



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2021

No. 40

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 3, 2021.

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

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, You breathed life into us at creation, making humanity a little lower than the angels, crowning us with glory and honor, putting everything under our feet. What a gift.

Keep us ever mindful of the responsibility that comes with that endowment: that You desire that each and all would flourish, that everyone would be able to live into the privilege of becoming the people You designed us to be.

As You did in the beginning, send Your spirit and bring order over the chaotic waters of disputes and debate that surround us.

Shed Your light on the darkness of alienation and division and divide the tempestuous argument from the unique, meaningful, and constructive dialogue.

Remind us that You have created us in Your image, and this is what we should see reflected in the lives of the other. Whether we like them or not, whether we vote as they do or remain adamantly opposed, they, too, are Your beloved children.

And as we labor in this place, we pray that You look over our stewardship of Your gifts and call it good.

In the strength of Your divine name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(A) of House Resolution 8, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIMENEZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

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

SHORING UP DEMOCRACY

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

The limits of our democracy have been tested like never before, especially in the last election, where we saw baseless lawsuits, misinformation, attempts to suppress legal votes, a refusal by a sitting President to transfer power peacefully that resulted in an attempted insurrection aimed solely to block the will of the people.

While our system ultimately worked—thanks to patriotic State and

local officials and volunteers across the country—its limitations were laid bare, for us to fix.

H.R. 1 would shore up our democracy and the people's faith in its power.

I am pleased this bill incorporates two of my bills. The first requires all States to offer same-day registration. The second ends partisan gerrymandering by requiring States to adopt citizen redistricting commissions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" for this transformational bill that fights special interests, takes money out of politics, and puts power back in the hands of the American people.

REMEMBERING ELEANOR "SANDY" TORREY WEST

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember and honor Mrs. Eleanor "Sandy" Torrey West, who passed away on January 17 at the age of 108.

Mrs. West was known as a woman who embodied the spirit of Ossabaw Island, which is the third largest of Georgia's barrier islands, just south of Savannah.

She established the Ossabaw Island Project in the 1960s and the Genesis Project in the 1970s as ways to allow students, artists, writers, scientists, ecologists, philosophers, and other intellectuals and creative thinkers to reconnect with the natural world and with each other.

In the late 1970s, Mrs. West spearheaded her family's effort to ensure that Ossabaw Island would remain preserved and protected.

She was the champion of Ossabaw, and her enthusiastic, joyful spirit shined in everything she did.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1019

Throughout Mrs. West's long, prosperous life, she inspired countless individuals.

I am so thankful for her many contributions to Georgia's First District, and I know her legacy will continue for years to come.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family, friends, and all who knew her during this most difficult time.

CONSTRUCTIVELY CHANGING THE CULTURE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, to help constructively change the culture of law enforcement and strengthen the trust between police and the communities they serve.

Last summer, communities across the Nation convulsed with raw emotion after George Floyd was brutally murdered by a police officer.

His death may have been the spark, but the true force motivating these protests was the systemic racism that harms Black Americans every day.

Last June, one month after his death, this House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, only to see it stall in the Senate.

We will vote again on the bill this week.

George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, these people and countless others should still be alive today.

We can't bring them and the others back, but we can honor their memory and, in so doing, strengthen our communities and our Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

WE NEED MEANINGFUL, BIPARTISAN ELECTION REFORM

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1.

Free, fair, and transparent elections are the cornerstone of our democracy. Americans must be able to trust in the integrity of our election processes.

This bill, however, federalizes elections and takes control of elections from State and local governments.

It will grant the Federal Government unprecedented power over voting processes and pave the way for rampant fraud, abuse, and litigation.

This legislation nullifies voter I.D. laws, allows convicted felons to vote, legalizes ballot harvesting, and expands mail-in voting.

It even allows, for the first time ever, taxpayer funding of Federal campaigns, with a 6-to-1 government, taxpayer-funded match in most cases.

H.R. 1 is a cynical and partisan measure that will erode faith in our democracy and not restore it.

Every citizen should be confident that every legal vote counts. Congress has a duty to deliver election reform that honors the will of the people and the Constitution.

We need meaningful, bipartisan election reform, and I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN DONALD LAMBERT, JR.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here to honor the life of Captain Donald Lambert, Jr.

Last weekend, the Henrico County Police Department lost one of its own.

Captain Lambert served in the Henrico Police Department for nearly 34 years, and his fellow officers remember him as a true friend, mentor, and leader.

I had the privilege of getting to know Captain Lambert through his work as the head of the Henrico Special Operations Group. Captain Lambert's security expertise helped keep me, as well as my predecessors, Congressmen Brat and Cantor, and our staffs, out of harm's way, and I am forever grateful for his dedication to his work.

Captain Lambert was a pillar of our central Virginia community. He was a dedicated member of the Henrico Police Department, but he will be remembered as a gifted musician, a beloved Sunday school teacher, and a man who demonstrated true compassion for others.

Captain Lambert's decades of selfless service to the community of Henrico and the Commonwealth of Virginia will never be forgotten.

Our hearts are with his family, friends, and fellow men and women of the Henrico County Police Department as they honor his life.

A TRAVESTY FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1.

Americans love election season. They absolutely love the endless political ads, having their phones blown up by political calls and texts, and having their email inboxes littered with solicitations from want-to-be politicians. My phone keeps ringing off the hook from all of my constituents just pleading for Congress to use their dollars to fund more campaign ads.

This is the fantasy world that government bureaucrats and career politicians who want a Federal takeover of our elections live in. They want to take Americans' money and give it to campaigns at a 6-to-1 ratio, effectively forcing you to finance political campaigns you don't support.

H.R. 1, the so-called For the People Act, weaponizes the FEC into a partisan commission and throws out commonsense voter I.D. laws, just to name a few. As one of the only Members of Congress who has actually had to implement election protocols, I speak on authority when it comes to our elections. This bill is a travesty for all Americans.

REBUILDING OUR CREDIBILITY ON THE WORLD STAGE

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

Ms. JACOBS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

Mr. Speaker, I was in this very Chamber on January 6 when our democracy was attacked.

In the days following, I received texts and calls from friends and former colleagues around the world, who were working on improving democracy in places like Burma and Hungary, who were devastated about what they were seeing and how it would impact their ability to make progress around the world.

Passing H.R. 1, rebuilding trust in our democracy, is imperative for our national security.

Since January 6, countries have questioned whether they need to listen to America's calls to defend human rights or abide by the results of free and fair elections.

Our allies and partners have questioned if they should continue following our lead when it seems like other countries' autocratic systems are more capable of addressing crises.

We need to rebuild our credibility on the world stage.

Countries needn't be defined by their darkest days, but rather by how they overcome them.

The world was watching on January 6, and it is watching again today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1.

RECKLESS SWAMP FUELS FRAUD

(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, in an era of fake news, it is refreshing to find editorialist Jerry Bellune, editor of the Lexington County Chronicle, expose the tragic fraud being perpetrated on taxpayers:

The Washington Swamp set up criminals to steal billions of dollars through fraud.

In attempts to shovel money to the rest of us, Congress has created an opportunity for criminal fraud.

Their real victims are us, the American taxpayers, and our great-grandchildren who will be paying for this folly for generations to come.

The reality is that those who created the CARES Act set us up for up to \$100 billion in fraud. The Labor Department inspector general estimates \$63 billion in tax dollars were stolen.

As the Chronicle Tech Talk columnist Katie Ritchie has warned, scammers wooed victims to convince them to give personal information.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Our sympathy to the family of Chamber of Commerce President Bill Mooneyhan.

NEED FOR RENTAL RELIEF

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of New York's renters and the far-too-many families who are struggling as a result of the coronavirus pandemic.

Hardworking New Yorkers who have lost their jobs and closed their businesses, through no fault of their own, now are struggling, too, to pay their rent.

The American Rescue Plan would provide more than \$20 billion in total for emergency rental and utility assistance. This is in addition to the \$25 billion provided in the December package.

The House took bold action last week by passing the American Rescue Plan, and I call on the Senate to pass it immediately and get it to the President's desk.

This is the lifeline our families and businesses so desperately need. Hope and health are on the way.

□ 0915

SACRIFICING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, just weeks into this administration, and after endless promises of unity, the President has issued over 40 radical executive orders, ranging from rejoining a failed climate pact to taking steps to dismantle the Nation's border security.

Governing via executive order, the administration has unilaterally launched a coordinated assault on American energy and a war on agriculture.

By revoking the Keystone XL pipeline project, the administration sent more than 10,000 skilled workers to the unemployment line, disrupted our safest and most efficient form of energy transportation, and increased the cost of transporting grain for farmers and agribusinesses.

The President also issued extremist moratoriums on new oil and gas leasing and drilling on Federal lands, which only serves to increase American reliance on foreign energy, eliminate good-paying jobs, further stifle economic growth, and drive up the cost of fuel and electricity for every American.

This backward agenda is sacrificing the energy independence achievements made by President Trump and Republicans these past 4 years. Sadly, the Biden Democrat Party energy policy is putting America last.

STOP TREATING MENTAL ILLNESS LIKE A CRIME

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, equality and justice are core values of this country, yet for Americans with mental illness, the risk of being killed when approached by law enforcement is 16 times higher. An estimated one in four fatal police encounters ends the life of an individual with mental illness.

We are not fulfilling the promise of equality and justice for Americans with mental illnesses and disabilities. That is why I introduced the Mental Health Justice Act, which would create specialized mental health first responder units. If someone is experiencing a mental health crisis, they are better served by a trained mental health professional, not a police officer.

Mental illness is not a crime, and we have to stop treating it like one. Getting the right help to individuals with mental illnesses prevents them from getting tangled up in a system that isn't built to serve their needs.

The Mental Health Justice Act makes our communities healthier and safer, more equal, and more just.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NICK WINUM

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Stanley Police Officer Nick Winum, who was tragically killed in the line of duty this weekend.

Originally a successful tomato farmer on the Eastern Shore, Officer Winum followed his calling to serve others and joined the Virginia State Police. After working for more than a decade as a State trooper, Officer Winum transitioned into the Stanley Police Department in 2016, where he served until his passing.

For the last 15 years of his life, he put the well-being of his neighbors above his own, and our community is forever grateful for the sacrifice he made while keeping our streets safe.

Officer Winum is survived by the love of his life, his wife, Cara; his children, Jedediah, Aubrey, Jackson, and Nicki; his granddaughter, Willa; as well as his parents, siblings, and 24 nieces and nephews.

He is remembered as a man of honor and principle who loved the Lord, his family, and his country.

To honor this patriot, those who knew him will continue to carry on his legacy of kindness, compassion, and service to others. I join his law enforcement colleagues in mourning his passing and extend my deepest condolences to his family.

DARK MONEY INTERESTS SQUEALING LOUDLY

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this week we will be passing H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and the dark money interests are squealing loudly about it right now.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, requires exposure of the identities of the people and companies that are the dark money that contribute hundreds of millions of dollars toward American elections, including Federal elections, in this country—people and companies that don't have to reveal who they are, what they are about, what profits they are trying to maximize, or even if they are from the United States of America. They don't have to reveal any of that.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, is to restore democracy to this country, to restore pure democracy so that we know who is paying for these elections. The dark money interests are squealing about it. They are squealing like stuck pigs. Let's pass H.R. 1.

REMEMBERING PEGGY SADLER

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

Mr. GARCÍA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my dear friend, Peggy Sadler, who is now with the Lord.

Peggy and her husband, David, met while attending the University of California-Santa Barbara. In the mid-1960s, they moved to the beautiful Simi Valley. David passed away last year as well, so they are now reunited in Heaven.

Peggy was the mother of two children, Robert and Leslie. She was a tireless public servant for over 40 years, supporting local public leaders and volunteering throughout the community. Peggy spent her retirement helping raise her grandchildren and great-grandchildren, serving as a docent at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Museum, and serving her community as a volunteer at her local church.

I am grateful for the friendship that Peggy and I shared. The city of Simi Valley is a better place because of Peggy Sadler. May we all pray for her family, and may God bless Ms. Peggy Sadler.

MAKING OUR DEMOCRACY MORE ACCESSIBLE

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

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

As a former voting rights attorney, I have seen firsthand the devastation on the faces of Americans when they are denied their ability to make their voice heard in our elections because they missed an arbitrary deadline or have shown up to their old polling place. It is heartbreaking, and it is not who we are as a nation.

With today's vote on the For the People Act, we, as a Congress, have an opportunity to affirmatively expand access to voting. This bill would do so by allowing for automatic and same-day voter registration and establishing a national early voting period, while also enacting key reforms that will make our elections more secure and that will ensure Americans and only Americans take part in them.

I am proud that two bills that I introduced, the Know Your Polling Place Act and the Shell Company Abuse Act, which would make our democracy more accessible and more secure, are included in today's bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to return political power to everyday Americans and to vote for this legislation.

REQUIRING VOTER ID STRENGTHENS ELECTION INTEGRITY

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1 because it violates the U.S. Constitution. It usurps the rights of States to establish and administer their own elections.

As we speak, Georgia lawmakers are working to make smart and targeted reforms to Georgia's election laws, like picture identification for absentee voting. Such reforms are critically important.

H.R. 1 would not only nullify Georgia lawmakers' efforts, but it would also mandate that all States provide no-excuse absentee voting with absolutely zero safeguards.

I read the bill to see what I needed to do to obtain and cast an absentee ballot under H.R. 1. I was shocked to learn I needed nothing: no witness signature, no picture identification. Nothing is required.

