that I am endorsing Bartlesville-native and fellow Tulsan, Luke Holland in the special election to replace me, because Luke is a fierce conservative and the best person to continue my legacy of a strong national defense and investment in local infrastructure.

May God bless the great state of Oklahoma and the United States of America.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. INHOFE,
U.S. Senator.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 5068

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 5068 be discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2022

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, November 30, and that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Velez-Rive nomination; further, if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, there will be two rollcall votes beginning at 11:30 a.m. and two rollcall votes at 2:15 p.m.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator PORTMAN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UKRAINE

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I come to the floor today for the 26th consecutive week that the Senate has been in session to highlight the very latest from Russia's illegal, unprovoked, and deadly assault on Ukraine. This continues to be a critical time for Ukraine and Ukraine's freedom fighters, and it is a classic fight for freedom. At this critical juncture, as the winter months approach, Russia's morale is flagging and Ukrainians are making steady gains on the battlefield. It is absolutely vital that the United States and our allies continue to stand by the people of Ukraine. We can't pull back now.

Ukraine, as you know, is a democracy. They are a great ally of ours. They just want to live in peace with their neighbors, including Russia.

Over the objections of 140 countries in the United Nations, Russia launched a brutal invasion of Ukraine on February 24. That was 9 months ago, and they haven't let up. While we celebrated Thanksgiving holiday this past week here in America, Ukrainians endured a deadly week of Russian attacks and bombardments on civilian population centers far, far from the frontlines. They didn't get a Thanksgiving break from the war.

Russia's military is actually continuing to bomb inside of Ukraine even today, civilian targets. What is interesting is that, at the same time, Ukraine is winning on the battlefield. Over half of Ukraine's Russian-occupied territory has now been liberated. Remember, at one point, Ukraine included the occupied territory up here near Kyiv, the capital, and all this area. Most of that area has now been liberated, and these are the areas where the Russians continue to occupy: Crimea, which they took back in 2014, parts of the Donetsk, and these additional areas. Even today, Ukrainians are making progress in these areas.

So on the battlefield, the Ukrainians, with our help and the help of 50 countries around the world, are making

progress. Yet, Russia continues to launch these missiles into Ukraine. Even in a place like Bakhmut, one place where the Russians were making some progress using mercenary forces—the Wagner Group, it is called—the monthslong assault by these Russian forces has turned into a grinding battle of attrition, and Russia has made little to no gains. So in the Bakhmut region, which is right here, even there, where the Wagner Group is fighting, they are not making significant progress at all.

By the way, back in April 2018, I visited Bakhmut. I was able to go there as part of a congressional factfinding trip, and the Ukrainian military allowed me to see the line of contact—actually go to that border area—the line of contact being between the occupied part in 2014 and the rest of Ukraine.

That is where I learned that the Ukrainians were going to fight, by the way, because I talked to a lot of the soldiers there about what was going on, and when there was discussion several years later about whether Ukrainians would fight if the Russians invaded, as it appeared clear they were going to do, I had no doubt that the Ukrainians were going to fight because I met these soldiers and talked to them, and they were hardened, and they knew what Russia had done to them and their families and their country and their freedom. And they have fought.

Here is a photo of me back in 2018 in this area of Bakhmut. As you can see, you have Ukrainian soldiers walking around freely.

Here is a photograph of Bakhmut today, to show you the difference. Back when I was there, there was sniper activity. You could hear some artillery being fired off in the distance, but today, months and months of Russia's brutal assault has led to Bakhmut looking like this.

Here is the Ukrainian soldier today.

It is a hellscape straight from the Western front of World War I, isn't it? Relentless artillery bombardments have forced soldiers into these trenches, just like they dug in France during World War I and World War II. This is the condition that Ukrainian soldiers are fighting in to defend their families, their freedom, and their country, and they are doing it as the temperature is falling and winter approaches. But they are undeterred, and they continue to fight hard.

The response to Ukraine making progress on the battlefield by Russia is to launch these missiles into the interior. I really think it is out of frustration. It is a cowardly approach. They can't win on the battlefield, so instead they are sitting back in Russia and bombing these civilian targets.

Here is one you can see. It is an energy grid in Ukraine. This is in western Ukraine. And it is just relentless bombing. They are killing people when they do this, by the way. They are not just taking out energy infrastructure; they are killing civilians, including energy workers. Again, it is a cowardly approach. They are killing civilians and noncombatants, needlessly slaughtering men, women, and children. They are attacking residential areas, and they have been all along—apartment buildings, hospitals, community buildings—and, of course, causing cities to go dark as they go into winter, dark and cold.

When we were in Ukraine just a few weeks ago—Senator COONS and myself—Senator COONS and I went to get some additional information on the ground in Ukraine, and we got to see this firsthand.

This is in Kyiv, the capital of Ukraine. This is where the control center was for this energy utility, and this had happened just a few days before we got there. So the Russians are targeting very specifically energy to knock out electricity, knock out heating, knock out water.

That night, by the way, we had dinner with Ukrainian Parliamentarians. It was a dinner meeting to talk about what we could do as Congress and they can do as Parliamentarians to help the Ukrainian people right now. We had to have the meal by flashlight and candles because there was no electricity.

The systemic bombing of civilian infrastructure, throwing these Ukrainian cities in the dark and in the cold, without running water, has been met by heroic repair by Ukrainians. I imagine this is already repaired. But again, the Russians keep bombing. They need our help to be able to help prepare and provide more equipment as this equipment is being destroyed by the Russians.

Today, I was pleased to see that Secretary of State Antony Blinken announced an additional $53 million from the United States to support efforts to rebuild this Ukrainian energy grid that keeps getting destroyed by the Russians. This package will include distribution transformers, circuit breakers, surge arresters, disconnectors, vehicles, and other key equipment. It brings U.S. support for Ukraine's energy infrastructure since February up to about $145 million.

But again, it is not just us, and it shouldn't just be us. Our allies need to step forward to help Ukraine in this difficult moment as well, and they are. Finland, as an example I just saw, will send energy equipment to Ukraine this week. The EU, the European Union, will give Ukraine 200 transformers and 40 heavy generators to support the energy sector. The EU has probably given more than anyone else. This critical aid is needed because, again, these attacks just continue and continue.

The recent attacks in Kyiv, by the way, that we saw earlier when I was there 3 weeks ago, 300,000 Ukrainian citizens in Kyiv had lost power when we were there. I am told that there are currently about 130,000 Kyiv residents losing power, without electricity.

The Ukrainian military, again, has been making progress. They have had a huge success here in Kherson. This city of Kherson in Ukrainian was the first provincial and only provincial capital the Russians occupied and the first major city that they took. The Ukrainian military carefully and over time orchestrated a great victory there, and about 3 weeks ago, it was liberated.

As this photo shows, Ukrainian citizens have welcomed these soldiers as heroes. You have probably seen some of this on TV news. They have just embraced these soldiers, and they put the Ukrainian flags back up in all the buildings. They have told these soldiers and others, including the investigators from the International Criminal Court, of the war crimes, the unthinkable war crimes that were committed by the Russian occupiers while they were there.

So the Russians were forced out of Kherson because of very effective work by the Ukrainians, using the weapons that we and the Europeans have provided them, including longer range missiles, taking out their supplies, taking out their ability to resupply themselves.

So what has happened now is that Russia, once they had left Kherson, has now started their bombing campaign, just nonstop bombing in the very city they occupied only a few weeks ago. So they are saying: If we can't have it, we are just going to bomb it into oblivion. Ukrainians are having now, after having lived through the occupation, to try to live through this bombing.

I saw the Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine recently urge civilians to leave Kherson and go to other parts of Ukraine this winter due to these Russian attacks. That is what has to be done. The soldiers will stay and they will fight, but the Russians are just constantly attacking Kherson.

In this area—this oblast, it is called—that provincial area, 10 people have recently been killed and 54 injured. The Russians shelled this provincial area 49 times on Thanksgiving day, 49 missiles and bombs on Thanksgiving day, hitting residential buildings, a shipyard, the school grounds, gas pipelines, everything.

The Russian shelling hit a school that was being used as a distribution point for humanitarian aid in the Zaporizhzhia area, up here. So in Zaporizhzhia, they had a school that was handing out humanitarian assistance, and it was attacked by a Russian missile. It killed a social worker and injured two other people.

You probably saw that also in eastern Ukraine recently, the Russians attacked a maternity hospital, and again they killed innocent civilians. They actually killed a newborn baby, a baby boy. They critically injured a doctor. The overnight explosion left a smalltown hospital there in total disrepair, just a crumble of bricks and scattered metal. There were medical supplies, by the way, strewn all over the streets. The newborn who was killed was only 2 days old—2 days old—but he had a name, Serhii, and his death will not be forgotten in Ukraine.

These are flagrant human rights abuses and war crimes. As a Zelenskyy Presidential adviser said, ''There is no military logic [here]: they just want to take revenge on the locals. This is a huge war crime.''

I agree. Vladimir Putin is trying to bring Ukraine to its knees, but do you know what it is doing? It is only strengthening their resolve, the amazing resolve of the Ukrainian people.

Russia is beginning to feel the negative impacts of this war more and more. The sanctions are beginning to bite more, and we should strengthen them even more, in my view. But it is having an impact. The Russian banking sector has been hit by this. The Russian central bank reported that a record $14.7 billion in hard currency was withdrawn from the Russian banking system last month, in October. People are taking their money and running. This was during the 300,000 troop mobilization of mostly untrained recruits.

A November report by the central bank warned that Russia's GDP would face a sharper contraction of 7.1 percent in the fourth quarter of this year, after falling 4.1 percent and 4 percent compared with last year in the previous two quarters.

So the economy is going the wrong way in Russia. Last week, the economy officially entered into a recession. So this war is having an impact on Russia, finally.