Just tell that to TSA the next time you try to get on an airplane, or to your local gun dealer when you try to buy a gun. In fact, if we are going to eliminate a valid government-issued photo ID for constitutional voting rights, then let's eliminate the need for photo ID to exercise your Second Amendment too.

The hypocrisy by the liberal left to eliminate voter ID is stunning. Trust starts by States taking steps to verify that all votes are legal and cast by eligible voters. That is why we must

verify citizenship and require picture identification.

I commend our Georgia lawmakers for strengthening the integrity of our Georgia elections, and I am proud to support those efforts by voting "no" on the Federal takeover of elections.

PUTTING THE FIX IN FUTURE ELECTIONS

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, what should be named the for the politicians act. There is nothing in this bill that is for the people.

I could spend hours highlighting the damaging aspects of this bill, but let's start with eliminating voter ID. Americans need an ID to drive, to get married, to get on an airplane, even to buy cold medicine, but to take part in the foundational component of our Republic? Apparently, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think eliminating any proof of who you are is for the people. It is not. It is for the politicians.

Then we have taxpayer-funded campaigns. H.R. 1 would implement a 6-to-1 match for small-donor contributions up to \$200 in a congressional or Presidential campaign. The people of Illinois' 15th District shouldn't be forced to fund the campaigns of people they vehemently disagree with.

The November election made it readily apparent that our election system needs fixing. This bill just puts the fix in future elections.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF JOSEPH CORR

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life and memory of New Hartford, New York Police Officer Joseph Corr. Fifteen years ago last month, Officer Corr was shot and killed in the line of duty while in pursuit of a robbery suspect.

Joe Corr, who was born and raised in my hometown of New Hartford, New York, was a dedicated father to Kaitlyn, a loving husband to Tracie, and a hero who served and protected our community with honor.

Today, the Officer Joseph D. Corr Foundation proudly honors Joe's memory and gives back to his fellow members in blue by supporting other families who have experienced similar tragedies. His parents, Dave and Kathleen, continue to provide their love and counsel to those families as well.

Officer Corr's death is a sad reminder of the dangers our brave men and women face each day in the line of duty. These heroes deserve our unwavering respect for the sacrifices that they make each and every day to keep our communities safe.

USING TAX DOLLARS TO FUND CAMPAIGNS IS WRONG

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

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 shamefully allows candidates for Congress to use tax dollars to fund campaigns with a \$6 match for every \$1 raised. Any normal person would call this a form of embezzlement.

Tax dollars are supposed to be used to maintain our transportation infrastructure, fund our schools, and keep the public safe, not to fund campaigns.

As a representative from New York City, which has public financing of campaigns, and as a former candidate for mayor, I can tell you that it does nothing to take big money out of politics, and it does nothing to level the playing field. Bill de Blasio still received big donations bundled by lobbyists and special interests, and I would have still been outspent 4 to 1 with or without matching funds.

Using taxpayer money to fund political campaigns is not only wrong; it is an abuse of taxpayers and has led to more corruption. Multiple candidates and elected officials in New York City were convicted for exploiting the system and developing schemes to illegally pad their campaigns with taxpayer money.

Additionally, at a time when so many Americans question the integrity of our election system and are looking for safeguards to protect their vote, this bill bans States from having voter ID and implements same-day voter registration, which does not give election boards the proper time to ensure individuals' eligibility and further erodes the public trust.

Instead of this ridiculous bill, we should be adopting the Save Democracy Act and restoring the trust and integrity of our election system.

□ 0930

RADICAL PATH OF DEMOCRATS

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

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform Democrats that the radical path you are taking will cause you to lose in 2022.

The American people are shocked at what you are doing and running through this House of Representatives. Passing a bill of \$1.9 trillion that spends less than 9 percent on COVID relief is shameful. Passing the inequality act, which destroys women's rights, religious freedoms; puts men in our little girls' bathrooms, locker rooms, and on sports teams is unforgivable.

Trying to pass what I call the Democrats' hate police bill, H.R. 1280—which puts police on Biden's hit list and allows police to be targets, also gets rid of qualified immunity, opening them up to be sued every time a criminal is offended and gets their feelings hurt—

is reckless and dangerous for our police.

Mr. Speaker, because of H.R. 1, which is a federalization of our elections, I also, today, will make a motion to adjourn so that Democrats can think a little bit harder.

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

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 222, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—182

Aderholt	Gaetz	Malliotakis
Allen	Garbarino	Mann
Armstrong	Garcia (CA)	Masse
Arrington	Gibbs	Mast
Babin	Gimenez	McCarthy
Baird	Gohmert	McClain
Balderson	Gonzales, Tony	McClintock
Barr	Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry
Bentz	Good (VA)	Meijer
Bergman	Gooden (TX)	Meuser
Bice (OK)	Gosar	Miller (WV)
Biggs	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Moore (AL)
Bishop (NC)	Greene (GA)	Mullin
Boebert	Griffith	Nehls
Bost	Grothman	Newhouse
Brooks	Guest	Norman
Buchanan	Guthrie	Nunes
Budd	Hagedorn	Oberholte
Burchett	Harris	Owens
Burgess	Harshbarger	Palazzo
Calvert	Hartzler	Palmer
Cammack	Hern	Pence
Carl	Herrell	Perry
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Pfluger
Carter (TX)	Hice (GA)	Posey
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Reed
Cline	Hill	Reschenthaler
Cloud	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Clyde	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Comer	Huizenga	Rose
Crawford	Jackson	Rosendale
Crenshaw	Jacobs (NY)	Rouzer
Curtis	Johnson (LA)	Roy
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Salazar
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
DesJarlais	Jordan	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Donalds	Katko	Sessions
Duncan	Keller	Smith (MO)
Dunn	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Estes	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Fallon	Kustoff	Staubert
Feenstra	LaHood	Steel
Ferguson	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Fischbach	Lamborn	Steil
Fitzgerald	Latta	Steube
Fitzpatrick	LaTurner	Stewart
Fleischmann	Lesko	Stivers
Fortenberry	Long	Taylor
Foxx	Loudermilk	Tenney
Franklin, C.	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Scott	Luetkemeyer	Tiffany
Fulcher	Mace	Timmons

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Banks
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente

Barragán
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Buck
Bucshon
Cawthorn
Costa
Crist
DeFazio

Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

NAYS—222

Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kabele
Kaptur
Keating
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller-Meeks
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross

NOT VOTING—27

Fudge
Green (TN)
Johnson (TX)
Kelly (IL)
Larsen (WA)
Lynch
McCaul
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Ruppersberger
Smith (NJ)
Titus
Trone
Waters
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Zeldin

O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Womack

Messrs. SCHNEIDER, SHERMAN, GARAMENDI, O'HALLERAN, and MORELLE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. BOEBERT and Mr. LAMALFA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, due to an unforeseen recorded vote, I was unable to leave a previously scheduled engagement. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, I was not able to make the recorded vote below. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you that I was unable to be present for the vote for the motion to adjourn today. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 56.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to clarify my position on the Motion to Adjourn considered on the floor this morning.

I support full consideration of the For the People Act and the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. I was unable to vote this morning. Had I been present, I would have voted: nay, on rollcall No. 56.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Buchanan	Kirkpatrick	Neguse
(LaHood)	(Stanton)	(Perlmutter)
Cárdenas	Langevin	Palazzo
(Gomez)	(Lynch)	(Fleischmann)
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Payne
(Matsui)	(Evans)	(Wasserman)
Deutch (Rice)	Lieu (Beyer)	Schultz
(NY)	Lowenthal	Pingree (Kuster)
Frankel, Lois	(Beyer)	Rodgers (WA)
(Clark (MA))	Meng (Clark)	(Joyce (PA))
Gaetz (McHenry)	(MA)	Roybal-Allard
Grijalva (Garcia)	Moore (WI)	(Escobar)
(IL)	(Beyer)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Hastings	Moulton	Rush
(Wasserman)	(McGovern)	(Underwood)
Schultz	Nadler (Jeffries)	Speier (Scanlon)
Huffman	Napolitano	Vargas (Correa)
(McNerney)	(Correa)	Watson Coleman
		(Pallone)
		Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 117-9.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 4208.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to offer an amendment to remove section 4208 from H.R. 1.

Section 4208 is a dangerous provision of this bill that will put people's private information on display and put their personal security at risk.

This section aims to forbid anonymous speech. Throughout American history, anonymous speech about political matters has played a vital role. From the Federalist Papers, to those who supported the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, many in history had very legitimate fears of having their identities uncovered and relied on anonymous speech to show their support for certain policies and initiatives.

Section 4208 removes the protection of anonymous speech forever. By requiring public reporting of the private information of individuals, partnerships, associations, and any group of people who spend \$500 or more on political advertising—which is a very broad definition in this bill—we put individuals at risk.

Furthermore, we drastically limit free speech and destroy the First Amendment. Notably, the courts have already begun to warn against the constitutionality of similar provisions in State law. We cannot allow this to stand. Not only will it cause a security problem for these individuals but, as we have seen, people could lose their jobs, be shamed, or even worse.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding, and I am proud to support her amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the so-called For the People Act a/k/a the for the politicians act. Supporters of this bill claim that it is the fix needed for the problems within our Nation's electoral system, but in reality this bill is a power grab that will blur the lines between official and campaign resources and leave taxpayers footing the bill.

It is shameful that this body is even considering this legislation that forces hardworking Americans amid an unprecedented crisis to give politicians money. H.R. 1 would funnel millions of taxpayer dollars into the campaign accounts of politicians through voucher and funding match programs. This bill will allow 16-year-olds to vote, give \$25 vouchers to individuals to donate to the candidate of their choice, redefines

free speech, triggers universal mail-in ballots, creates an election czar, strips voter ID requirements, and so much more.

This bill jeopardizes the future of Americans' freedom of speech with new requirements for public disclosure of support of political campaigns and candidates.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot claim to be protecting the rights and freedoms enshrined in our Constitution when this, the For the People Act—more aptly named the for the politicians act—is under consideration.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE).

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's amendment, and I will be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1, the underlying bill, the “destroy election integrity and centralize all power in Washington, D.C., act” that Democrats are, once again, pushing because they never have and never will believe in the rights of our States and the limited power of Federal Government.

Some of my colleagues who took every opportunity to emphasize that democracy was on the ballot in this past election have returned to Congress eager to change election laws in their favor.

H.R. 1 is wholly about control—control of free speech and control of how elections are conducted. And when they exercise this control, their purpose is to crush opposing views, because opposing views will not be tolerated when there are Democrat majorities at stake.

America's strength lies in its free speech and decentralized elections, and we must continue to make our election system more resilient to natural challenges and foreign actors. H.R. 1 fails to do this on all fronts.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected by the people of the 24th District of Texas to stand up for freedom, the rule of law, and limited government. I urge my colleagues to vote against this vile new form of tyranny in H.R. 1.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with this amendment. It would strike section 4208 of H.R. 1 which requires online platforms to retain records of certain online political advertisements. According to Forbes magazine, political advertisers spent \$1.6 billion online in the 2020 election—almost 10 times what they spent in 2012.

At a time when Americans are increasingly bombarded with political ads online, striking this provision is not useful and would harm the efforts

of this bill to provide increased transparency in political advertising. Fundamentally, Americans deserve to know who is paying for online political ads to ensure that they are informed voters.

Digital advertising can also have a far greater reach than broadcast advertising. Online political ads are relatively inexpensive to produce and can be disseminated instantly to vast audiences across great distances without regard to geographic boundaries. It is time for our disclosure and disclaimer laws and regulations to be updated to reflect how campaigns are run in the 21st century and how to keep pace with changing technology.

The online platform records requirements in this section are key to the Honest Ads Act, which is a part of H.R. 1, designed to improve transparency in political advertising. By requiring online platforms to retain copies of political ads, everyday Americans at home will be able to see who is paying for what. These requirements are narrowly drawn and only apply to online platforms with over 50 million monthly unique visitors and to advertisers who run over \$500 a year in political advertisements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the measure and protect this important reform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the insurrection on January 6 had a specific purpose: to overturn our election and to violently disenfranchise millions of voters.

The immediate threat to the Capitol has been quelled, but our democracy's future is still unclear. Across the country there are ongoing efforts to suppress and limit votes. Dark money fuels campaigns without transparency and accountability, and partisan gerrymandering tilts the playing field.

A vote for H.R. 1 is a vote for equality, for transparency, and for returning power to the people.

Mr. Speaker, 56 years ago on March 7, John Lewis almost lost his life on the Edmund Pettus Bridge for the right to vote. He said: “Your vote is precious, almost sacred. It is the most powerful, nonviolent tool we have to create a more perfect union.”

Let's strive for that more perfect union. Let's confirm our democracy and vote “yes” on H.R. 1.

□ 1045

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the late Justice Scalia, who was not exactly one of our liberal beacons on the Court, said this: “Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.”

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposes to knock out the

heart of the Honest Ads Act, so the public won't know who is purchasing ads online. That is the exact opposite of what we need to be doing. We need far greater transparency about who is polluting the airwaves and who is polluting the internet with propaganda and fake news. We should know who is paying for all of that.

This used to be a very solid bipartisan commitment between Democrats and Republicans. Everybody agreed there should at least be disclosure of campaign spending.

Now, they not only want to put out propaganda online, but they don't even want anybody to know who is paying for it. That is the opposite direction that we should be moving in America.

We should be defending everybody's right to vote, everybody's right to participate against all of the schemes to undermine voting rights, and we should make sure that everybody knows who is putting money into the political system.

I urge a "no" vote on that amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, in Florida, we have strong redistricting standards that were passed by a large majority of Florida voters and placed in our State constitution.

I also recognize that strong standards and criteria are provided for in H.R. 1.

Would the chairperson agree to working together with the State-adopted redistricting criteria to ensure H.R. 1 does not dilute the Florida requirements?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to work with the gentlewoman as this bill advances towards enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I would urge a "no" vote on the Lesko amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 117-9.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 88, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1055. LOWERING MANDATORY MINIMUM VOTING AGE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) LOWERING VOTING AGE TO 16 YEARS OF AGE.—A State may not refuse to permit an

individual to register to vote or vote in an election for Federal office held in the State on the grounds of the individual's age if the individual will be at least 16 years of age on the date of the election.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2022 or any succeeding year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

H.R. 1 is bold, transformative legislation, which fights voter suppression, promotes access to the ballot, cracks down on money in politics, and provides transparency to the American people.

Passing this bill has never been more urgent. We must act to protect and preserve our democracy.

My amendment gets to the heart of H.R. 1 and recognizes the contributions that young people continue to make to our democracy.

By lowering the Federal voting age from 18 to 16 years of age, my amendment would enfranchise young Americans to help shape and form the policies that will set the course for our future.

From police violence, to immigration reform, to climate change, to the future of work and the minimum wage, our young people are organizing, mobilizing, and calling us to action. They are at the forefront of social movements and have more than earned inclusion in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, 16- and 17-year-old constituents of mine are supporting their families. They are working, not for enrichment or to build a resume, but because they have no choice. They are attending school full-time and taking care of loved ones in the midst of the COVID crisis.

Young people are contributing both to the labor force and their local economies by paying taxes, and yet they are deprived of the opportunity to exercise their right to vote.

Some have questioned the maturity of our youth. I don't.

Sixteen- and 17-year-olds today possess wisdom and maturity defined by today's challenges, hardships, and opportunities.

They deserve and demand a government that is accountable to them, a government that values their voices, and understands the depth and breadth of their lived experience.

They are not a monolith. But they are nation-builders, living through a global pandemic, confronting racial injustice, and rebuilding our democracy.

Now is the time for us to meet the moment and enfranchise 16- and 17-year-olds.

I would like to thank my colleagues and dear friends, Representatives MENG

and SCHAKOWSKY, for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my friend, AYANNA PRESSLEY, the wonderful congresswoman from Massachusetts. I have had the pleasure of knowing AYANNA PRESSLEY well before she was even 16, and she was ready to vote as soon as that.

I want to say that all over the country, and especially in my district, I feel we see young people, young activists, who are working tirelessly to make their voices heard, from battling climate change, battling gun violence, to advocating for racial justice and economic equality.

This is their century, and our national leadership should be accountable to them, to these young people in their generation who will be most impacted by the existential threats that are looming before us today.

This is a serious proposal. Sixteen-year-olds are doing the work of adults, and they should be treated with the respect that they deserve and the participation that they should be able to have.

So I heartily support this amendment and urge my colleagues to consider it carefully and vote for it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend.

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation faces serious challenges, including an ongoing pandemic, vaccine distribution hurdles, continued lockdowns from out-of-touch Governors, prolonged closures of our schools, and one-in-four small businesses face the risk of permanent closure.

At a time when the American people are concerned with election integrity, a top priority of our Democrat leadership is to federalize election laws, removing the authority of State legislatures expressed in Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution.

H.R. 1, the bill before us today, would allow for taxpayer-funded campaigns through a government match on political contributions at a 6-to-1 ratio. So a \$200 contribution would be matched by the taxpayer to the tune of \$1,200.

H.R. 1 would also hinder the rights of States to determine their registration voting practices, including mandating automatic voter registration.

The suggestion being made by my Democrat friends and colleagues that opposition to this legislation is somehow a form of voter suppression is ridiculous. I and my colleagues would never consider engaging in a course of

action that suppresses a citizen's legitimate right to vote.

This is a partisan power grab that threatens election integrity. "One citizen, one vote" is my solemn resolve. I oppose this amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me rise to support the Pressley-Meng-Schakowsky amendment. I thank Congresswoman PRESSLEY for bringing this forward and to say that she is about the future and really about making sure that civic participation is really enhanced and moved forward by allowing for this amendment to come into this bill, H.R. 1, because this is what it is about. It is about our democracy, and she has been consistent in terms of inclusion and making sure our democracy works.

Elections are about the future, and no one has more at stake in that future than our youth. By age 16, we trust our young people with a host of important decisions and responsibilities. It is the moment when lifelong habits are built and when ideas about the world become to be fixed. Evidence has shown that when people start voting younger, they are more likely to exercise their right to vote as they grow older.

Too many of the arguments against lowering the voting age to 16 crumble when you really examine them clearly. Often the objection is simply that 16-year-olds are too young to exercise good judgment. This is really a patronizing thought. In fact, it is downright scary to think that we would have our government policies decide what constitutes as wisdom for our young people.

It is past time for us to elevate voting as one of the central responsibilities of our democracy. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my good friend.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment en bloc No. 4 and the underlying bill.

I have a long list of concerns with this bill, and at the top of this list is nationwide ballot harvesting.

Democrats in California have already legalized ballot harvesting in our State. Despite our concerns with the practice, Republicans were determined to play by the rules and utilized legal ballot collection methods in the last election.

One amendment in this package, offered by my California colleague, puts this hypocrisy on full display. Under current law, with my colleague's amendment, a foreign operative—maybe a Russian operative, maybe a Chinese spy—could still handle ballots for untold numbers of people. My colleague's amendment is a blatant attempt to criticize ballot harvesting only when the other guys do it.

In other words, California Democrats think it is fine when their paid operatives collect ballots from strangers and throw them in a bag. But they object when churches try to collect them for members of their congregation and put them in a box.

Don't be fooled. Democrats don't want to facilitate ballot collection for all Americans. They just want to make it easier for their operatives to harvest ballots and will cry foul whenever Republicans try to play by the same rules.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I stand in this Chamber today thanks to the young people of Westchester and Rockland Counties.

When I first ran for Congress, I was joined by a small group of young, committed volunteers. Many of them were not eligible to vote. Many of them were 16 and 17 years old. And my goodness, did they know more about policy and national politics than people who are four and five times their senior.

In this country, when you are 16 and 17 years old, we charge you as an adult in the courtroom. You are able to drive to the job we expect you to work in order to help support your family. So I think that the least we can do is give 16- and 17-year-olds a say in who governs them.

□ 1100

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), another great friend.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution vests primary responsibility in State legislatures to set the times, places, and manner of congressional elections, allowing States and localities to determine how best to conduct elections that suit the needs of voters in their communities.

But the bill before us today, and this amendment also, reverses the longstanding history of State control over the electoral process, makes unconstitutional changes to our election laws through a top-down Federal power grab, and places unprecedented limitations on political speech.

Rather than strengthening the election process by working with Republicans to find bipartisan solutions, H.R. 1 was written without any input from Republican Members. Some of the most egregious provisions include mandating that States allow ballot harvesting, mandating same-day registration in all 50 States, abolishing the signature requirements for mail-in ballots, mandating absentee ballots be accepted up to 10 days after election day, mandating that States send ballots in the mail proactively, and, finally, forcing taxpayers to pay politicians to campaign for office.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt by Democrats to cement their fragile and fleeting majorities at taxpayer expense.

The bill would limit the free speech of my voters, use my voters' tax dollars to fund candidates, and violate the Constitution by superseding the Commonwealth's ability to determine their own laws on voter eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this misguided and radical legislation.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, we must do right by the young organizers and activists who have fought for our democracy. They have a stake in our democracy, and they deserve to have a stake at the ballot box.

Civil rights heroes like the late John Lewis taught us through example that no one is too young to fight for access to the ballot. In fact, he supported this very amendment last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), a mediocre friend, not a great friend.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, after a divisive election season, allegations of election fraud, objections to the electoral college, and impeachment, a friend of mine on the other side of the aisle recently asked what it would take to unify our country. My answer is that it is certainly not this legislation which, from my standpoint, is the most divisive, unconstitutional, and destructive piece of legislation in my time in Congress.

They call it the For the People Act, but it should be called the for the politicians act because it would force taxpayers to fund political campaigns, including the campaigns of politicians with whom those taxpayers disagree.

Maybe a better name would be the election power grab act because it would normalize the chaos, uncertainty, and irregularities surrounding mail-in voting in the 2020 election by centralizing the administration of elections in Washington, D.C., commandeering States to permanently expand mail-in voting without safeguards, legalize ballot harvesting, disregard voter ID laws, permit same-day voter registration without citizenship verification, among other egregious measures.

Mr. Speaker, election laws should make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. This bill would not only make it easy to cheat, but it would also effectively make it legal to cheat.

At a time when half of Americans have lost confidence in the integrity of our elections, this bill will only drive distrust and division higher.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of ending division in our country, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this power grab of our elections.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON), another mediocre friend.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have only been here 2 months, and in that

time, I have seen some bad legislation. To date, this is one of the worst that I have seen.

The age of consent has always coincided with the franchise. For nearly 200 years, it was 21. Then, in the 1970s, they changed it to 18. Our society has agreed since then, for 50 years, that 18 is when a child becomes an adult. I find it interesting that our friends across the aisle don't want to have 16- and 17-year-olds tried as adults when they commit violent adult crimes, yet they want those 16- and 17-year-olds to have the franchise. Some even, believe it or not, want 16- and 17-year-olds who are convicted of murder to be able to vote while they are in prison after they have been convicted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a horrible amendment, and I respectfully request that all of our Members join us in voting "no."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I rise to offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, printed in part B of House Report 117-9, offered by Ms. LOFGREN of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER OF VIRGINIA

Add at the end of subtitle B of title VII the following:

SEC. 7105. DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR MATERIALS POSTED ON ONLINE PLATFORMS BY AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS ON BEHALF OF CLIENTS.

(a) METHOD AND FORM OF DISCLAIMER; PRESERVATION OF DISCLAIMERS BY CERTAIN SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS.—

(1) REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 4(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 614(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking "(b) It shall be unlawful" and inserting "(b)(1) It shall be unlawful"; and

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

"(2) In the case of informational materials for or in the interests of a foreign principal

which are transmitted or caused to be transmitted by an agent of a foreign principal by posting on an online platform, the agent shall ensure that the conspicuous statement required to be placed in such materials under this subsection is placed directly with the material posted on the platform and is not accessible only through a hyperlink or other reference to another source.

"(3) If the Attorney General determines that the application of paragraph (2) to materials posted on an online platform is not feasible because the length of the conspicuous statement required to be placed in materials under this subsection makes the inclusion of the entire statement incompatible with the posting of the materials on that platform, an agent may meet the requirements of paragraph (2) by ensuring that an abbreviated version of the statement, stating that the materials are distributed by a foreign agent on behalf of a clearly identified foreign principal, is placed directly with the material posted on the platform.

"(4) An online platform on which informational materials described in paragraph (2) are posted shall ensure that the conspicuous statement described in such paragraph (or, if applicable, the abbreviated statement described in paragraph (3)) is maintained with such materials at all times, including after the material is shared in a social media post on the platform, but only if the platform has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors or users for a majority of months during the 12 months preceding the dissemination of the materials."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Attorney General has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments prior to the expiration of such period.

(b) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO PERSONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b)(1) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614(b)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking "any person within the United States" and inserting "any person".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Attorney General has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments prior to the expiration of such period.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS DISSEMINATING INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS TRANSMITTED BY AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 614) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) If the Attorney General determines that an agent of a foreign principal transmitted or caused to be transmitted informational materials on an online platform for or in the interests of the foreign principal and did not meet the requirements of subsection (b)(2) (relating to the conspicuous statement required to be placed in such materials)—

"(1) the Attorney General shall notify the online platform; and

"(2) the online platform shall remove such materials and use reasonable efforts to inform recipients of such materials that the materials were disseminated by a foreign agent on behalf of a foreign principal."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to materials disseminated on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which be-

gins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITION.—Section 1 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) The term 'online platform' means any public-facing website, web application, or digital application (including a social network, ad network, or search engine)."

SEC. 7106. CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS WHO ENGAGE WITH THE UNITED STATES IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES FOR A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL IN ANY PLACE AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS.

Section 1(c)(1)(i) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)(1)(i)) is amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "(whether within or outside of the United States)".

SEC. 7107. ANALYSIS AND REPORT ON CHALLENGES TO ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938.

(a) ANALYSIS.—The Attorney General shall conduct an analysis of the legal, policy, and procedural challenges to the effective enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on the analysis conducted under subsection (a), and shall include in the report such recommendations, including recommendations for revisions to the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as the Attorney General considers appropriate to promote the effective enforcement of such Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 476, strike lines 5 through 9 and insert the following:

"(B) a description of the audience targeted by the advertisement, the number of views generated from the advertisement, the number of views by unique individuals generated by the advertisement, the number of times the advertisement was shared, and the date and time that the advertisement is first displayed and last displayed."

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 50, line 14, strike "and" at then end.

Page 50, line 20, insert "and" at the end.

Page 50, after line 20, insert the following:

(G) an explanation of what information the State and local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, how that information is shared or sold and with whom, what information is automatically kept confidential, what information is needed to access voter information online, and what privacy programs are available, such as those described in section 1055;

Page 88, after line 8 insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1055. REQUIRING STATES TO ESTABLISH AND OPERATE VOTER PRIVACY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall establish and operate a privacy program to enable victims of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, and trafficking to have personally identifiable information that the State or local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, including addresses, be kept confidential.