The central bank chairwoman told the Russian lawmakers that next year the situation will get darker still. She said:

> We really need to look at the situation very soberly and with our eyes open. Things may get worse, we understand that.

I sure hope so. I sure hope so—that countries around the world see what is happening here and tighten these sanctions.

For many Russian companies, the reality of war sank in with the latest desperate mobilization. This is according to the German Institute for International and Security Affairs. I think that is true.

While there are a lot of Russians who still believe the propaganda and the disinformation from the Kremlin about Ukraine and, therefore, continue to fight innocent Ukrainians—their neighbors—other Russians now understand that this battle is not against an enemy; this battle is a failed ploy by Vladimir Putin to achieve his misguided ambitions to recreate the Russian Empire, the Russian Federation. That is what it is about. It is not about Ukraine.

I want to take a moment to talk about the aid package that is being developed right now here on the floor to send to Ukraine to continue our help at this crucial moment and to make an important point, which is that oversight of our assistance to Ukraine is very important. It is important to me. It is important to my constituents. It is important to my colleagues. We need to be sure there are significant accountability measures in place. We have got to know where the aid is going. We need to know exactly where it is going and who is using it and how.

No one is advocating that we give Ukraine a blank check; and, by the way, they have not gotten a blank check. There are spending safeguards in place already. President Zelenskyy agrees with that. He wants those kind of checks in the system because he knows that that transparency is critical to the continued aid—not just from us but from the 50 other countries around the world that are providing assistance or more.

There is an accounting firm from the United States involved that follows all the aid to the government, as an example. Also, the World Bank sends a report about all the aid that goes to—the state aid, the government aid part, and they constantly audit that and report on that. So there are mechanisms in place already. Could they be strengthened? Probably so.

With regard to military equipment, we have put in place unprecedented policies to be able to have what is called end-use monitoring of the military weapons that are going to Ukraine. I visited with the 101st Airborne in Poland a few weeks ago and talked a lot about how that end-use monitoring is going. We finally have a military attache in country and some people who can help follow where these various weapons are going. And, honestly, so far, so good.

I have to tell you, I am surprised by this, but there has been absolutely no documented instance yet of diversion of U.S.-supplied weapons—to Russia, to Belarus, to third parties. Now, that may happen in the future, but this end-use monitoring is carefully ensuring that you get the serial number and you find out where the thing is going and you check on it. And I think that is very important, and my colleagues need to know that. This is something that the Ukrainian Government wants to do. And they should want to do it, and our military certainly wants to do it.

The Ukrainian Government has been transparent in terms of the funding because it is in their interest. It is in all of our interest. They hear questions about oversight coming from Members of Congress, and they understand the need to provide the accountability. So we need to continue the assistance at this crucial time, as we have said tonight, but we need to be sure it continues to be accountable.

You know, Vladimir Putin, when he decided to initiate this invasion, which so many people around the world thought he would never do because it made no sense; there was no logic behind it. But when he did this, he thought it would be a walk in the park. He thought the Russian Army would roll in and the Ukrainians would roll over.

It turned out to be a walk through Hell for his army and his government. Why? Because the Ukrainian people showed grit and determination and the military fought more effectively than anybody expected. It is because Ukraine's morale and leadership has not faltered, even against overwhelming odds, a much larger military, and many more missiles. They have not faltered.

I have seen this mindset in Ukraine on my visits there. I think I have been there 8 or 10 times since 2014. It goes from President Zelenskyy all the way down to the soldiers we saw in the trenches, to the civilians who are doing their part.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported that during the Russian occupation of Kherson, the area we talked about earlier, the 68-year-old head doctor at the hospital there in Kherson refused to bow down to the Russian invaders, setting a tone for citywide resistance. He told the invaders: ''You can shoot me if you want,'' but I am not going to do what you want. I have a responsibility to this hospital, and I am going to carry it out for the citizens of Kherson.

Other Ukrainian workers at the hospital were just as heroic and clever. The Journal reports that their resistance lasted 8 months. They faked a COVID outbreak to keep Russians from stealing their equipment, coming into the hospital and taking equipment. They spied for Ukrainian forces.

The fighting spirit of the Ukrainians should come as no surprise. They are a proud, patriotic, and tough people. For perhaps one of the best illustrations of this courage, I am reminded of the grandmother who gave sunflower seeds to invading Russian soldiers way back in February when they first started coming in. She gave them the sunflowers and said: Give these to somebody to plant at your burial place because you are going to die for invading our country and you might want to have something beautiful being grown at your gravesite.

That was a brave Ukrainian grandmother. I remember the photograph of a woman about 5 feet tall telling this to a Russian soldier a foot or so taller.

And who can blame the patriotic defiance that they have shown. Today, half of Ukraine's energy infrastructure is gone. Kyiv is operating on scheduled blackouts that last 4 hours. This is the capital. Civilians are being killed every day. Ukraine's economy continues to suffer catastrophic consequences. War crimes continue to be revealed day after day.

The actions by the Kremlin to knowingly destroy and attack civilian areas and kill innocent Ukrainians, of course, are meant to dampen Ukrainians' resolve, but, instead, these actions encourage fortitude among the ranks of Ukraine's freedom fighters against the barbaric enemy that has invaded their homeland. That is how they feel.

When I have come down to the floor each week to discuss the status of this

war on Ukraine's land, I have pointed out that this is where the battle is occurring for freedom over tyranny, of democracy over authoritarianism. This is where it is being waged here, in our generation, now. This is why we need to stand up and be counted.

If we don't join allies throughout the world in condemning it and helping Ukraine defend itself, what happens? Well, the world becomes a much more dangerous and volatile place. Trust me, people are watching—our enemies and our adversaries. Iran is watching. China is watching. Others are watching.

This is not the time for the United States and the allies around the world—more than 50 of them who have provided military assistance—to pull back. At a meeting in Romania today, the NATO Secretary General reaffirmed that NATO's door to membership remains open to Ukraine. It has been open since 2008.

I found this to be very welcome news, something I have called for, for years. I don't think Russia would be in Ukraine if it had happened.

Ukraine is making gains on the battlefield, as I said. Russian forces and equipment are being destroyed and depleted. Russian war crimes continue to be committed as they punish Ukrainian civilians, and the Russian people are beginning to feel the negative effects of this failed war.

I think, frankly, that Vladimir Putin believes his supply of missiles will outlast the patience of the free world. I think that is what he believes. That is why he continues this senseless war. I think he believes he will continue to be able to have enough missiles to outlast the patience of the Western World, of us, the freedom-loving people.

I don't think that is accurate, but we need to prove him wrong. We need to keep the pressure up to end with a resolution to this senseless, brutal war. I believe, with the help of the United States and our allies, democracy can and will prevail over tyranny and authoritarianism. And that, of course, would send the right message echoed across the world, a message that tyranny and authoritarianism must not triumph.

I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:24 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, November 30, 2022, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KATE E. BRUBACHER, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE STEPHEN R. MCALLISTER, RESIGNED.

ISMAIL J. RAMSEY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DAVID L. ANDERSON, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER MAZAK

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month I had the pleasure of attending Alexander Mazak's Eagle Scout Court of Honor. Alex started his scouting career 10 years ago as a Tiger Cub Scout and worked his way all the way up to the rank of Eagle Scout. For his Eagle Scout project, which he named the ''Remembrance Tree Project,'' he planted 40 trees at Reed's Organic Farm and Animal Rescue in Egg Harbor Township, South Jersey. Alex also built benches for the farm. In his free time, Alex plays the violin, has a black belt in karate, participates in CrossFit, and is working towards getting Scuba Diving certified. Alex should be proud of his many achievements, and it was my pleasure to attend his Eagle Scout ceremony. God Bless Alex, and God Bless our America.

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN LEGION POST 79 ON ITS 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an incredible Veterans Service Organization within my district on the centennial of its founding. The New Hope, Pennsylvania American Legion Post 79 will celebrate 100 years of service in 2023. The post is named after Private 2nd Class Edgar Denson who served in the 79th Infantry Division in the Great War. Private Denson was killed in the Meuse Argonne Offensive of 1918 and American Legion Post 79 has continued to honor his sacrifice and service through the years.

Since its founding in 1923, Post 79 has been a pillar in the community. Its members have served in every major United States conflict as well as taking part in numerous humanitarian and peace operations. Post 79 supports our community's Veterans through a myriad of programs and efforts. These include support for Wounded Warrior events, participation in the local County Veterans Court, sponsoring entertainment at the local county playhouse, and much more. The Post also helps to develop our youth by sponsoring Little League teams, scholarships at the high school level, and helping local Scouting programs. Additionally, American Legion Post 79 sends care packages to our community's forward deployed troops to remind them of our appreciation for their sacrifice.

I believe it is fitting that such an accomplished and storied organization makes its home just a few miles from the spot that General Washington crossed the Delaware River. The legacy of American Legion Post 79 carries on the patriotic spirit instilled into our country that fateful Christmas Eve, 1776. I am extremely grateful for the example and the impact that Post 79 has had on our community for the past century, and I look forward to the amazing achievements to come in the next 100 years.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MAE MOODY

HON. TIM BURCHETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Mae Moody, a leader and pinnacle of the Knox County community, who passed away on October 17, 2022, at age 83.

Mae loved her community and dedicated much of her life to trying to make it better every day. She cared deeply about supporting leaders who would help East Tennessee thrive. Most often, she voted as a Republican, but she was more focused on supporting the best candidate no matter what. For her, each election was not a partisan issue, but a community issue.

Many community leaders honored Mae's life and passing. They talked about her compassion, integrity, honesty, and community advocacy which was apparent to everyone who knew her. She was described as a ''community champion,'' a ''neighborhood advocate,'' and a ''virtuous leader.''

Mae was incredibly dedicated to supporting our law enforcement and community safety. She taught thousands of children how to properly use 911 and served as a community organizer for the Knoxville Police Department. Mae also completed the Citizen Academies of the FBI, District Attorney, Knox County Sheriffs Office, Tennessee Highway Patrol, and Fire Department to gain a better insight into how our law enforcement operates and how she could help them.

I want to extend my condolences to her husband Jack, her children Susan, Terry, and Chuck, her sister Carol, as well as her grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Rest in peace Mae and I thank her for everything she has done for our community.

TRIBUTE TO DON WILLIAMS

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, today, I would like to honor the lifelong achievements of my friend, Don Williams. Don was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and began his broadcasting career in the early 1980s. Ever since then, his radio show has received top ratings from listeners across South Jersey. Over the years, Don has become a friend of mine and I enjoy frequently joining him on his radio show. In addition to being a popular radio host, Don has an abundance of other noteworthy career highlights. These highlights include broadcasting an announcement with Paul Harvey, interviewing Steve Wynn and James Kalstrom, meeting Rush Limbaugh, being inducted into the New Jersey Broadcasters Hall of Fame, becoming a member of the Marine Corps Law Enforcement Foundation, and interviewing several Medal of Honor recipients. Don currently lives in Brigantine, South Jersey with his wife and two dogs. His radio show continues to play every Monday through Friday from 6 a.m. to 10 a.m. Don should be proud of his broadcasting achievements and his contributions to the South Jersey community, and it is my pleasure to call him a friend of mine. God Bless Don, and God Bless our United States of America.

IN APPRECIATION OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER MARLEY CASSELS FOR HER SERVICE ON MY STAFF

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition and appreciation of Lieutenant Commander Marley Cassels, U.S. Navy, upon her completion of the Department of Defense Legislative Fellowship program. Assigned to my office for the 2022 calendar year, Lieutenant Commander Cassels quickly became an integral part of my legislative staff.

Lieutenant Commander Cassels' background as a U.S. Navy Surface Warfare Officer directly informed my work as Chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness during a challenging time framed by Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic, and China's continued aggression on the world stage. Working closely with both my personal office and the Readiness Subcommittee staffs on the military's most pressing readiness challenges, her professionalism, positivity, and expertise helped to advance numerous legislative priorities.

Throughout the course of the year, she prepared me for important House Armed Services Committee Hearings, worked with constituents on pressing concerns, and championed legislative priorities dealing with California's Third Congressional District, military readiness, and the maritime industry. The ultimate team-player, she always looked for ways to contribute. There is no doubt her efforts helped to secure a range of priorities within the House passed H.R. 7900, ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023''. She made a lasting impact and will be deeply missed after an exceptional year of service.

Lieutenant Commander Cassels received a naval commission from the U.S. Naval Academy, where she graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in English. She later earned a Master of Business Administration degree from the Naval Postgraduate School. Lieutenant Commander Cassels' operational assignments have included service aboard the USS *Laboon* (DDG 58), USS *Mustin* (DDG 89), and USS *Lake Erie* (CG 70). During her service, she has completed a Sixth Fleet deployment, a Seventh Fleet patrol, and a shipyard overall and modernization. She also served as the flag aide to the Commander of Navy Recruiting Command.

Her extensive expertise, work ethic, and problem-solving skills were critical to my work ensuring that our military is ready when needed. While Lieutenant Commander Cassels will be missed by Team Garamendi, the U.S. Navy is lucky to have her in its ranks and we are excited for all her future successes.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the people of California's Third Congressional District and a grateful country, I wish her fair winds and following seas and extend our deepest appreciation for her dedicated service.

RECOGNIZING THE MOTOR MACHINIST MATE 1ST CLASS (RETIRED) RICHARD EVERETT MARTIN UPON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I'm honored to recognize Retired Motor Machinists Mate 1st Class (MM) Richard Everett Martin on this most auspicious occasion of his 100th birthday.

Growing up in the York Area, MM Martin attended William Penn High School, where he took a machinery and cabinet making course, while holding a job at Weaver Piano company. He split his months during his final high school year, between the factory and school, developing his love of machinery and honest labor.

After high school, MM Martin felt a call to serve and use his newfound passion, enlisting in the Navy Reserve in 1942 at the age of 19. Studying at the University of Missouri, as well as traveling to Norfolk and New York City, he completed his training and education to become a Motor Machinist's mate 1st class. He was assigned to the USS *LST–325*, a landing ship for amphibious assaults.

MM Martin was deployed to North Africa, where he would spend one (1) year training along the coast, before taking part in the invasion of Sicily. After a successful landing, during which MM Martin would receive The Purple Heart, the USS *LST–325* was deployed to Great Britain to take part in D-Day, where MM Martin, along with thousands of Allied Soldiers, bravely served.

MM Martin is the last surviving member of the original crew of the USS *LST–325*. His story stands as a testimony to true courage, bravery, and service. His service to our Nation reflects great credit not just upon himself, but also upon the Navy Reserve, as well as all those who served in World War II. As he continues to stand as an icon of selflessness, I wish him many more years of happiness and health.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK MILLER

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I would like to honor the achievements of Sheriff Charles Miller. Sheriff Miller began his career in law enforcement as a patrolman for the Salem City Police Department in 1979. Then, in 1984, he was hired as an Investigator in the Salem County Prosecutor's Office. Sheriff Miller worked through the ranks at the Salem County Prosecutor's Office to become the Chief of County Detectives. After this, he retired from the Prosecutor's Office and accepted a position as a Security Domestic Planner with the Salem County Department of Homeland Security. Chuck stayed in this role until he was elected to be the sheriff of Salem County in 2006. He is currently serving his fourth term as Sheriff. During his tenure, Sheriff Miller has broadened leadership roles and developed new initiatives at the Salem County Police Department. Additionally, he has been an advocate for protecting the quality of life for seniors in Salem County, South Jersey. Sheriff Miller should be proud of his contributions to the South Jersey community, and it is my honor to have the opportunity to acknowledge his success. God bless Sheriff Miller, and God bless our United States of America.

HONORING RACHEL RUNFOLA

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. HERN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor a woman who has served Tulsa veterans with care and compassion for years. Rachel Runfola is a champion for Oklahoma veterans. She works tirelessly to help the men and women who have faithfully served our country. She is an invaluable asset, not only to our veterans, but to all of Oklahoma.

Thanks to Rachel's leadership with Tulsa's Support Services for Veteran Families, our veterans have access to safe housing, and the support they need to maintain it.

SSVF works to help local veterans who are homeless, experiencing a housing crisis, or facing eviction within 21 days. SSVF covers 42 counties and is planning to help over 800 families every year.

Our veterans deserve the very best we have to offer, and I know Rachel gives them exactly that.

I thank Rachel and the entire SSVF team for what they do every day to give our community's veterans a better life. It does not go unnoticed.

NOVEMBER CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH, MASTER SERGEANT RUDY MORENO

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize Master Sergeant Rudy Moreno, United States Air Force (Retired) as my November Constituent of the Month. Master Sergeant Moreno is a retired combat engineer who served in the United States Air Force for 20 years and has gone above and beyond to enrich our community.

After retiring from the Air Force in 2013, Master Sergeant Moreno returned to our community and began working as an Engineering Technician at Camp Pendleton. However, his service to our region does not end there. In 2017, he founded Helping Everyone Reach Opportunity (H.E.R.O.) Inc., a non-profit to instill discipline, encouragement, and accountability in at-risk youth through boxing and fitness. The program offers a safe and positive training environment for people ages 10 to mid-20s who are at risk of joining gangs or doing drugs. When the program's usual training space in Vista was no longer available due to the pandemic, Master Sergeant Moreno decided to create a boxing gym in his backyard so he could continue improving participants' mental and physical health.

During Veterans and Military Families Month, I am proud to honor an esteemed veteran like Master Sergeant Moreno, who bravely served our country and continues to contribute to our unique and beautiful district. His expansive military background and passion to improve the lives of others is honorable and it is why I am proud to honor Master Sergeant Rudy Moreno, United States Air Force (Retired) as my November Constituent of the Month.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR MAYA TROUPE, UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Major Maya Troupe for her exemplary dedication to duty and service as an Army Congressional Fellow for my office from 1 January through 31 December 2020.

MAJ Troupe distinguished herself by serving in a broad range of assignments during her Army career. In her assignment as the Defense Fellow in my office, MAJ Troupe served as the lead on the defense portfolio and assisted with MILCON/VA and Foreign Operations. She provided insight on national security and Veterans Affairs priorities impacting over 50,000 military and veteran-related constituents and the defense industry in Northern Ohio.

MAJ Troupe transitioned to the Congressional Budget Liaison (BUL) for the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management as an Army budget liaison. In this role, she served as BUL Forward Liaison as the Army's direct budget lead for communicating strategic initiatives and requirements with House Appropriations Committee Members of Congress and professional staff, ensuring seamless synchronization of efforts. She served in this position from 1 January 2021 to 1 December 2022.

In her previous assignment, MAJ Troupe served as the Executive Officer to the Office of the Chief (OCAR), Army Reserve, G–1. Following her XO position, MAJ Troupe did a

short assignment in the OCAR Legislative Affairs Division, managing the personnel portfolio in preparation for the Chief of Army Reserve's Posture hearing. MAJ Troupe's previous positions include Deputy, G–1 for the 335th Signal Command (Provisional). In this capacity, she oversaw personnel management and accountability for the command's Active and Reserve personnel throughout Southwest Asia. As a Reserve Officer, MAJ Troupe served as a Department of Defense civilian employee and the 92nd Chemical Battalion Detachment Commander under the 335th Signal Command. She initiated the 335th Signal Command's Yellow Ribbon Program in her civilian capacity. The program prepared soldiers and families for deployment and ensured smooth transition and reintegration upon the soldier's return. As detachment commander, MAJ Troupe provided training and personnel readiness for the Battalion to support their Homeland Defense Mission.