(b) NOTICE.—Each State shall notify residents of that State of the information that

State and local election officials maintain with respect to an individual voter registration status for purposes of elections for Federal office in the State, how that information is shared or sold and with whom, what information is automatically kept confidential, what information is needed to access voter information online, and the privacy programs that are available.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Each State shall make information about the program established under subsection (a) available on a publicly accessible website.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The terms “domestic violence”, “stalking”, “sexual assault”, and “dating violence” have the meanings given such terms in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291).

(2) The term “trafficking” means an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 666, insert after line 2 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SECTION 6010. EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR OFFENSES UNDER FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971.

(a) **CIVIL OFFENSES.**—Section 309(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

“(10) No person shall be subject to a civil penalty under this subsection with respect to a violation of this Act unless a complaint is filed with the Commission with respect to the violation under paragraph (1), or the Commission responds to information with respect to the violation which is ascertained in the normal course of carrying out its supervisory responsibilities under paragraph (2), not later than 15 years after the date on which the violation occurred.”.

(b) **CRIMINAL OFFENSES.**—Section 406(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30145(a)) is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “10 years”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to violations occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 154, beginning line 2, strike “at least one voting system” and insert “a sufficient number, but at least one, of voting systems, as determined by the Commission in consultation with the United States Access Board and the National Institute of Standards and Technology”.

Page 154, beginning line 3, strike “for individuals with disabilities” and insert “to serve individuals with and without disabilities”.

Page 154, beginning line 7, strike “at each polling place” and insert “for all in person voting options”.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 223, line 18, insert “, without being subjected to intimidation or deceptive practices,” after “vote”.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 129, line 8, insert “, including by operating a polling place or ballot box that falsely purports to be an official location established for such an election by a unit of government” before the period.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

Page 220, line 20, strike “clause” and insert “clause, and shall include on the institu-

tion’s website and boost awareness on the institution’s social media platforms.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 94, insert after line 25 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

(c) **PRIORITY FOR SCHOOLS RECEIVING TITLE I FUNDS.**—In selecting among eligible local educational agencies for receiving funds under the pilot program under this part, the Commission shall give priority to local educational agencies that receive funds under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq).

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 79, insert after line 9 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

“(c) **ENSURING AVAILABILITY OF FORMS.**—The State shall ensure that each polling place has copies of any forms an individual may be required to complete in order to register to vote or revise the individual’s voter registration information under this section.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 248, line 15, strike the closing quotation mark and the second period.

Page 248, insert after line 15 the following: “(c) **MINIMUM HOURS OF OPERATION OUTSIDE OF TYPICAL WORKING HOURS.**—Each State shall establish hours of operation for all polling places in the State on the date of any election for Federal office held in the State such that no polling place is open for less than a total of 4 hours outside of the hours between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm in time zone in which the polling place is located.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 548, strike lines 3 through 12 and insert the following:

(c) **STUDY AND REPORT ON IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF VOUCHER PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Federal Election Commission shall conduct a study on the efficacy of political voucher programs, including the program under this part and other similar programs, in expanding and diversifying the pool of individuals who participate in the electoral process, including those who participate as donors and those who participate as candidates.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish and submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), and shall include in the report such recommendations as the Commission considers appropriate which would enable political voucher programs to be implemented on a national scale.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 255, after line 16, insert the following: **SEC. 1909. GAO STUDY ON VOTER TURNOUT RATES.**

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on voter turnout rates delineated by age in States and localities that permit voters to participate in elections before reaching the age of 18, with a focus on localities that permit voting upon reaching the age of 16.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 255, insert before line 17, the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1909. STUDY ON RANKED-CHOICE VOTING.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study on the implementation and

impact of ranked-choice voting in States and localities with a focus on how to best implement a model for Federal elections nationwide. The study shall include the impact on voter turnout, negative campaigning, and who decides to run for office.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Comptroller General shall transmit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations on how to best implement a ranked-choice voting for Federal elections nationwide.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD OF ILLINOIS

In section 542(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 5111 of the bill—

(1) strike “and” at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) redesignate subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F); and

(3) insert after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

(E) the extent to which the program increased opportunities for participation by candidates of diverse racial, gender, and socio-economic backgrounds; and

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

On page 124, line 1, strike “criminal penalties” and insert “criminal, civil, or other legal penalties”.

On page 128, line 17, strike “criminal penalties” and insert “criminal, civil, or other legal penalties”.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA

Page 88, after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 1055. INCLUSION OF VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION WITH CERTAIN LEASES AND VOUCHERS FOR FEDERALLY ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING AND MORTGAGE APPLICATIONS.

(a) **DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM STATEMENT.**—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in coordination with the Election Assistance Commission, shall develop a uniform statement designed to provide recipients of such statement pursuant to this section of how they can register to vote and their voting rights under law.

(b) **LEASES AND VOUCHERS FOR FEDERALLY ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING.**—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall require—

(1) each public housing agency to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to each lessee of a dwelling unit in public housing administered by such agency—

(A) together with the lease for such a dwelling unit, at the same time such lease is provided to the lessee; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the lessee;

(2) each public housing agency that administers rental assistance under the Housing Choice Voucher program under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)), including the program under paragraph (13) of such section 8(o), to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to each assisted family or individual—

(A) together with the voucher for such assistance, at the time such voucher is issued for such family or individual; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the applicant or assisted family or individual; and

(3) each owner of a dwelling unit assisted with Federal project-based rental assistance

to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) to provide to the lessee of such dwelling unit—

(A) together with the lease for such dwelling unit, at the same time such form is provided to the lessee; and

(B) together with any income verification form, at the same time such form is provided to the applicant or tenant;

except that the Secretary of Agriculture shall administer the requirement under this paragraph with respect to Federal project-based rental assistance specified in subsection (e)(1)(D),

(C) APPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall require each creditor that receives an application (within the meaning of such term as used in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691)) for a residential mortgage loan to provide a copy of the uniform statement developed pursuant to subsection (a) in written form to the applicant for such residential mortgage loan, within 5 business days of the date of application.

(D) OPTIONAL COMPLETION OF APPLICATION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require any individual to complete an application for voter registration.

(E) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) FEDERAL PROJECT-BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE.—The term “Federal project-based rental assistance” means project-based rental assistance provided under—

(A) section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f);

(B) section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q);

(C) section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013);

(D) title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.), including voucher assistance under section 542 of such title (42 U.S.C. 1490r);

(E) subtitle D of title VIII of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12901 et seq.);

(F) title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12721 et seq.);

(G) the Housing Trust Fund program under section 1338 of the federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4588); or

(H) subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.).

(2) OWNER.—The term “owner” has the meaning given such term in section 8(f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(f)).

(3) PUBLIC HOUSING; PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCY.—The terms “public housing” and “public housing agency” have the meanings given such terms in section 3(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)).

(4) RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOAN.—The term “residential mortgage loan” includes any loan which is secured by a first or subordinate lien on residential real property (including individual units of condominiums and cooperatives) designed principally for the occupancy of from 1- to 4- families.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau may issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bloc of amendments provides important additions to H.R. 1 that strengthen the bill and enhance voter access.

Among the amendments in the bloc is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Virginia that would require foreign agent disclaimers to be included on social media content. This increases transparency by requiring disclaimers to be embedded on the face of a social media post itself, and those disclaimers must remain whenever the post is subsequently shared.

There are four amendments from the gentlewoman from California, including one that addresses longstanding privacy concerns of survivors of domestic and sexual abuse who want to register to vote but do not want their personal information to be publicly accessible; and a second that requires all in-person voting locations to have a sufficient number of accessible voting machines for their voters.

There is an amendment from the gentleman from California that clarifies prohibitions on polling places or ballot drop boxes that falsely purport to be an official location established for an election.

I would note that, in California, the Republican Party in southern California established drop boxes that purported to be from the registrar of voters. That was deceptive. An agreement was reached with the secretary of state that they could have the boxes, but they couldn't hold themselves out to be the registrar of voters.

H.R. 1 calls for all States to provide same-day voter registration. The gentlewoman from Michigan's amendment makes an important addition that will help ensure the successful carrying out of this requirement: States must ensure that they have adequate copies of registration forms and other relevant voter registration at polling places.

There is an amendment from the gentleman from New York that requires the GAO to conduct a study on voter turnout rates, broken down by age in States and localities that permit voters to participate in elections before the age of 18. This is an issue that merits examination, and this amendment will ensure that Congress is fully equipped to debate the issue.

There is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Illinois that would require the GAO to review small-donor campaign financing to study the extent to which the program increases opportunities for candidates of diverse racial, gender, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

There is an amendment from the gentlewoman from Georgia that would require the Director of the CFPB to work with the EAC to develop a statement providing certain individuals with information regarding voter registration and their voting rights. This common-

sense reform ensures that tenants and homeowners will have easy access to voter registration and other voter-related information.

Finally, there is an amendment from the gentlewoman from California that would ensure that the bill's prohibitions against election disinformation cover false claims that voters will face civil and other legal penalties for voting.

I support these amendments, and I urge their adoption.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the en bloc. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a good friend and a problem solver.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an issue that is so important to so many of the people from my district, and that is election integrity.

I am confident in the integrity of our democracy, but the fact remains that over 59 percent of Americans do not have confidence in the integrity of our election process.

Time and time again, I have worked across the aisle with my Democratic colleagues to try to come together on commonsense reforms to address the issue of election integrity, and the issue that I am passionate about today is the question of voter ID.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) and I had an amendment that we asked to be considered and debated on this floor to say that funds under this bill would not go to States that did not have a voter ID law in place. A simple reform to make sure that we have voter ID cards issued across America is a simple, commonsense integrity measure for our election systems to make sure that our votes count and the people casting the votes are those individuals who are registered to make that vote.

We have IDs in America for simple things like buying alcohol, renting a car, and going into your grocery stores to get food stamps. We issue government IDs for EBT cards. There are simple ways to make sure that people have access to identification so that they could perform one of the most fundamental civic duties and fundamental rights that we have, and that is to vote.

To ask an individual to have an ID is a simple measure, and my Democratic colleagues did not allow us to have that debate and have an open, honest conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on these amendments and continue to work with us to ensure that the election integrity of our country is safe and secure.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

My amendment would require the Comptroller General to analyze the impact of the voluntary small-donor financing program on the racial, gender, and socioeconomic diversity of candidates for public office.

As the first woman and first person of color to represent Illinois' 14th Congressional District, I know that Americans with diverse backgrounds and experiences are electable everywhere in this country, but too often, excellent candidates without personal wealth or corporate backing are outspent and overpowered long before the voters get a say.

The Brennan Center found that small-donor financing cannot only make running for public office an opportunity for more Americans, but also increase the racial and gender diversity of our elected officials by giving every candidate a fighting chance.

My amendment would make sure H.R. 1 fulfills its promise of letting the people decide who represents them. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), who can take you on a tour of the best Philly cheesesteak places in the world.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, prior to my coming to Congress, I dedicated my entire life as an FBI agent to fighting corruption and fighting for electoral reform, having overseen that program for the entire Nation. H.R. 1 sets us back.

H.R. 1 should not be called For the People. It should be called for the politicians. We know what we need to do to fix this system, Mr. Speaker.

Several of my colleagues and I have introduced legislation that would actually restore faith in this institution and in the electoral process: term limits, no budget-no pay, a balanced budget amendment, single-issue legislation, abolishing congressional pensions, ending ballot harvesting, providing free photo IDs to every registered voter, ensuring signature matching, and, with the exception of military ballots, requiring that all ballots be received by 8 p.m. on election night.

Mr. Speaker, this is common sense. What this body is doing today is the opposite. My colleagues are further eroding trust in this system, and that is a real shame because we have the opportunity to fix this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know why House leadership refuses to put these issues on the floor that would unequivocally pass with overwhelming margins in the House and the Senate. If it is going to pass overwhelmingly here, that means the American people want it. Let's put those on the floor.

□ 1115

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership and for adding to this legislation—my legislation—the For the People Act, adding the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I wrote as long ago as 2006.

Madam Speaker, section 2402 prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from doing it in the mid-decennial, waiting till the next time, the decennial apportionment; so no mid-decade kind of redistricting that has been so unhelpful to all of us.

Madam Speaker, I rise, as well, to support the Swalwell amendments regarding the college student voting, as well as prohibiting false voting polling places and adding colleges and universities' responsibility to give civic information to our students.

I also support the privacy information required by the Speier amendment to ensure that there is no domestic violence and dating violence because your voting information gets out.

And I also support the Waters amendment that prohibits misinformation, which threatens potential voters with civil or legal penalties if they exercise their right to vote. I can assure you, this happens in the minority community.

And I do support the 16-years-of-age amendment, because if you can be on the front lines of civil rights and protest for justice and democracy, you have the right to vote.

Madam Speaker, let's educate our young people so they can vote. I am very happy to support the en bloc.

Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor, I rise today in support of H.R. 1, the "For the People Act of 2021," which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

Specifically, the For the People Act will:

Make it easier, not harder, to vote by implementing automatic voter registration, requiring early voting and vote by mail, committing Congress to reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act and ensuring the integrity of our elections by modernizing and strengthening our voting systems and ending partisan redistricting.

Reform the campaign finance system by requiring all political organizations to disclose large donors, updating political advertisement laws for the digital age, establishing a public matching system for citizen-owned elections, and revamping the Federal Election Commission to ensure there's a cop on the campaign finance beat.

Strengthen ethics laws to ensure that public officials work in the public interest by extending conflict of interest laws to the President and Vice President; requiring the release of their tax returns; closing loopholes that allow former members of Congress to avoid cooling-off periods for lobbying; closing the revolving door between industry and the federal government; and establishing a code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

This bill ensures that individuals who have completed felony sentences have their full

rights restored and expands early voting and simplify absentee voting; and modernize the U.S. voting system.