MAJ Troupe hails from the Midwest, a St. Louis, MO native. She received her commission from the Georgia Institute of Technology as an Adjutant General officer after completing a bachelor's degree in psychology from Georgia State University. She also earned a master's degree in legislative affairs from the George Washington University and a master of science in management in healthcare administration from Troy University.

MAJ Troupe contributes her motivation and dedication to the honorable sacrifice exemplified by her father, Calvin Walter Troupe Sr., who served in Vietnam, and her mother, Rochelle Louise Ballinger. The latter provides unwavering support to her career. She aspires to set the same example for her children, Kylen Jay Krueger and Kaleigh Jae Krueger.

MAJ Troupe has positively impacted servicemembers, veterans, families, and leaders throughout her career. Our country has benefited tremendously from her extraordinary leadership, innovative ideas, and commitment to service. I join my colleagues today in honoring her dedication to our Nation and invaluable service to the United States Congress as an Army Congressional Liaison.

Madam Speaker, it has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with MAJ Maya Troupe over this past year, especially during one of the most memorable years our Congress has faced. On behalf of a grateful nation, this body recognizes and commends Maya for her steadfast service to our country. We wish her the best as she continues serving in the United States Army.

TRIBUTE TO KYLE MAINS

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, this month, I had the pleasure of attending Kyle Mains' Eagle Scout Court of Honor. Kyle started his scouting career at 8 years old as a Cub Scout. Then, at 11 years old, he became a Boy Scout until he achieved the rank of Eagle Scout this year. During his time as a scout, Kyle has never missed a weekly scouting meeting or any of the scout's monthly camping trips. He truly demonstrates the scouting ideals of "trustworthy, loyal, helpful, and friendly." Currently, Kyle attends Rowan University where he studies computer science. Kyle should be proud of his scouting accomplishments, and it was my honor to attend his Eagle Scout award ceremony. God Bless Kyle, and God Bless our America.

RECOGNIZING CASEY LEE AND HER SERVICE TO THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise to thank Casey Lee for her service to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Casey came to the Committee after first working on AAPI civil rights and housing issues for Congressman Ted Lieu through a fellowship with APAICS. Casey received her B.A. from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA).

Casey joined the Committee in 2022 as a Staff Assistant for the Full Committee. As Staff Assistant, Casey supported the full committee's senior staff and me directly. A core part of my administrative team, Casey acted as assistant clerk during hearings and markups and oversaw the committee's internship program. When other full committee administrative staff and subcommittee legislative aides/assistant clerks left their positions, Casey seamlessly assumed their duties in addition to her own and worked diligently to support the Staff Director, two Deputy Staff Directors, and multiple subcommittee counsels for all their research and administrative needs. This included helping compile the Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law subcommittee activity report for the 117th Congress and helping manage cosponsorship requests for immigration legislation.

Casey worked with our Member Services, Communications, and Digital Directors to highlight committee accomplishments for the 117th Congress and draft social media posts. She also created graphics and videos for the Respect for Marriage Act, the Assault Weapons Ban Act, and more.

Casey was also a founding member of the committee's first diversity, equity, and inclusion working group to facilitate trainings, plan initiatives, enhance our recruitment, and be a resource to other staff on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Throughout all her work, Casey brought her tireless worth ethic and commitment to excellence. Our Committee, Congress, and the American people greatly benefited from her service.

While we are sad to see Casey go and she will certainly be missed, we are happy that she will continue to serve the public interest as a policy advisor for the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus.

We thank Casey for her service to the Committee and wish her the best of luck with this new chapter.

CELEBRATING SHERIFF GREG AHERN

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. SWALWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Alameda County Sheriff Greg Ahern after 33 years of service to Alameda County.

Greg graduated from Saint Mary's College with a degree in Economics and Business Administration and from the National Academy at the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

Greg joined the Alameda County Sheriffs Department in 1980 and was promoted to sergeant at the age of 28. He has served as Sheriff since 2007, where his leadership led to the implementation of many new programs that serve the community.

Greg developed an Urban Shield tactical training exercise, which was the first of its kind in the nation, and was replicated by other cities throughout the nation. After the Boston Marathon bombing, Boston Police credited Greg's urban Shield exercise with bringing the bombers to JustIce.

In addition, as Sheriff, Greg supported the Alameda County Deputy Sheriffs Activities League (DSAL)'s staff in their creation and expansion of athletic programming for youth, reentry internships, and work to address food equity in Alameda County. The DSAL boxing and soccer leagues are known county-wide, and Dig Deep Farms, founded in 2010 under Greg's leadership, is not only providing internship opportunities to increase job training opportunities for the recently incarcerated, but also makes deliveries of fresh produce for patients of public health clinics in need of healthy food.

He also organized and implemented a Tri-Valley Substation for additional patrol and community policing coverage for the rural eastern part of Alameda County and increased staffing, participation and grant funding for the Narcotics Task Force, interoperable communications, training, and DNA cold case investigations. Furthermore, during the COVID–19 pandemic, Greg managed various departments as the Director of Emergency Services for Alameda County, overseeing housing. testing, vaccination, hospitalizations, supplies and providing emergency workers.

Under Greg's leadership, the Alameda County Sheriffs Office is better equipped, has become more technologically advanced, and is better prepared to manage large-scale emergencies.

Greg helped create a professional culture with well-trained staff that treats the community with dignity and respect. I thank Greg for his career of serving and protecting Alameda County, in addition to his wife, Kathleen, who supported him throughout his service. I wish him and his family the best in his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO GWYN M. PARRIS-ATWELL

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the

Salem Community College Foundation Veterans Dinner. At the event, Gwyn Parris-Atwell of Alloway, South Jersey was honored for her 21 years of service in the United States Air Force, where she earned the rank of colonel. During her time in the Air Force, she bravely served in Iraq. Gwyn earned many awards in the military including the Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon, and Global War on Terrorism Service Medal. In addition to her military career, she also has experience as a professional nurse and served on the Executive Board of the New Jersey Emergency Nurses Association. I want to thank Gwyn for her heroic service to our country, and it was my honor to attend the Veterans Dinner. God Bless Gwyn, and God Bless our United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF COMMISSIONER DICK HALL

HON. MICHAEL GUEST

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the life of former Mississippi Transportation Commissioner, Dick Hall. Commissioner Hall committed his life to the service of his fellow man through a long and distinguished career, and I rise today to recognize him as a dedicated leader whose example will continue to inspire many who wish to make the world around them a better place for their neighbors, friends, and family.

As a transportation commissioner for the State of Mississippi for over 20 years, Commissioner Hall was an outspoken advocate for providing additional revenue to improve Mississippi's infrastructure system. Before being elected to this post, Commissioner Hall served for three terms in the Mississippi Senate and three terms in the Mississippi House of Representatives, representing my home county of Rankin in the State Legislature throughout a noteworthy career. Commissioner Hall also served our country as a Lieutenant in the United States Army.

Commissioner Hall was fond of saying, ''We're not just building a transportation system. We're building an economy,'' which was a quip that was born out in the many projects he spearheaded. He oversaw the opening of the U.S. Highway 82 Mississippi River Bridge; the widening of Lakeland Drive in Jackson; the Highway 463 Single Point Urban Interchange project in Madison; two phases of the STACK interchange connecting Jackson, Pearl, and Brandon; projects throughout the Metro Jackson area from Canton to Crystal Springs; the Nissan Parkway; and countless rehabilitation projects throughout Mississippi's Central District. Commissioner Hall's tireless effort was vital in creating a modern infrastructure system and a strong Mississippi economy that has created better lives for those who call our state home.

For his numerous accomplishments and industrious spirit, Commissioner Hall received many accolades and awards, including the Hugh L. White Free Enterprise Award, the Friend of Education Award, Conservation Legislator of the Year, and Alumnus of the Year by the Mid-Mississippi Chapter of the Mississippi State University Alumni Association.

Commissioner Hall was an extraordinary person who will be remembered by those who had the pleasure of meeting him or working alongside him. His legacy of a deep respect and dedication to our state will endure.

It is my honor to recognize the life of Commissioner Dick Hall for the many contributions he made to our state and our Nation, and I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in recognizing his service and commitment to Mississippi and to the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING MRS. KELLY SANTORO

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VALADAO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Warden Kelly Santoro for her 30 years of service to the Central Valley community and congratulate her on her well-earned retirement.

Just like many in her family before her, Mrs. Santoro knew she wanted to dedicate her career to serving the state of California. She began her career in the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation in 1993 as a correctional officer at Centinela State Prison. Throughout her decorated career, she held crucial positions in the California Prison system ranging from Correctional Counselor to Associate Warden.

In 2012, Mrs. Santoro was named the Chief Deputy Warden of the Wasco State Prison Reception Center. In this role, she displayed incredible professionalism and competence as she oversaw over 5,000 inmates and nearly 1,500 members of staff. Her work in running the day-to-day in this role impressed her colleagues and would lead her to be named the acting Warden of the North Kern State Prison in 2015. In August of 2016, she would officially be named Warden of North Kern State Prison—a role she held until her retirement this year.

Not only has Mrs. Santoro served her community through the State's Correctional Department, but she has also been a leader in the Central Valley through her philanthropic work. She and the North Kern State Prison raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for charities such as the Ronald McDonald House, the Make-A-Wish Foundation, the Women's Shelter, and many others. For 30 years, Mrs. Santoro has been an incredible example of the dedication, professionalism, and selflessness that encompass the values of the Central Valley community.

I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Mrs. Kelly Marie Santoro for her 30 years of service to our community and congratulate her on a well-earned retirement.

RECOGNIZING RESOLUTION 181 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY VOTE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, today marks the 75th anniversary of the U.N. General Assembly vote on Resolution 181, also known as the partition plan. The resolution supported the creation of two independent states from Palestine, one Arab and one Jewish, at the end of the British Mandate.

The adoption of this resolution laid the foundation for the creation of the modern Jewish State of Israel.

The passage of the resolution came with strong U.S. leadership in helping garner the support necessary for its advancement, including from President Harry Truman who told the U.S. delegation to the U.N. to quote, ''get busy and get all the votes you can.''

Members of this body, like Representative Sol Bloom, a former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, also played a key role, reaching out to foreign nations and encouraging them to support the plan.

The plan was not everything Jewish leaders wanted. It left Jerusalem outside of what would become Israel. But nonetheless, it was proudly accepted by the Jewish Agency and Zionist groups, while the Arab League and Palestinian leaders rejected this plan.

I especially appreciate that today the United States fully recognizes Jerusalem as the capitol of Israel. On May 14, 2018, I led the House delegation for the opening the U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem with Ambassador David Friedman, welcomed by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The re-location of the Embassy was the fulfilment of ''promises made, promises kept'' by President Donald Trump. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM led the Senate Delegation.

Since that day, Palestinian rejectionism continues to limit the opportunity for peace. The Palestinians did not support a Palestinian state in 1947 because it would have meant accepting a Jewish state. To this day there are far too many Palestinians that refuse to accept Israel's right to exist and live in peace and security.

As the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa and Global Counterterrorism, Co-Chairman of the House Republican Israel Caucus, and a veteran supporter of our democratic ally Israel, I am grateful to mark this historic 75th anniversary of the UN Partition Plan vote with a strong commitment to the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Since its creation, the United States supported the Jewish State with bipartisan support from Congress, working to build a strong security, intelligence and defense relationship enshrined by shared values and mutually strategic interests. The United States Congress has worked to support our ally with annual security assistance, defense cooperation, and an emerging relationship in key areas including agriculture, hi-tech and homeland security.

Both our countries are committed to democracy and justice, and we continue to look for new ways to integrate Israel into the region, such as support for the historic Abraham Accords that normalized ties between Israel and

our Arab allies, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Morocco, and Sudan. Unlike the Palestinian leadership, I am encouraged to see these Arab nations suspend their continued rejection of Israel and work to integrate it into the region.

While we continue to see the UN's deplorable efforts to isolate, condemn and excessively attack Israel, I celebrate one of the few positive things it has done in the Middle East—the historic 75th anniversary of the UN Partition Plan vote, guided by strong U.S. leadership.

May the U.S.-Israel relationship continue to flourish for the next 75 years and beyond, and may we continue to promote our shared interests supporting democracy, peace, and cooperation throughout the region.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK P. HOFACKER

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the Salem Community College Foundation Veterans Dinner. At the event, Frank Hofacker was honored for his service to our nation in the United States Army from 1966 to 1969. He was ranked as a sergeant and received many awards and decorations for his exemplary service. Frank earned the National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Good Conduct Medal, and Vietnam Campaign Medal. He also was honored with the Bronze Star Medal, which is a decoration for heroic achievement and heroic service, as well as meritorious achievement and service in a combat zone. I want to personally thank Frank for his brave service to our great nation and it was truly an honor to attend the Veterans Dinner honoring him. God Bless Frank, and God Bless our United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE VSC LUNAR ALLIANCE AND FOUNDER DAVID H. VAN DE VELDE

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize VSC Lunar Alliance and Founder David H. van de Velde of The Villages, Florida, along with the Leesburg Noon Rotary Club for their Pledge Not to Bully Movement.

The Pledge Against Bullying Program was established in 2018 with the Interact Club at Leesburg High School with Principal Michael Randolph and has influenced numerous teenagers to make the Pledge. The VSC Lunar Alliance has drawn interest to the Pledge Against Bullying Program by allowing the participants to be a part of an exciting night program.

Moon Mission No. 1 is the first space rocket mission of VSC Lunar Alliance in a series of three missions. VSC Lunar Alliance has arranged to have a micro-SD card placed in a capsule aboard a space rocket ship at Space Port America in New Mexico. Students have their pledges, pictures, and essays on the micro-SD card along with memorabilia from the Leesburg Rotary Club and community organization. Moon Mission No. 1 is a test flight scheduled to launch November 30th and will go into space and return to the Earth.

Moon Mission No. 2 and Moon Mission No. 3 are scheduled for 2023. Moon Mission No. 2 will launch from the Kennedy Space Centre at Cape Canaveral in Florida. Moon Mission No. 2 will also carry the capsule with the micro-SD card and this time will remain on the moon. VSC Lunar Alliance and the Leesburg Noon Rotary Club will be the first to place the Leesburg High School students and participants of the Pledge Against Bullying Program on the moon along with the Leesburg Noon Rotary Club.

Founder David H. van de Velde has personally monetarily invested in support of this program to join in the three space rocket ship launches. David H. van de Velde has a vast knowledge and experience in space technology. As part owner of Quality Materials Inspection in Southern California from 1988 to 1990, Mr. van de Velde began his great interest in space technology.

I am honored to recognize Mr. van de Velde for his passion for space science and his love for children and their success. It is commendable that through Mr. van de Velde's vision and the Leesburg Noon Rotary Club students can choose not to bully through the participation and education of science space technology.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND FRANK E. WILLIAMS, JR.

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. CLYBRUN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a devoted preacher, trusted funeral director, and beloved community leader, Reverend Frank E. Williams, Jr. Affectionately known as Frank, Jr., Rev. Williams transitioned on October 12, 2022, in his hometown of Sumter, South Carolina. His lifelong commitment to his community was deeply felt and will be sorely missed.

Reverend Frank E. Williams, Jr. was born on October 8, 1952, in Sumter, South Carolina to the late Reverend Frank E. Williams, Sr. and Magnolia Robinson Williams. He attended public schools in Sumter County before pursuing a bachelor's degree in Sociology at Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina. He later attended the Gupton-Jones College of Funeral Service in Atlanta, Georgia, where he was a member of the National Morticians Fraternity, Pi Sigma Eta. He graduated in 1976 with a diploma in Funeral Service Sciences.

Frank, Jr. returned to Sumter to begin work at his family's funeral home. He became the youngest funeral director and embalmer in Sumter, South Carolina. Throughout the next 46 years, he would touch the lives of hundreds of families in this role as he guided them through some of their most difficult times.

Rev. Williams, a Godfearing man, recognized his calling to preach the gospel during his membership at Rafting Creek Missionary Baptist Church. He received his license to preach on June 8, 2003 and was ordained on May 30, 2004. Shortly thereafter, he founded Faith Missionary Baptist Church, which he faithfully pastored until his health declined.

I knew Frank, Jr. well through his civic endeavors throughout the Sumter community, the state of South Carolina and beyond. At one time he was the youngest person to serve on the Sumter County Council representing District 5, a position which he held honorably for 12 years. He spearheaded the effort to erect a statue in honor of Dr. Luns C. Richardson of Morris College, who became the longest-serving college President in South Carolina. The statue was erected on Morris College's campus in 2021.

Throughout his life, Frank, Jr. was an active member of several social orgainzations. He was 33 Grand Inspector General of the C.C. Johnson Consistory No. 136 and served as Worshipful Master of Catchall Masonic Lodge No. 425. He was also a lifelong member of the NAACP and participated in several civil rights actions, including the 1995 "Million Man March" in Washington, D.C.

Frank, Jr. is survived by his wife of 40 years, Mrs. Thoma Lewis Williams and 4 children, Marcus Evans, M. Brooke Williams, Frank E. Williams, III, and Thomas Wesley Williams, and 2 grandchildren, Nova Imani Williams, and Malik Rivers.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in honoring the remarkable life led by Reverend Frank E. Williams, Jr. His work as a minister, funeral director and county council member cemented him in the bedrock of his community. He has left an indelible mark on those around him and was an inspiration to us all.

TRIBUTE TO CORDELL CARR

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the Salem Community College Foundation Veterans Dinner. At the event, Cordell Carr was honored. Cordell served in the United States Marine Corps from September of 1967 to September of 1969. During his service, he earned the rank of Corporal within the Marine Corps. Cordell also was awarded numerous medals and badges in honor of his heroic service. These awards include the National Defense Service Medal, the Rifle Expert Badge, the Vietnam Service Medal, and the Good Conduct Medal. Cordell should be proud of his military achievements and brave service to our nation, and I want to sincerely thank him for all he has done to keep our country safe. God Bless Cordell, and God Bless America.

HONORING WARREN C. DOCKUM

HON. LAUREN BOEBERT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the work of a group of

veterans from Pueblo, Colorado for their act of service restoring the grave of a Civil War Medal of Honor recipient, Warren C. Dockum. Pueblo is the ''Home of Heroes,'' and it is only proper that it should honor Warren C. Dockum, the only known Medal of Honor recipient buried in this great American city.

Warren C. Dockum earned the Medal of Honor during the Civil War at the Battle of Sayler's Creek where he showed exemplary bravery in service of the Union. After two other soldiers were killed, Dockum charged forward and captured a key position. Dockum was recognized for his heroism and received the Medal of Honor from President Andrew Johnson who assumed office after the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

The Medal of Honor is the United States' highest award for military valor in action. While over 150 years have passed since the Medal of Honor's inception, the meaning behind the Medal has never been tarnished or diminished. A distinguished award presented only to the most deserving, the Medal of Honor tells a story of its own. Etched into the history of the Medal of Honor are the values that each recipient has displayed: bravery, courage, sacrifice, integrity, a deep love of country, and a desire to always do what is right.