I am particularly proud and appreciative to Chairwoman LOFGREN and Congressman SARBANES that the For the People Act incorporates in Section 2402 of the legislation the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I first offered in 2006 during the Judiciary Committee markup of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 reauthorization and as standalone legislation in the 114th Congress.

This provision, section 2402, prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from engaging in redistricting again until after the next decennial apportionment unless required by a court to do so to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this subtitle.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is particularly timely because more than 55 years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

If is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

Madam Speaker, let me list some of the salutary features of the legislation that will make it easier for Americans to exercise their right to vote, the most precious right of all because as President Johnson said in securing passage of the Voting Rights Act, the right to vote "is preservative of all other rights."

H.R. 1 modernizes the voter registration system by requiring each state to make available online voter registration, correction, cancellation, and designation of party affiliation.

In addition, H.R. 1:

Requires states to permit voters to register on the day of a federal election, including during early voting.

Limits the authority of states to remove registrants from the official list of eligible voters in elections for federal office in the state based on interstate voter registration crosschecks.

Requires states to provide annual reports on voter registration statistics to the Election Assistance Commission.

Provides HAVA funds to implement the voter registration modernization reforms.

Makes it unlawful to hinder, interfere or prevent an individual from registering to vote.

Instructs the Election Assistance Commission to develop best practices for states to deter and prevent such violations.

H.R. 1 explicitly prohibits ‘voter caging’, the pernicious practice of using returned non-forwardable mail as the basis for removing registered voters from the rolls, and it prohibits challenges to eligibility from individuals who are not election officials without an oath of good faith factual basis.

Importantly, the legislation prohibits providing false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting and increases penalties for voter intimidation.

I support the declaration in the legislation of the right of citizens to vote in federal elections will not be denied because of a criminal conviction unless a citizen is serving a felony sentence in a correctional facility and it requires states and the federal government to notify individuals convicted of a state or federal felony, respectively, of their disenfranchisement.

H.R. 1 promotes election accuracy, integrity, and security by requiring states to use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots and that said ballots be counted by hand or an optical character recognition device and that a voter be given the opportunity to correct his or her ballot should a mistake be made; and it also requires that provisional ballots from eligible voters at incorrect polling places be counted.

The legitimacy and stability of democratic governance is always enhanced by increased voter participation in elections, so I am very pleased that H.R. 1 outlaws many practices resorted to by voting opponents to reduce election participation.

In particular, H.R. 1 requires at least 15 consecutive days of early voting for federal elections and that early voting locations be near public transportation, in rural areas, and open for at least 10 hours per day.

Additionally, the legislation prohibits a state from imposing restrictions on an individual’s ability to vote by mail and requires a state to carry out a program to track and confirm the receipt of absentee ballots and to make this information available to the voter who cast the ballot.

Also, the bill requires the prepayment of postage on return envelopes for voting materials, which includes any voter registration form, any application for an absentee ballot, and any blank absentee ballot transmitted by mail.

Madam Speaker, another important feature of H.R. 1 is that it promotes voter access by mandating several improvements to election administration, including:

Treating universities as voter registration agencies;

Requiring states to notify an individual, not later than 7 seven days before election, if the individual’s polling place has changed;

Requiring states to allow voters to sign sworn affidavits to vote in lieu of presenting photo ID;

Providing accommodations for voters residing in Indian lands;

Ensuring equitable and efficient operation of polling places, reducing long lines and wait times for voters;

Requiring states to provide secured drop boxes for voted absentee ballots in elections for federal office;

Prohibiting states from restricting curbside voting;

Imposing requirements for federal election contingency plans in response to natural disasters and emergencies; and

Clarifying that failure to vote is not grounds for removing registered voters from the rolls.

Of course, nothing in this legislation prohibits or restricts the authority of states to provide greater opportunities for voting, and the bill makes that explicitly clear.

This litany of good measures demonstrates all the many ways and means through which H.R. 1 expands voter participation and election integrity, and our experience of the previous four years counsels the urgency of adopting them.

I am much less confident of the ability of one component of the bill—the title mandating creation of “Independent Redistricting Commissions”—to strengthen our democracy; in fact I believe that title of the legislation should be stricken because of its potential to negatively effective marginalized communities and minority groups.

I am not contending that independent redistricting commissions are an unconstitutional usurpation of authority belonging exclusively to state legislatures; that argument was presented and rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*, 576 U.S. 787 (2015).

Instead, the nation’s experience with independent redistricting commissions is still in its early stages, and I believe that instead of mandating a one-size fits all approach, Congress should allow further experimentation to occur in the states, the “laboratories of democracy,” as they were described by Justice Brandeis in *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262 (1932).

In addition, it appears to me that the selection process laid out in the bill for choosing members of the independent redistricting commissions is too random and will not result in a commission comprised of members reflective of the communities directly affected by the work of the commission, particularly members of racial and language minorities.

Madam Speaker, the issue of redistricting and how to do it fairly is a never-ending one, and, as most political scientists agree, it is virtually impossible to draw most congressional and legislative districts in ways that are competitive; redistricting exacerbates geographical polarization, but it does not create it.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1 must be passed because many of the civil rights that I fought for as a student and young lawyer have been undermined or been rolled back by reactionary forces in recent years.

To add insult to injury, the immediately preceding Administration issued an Executive Order establishing a so-called “Election Integrity” Commission to investigate not voter suppression, but so-called “voter fraud” in the 2016 election.

The 45th President and his followers were unceasing in their efforts to perpetuate the myth of voter fraud, but it remains just that: a myth.

Between 2000 and 2014, there were 35 credible allegations of voter fraud out of more than 834 million ballots cast—that is less than 1 in 28 million votes.

An extensive study by social scientists at Dartmouth College uncovered no evidence to

support Trump’s hysterical and outrageous allegations of widespread voter fraud “rigging” the 2016 election.

Just for the record, Madam Speaker, the popular vote of the 2016 presidential election was:

Hillary Clinton: 65,853,5160.

Donald Trump: 62,884,8240.

Trump’s deficit of 2.9 million was the largest of any Electoral College winner in history by a massive margin, and despite the allegations of the current Administration, there have been only 4 documented cases of voter fraud in the 2016 election.

The same is true for the 2020 presidential election, which again Donald Trump claimed was fraudulent after losing the popular vote to President Biden by more than 7 million votes, and the Electoral College by 306–232, the exact margin that he claimed constituted a landslide and epic blowout when he won the Electoral College vote in 2016.

Again, and just for the record, Madam Speaker, the popular vote of the 2020 presidential election was:

Joe Biden: 81,281,502.

Donald Trump: 74,222,593.

The Trump Campaign brought more than 63 legal challenges to the 2020 election, claiming the outcomes were tainted by wide-spread and massive fraud but every court, whether state or federal, and nearly 90 judges, including Trump appointees, summarily rejected these baseless claims for failure of proof.

Of course, this did not deter the reckless 45th President who then went on to threaten and coerce state election officials to corruptly change vote counts and after that ploy failed, incited his loyalists to storm the U.S. Capitol and use force and violence if necessary to prevent the Congress from conducting the constitutionally required Joint Meeting to count the electoral votes cast and announce the winner of the presidential election.

Madam Speaker, the Trump Voter Fraud Commission, like many of Trump’s business schemes, was a massive scam built on countless lies that did not hold up to any level of scrutiny.

As Members of Congress, we should be devoting our time, energy, and resources addressing Russian infiltration of our election infrastructure and campaigns, along with other pressing issues.

Instead of enjoying and strengthening the protections guaranteed in the Voting Rights Act—people of color, women, LGBTQ individuals, and immigrants—have been given the joyless, exhausting task of fending off the constant barrage of attacks leveled at our communities by Trump and other conspiracy theorists.

Not only are we tasked with reversing the current dismal state of voter suppression against minorities; we are forced to refute the blatant, propagandist lie of voter fraud.

To this end, I have been persistent in my efforts to protect the rights of disenfranchised communities in my district of inner-city Houston and across the nation.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have cosponsored dozens of bills, amendments, and resolutions seeking to improve voters’ rights at all stages and levels of the election process.

This includes legislation aimed at:

Increasing voter outreach and turnout;

Ensuring both early and same-day registration;

Standardizing physical and language accessibility at polling places;

Expanding early voting periods;

Decreasing voter wait times;

Guaranteeing absentee ballots, especially for displaced citizens;

Modernizing voting technologies and strengthening our voter record systems;

Establishing the federal Election Day as a national holiday; and

Condemning and criminalizing deceptive practices, voter intimidation, and other suppression tactics.

Along with many of my CBC colleagues, I was an original cosponsor of H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act, which became public law on July 27, 2006.

I also authored H.R. 745 in the 110th Congress, which added the legendary Barbara Jordan to the list of civil rights trailblazers whose memories are honored in the naming of the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act.

This bill strengthened the original Voting Rights Act by replacing federal voting examiners with federal voting observers—a significant enhancement that made it easier to safeguard against racially biased voter suppression tactics.

As noted earlier, in the 114th Congress, I introduced H.R. 75, the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act of 2015, which prohibits states whose congressional districts have been redistricted after a decennial census from redrawing their district lines until the next census.

Prejudiced redistricting, or gerrymandering as it is more commonly known, has been used for decades to weaken the voting power of African Americans, Latino Americans, and other minorities since the Civil Rights Era.

Immediately after the *Shelby County v. Holder* ruling, which lifted preclearance requirements for states with histories of discrimination seeking to change their voting laws or practices, redistricting became a favorite tool for Republicans who connived to unfairly gain 3 congressional seats in Texas.

In the 110th Congress, I was the original sponsor of H.R. 6778, the Ex Offenders Voting Rights Act of 2008, which prohibited denial of the right to vote in a federal election on the basis of an individual's status as a formerly incarcerated person.

The Ex-Offenders Voting Rights Act sought to reverse discriminatory voter restrictions that disproportionately affect the African American voting population, which continues to be targeted by mass incarceration, police profiling, and a biased criminal justice system.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Voter ID laws are just one of the means that can be used to abridge or suppress the right to vote but there are others, including:

Curtailing or Eliminating Early Voting;

Ending Same-Day Registration;

Not counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day;

Eliminating Teenage Pre-Registration; Shortened Poll Hours;

Lessening the standards governing voter challenges used by vigilantes, like the King Street Patriots in my city of Houston, to cause trouble at the polls;

“Voter Caging,” to suppress the turnout of minority voters by sending non-forwardable mail to targeted populations and, once the mail is returned, using the returned mail to compile lists of voters whose eligibility is then challenged on the basis of residence under state law; and

Employing targeted redistricting techniques to dilute minority voting strength, notably “Cracking” (i.e., fragmenting and dispersing concentrations of minority populations); “Stacking” (combining concentrations of minority voters with greater concentrations of white populations); and “Packing” (i.e., over-concentrating minority voters in as few districts as possible).

Madam Speaker, we must not allow our democracy to slide back into the worst elements of this country's past, to stand idly by as our treasured values of democracy, progress, and equality are poisoned and dismantled.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1, the “For The People Act of 2021.”

Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the rule governing debate of H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2021,” which expands access to the ballot box, reduces the influence of big money in politics, and strengthens ethics rules for public servants.

H.R. 1 is intended to increase public confidence in our democracy by reducing the role of money in politics, restoring ethical standards and integrity to government, and strengthening laws to protect voting.

I am particularly proud and appreciative to Chairwoman LOFGREN and Congressman SARBANES that the For The People Act incorporates in Section 2402 of the legislation the Coretta Scott King Mid-Decade Redistricting Prohibition Act that I first offered in 2006 during the Judiciary Committee markup of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 reauthorization and as standalone legislation in the 114th Congress.

This provision, section 2402, prohibits a State that has been redistricted in accordance with this legislation from engaging in redistricting again until after the next decennial apportionment unless required by a court to do so to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this subtitle.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is particularly timely because more than 55 years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are still discussing voter suppression—something which should be a bygone relic of the past, but yet continues to disenfranchise racial minorities, immigrants, women, and young people.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was a watershed moment for the Civil Rights Movement—it liberated communities of color from legal restrictions barring them from exercising the fundamental right to civic engagement and political representation.

But uncaged by Supreme Court's infamous 2013 decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which neutered the preclearance provision of the Voting Rights

Act, 14 states, including my state of Texas, took extreme measures to enforce new voting restrictions before the 2016 presidential election.

It is not a coincidence that many of these same states have experienced increasing numbers of black and Hispanic voters in recent elections.

If not for invidious, state-sponsored voter suppression policies like discriminatory voter ID laws, reduced early voting periods, and voter intimidation tactics that directly or indirectly target racial minorities, the 2016 presidential election might have had a drastically different outcome.

H.R. 1 expands access to the ballot box by taking aim at institutional barriers to voting.

Let me list some of the salutary features of the legislation that will make it easier for Americans to exercise their right to vote, the most precious right of all because as President Johnson said in securing passage of the Voting Rights Act, the right to vote “is preservative of all other rights.”

H.R. 1 modernizes the voter registration system by requiring each state to make available online voter registration, correction, cancellation, and designation of party affiliation.

In addition, H.R. 1:

Requires states to permit voters to register on the day of a federal election, including during early voting.

Limits the authority of states to remove registrants from the official list of eligible voters in elections for federal office in the state based on interstate voter registration crosschecks.

Requires states to provide annual reports on voter registration statistics to the Election Assistance Commission.