The Medal of Honor reminds us that freedom isn't free. It's bought by patriots who pay the ultimate price. It reminds us to love our country and to remember that united we stand but divided we fall.

After the Civil War, Dockum eventually moved to Colorado and lived near Pueblo for the rest of his life. To honor this American hero's place of rest in Pueblo, local veterans volunteered to restore his gravesite. I thank the veterans in Pueblo for their magnificent work honoring Warren C. Dockum and highlighting yet another hometown hero who is associated with Pueblo's long and storied history of patriotism.

HONORING DR. CHARLES E. ANDERSON, SR. AS A DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL FLORIDA

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Dr. Charles E. Anderson, Sr. is the Senior Pastor and Founder of Trinity Church—one church in several locations. Dr. Anderson has served over 25 years in pastoral ministry and has had the opportunity to serve in various capacities in the International, National, State, and Local arenas. He is the President of Unity in the Community in Haines City, Florida, which is a group of local pastors, local businesses, and community leaders who work together to promote unity in the Haines City community and other surrounding areas throughout Polk County. UIC promotes and develops economic empowerment for businesses and fosters positive relationships between city government, law enforcement, and citizens.

Through Dr. Anderson's leadership, UIC and Trinity Church have championed several annual community projects and programs such as hosting a testing site for COVID–19 vaccines, a community feeding program, constructing affordable housing in the East Polk County area, a work readiness program that educates youth and prepares them for success, a back-to-school bash which continues to serve more than 2,000 families with backpacks and school supplies, and a Miracle Christmas serving over 250 families with bicycles, toys, and gift cards.

Dr. Anderson serves on the Central Florida Health Care Board of Directors where he provides guidance for policies and strategic development. He also serves on the Advent Health Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion Council. Dr. Anderson has also worked with the State Attorney's office of the 10th Judicial Circuit to host several expungement seminars to allow citizens with criminal records to be sealed or expunged and live more productive lives.

Dr. Anderson received his Bachelor of Arts in Biblical Studies, a Master of Theological Studies, and a Doctor of Divinity from Logos University Christian College in Jacksonville. He also received a second Master of Ministry from Warner University in Lake Wales. Dr. Anderson has been married to Dr. Judith F. Anderson for the past 42 years. He has two sons, Charles II (Shaelis) and Javier (Chassidee), nine grandchildren, and two great-grandkids.

HONORING JOE MOTTLOW

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share the story of a fellow Minnesotan, Joe Mottlow.

On Wednesday June 14, 2017, Joe, (aka-JoeJoe Tough as he's become known since his battle began), was admitted to the hospital with an enlarged spleen. Within the next few days Joe, a previously healthy 35-year-old, learned he had a type of leukemia called ALL (b-cell) IGH which carried with it a measly 15 percent two-year survival rate for adults.

While he and his mom sat stunned after the doctor left the room, Joe said, ''great news about Mark and Natalie!'' That morning his cousin and wife announced they were pregnant with their first child. Joe's mom began to cry and Joe just consoled her saying, ''let's just have fun with this.'' That's Joe. Always thinking about those he loves.

This was the beginning of a 5½ year rolling coaster ride full of laughs, fears, cries and camaraderie—a ride that still continues. Joe, a guy who has never met a stranger, is a different kind of fellow. The most unaverage average Joe you will ever meet—and if you do meet him, know this, he'll never forget YOU. Because not only will you learn his story, he'll learn your story as well.

Originally it was thought a bone marrow transplant was going to be his cure. Thankfully Joe's brother was a 100 percent match and the transplant seemed to do the trick and cure Joe. Unfortunately, this dreaded pest not only came back, but continued to come back 5 more times. Having a nearly incurable type of leukemia for an adult, Joe has willingly been a trailblazer, trying out new treatments and old treatments used in new ways, to help not only try to cure him, but hopefully open up the door to curing many others. Joe has endured a grueling chemo regiment, two different newer immunotherapy treatments, an experimental CAR-T trial that brought him out to Seattle, another bone marrow transplant and yet another CAR-T trial right in our own backyard at the University of MN. Joe was only the 21st person to attempt this particular type of cure. This one worked for over a year, but this summer Joe learned the beast was back and his time was short. He was told that modern medicine could only hope to promise him three to six months. Joe's bucket list is now the priority—a list filled with connections to others.

Early on in this journey, his Aunt Allison took Joe to the clinic and observed that cancer does not discriminate. Looking around the waiting room there were rich and poor, young and old. If it wants you, it gets you. She also watched Joe connecting with those in the waiting room. So many stories have been told about Joe helping other patients get through their cancer nightmares. Get up. Get dressed. Smile. Live.

Joe's smile and inspiration have not gone unnoticed. Joe's doctors let the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society know about this amazing guy their patients kept talking about. How this guy just started talking to them while they sat in the clinic, full of anxiety and sadness, and the next thing they knew they are laughing, talking the uncomfortable conversations of their cancer journey, and finding camaraderie. Joe has started group outings and text chains bringing cancer warriors together to support and love one another. These groups brought diverse unlikely people together and have made all their lives richer for having cancer and learning to dig deep to find friendship and grace in the process.

Accolades have come Joe's way. The Leukemia/Lymphoma Society nominated Joe for ''Man of the Year'' 2020, and recently honored him with their prized ''Lifetime Achievement'' award. One of Joe's clinic buddies wanted to thank the U of M for saving his life, but realized science was only part of his success. This buddy felt JoeJoe Tough gave him the fight and positivity that pushed him over the finish line and is now working with the U to develop a virtual workout motivational program that will soon be available to patients. When completed, it will be named in Joe's honor.

Accolades are wonderful, but it's the love and support Joe has received from his army of JoeJoe Toughens that has humbled and inspired him. Who has over 2000 friends? Friends, not donors, wanting something from you—but ride or die type friends? Joe does. Why? Because he is ''that'' friend we all want and is so hard to find. Joe listens and hears others, and that is what makes Joe an unaverage average Joe.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE T. CARTER

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the Salem Community College Foundation Veterans Dinner. At the event, Wayne T. Carter was honored for his 21 years of service in the United States Army, where he earned the rank

of Sergeant First Class. He earned six impressive decorations during his 21 years of military service. Wayne earned the Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Bronze Star Medal, Republic Vietnam Medal, and Meritorious Unit Citation. He performed outstanding service in warlike operations and should serve as a role model to many young men and women in South Jersey who hope to serve our country in the Army. I want to sincerely thank Wayne for his exemplary service to our nation, and it was my pleasure to attend the Veterans Dinner honoring him. God Bless Wayne, and God Bless our United States of America.

RECOGNIZING GERMAIN HARNDEN'S REMARKABLE CAREER

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Germain Harnden and her remarkable 42-year career.

Germain has dedicated her career to safety, health training, education, and advocacy for workers. For the last decade, she has served as the executive director of WNYCOSH.

Before beginning her career at WNYCOSH, Germain studied at the University of Buffalo. She worked as an editor of the Humanist Magazine at the Center of Inquiry, and she would go onto enroll in the Cornell Cooperative Extension Labor Studies program, where she took several courses on collective bargaining, labor history, and mediation. Germain worked as a certified mediator and volunteered in numerous community mediation cases.

In 1978 and 1979, Germain participated with Cornell Extension staff and other labor activists in the formation of what would become the WNY Council on Occupational Safety & Health. She helped organize the first kick-off event of WNYCOSH at a winter safety and health conference, which drew over 300 labor union participants. Germain took an official staff position at WNYCOSH in 1979 and was instrumental in creating safety and health training under OSHA's New Direction grant program.

In 1980, she also worked on advocating for the Right-to-Know legislation, which would become the nation's first law in the country to require employers to provide workers with information on the chemicals they were working with and protective measures to reduce or eliminate hazardous exposures. Throughout the 1980s, Germain organized safety workshops and seminars.

Germain served as WNYCOSH Program Director from 1986 until 2012. Germain wrote all WNYCOSH grants, including the annual contributions, and organized worker training which regularly draws 6,000 participants each year. Her work as Executive Director allowed WNYCOSH to continue its significant presence in the Buffalo area.

Germain's career was focused on bettering the lives of workers in our community, and I will always be grateful to her for those efforts. On behalf of countless workers, I sincerely thank Germain Harnden for being a dedicated community leader, advocate, and vital player in Western New York for over four decades.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today regarding missed votes. Had I been present for Roll Call vote No. 482, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 3369, I would have voted Yea. For Roll Call vote No. 483, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 4359, 1 would have voted Yea. For Roll Call vote No. 484, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended H.R. 2250, I would have voted Yea. For Roll Call vote No. 485, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended H.R. 3630, I would have voted Yea.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MR. ASA HARDISON

HON. MICHAEL GUEST

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Asa Hardison. Mr. Hardison served his community, state, and Nation and set an example for those who work to make the world around them a better place.

Mr. Hardison served the United States of America in the 101st Airborne Division during the Vietnam War. Following his service, he returned to the United States of America where he and his wife, Ruth Hardison, raised two daughters. As a civilian, Mr. Hardison served as Senior Vice President for Georgia Pacific and, in his free time, could often be found playing golf or tennis. Later in life, he enjoyed spending time with his grandchildren.

It is my honor to recognize the life of Mr. Asa Hardison for his service to our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL E. HOPKINS, JR.

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the Salem Community College Foundation Veterans Dinner. At the event, Paul E. Hopkins, Jr. was honored for his service to our country in the United States Navy from May of 1969 to January of 1971. He earned the rank of Quarter Master 3rd class during his time in the Navy. Paul was decorated with three noteworthy medals including the National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, and Vietnam Campaign Medal. He should be very proud of his selfless devotion to the United States Navy, and I want to thank him sincerely for his service to our great nation, God Bless Paul, and God Bless our United States of America.