Provides HAVA funds to implement the voter registration modernization reforms.

Makes it unlawful to hinder, interfere or prevent an individual from registering to vote.

Instructs the Election Assistance Commission to develop best practices for states to deter and prevent such violations.

H.R. 1 explicitly prohibits ‘voter caging’, the pernicious practice of using returned non-forwardable mail as the basis for removing registered voters from the rolls and it prohibits challenges to eligibility from individuals who are not election officials without an oath of good faith factual basis.

Importantly, the legislation prohibits providing false information about elections to hinder or discourage voting and increases penalties for voter intimidation.

I support the declaration in the legislation of the right of citizens to vote in federal elections will not be denied because of a criminal conviction unless a citizen is serving a felony sentence in a correctional facility and it requires states and the federal government to notify individuals convicted of a state or federal felony, respectively, of their reenfranchisement.

H.R. 1 promotes election accuracy, integrity, and security by requiring states to use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots and that said ballots be counted by hand or an optical character recognition device and that a voter be given the opportunity to correct his or her ballot should a mistake be made; and it also requires that provisional ballots from eligible voters at incorrect polling places be counted.

The legitimacy and stability of democratic governance is always enhanced by increased voter participation in elections, so I am very

pleased that H.R. 1 outlaws many practices resorted to by voting opponents to reduce election participation.

In particular, H.R. 1 requires at least 15 consecutive days of early voting for federal elections and that early voting locations be near public transportation, in rural areas and open for at least 10 hours per day.

Additionally, the legislation prohibits a state from imposing restrictions on an individual's ability to vote by mail and requires a state to carry out a program to track and confirm the receipt of absentee ballots and to make this information available to the voter who cast the ballot.

Also, the bill requires the prepayment of postage on return envelopes for voting materials, which includes any voter registration form, any application for an absentee ballot, and any blank absentee ballot transmitted by mail.

Madam Speaker, another important feature of H.R. 1 is that it promotes voter access by mandating several improvements to election administration, including:

Treating universities as voter registration agencies;

Requiring states to notify an individual, not later than 7 seven days before election, if the individual's polling place has changed;

Requiring states to allow voters to sign sworn affidavits to vote in lieu of presenting photo ID;

Providing accommodations for voters residing in Indian lands;

Ensuring equitable and efficient operation of polling places, reducing long lines and wait times for voters;

Requiring states to provide secured drop boxes for voted absentee ballots in elections for federal office;

Prohibiting states from restricting curbside voting;

Imposing requirements for federal election contingency plans in response to natural disasters and emergencies; and

Clarifying that failure to vote is not grounds for removing registered voters from the rolls.

Of course, nothing in this legislation prohibits or restricts the authority of states to provide greater opportunities for voting, and the bill makes that explicitly clear.

This litany of good measures demonstrates all the many ways and means through which H.R. 1 expands voter participation and election integrity and our experience of the previous four years counsels the urgency of adopting them.

I am much less confident of the ability of one component of the bill—the title mandating creation of “Independent Redistricting Commissions”—to strengthen our democracy; in fact I believe that title of the legislation should be stricken because of its potential to negatively effective marginalized communities and minority groups.

I am not contending that independent redistricting commissions are an unconstitutional usurpation of authority belonging exclusively to state legislatures; that argument was presented and rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Arizona State Legislature v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission*, 576 U.S. 787 (2015).

Instead, the nation's experience with independent redistricting commissions is still in its early stages and I believe that instead of mandating a one-size fits all approach, Congress

should allow further experimentation to occur in the states, the “laboratories of democracy,” as they were described by Justice Brandeis in *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262 (1932).

In addition, it appears to me that the selection process laid out in the bill for choosing members of the independent redistricting commissions is too random and will not result in a commission comprised of members reflective of the communities directly affected by the work of the commission, particularly members of racial and language minorities.

Madam Speaker, the issue of redistricting and how to do it fairly is a never-ending one and, as most political scientists agree, it is virtually impossible to draw most congressional and legislative districts in ways that are competitive; redistricting exacerbates geographical polarization, but it does not create it.

For this reason, unlike the other titles of H.R. 1, I withhold my support for Title II, Subtitle E, Part 2.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Naples, Florida, (Mr. DONALDS), my good friend, who represents many of my former constituents from Illinois who have left Illinois because of overtaxation.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, the For the People Act. This is really just a take-over of elections by Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, I got a chance to go through some of this bill—790 pages. Most of these things would basically eviscerate Florida's election law.

You see, I served in Florida's legislature. We had the responsibility for adjusting legislation law from time to time. Our State was a State that went through hanging chads in 2000, and we have made the adjustment systematically in the State legislature to make sure that Florida has the very best election laws in these United States.

You see, on election night, November 3, we were done counting around 9:30. We knew the results by 10 o'clock. We have absentee ballots, we have voter ID, we have early voting, and we have a robust count system on election day.

The people of Florida have never been disenfranchised when it comes to elections. The people of Florida have come accustomed to having a voter system that works. And what this body is trying to do with H.R. 1 is completely destroy Florida's election laws. That is, to me, ridiculous. This Capitol should never allow that. If we are going to do anything, we should replicate what Florida has actually done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD). The gentleman needs to put his mask up.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, I am sorry. It keeps falling down.

Madam Speaker, I was trying to make a point—

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DONALDS. Madam Speaker, the point is clear: 33 States have voter ID

laws. Many States have already taken care of these problems themselves. State legislatures should be changing their laws. This Capitol should not. And the people of the State of Florida definitely do not want the things that are in this bill. Our system is the best. Frankly, leave Florida alone.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, before I reserve, can I make a parliamentary inquiry?

When a mask falls down unintentionally from a speaker, what is the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members must properly wear their masks at all times.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Is this being enforced equally on the majority and minority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not answer a hypothetical question, but the Speaker's announced policy applies to all Members.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. So I should ask the second-rate parliamentarian off the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 4½ minutes. The gentleman from Illinois has 6 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 1 to crack down on foreign-backed disinformation and propaganda on social media. This amendment is the text of the Bipartisan Foreign Agent Disclaimer Enhancement—FADE—Act.

Under the FADE Act, political ads, issue campaigns, and content funded or directed by a foreign principal and intended to influence the American people must be disclosed to the Department of Justice. But too often, this rule does not extend to the world of social media.

Additionally, foreign agents acting from abroad too often evade current disclaimer requirements. Amid the pandemic and following the 2020 general election, foreign governments continue to exploit existing vulnerabilities in our national security, including influencing Americans directly and infiltrating public discourse without their knowledge. Foreign adversaries, such as Russia, China, and Iran, are among the most active, and they are increasingly assertive in their efforts.

Madam Speaker, this amendment will help protect against foreign influence that seeks to sow political division and promote dangerous information contrary to the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

My amendment would require disclaimers—clearly stating this content is coming from a foreign principal.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW), my good friend and best-dressed member of our conference.

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, I am not so sure about that, but I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1.

We were warned for years about the rise of socialism. Well, here it is, served on a platter, using your money to pay for politicians campaigns.

Do you like those robocalls during campaign season?

How about the negative TV ads and the mailers?

Or how about all of the political stuff that just comes out?

Well, your tax dollars are paying for them. And, yes, this is taxpayer dollars, no matter how they tell you otherwise.

Madam Speaker, this bill puts Washington, D.C., in charge of our States' elections and how those elections are run. It would keep the status quo, like we saw this past November, with voter rolls that are not up to date and live ballots being mailed to voters who have died, moved, or even multiple ballots to the same voter.

Madam Speaker, elections do have consequences. And when leaders said the goal was to change America, they were telling the truth; and here we are.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS), who serves in the seat of our late, beloved John Lewis.

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is our duty to not only do the work of the people, but to ensure that people have a voice in our democracy.

H.R. 1 amplifies the voice of the people, empowers individuals to shape our democracy, and breaks down barriers to voting. It is historymaking by design, as a portion of H.R. 1 was written by my predecessor, Congressman John Lewis. We must honor his legacy and take this necessary step forward because Georgians and all people in this country deserve to retain their right to accessible elections.

Madam Speaker, I have added provisions to this bill that underscore not only the importance of voting, but making it easier for hardworking people to do so. And making it easier, not harder to vote, should always be our main concern.

Madam Speaker, this week, Georgia's legislators moved forward to further restrict Black and Brown communities from voting by enacting new ID laws for absentee ballot applications and limiting the use of ballot drop boxes—old tactics, but the same tricks. We cannot let self-serving politicians stack the deck through voter suppression and discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1 so that we can make it easier for peo-

ple to cast their ballots and have their voices be heard.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a summary of letters submitted yesterday by the Institute for Free Speech and others opposing H.R. 1.

INSTITUTE FOR FREE SPEECH,
March 3, 2021.

Re H.R. 1 Would Greatly Harm Free Speech.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Institute for Free Speech strongly opposes H.R. 1, the Orwellian For the People Act. More appropriately known as the For the Politicians Act, this radical bill would, in fact, greatly harm the ability of the people to freely speak, publish, organize into groups, and petition their elected representatives in pursuit of a better government.

In particular, H.R. 1 would impose onerous and unworkable standards on the ability of Americans and groups of Americans to discuss the policy issues of the day with elected officials and the public. Certain sections of the bill would violate the privacy of advocacy groups and their supporters, limit political speech on the internet, and compel speakers to recite lengthy government-mandated messages identifying some of their supporters by name in their communications.

Importantly, these restrictions would reach far beyond campaign speech to regulate discussion of legislative issues and public affairs. For advocacy groups, unions, and trade associations, several of the limits proposed in H.R. 1 would operate as a total ban on speech.

If signed into law, all of these provisions would be interpreted and enforced by a newly partisan Federal Election Commission. Under H.R. 1, the Commission would be radically transformed from its historic and deliberately bipartisan structure to one under partisan control of the president. As nine former members of the Federal Election Commission with a combined 60 plus years of service warned in a recent letter to Congress, the likely impact would be to shrink public confidence in the impartial enforcement of campaign finance laws, weaponize these regulations for partisan gain, and silence much political speech through new rules on groups that speak about public affairs.

H.R. 1 would also force Americans to pay for speech they oppose. This new financing system is a riverboat gamble on an untested—and costly—scheme that would have many unforeseen effects. Existing research has proven that similar schemes elsewhere have failed to achieve proponents' stated goals. Instead, the program will likely incentivize—and subsidize—candidates with hateful messages, create new avenues for corruption, increase polarization, give government greater control over campaigns, waste tax dollars, and fail markedly at improving the quality of governance or the diversity of those who are elected to higher office.

At its core, H.R. 1 would greatly increase the already high legal and administrative compliance costs, liability risk, and costs to donor and associational privacy for civic groups that speak about policy issues. Organizations will be further deterred from speaking or will have to divert additional resources away from their advocacy activities to pay for compliance staff and lawyers. Some groups will not be able to afford these costs or will violate the law unwittingly. The effect will be less speech by Americans and organizations, allowing politicians to act with less accountability to public opinion and criticism.

Few bills are more antithetical to the text of and principles underlying the First Amendment than H.R. 1. The numerous, overlapping, and interrelated provisions in this legislation combine to impose and tighten severe government controls on speech about campaigns, judicial nominees, and policy issues in truly shocking ways. Any American lacking expertise in campaign finance law would have little to no hope of understanding this bill or the voluminous restrictions it proposes on political speech and association. The sad result will be a political discourse dominated by Washington, DC insiders. Far from being For the People, H.R. 1 is truly For the Politicians.

The best way to give the American people a voice and to safeguard democracy is to protect and enhance the right to free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment. While the Institute takes no position on the myriad provisions in H.R. 1 that deal with election administration, voting rights, and redistricting, the portions of H.R. 1 that trample on free speech are sufficient to warrant our firm opposition to this measure. For the above reasons, the Institute for Free Speech strongly opposes passage of H.R. 1.

Sincerely,

DAVID KEATING,
President.

ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Springfield, IL, February 19, 2021.

To: Illinois Federal Delegation
Fr: Illinois Representative Joe Sosnowski,
69th District, Illinois House of Representatives

TO THE ILLINOIS FEDERAL DELEGATION: As a state legislator elected to be a voice for the people of Illinois, I write to express my opposition to H.R. 1/S. 1, an unconstitutional takeover of citizens' right to free speech and association.

As elected officials, we both have a duty to represent our constituents best interests and a responsibility to defend the United States Constitution. Therefore, it is my obligation to urge you to oppose the deceptively named For the People Act. The legislation is ill-considered and deeply unconstitutional, and I have seen firsthand the chilling effects of the donor disclosure provisions that it would enact.

As a member of the American Legislative Exchange Council, a membership organization of state legislators dedicated to principles of limited government, free markets and federalism. In 2013, activists launched a campaign to reveal, then harass and shame, the ALEC donor base. Their goal was simple: Harassing ALEC donors and corporate members would chill their participation with and support for the organization, ultimately cutting off a funding source for ALEC.

Worse, public elected officials used their platform to heighten this threat of donor disclosure in order to further intimidate ALEC supporters. In 2013, every company tangentially associated with ALEC received an official letter from US Senator Richard Durbin, demanding to know whether it had served as a member of ALEC or provided any funding to ALEC, with the intent of intimidating them. Durbin wrote that he would read their responses into the official Congressional record, forever memorializing their support and creating a public target list for activists opposed to the organization. Even the Chicago Tribune, the Senator's hometown newspaper that had endorsed his candidacy, rebuked Durbin's attempt at creating an enemies list by using his high federal office as a cudgel against his enemies.