HONORING WILLIAM BRECKENRIDGE ''BRECK'' BOWDEN FOR HIS LONGTIME SERVICE TO THE NORTH COUNTRY COMMUNITY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor William Breckenridge Bowden, the Director of the Lake Champlain Sea Grant Institute, for his years of service to protecting our lakes and native aquatic life.

Since 2012, Dr. Bowden has served as the Director of the Lake Champlain Sea Grant Institute. Under his leadership, the Lake Champlain Sea Grant has grown and was even awarded institute status in 2018. This redesignation came with a 150 percent increase in its base budget in federal support for research, outreach, and education to improve the environment and economy in the Lake Champlain Basin. Thanks to Dr. Bowden's leadership, the Lake Champlain Sea Grant earned the institute designation for demonstrating excellence in research, education, and public service dedicated to environmental responsibility and outreach. Dr, Bowden was instrumental in getting the program to the level necessary to receive this prestigious designation, which has allowed the Institute to expand its educational outreach program to New York State schools and has increased support for combatting invasive species.

Founded in 1999, the Lake Champlain Sea Grant Institute aims to raise awareness to benefit the environmental health of Lake Champlain, Lake George, and their respective watersheds, and encourage sustainable economic development. Dr. Bowden has led the Institute in building resilient communities and economies in the Lake Champlain basin, improving environmental literacy, and promoting healthy coastal ecosystems.

Dr. Bowden has committed his life to educating the next generation on environmental sustainability and is currently a professor in Watershed Science and Planning in the Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources at the University of Vermont.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I would like to thank Dr. Bowden for his contributions to the Lake Champlain basin and congratulate him on his retirement. I wish him well in this next chapter of his life.

TRIBUTE TO LAVEL NORMAN DAVIS, JR.

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a brilliant student and gifted athlete. Lavel Norman Davis, Jr., affectionately known as Tyler, was called too soon to his heavenly home on November 13, 2022, in Charlottesville, Virginia. Although he is no longer with us, memory of his unbreakable spirit will remain a beacon for all who knew him.

Tyler Davis was born on January 7, 2002, in Ridgeville, South Carolina to Thaddeus Lavel

Davis and Fallom Simone Davis. Tyler attended Harleyville-Ridgeville Elementary, Clay Hill Elementary, Harleyville-Ridgeville Middle School and Woodland High School in Dorchester, South Carolina. Throughout his primary education, Tyler established his excellence both on and off the field. He maintained a 3.577 GPA, A-B Honor Roll status, and concurrently earned certification as a Nursing Assistant through the Dorchester County Career School. Tyler was also a dedicated multi-sport athlete, playing football, soccer, basketball, and running track. Tyler graduated from Woodland in June of 2020.

After receiving several football scholarship offers, Tyler selected the University of Virginia in Charlottesville in order to benefit from both their rigorous academic and athletic programs. He immediately rose to the occasion and would finish his freshman season ranked second in the nation and first in the ACC for wide receivers. Even after suffering a knee injury that sidelined him for his sophomore season, he remained a force of inspiration and motivation to his teammates. He was anticipated to graduate in December of 2023 with a bachelor's degree in African American Studies, after which he aspired to play football professionally and give back to the community by opening a local Boys and Girls Club.

As a giant on the field, Tyler was recognized with several athletic honors. After just his first game with the Cavaliers, he was named the ACC's ''Receiver of the Week.'' Tyler was an All-American and became two-time ''Rookie of the Year.'' His persistent leadership throughout his athletic injury in 2021 earned him the 2022–2023 Danny Lee Fassio Family Bicentennial Scholarship. He was also nominated by the College Sports Communicators, the Associated Press, and the Fiesta Bowl Organization to the ''Come Back Player of the Year'' Watch List for the 2022 season, as he was projected to thrive in his return from his injury. His high school jersey, #13, was also retired in his honor.

Tyler was an active member of several social organizations. In high school, he was a proud member of the National Technical Honor Society and the Athletics Leading in Literacy (ALL) Program. He used his Nursing Assistant certification to volunteer with the elderly in his community. In college, Tyler was a participant of the UVA Football Thursday's Heroes Program, which supports local residents who are facing medical challenges. He was also an exemplary member of the ''Groundskeepers,'' a group of fellow UVA football players who advocate for racial and social justice. Despite his busy social, academic, and athletic life in Charlottesville, Tyler never forgot his roots in South Carolina and returned regularly to Woodland High School to mentor and motivate students to pursue their dreams.

Tyler was a devout Christian, and his love of God was fostered at Bethel AME Church. The principles of his faith guided him throughout his life and shaped his resilient character. He is lovingly remembered by his parents, Thaddeus and Fallom, his two younger siblings, Taniya Skylar and Teigan Jeremiah Hollins Davis, his grandparents, Monroe and Cynthia Lampkin, Thaddeus (Deloris) Davis and Linda Varner, and his great grandfather, Herman Davis.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in honoring the life of Lavel ''Tyler'' Norman Davis, Jr. Despite his youth, he touched the lives of many and will be sorely missed. As we remember him and mourn his loss, may we draw strength from the very resilience and kindheartedness that led Tyler to live such an impactful life.

TRIBUTE TO LESTER R. SUTTON

HON. JEFFERSON VAN DREW

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2022

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, last month, I had the pleasure of attending the Salem Community College Foundation Veterans Dinner. At the event, Lester R. Sutton was honored. Lester served our nation in the United States Coast Guard and held the rank of Storekeeper Third Class. He was awarded with the National Defense Service Medal, First Coast Guard Good Conduct Award, Vietnam Service Medal, and Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal during his time serving in the Coast Guard. Lester retired from the Coast Guard in 1973 after 8 years of exemplary service. I am so proud of Lester for his time in the United States Coast Guard, and I want to thank him for his dedication to our great nation. God Bless Lester, and God Bless our America.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 8404, Respect for Marriage Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6831–S6865

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 5136–5146, and S. Res. 851. **Page S6857**

Measures Passed:

Respect for Marriage Act: By 61 yeas to 36 nays (Vote No. 362), Senate passed H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, by the order of the Senate of Monday, November 28, 2022, 60 Senators having voted in the affirmative, and after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S6831–46**

Adopted:

Schumer (for Baldwin) Amendment No. 6487, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6844**

Rejected:

By 48 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 359), Lee Amendment No. 6482 (to Amendment No. 6487), of a perfecting nature. (Pursuant to the order of Monday, November 28, 2022, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) **Pages S6834–37, S6843–44**

By 45 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 360), Lankford Amendment No. 6496 (to Amendment No. 6487), of a perfecting nature. **Pages S6837–43, S6844**

By 45 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 361), Lankford (for Rubio) Amendment No. 6493 (to Amendment No. 6487), to eliminate a private right of action. **Pages S6837–43, S6844**

Withdrawn:

Schumer Amendment No. 6488 (to Amendment No. 6487), to add an effective date. **Page S6844**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Schumer Amendment No. 6489 (to Amendment No. 6488), to add an effective date, fell when Schumer Amendment No. 6488 (to Amendment No. 6487) (listed above), was withdrawn. **Page S6844**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached provided that the motion to invoke cloture on the bill, be withdrawn. **Page S6844**

Safeguard Tribal Objects of Patrimony Act: Senate passed H.R. 2930, to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage. **Pages S6847–48**

Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project Amendments Act Referral—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that S. 5068, to amend the Northwestern New Mexico Rural Water Projects Act to make improvements to that Act, be discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. **Page S6862**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motions to invoke cloture with respect to the nominations of Camille L. Velez-Rive, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Anne M. Nardacci, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York, Jerry W. Blackwell, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, and Doris L. Pryor, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, ripen at 11:30 a.m., on Wednesday, November 30, 2022; that at 11:30 a.m., on Wednesday, November 30, 2022, Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Camille L. Velez-Rive, and Anne M. Nardacci; that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, all post-cloture time be considered expired at 2:15 p.m., on Wednesday, November 30, 2022. **Page S6846**

Velez-Rive Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Camille L. Velez-Rive, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico. **Pages S6846–47**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, November 30, 2022. **Page S6862**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Kate E. Brubacher, of Kansas, to be United States Attorney for the District of Kansas for the term of four years.

Ismail J. Ramsey, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of California for the term of four years. **Page S6865**

Messages from the House: **Page S6851**

Measures Referred: **Page S6851**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6851–56**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S6856–57**

Notice of a Tie Vote Under S. Res. 27: **Page S6849**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6857–59**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6859–62**

Additional Statements: **Page S6849**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S6862**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—362) **Pages S6843–44, S6846**

Recess: Senate convened at 12 noon and recessed at 7:24 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, November 30, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6862.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 692 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Space Force.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

18 General Services Administration resolutions; and

The nominations of Beth Pritchard Geer, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Shailen P. Bhatt, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, and Juan Eduardo Sanchez, of Texas, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Southwest Border Regional Commission.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Christopher T. Robinson, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia, George P. Kent, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Estonia, Kenneth Merten, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bulgaria, Bijan Sabet, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic, who was introduced by Senator Markey, Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador, Henry V. Jardine, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mauritius, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles, Kathleen Ann Kavalec, of California, to be Ambassador to Romania, and Manuel P. Micaller, Jr., of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Tajikistan, all of the Department of State, L. Felice Gorordo, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, who was introduced by Senator Menendez, and Richard L.A. Weiner, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Karla Ann Gilbride, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Jessica Looman, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

KROGER-ALBERTSONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Competition Policy, Antitrust, and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine the competitive impact of the proposed Kroger-Albertsons transaction, after receiving testimony from Rodney McMullen, The Kroger Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Vivek Sankaran, Albertsons Companies, Inc., Boise, Idaho; Sumit Sharma, Consumer Reports, Washington, D.C.; Andrew Sweeting, University of Maryland, College Park; and Michael Needler, Fresh Encounter, Inc., Findlay, Ohio, on behalf of the National Grocers Association.

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: 7 public bills, H.R. 9357–9363; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 100; H. Con. Res. 118–119; and H.Res. 1494–1498 were introduced. **Pages H8647–48**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H8648**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

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, adversely, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–585); and

H.R. 5455, to amend the First Step Act of 2018 to permit defendants convicted of certain offenses to be eligible for reduced sentences, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–586). **Page H8647**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the passing of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. McEachin, the whole number of the House is 432. **Page H8599**

Permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives: The House agreed to H. Res. 1494, permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on a date designated by the Speaker. **Page H8599**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Reauthorization Act of 2022: S. 3846, amended, to reauthorize the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 389 yeas to 22 nays, Roll No. 487; **Pages H8618–22, H8643–44**

Terry Technical Correction Act: H.R. 5455, amended, to amend the First Step Act of 2018 to permit defendants convicted of certain offenses to be eligible for reduced sentences, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 307 yeas to 101 nays, Roll No. 488; and **Pages H8625–29, H8644**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 South 1st Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, as the "Martin Olav Sabo Post Office": H.R. 8025, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 South 1st Street in Minneapolis, Minnesota, as the "Martin Olav Sabo Post Office". **Page H8638**

Suspensions: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act: S. 4003, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 160 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 486. **Pages H8612–18, H8642**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:26 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H8642**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in remembrance of the late Honorable A. Donald McEachin of Virginia. **Page H8643**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Delivering Optimally Urgent Labor Access for Veterans Affairs Act: H.R. 2521, amended, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to furnish doula services to veterans; **Pages H8600–02**

Commitment to Veteran Support and Outreach Act: H.R. 4601, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to States to improve outreach to veterans; **Pages H8602–04**

Mark O'Brien VA Clothing Allowance Improvement Act: H.R. 4772, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the application and review process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for clothing allowance claims submitted by veterans; **Pages H8604–05**

Designating the outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Greenville, South

Carolina, as the "Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell Outpatient Clinic": H.R. 5943, amended, to designate the outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Greenville, South Carolina, as the "Lance Corporal Dana Cornell Darnell Outpatient Clinic"; **Pages H8605–07**

Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act: H.R. 7158, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the payment of care in non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently; **Pages H8607–09**

Protecting Firefighters from Adverse Substances Act: S. 231, to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on best practices to protect them from exposure to PFAS and to limit and prevent the release of PFAS into the environment; **Pages H8609–12**

Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act: S. 3115, to remove the 4-year sunset from the Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018; **Pages H8622–25**

Condemning the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizing the effect of conflict on global food security and famine: H. Res. 922, amended, condemning the use of hunger as a weapon of war and recognizing the effect of conflict on global food security and famine; **Pages H8629–31**

Condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: H. Res. 744, amended, condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; **Pages H8631–33**

Uyghur Policy Act: H.R. 4785, amended, to support the human rights of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups residing in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region and safeguard their distinct identity; **Pages H8633–37**

Designating 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": H.R. 9308, 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"; **Pages H8637–38**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 651 Business Interstate Highway 35 North Suite 420 in New Braunfels, Texas, as the "Bob Krueger Post Office": H.R. 8203, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 651 Business Interstate Highway 35 North Suite 420 in New Braunfels, Texas, as the "Bob Krueger Post Office"; **Pages H8638–40**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Broadway Street West, in Akeley, Minnesota, as the "Neal Kenneth Todd Post Office": H.R. 4899, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Broadway Street West, in Akeley, Minnesota, as the "Neal Kenneth Todd Post Office"; and **Page H8640**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 Melear Drive in Arlington, Texas, as the "Ron Wright Post Office Building": S. 3825, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 Melear Drive in Arlington, Texas, as the "Ron Wright Post Office Building". **Page H8641**

Expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable A. Donald McEachin: The House agreed to H. Res. 1496, expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable A. Donald McEachin. **Page H8645**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8642, H8643–44, and H8644.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:50 p.m. pursuant to House Resolution 1496, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable A. Donald McEachin.

Committee Meetings

ONE STOP SHOP COMMUNITY REENTRY PROGRAM ACT OF 2021; PREGNANT WOMEN IN CUSTODY ACT; JACKIE WALORSKI MATERNAL AND CHILD HOME VISITING REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2022; TO PROVIDE FOR A RESOLUTION WITH RESPECT TO THE UNRESOLVED DISPUTES BETWEEN CERTAIN RAILROADS REPRESENTED BY THE NATIONAL CARRIERS' CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL RAILWAY LABOR CONFERENCE AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES; PROVIDING FOR A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.J. RES. 100

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 3372, the ''One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021''; H.R. 6878, the ''Pregnant Women in Custody Act''; H.R. 8876, the ''Jackie Walorski Maternal and Child Home Visiting Reauthorization Act of 2022''; H.J. Res 100, to provide for a resolution with respect to the unresolved disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; and H. Con. Res. 119, providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 100 [Rule Markup Only]. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3372, the ''One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021'', H.R. 6878, the ''Pregnant Women in Custody Act'', H.R. 8876, the ''Jackie Walorski Maternal and Child Home Visiting Reauthorization Act of 2022'', H.J. Res. 100, To provide for a resolution with respect to the unresolved disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, and H. Con. Res. 119, Providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 100. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3372, the ''One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2021'', under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order the amendment printed in part B of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in Part B of the Rules Committee report. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6878, the ''Pregnant Women in Custody Act'', under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order the amendment printed in part D of the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The amendment may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in Part D of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8876, the ''Jackie Walorski Maternal and Child Home Visiting Reauthorization Act of 2022'', under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–69 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 100 under a closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The rule provides that at any time through the legislative day of December 2, the Speaker may entertain motions offered by the Majority Leader or a designee that the House suspend the rules with respect to multiple measures that were the object of motions to suspend the rules on the legislative day of November 29, November 30, December 1, or December 2, on which the yeas and nays were ordered and further proceedings postponed. The Chair shall put the question on any such motion without debate or intervening motion, and the ordering of the yeas and nays on postponed motions to suspend the rules with respect to such measures is vacated. The rule provides that proceedings may be postponed through December 2, on measures that were the object of motions to suspend the rules on the legislative day of November 29, and on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The rule provides that House Resolution 1495 is hereby adopted. The rule provides that House Concurrent Resolution 118 is hereby adopted. The rule provides that during the remainder of the 117th Congress, it shall not be in order to offer a motion under clause 7(c) of rule XXII with respect to H.R. 4521. The rule provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 119, providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 100, under a closed rule. The rule provides 10 minutes of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution. The rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution. Testimony was heard from Representatives Jackson Lee, Bishop of North Carolina, Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Smith of Nebraska, Payne, and Rodney Davis of Illinois.

MEMBERS' DAY HEARING ON PROPOSED RULES CHANGES FOR THE 118TH CONGRESS

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Members' Day Hearing on Proposed Rules Changes for the 118th Congress'' [Original Jurisdiction Hearing]. Testimony was heard from Representatives Bourdeaux, Burchett, Cammack, Davidson, Griffith, Joyce of Ohio, Latta, Massie, Radewagen, and Timmons.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to receive a closed briefing on electronic warfare, 9 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Martin J. Gruenberg, of Maryland, to be Chairperson, Travis Hill, of Maryland, to be a Member, and to be Vice Chairperson, and Jonathan McKernan, of Tennessee, to be a Member, all of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Kimberly Ann McClain, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine putting the Bipartisan Infrastructure law to work, focusing on the private sector perspective, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness, to hold hearings to examine opportunities and challenges for trade policy in the digital economy, 3 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lynne M. Tracy, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Julie D. Fisher, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus, Kristina A. Kvien, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Armenia, and Cynthia Dyer, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large, all of the Department of State, and Carol Spahn, of Maryland, to be Director of the Peace Corps, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Children and Families, to hold hearings to examine caring for our kids, focusing on supporting mental health in the transition from high school to college, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jonathan James Canada Grey, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Julia E. Kobick, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, Rita F. Lin, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Ramon Ernesto Reyes, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, James Edward Simmons, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, and Amy Lefkowitz Solomon, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, 10:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Native American veterans, focusing on ensuring access to VA health care and benefits, 3 p.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, November 30

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Camille L. Velez-Rive, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico. At 11:30 a.m., Senate will vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of Camille L. Velez-Rive, and Anne M. Nardacci, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York. If cloture is invoked on either of the nominations, the votes on confirmation of the nominations will occur at 2:15 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Wednesday, November 30

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 3372—One Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 6878—Pregnant Women in Custody Act (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 8876—Jackie Walorski Maternal and Child Home Visiting Reauthorization Act (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.J. Res. 100—To provide for a resolution with respect to the unresolved disputes between certain railroads represented by the National Carriers' Conference Committee of the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H. Con. Res. 119—Providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.J. Res. 100 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Boebert, Lauren, Colo., E1185
Burchett, Tim, Tenn., E1181
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1185, E1187
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E1186
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E1181
Garamendi, John, Calif., E1181
Guest, Michael, Miss., E1184, E1187
Hern, Kevin, Okla., E1182
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1187
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E1187
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1182
Levin, Mike, Calif., E1182
Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E1183
Perry, Scott, Pa., E1182
Soto, Darren, Fla., E1186
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1187
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1183
Valadao, David G., Calif., E1184
Van Drew, Jefferson, N.J., E1181, E1181, E1182, E1183, E1183, E1185, E1185, E1186, E1187, E1188
Webster, Daniel, Fla., E1185
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1184

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.