H.R. 1/S. 1 would institutionalize this harassment and intimidation and extend it to all nonprofits, regardless of their issue area or political persuasion. Whatever issues you

support or oppose, this should be of serious concern to you. If this legislation is enacted, passionate activists on both sides of the aisle would have access to a government-run database of donors who give to every organization from ALEC and the Family Research Council to the ACLU and Planned Parenthood. Does anyone doubt that the blunt instrument of donor disclosure in H.R. 1/S. 1 would put millions of Americans' peace and livelihoods at risk of significant, material harm?

These tactics are flimsy bureaucratic structures designed to harass nonprofits and chill speech, despite fundamental violations of the First Amendment. In keeping with today's cancel culture, H.R. 1/S. 1 is a government-sanctioned attempt to chill speech and participation. Good governance watchdogs argue this measure increases transparency. Transparency is good when applied to government, but when it strips away Constitutionally protected privacy for individuals, it is exceedingly dangerous. For the federal government to expose our constituents as supporters of any nonprofit's cause would be an enormous overreach of centralized power.

If passed, the donor disclosure provisions in H.R. 1/S. 1 would bludgeon our democratic institutions and threaten the safety and peace of our everyday constituents. It would further normalize the darkness of cancel culture and intimidation through overregulation in American society. Therefore, we call on you to oppose H.R. 1/S. 1.

Sincerely,

Representative JOE
SOSNOWSKI,
69th District, Illinois
House of Representatives,
ALEC State Chair.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, over the last couple of days, I have spoken a lot about my opposition to this bill's creation of a public fund filled with dollars from corporate fines to directly fund the campaign coffers of every Member of this institution and candidates.

And my Democrat colleagues have continued to say this isn't public funding or corporate donations because it is corporate fines.

So what is the truth?

I think my chart here tells the story. So we have corporate fines. That is corporate dollars, something that we, as Members of Congress in our campaigns, cannot accept right now. Those corporate dollars that pay these corporate fines that we set the levels of in this institution, they then go to the U.S. Government in this new—that H.R. 1 creates—the Freedom From Influence Fund.

It is really a laundering machine. So they launder that corporate money that we cannot accept right now into the Treasury and it comes out clean as public money. It is money that used to be used for things like the Crime Victims Fund. Instead, this new laundered money, this taxpayer money—because it is public, it is under the control of us—then goes out exponentially to all of us, to our campaigns to pay for attack ads, fundraisers, mailers, phone calls, whatever you want.

But either way, it is government spending—government sending cor-

porate dollars directly to us. This is, and should be, prohibited, but H.R. 1 changes that and it puts more money into politics and not less.

How about the Crime Victims Fund or victims of domestic violence get these dollars?

Let's make sure that we address programs that deal with sexual assault, child abuse, and other crimes. This money will not go into the Crime Victims Fund because it is going to all of us. All 50 State attorneys general have told us that this vital Crime Victims Fund is nearly depleted. But instead of plussing it up, here we are today, funding our own campaigns with a "yes" vote.

Madam Speaker, this bill isn't for the people. It is for the politicians. This is why I am offering a motion to recommit so that we can put forward a bill that works for the American people.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt this motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on House Administration to consider an amendment to remove all public financing from this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, it is one reason I am opposed to H.R. 1, and giving Democrats another chance to join me, stopping this charade, stopping enriching themselves in their own campaign. This is one last chance before you do it again.

Madam Speaker, another reason I oppose H.R. 1 is because the election mandates on States in this bill go against what our Founding Fathers intended and essentially nationalizes our election system.

If signed into law, H.R. 1 would be the greatest expansion of the Federal Government's role in our elections than we have ever seen. By moving these decisions to D.C., we are further removing people from the laws that govern their elections. People should have more say in how their elections are run, not less. Our goal is to always ensure all eligible voters are able to vote and all lawful votes are counted. That is not what H.R. 1 does. And the only witness who has run an election before said during the single House Administration hearing held on this bill that H.R. 1 will undermine many of the election laws States have put into place to make it easier for people to vote and improve their election process for their voters.

One-size-fits-all mandates from Washington will not fix the problems we have seen in elections across the country. They will just cause more chaos and confusion. These issues need to be solved at the local and State level. Instead of dictating to States, we

should be working with them and localities to address these issues. And I stand ready and willing to work with my Democrat colleagues to do just that, but I will not vote for a Federal takeover of elections and I will not vote to use the Federal Government to put more money into my campaign. It is bad policy and it is bad for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for the motion to recommit at the appropriate time, and I urge a "no" vote on the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is ready to yield back or use the rest of his time.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I would like to request a meeting with the Parliamentarian. I personally witnessed one of my Democratic colleagues immediately remove his mask and was never told to put it back on from the Chair at the time. So all we ask for is consistency.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this bill. I urge support for the motion to recommit. I urge my Democratic colleagues: Don't vote to put money into your own campaigns.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the secretary of state of Colorado, with a number of other secretary of states, urging support for this bill; and a letter from former leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union and concerned first amendment scholars urging support.

JENA GRISWOLD,
COLORADO SECRETARY OF STATE,
March 2, 2021.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER PELOSI, LEADER MCCONNELL, AND LEADER MCCARTHY: It's no accident that the 2020 elections were the most secure in American history. A monumental effort by election administrators—from board of elections officials, to county clerks, to poll workers—ensured our country's democratic process was stronger than ever, even with the unique challenge posed by the COVID-19 pandemic.

While the 2020 elections proved that our democracy is resilient, the elections also showed us that they cannot be taken for granted. Our elections were safe, secure, and successful because countless patriotic Americans took action to protect them. The policies that gave voters better options to safely

register to vote and cast a ballot in the face of the pandemic were a resounding success and must now be made permanent.

Modernizing elections meant that eligible voters did not have to choose between casting a ballot and risking their health. It also resulted in record turnout for both parties. Policies like vote-by mail for all and early voting saw resounding success in states and municipalities across the country. Now, only Congress can ensure that every eligible voter across America has access to these voting options in the future. That's why we need to immediately enact the *For The People Act* (H.R. 1) into law.

The *For The People Act* offers a comprehensive path to securing and modernizing American democracy for generations to come. The bill provides clear guidance for all 50 states and the District of Columbia to implement election processes that work for administrators and voters alike, and its adoption into law is critical to the future of American elections. Proven policies such as automatic and same-day voter registration will remove administrative obstacles for eligible voters while maintaining up-to-date and accurate voter rolls. Voter-verified paper ballots will ensure every vote is accurately recorded and allow administrators to run key audits to verify election results. Other provisions, such as independent redistricting commissions to combat gerrymandering and shining light on dark money, will further strengthen the integrity of our elections.

As the chief elections officials in our respective states, and as the administrators who will be tasked with executing many of the policies proposed in H.R. 1, we can confidently state that this bill is designed to make our democracy stronger and safer than ever. We proudly and firmly support the *For The People Act*, and we strongly recommend its passage in the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,

Katie Hobbs, Arizona Secretary of State; Shirley Weber, California Secretary of State; Jena Griswold, Colorado Secretary of State; Denise Merrill, Connecticut Secretary of State; Kimberly Bassett, Secretary of the District of Columbia; Shenna Bellows, Maine Secretary of State; Jocelyn Benson, Michigan Secretary of State; Steve Simon, Minnesota Secretary of State; Maggie Toulouse Oliver, New Mexico Secretary of State; Shemia Fagan, Oregon Secretary of State; Nellie Gorbea, Rhode Island Secretary of State; Jim Condos, Vermont Secretary of State.

FORMER LEADERS OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND CONCERNED FIRST AMENDMENT SCHOLARS,

February 18, 2021.

Re H.R. 1, For the People Act.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chair, House Administration Committee,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN SARBANES,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chair, House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR LOFGREN, CHAIR NADLER, AND REP. SARBANES: The undersigned are former leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and concerned academics who have devoted much of their careers to the defense of the First Amendment and the protection of American democracy. We write in support of speedy House enactment of H.R.1, the *For the People Act*.

American democracy is at a perilous crossroads. H.R.1 responds with sweeping reforms countering voter suppression and partisan

gerrymandering that have targeted communities of color; overhauling our deeply inequitable campaign finance system; and reducing the influence of secret "dark money" in federal elections. We view H.R. 1 as the most significant prodemocracy legislation since the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Some have argued that despite the overwhelmingly positive content of H.R.1, enactment should be delayed in the House pending legislative hearings and efforts to amend certain provisions in the 700-page legislation, especially provisions requiring disclosure of the identities of large donors to tax-exempt organizations operating on the margins of electoral politics. We agree that, ordinarily, best legislative practice would call for hearings designed to resolve First Amendment concerns over important legislation. But, given the importance of shoring up the democratic process, the limited window of opportunity for passage of H.R.1, the likely delay in Senate consideration, and the nature of the First Amendment objections to disclosure, we believe that immediate passage of H.R.1 in its present form is the preferable course of action.

Objectors to immediate passage of HR 1 appear to us to: (1) underestimate the risks to enacting HR 1 posed by substantial delay in House passage; (2) understate the importance of closing loopholes in our campaign finance disclosure laws; and (3) overstate the risks to First Amendment freedom posed by the bill's disclosure provisions. We live in a democratic culture saturated by great wealth. The Supreme Court has rendered it almost impossible to directly regulate the role of money in determining electoral outcomes. One of the few practical reform windows left open is public disclosure of the sources of money-driven influence over electoral politics. Such disclosure is important, not only to prevent corruption, but to allow ordinary citizens to evaluate the truth of electoral speech by knowing who is paying for it. We recognize the need to preserve anonymity for persons whose speech or association might be deterred by fear of disclosure. That is why the H.R.1 disclosure rules apply only to large donations exceeding \$10,000. Moreover, current First Amendment doctrine already provides an "as applied" exception to disclosure rules if a genuine fear of retaliatory action were to exist.

In short, we do not view First Amendment concerns over the precise scope of disclosure requirements affecting large donors to tax exempt organizations operating on the margins of electoral politics as outweighing the need for expeditious enactment of the clearly desirable aspects of H.R.1 into law.

We urge you to press for speedy enactment of H.R. 1 in its current form.

Respectfully submitted,

Aryeh Neier, President Emeritus of the Open Society Foundations, ACLU Executive Director, 1970-78; Burt Neuborne, Norman Dorsen Professor of Civil Liberties Emeritus at NYU School of Law, ACLU National Legal Director, 1981-86; Helen Hershkoff, Herbert Mand. Svetlana Wachtel/Professor of Constitutional Law and Civil Liberties at NYU School of Law, ACLU Associate Legal Director, 1987-95; John Shattuck, Senior Fellow at the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy, Harvard Kennedy School, Professor of Practice in Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Director of the ACLU's Washington office, 1976-84; Judith Resnik, Arthur Liman Professor of Law at Yale Law School; Erwin Chemerinsky, Dean and Jesse Choper Distinguished Professor of Law at Berkeley Law School, University of California; Robert Post, Sterling Professor of Law and former Dean of Yale Law School; Geoffrey Stone, Edward H. Levi Distinguished Service Professor of Law and

former Dean of the University of Chicago Law School.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate that the ranking member has shown us this chart because he has proven that all of the Republican Members claiming that there was tax money funding the pilot project for the small matching donors were wrong.

This is a pilot project that is funded by an additional fine on corporate wrongdoing. It doesn't take money away from anything else. It is an additional fine that, if H.R. 1 doesn't pass, will not be imposed.

I was interested to hear our colleague from New Jersey say it is your money that will be used. Well, it is only your money if you are a corporate malfeasance individual, a corporate wrongdoer that gets fined; and I don't think very many of us have sympathy for that crew.

I would like to just give some perspective here because all over the United States, because of the pandemic, efforts were made to allow for people to vote and not have to endanger their health. So absentee voting became more of the norm. There were more early voting efforts, a lot of things of that nature, because of the pandemic.

And what happened?

There was a huge increase in turnout, both among Republicans and Democrats. It was a safe and secure election, the most safe and secure election in modern history. There wasn't a bunch of fraud.

Some of my colleagues said that people don't trust our system.

Why is that?

Because there are politicians in this country that are misleading the American public about that election. And I would say the former President is first among them, telling things that are not true and convincing people of that.

So now that we have had this huge turnout because of the pandemic, we are seeing States—Republicans, I must say, unfortunately, all over the United States trying to cut off access to the ballot.

In Georgia, they just passed a whole slew of voter restriction measures to try and tamp down turnout, and we see hundreds of bills being introduced to do that.

I urge a "yes" vote on this en bloc and on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1 is postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 37, printed in part B of House Report 117-9, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 125, nays 302, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—125

Adams	Bowman	Casten
Auchincloss	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Bass	F.	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Brown	Chu
Beyer	Brownley	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Bush	Clark (MA)
Blunt Rochester	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Bonamici	Carson	Cleaver

Clyburn	Kahele	Quigley
Cooper	Khanna	Raskin
Correa	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Crist	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny K.	Kim (NJ)	Ruiz
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lamb	Rush
Delgado	Langevin	Ryan
DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Deutch	Lee (NV)	Schiff
Dingell	Leger Fernandez	Sewell
Doggett	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Escobar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Eshoo	Lieu	Speier
Espallat	Lowenthal	Stanton
Evans	Malinowski	Strickland
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell
Frankel, Lois	McGovern	Takano
Gallego	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Garcia (IL)	Moulton	Tlaib
Golden	Murphy (FL)	Tonko
Gomez	Neal	Torres (NY)
Gonzalez,	Neguse	Trahan
Vicente	Newman	Underwood
Green, Al (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Grijalva	Omar	Velázquez
Haaland	Pallone	Wasserman
Hastings	Panetta	Schultz
Hayes	Pascarell	Waters
Higgins (NY)	Payne	Watson Coleman
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Welch
Jacobs (CA)	Pingree	Williams (GA)
Jayapal	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (TX)	Pressley	Yarmuth
Jones	Price (NC)	

NAYS—302

Aderholt	Davidson	Hinson
Aguilar	Davis, Rodney	Hollingsworth
Allen	Dean	Houlahan
Allred	DeGette	Hoyer
Amodei	DeLauro	Hudson
Armstrong	Demings	Huffman
Arrington	DesJarlais	Huizenga
Axne	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Babin	Donalds	Jackson
Bacon	Duncan	Jacobs (NY)
Baird	Emmer	Jeffries
Balderson	Estes	Johnson (GA)
Banks	Fallon	Johnson (LA)
Barr	Feenstra	Johnson (OH)
Barragán	Ferguson	Johnson (SD)
Bentz	Fischbach	Jordan
Bera	Fitzgerald	Joyce (OH)
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (PA)
Bice (OK)	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Biggs	Fletcher	Katko
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Franklin, C.	Keller
Bishop (NC)	Scott	Kelly (IL)
Boebert	Fudge	Kelly (MS)
Bost	Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Bourdeaux	Gaetz	Kim (CA)
Brady	Gallagher	Kind
Brooks	Garamendi	Kinzinger
Buchanan	Garbarino	Krishnamoorthi
Buck	Garcia (CA)	Kuster
Bucshon	Garcia (TX)	Kustoff
Budd	Gibbs	LaHood
Burchett	Gimenez	LaHood
Burgess	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Bustos	Gonzales, Tony	Lamborn
Butterfield	Gonzalez (OH)	Larsen (WA)
Calvert	Good (VA)	Larson (CT)
Cammack	Gooden (TX)	Latta
Cárdenas	Gosar	LaTurner
Carl	Gottheimer	Lawrence
Carter (GA)	Granger	Lawrence (FL)
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Cartwright	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Case	Green (TN)	Long
Cawthorn	Greene (GA)	Loudermilk
Chabot	Griffith	Lucas
Cheney	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Cline	Guest	Luria
Cloud	Guthrie	Lynch
Clyde	Hagedorn	Mace
Cohen	Harder (CA)	Malliotakis
Cole	Harris	Maloney,
Comer	Harshbarger	Carolyn B.
Connolly	Hartzler	Mann
Costa	Hern	Manning
Courtney	Herrell	Massie
Craig	Herrera Beutler	Mast
Crawford	Hice (GA)	Matsui
Crenshaw	Higgins (LA)	McBath
Crow	Hill	McCarthy
Cuellar	Himes	McCauley
Curtis		McClain
		McClintock

McCollum	Posey	Steil
McEachin	Reed	Steube
McHenry	Reschenthaler	Stevens
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Stewart
McNerney	Rodgers (WA)	Stivers
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Suozzi
Meijer	Rogers (KY)	Taylor
Meuser	Rose	Tenney
Mfume	Rosendale	Thompson (CA)
Miller (IL)	Ross	Thompson (PA)
Miller (WV)	Rouzer	Tiffany
Miller-Meeks	Roy	Timmons
Moolenaar	Rutherford	Titus
Mooney	Salazar	Torres (CA)
Moore (AL)	Sánchez	Trone
Moore (UT)	Sarbanes	Turner
Moore (WI)	Scalise	Upton
Morelle	Scanlon	Valadao
Mrvan	Schneider	Van Drew
Mullin	Schrader	Van Dyne
Murphy (NC)	Schrier	Veasey
Nadler	Schweikert	Vela
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Wagner
Nehls	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Newhouse	Scott, David	Walorski
Norcross	Sessions	Waltz
Norman	Sherman	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Sherrill	Webster (FL)
O'Halleran	Simpson	Wenstrup
Obermole	Sires	Westerman
Owens	Slotkin	Wexton
Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Wild
Palmer	Smith (NE)	Williams (TX)
Pappas	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Pence	Smucker	Wittman
Perlmutter	Spanberger	Womack
Perry	Spartz	Young
Peters	Stauber	Zeldin
Pfleger	Steel	
Porter	Stefanik	

NOT VOTING—4

Doyle, Michael F.	Dunn	Horsford
	Foxx	

□ 1304

Messrs. THOMPSON of California and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. DINGELL, Messrs. GOLDEN and KIM of New Jersey changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kelly (IL)	Neguse (Perlmutter)
Buchanan (LaHood)	(Kuster)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Langevin (Lynch)	Pingree (Kuster)
Deutch (Rice)	Lawson (FL)	Rodgers (WA)
(NY)	(Evans)	(Joyce (PA))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Lieu (Beyer)	Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Gaetz (McHenry)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Meng (Clark (MA))	Rush (Underwood)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Moore (WI)	Speier (Scanlon)
Huffman (McNerney)	(Beyer)	Vargas (Correa)
	Moulton (McGovern)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
	Nadler (Jeffries)	Wilson (FL)
	Napolitano (Correa)	(Hayes)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 4, printed in part B of House Report 117-9, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 208, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—208

Aderholt	Bacon	Bergman
Allen	Baird	Bice (OK)
Amodi	Balderson	Biggs
Armstrong	Banks	Bilirakis
Arrington	Barr	Bishop (NC)
Babin	Bentz	Boebert

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

□ 1349

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Boyle, Brendan	Kelly (IL)	Neguse
F. (Jeffries)	(Kuster)	(Perlmutter)
Buchanan	Kirkpatrick	Palazzo
(LaHood)	(Stanton)	(Fleischmann)
Cárdenas	Langevin	Payne
(Gomez)	(Lynch)	(Wasserman)
DeSaulnier	Lawson (FL)	Schultz
(Matsui)	(Evans)	Pingree (Kuster)
Deutch (Rice	Lieu (Beyer)	Rodgers (WA)
(NY))	Lowenthal	(Joyce (PA))
Frankel, Lois	(Beyer)	Roybal-Allard
(Clark (MA))	Meng (Clark	(Escobar)
Gaetz	(MA))	Ruiz (Aguilar)
(McHenry)	Moore (WI)	Rush
Grijalva (García	(Beyer)	(Underwood)
(IL))	Moulton	Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings	(McGovern)	Vargas (Correa)
(Wasserman	Nadler (Jeffries)	Watson Coleman
Schultz)	Napolitano	(Pallone)
Huffman	(Correa)	Wilson (FL)
(McNerney)		(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1 is postponed.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-20)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021.

President Emmerson Mnangagwa has not made the necessary political and economic reforms that would warrant terminating the existing targeted sanctions program. Throughout the last year, government security services routinely intimidated and violently repressed citizens, including members of opposition political parties, union members, and journalists. The absence of progress on the most fundamental reforms needed to ensure the rule of law, democratic governance, and the protection of human rights leaves Zimbabweans vulnerable to ongoing repression and presents a continuing threat to peace and security in the region.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288, as amended, with respect to

Zimbabwe and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-21)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, and the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
VENEZUELA—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-22)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes

in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2021.

The situation in Venezuela continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 with respect to the situation in Venezuela.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1815

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT) at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on House Administration.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois is as follows:

Strike subtitle B of title V.
Strike section 5218.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1 is postponed.

GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN
POLICING ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 179, I call up the bill (H.R. 1280) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1280

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Subtitle A—Holding Police Accountable in the Courts

Sec. 101. Deprivation of rights under color of law.
Sec. 102. Qualified immunity reform.
Sec. 103. Pattern and practice investigations.
Sec. 104. Independent investigations.

Subtitle B—Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act

Sec. 111. Short title.
Sec. 112. Definitions.
Sec. 113. Accreditation of law enforcement agencies.
Sec. 114. Law enforcement grants.
Sec. 115. Attorney General to conduct study.
Sec. 116. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 117. National task force on law enforcement oversight.
Sec. 118. Federal data collection on law enforcement practices.

TITLE II—POLICING TRANSPARENCY
THROUGH DATA

Subtitle A—National Police Misconduct Registry

Sec. 201. Establishment of National Police Misconduct Registry.
Sec. 202. Certification requirements for hiring of law enforcement officers.

Subtitle B—PRIDE Act

Sec. 221. Short title.
Sec. 222. Definitions.
Sec. 223. Use of force reporting.
Sec. 224. Use of force data reporting.
Sec. 225. Compliance with reporting requirements.
Sec. 226. Federal law enforcement reporting.
Sec. 227. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—IMPROVING POLICE TRAINING AND POLICIES

Subtitle A—End Racial and Religious Profiling Act

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

PART I—PROHIBITION OF RACIAL PROFILING

Sec. 311. Prohibition.

Sec. 312. Enforcement.

PART II—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Sec. 321. Policies to eliminate racial profiling.

PART III—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Sec. 331. Policies required for grants.

Sec. 332. Involvement of Attorney General.

Sec. 333. Data collection demonstration project.

Sec. 334. Development of best practices.

Sec. 335. Authorization of appropriations.

PART IV—DATA COLLECTION

Sec. 341. Attorney General to issue regulations.

Sec. 342. Publication of data.

Sec. 343. Limitations on publication of data.

PART V—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REGULATIONS AND REPORTS ON RACIAL PROFILING IN THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 351. Attorney General to issue regulations and reports.

Subtitle B—Additional Reforms

Sec. 361. Training on racial bias and duty to intervene.

Sec. 362. Ban on no-knock warrants in drug cases.

Sec. 363. Incentivizing banning of chokeholds and carotid holds.

Sec. 364. PEACE Act.

Sec. 365. Stop Militarizing Law Enforcement Act.

Sec. 366. Public safety innovation grants.

Subtitle C—Law Enforcement Body Cameras

PART 1—FEDERAL POLICE CAMERA AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Sec. 371. Short title.

Sec. 372. Requirements for Federal law enforcement officers regarding the use of body cameras.

Sec. 373. Patrol vehicles with in-car video recording cameras.

Sec. 374. Facial recognition technology.

Sec. 375. GAO study.

Sec. 376. Regulations.

Sec. 377. Rule of construction.

PART 2—POLICE CAMERA ACT

Sec. 381. Short title.

Sec. 382. Law enforcement body-worn camera requirements.

TITLE IV—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Prohibition on engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.

Sec. 403. Enactment of laws penalizing engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.

Sec. 404. Reports to Congress.

Sec. 405. Definition.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Severability.

Sec. 502. Savings clause.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BYRNE GRANT PROGRAM.**—The term “Byrne grant program” means any grant program under 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.),

without regard to whether the funds are characterized as being made available under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs, the Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants Program, the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, or otherwise.

(2) **COPS GRANT PROGRAM.**—The term “COPS grant program” means the grant program authorized under section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381).

(3) **FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The term “Federal law enforcement agency” means any agency of the United States authorized to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of Federal criminal law.

(4) **FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given the term “Indian tribe” in section 901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251).

(6) **LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “local law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State or unit of local government authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law.

(7) **STATE.**—The term “State” has the meaning given the term in section 901 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10251).

(8) **TRIBAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “tribal law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of an Indian tribe, or the Bureau of Indian Affairs, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, or investigation of any violation of criminal law.

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

(10) **DEADLY FORCE.**—The term “deadly force” means that force which a reasonable person would consider likely to cause death or serious bodily harm, including—

(A) the discharge of a firearm;

(B) a maneuver that restricts blood or oxygen flow to the brain, including chokeholds, strangleholds, neck restraints, neckholds, and carotid artery restraints; and

(C) multiple discharges of an electronic control weapon.

(11) **USE OF FORCE.**—The term “use of force” includes—

(A) the use of a firearm, electronic control weapon, explosive device, chemical agent (such as pepper spray), baton, impact projectile, blunt instrument, hand, fist, foot, canine, or vehicle against an individual;

(B) the use of a weapon, including a personal body weapon, chemical agent, impact weapon, extended range impact weapon, sonic weapon, sensory weapon, conducted energy device, or firearm, against an individual; or

(C) any intentional pointing of a firearm at an individual.

(12) **LESS LETHAL FORCE.**—The term “less lethal force” means any degree of force that is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury.

(13) **FACIAL RECOGNITION.**—The term “facial recognition” means an automated or semi-automated process that analyzes biometric data of an individual from video footage to

identify or assist in identifying an individual.

TITLE I—POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Subtitle A—Holding Police Accountable in the Courts

SEC. 101. DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “willfully” and inserting “knowingly or recklessly”;

(2) by striking “, or may be sentenced to death”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this section, an act shall be considered to have resulted in death if the act was a substantial factor contributing to the death of the person.”.

SEC. 102. QUALIFIED IMMUNITY REFORM.

Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by adding at the end the following: “It shall not be a defense or immunity in any action brought under this section against a local law enforcement officer (as such term is defined in section 2 of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021), or in any action under any source of law against a Federal investigative or law enforcement officer (as such term is defined in section 2680(h) of title 28, United States Code), that—

“(1) the defendant was acting in good faith, or that the defendant believed, reasonably or otherwise, that his or her conduct was lawful at the time when the conduct was committed; or

“(2) the rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws were not clearly established at the time of their deprivation by the defendant, or that at such time, the state of the law was otherwise such that the defendant could not reasonably have been expected to know whether his or her conduct was lawful.”.

SEC. 103. PATTERN AND PRACTICE INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—Section 210401 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “, by prosecutors,” after “conduct by law enforcement officers”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “subsection (a)”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.**—In carrying out the authority in subsection (b), the Attorney General may require by subpoena the production of all information, documents, reports, answers, records, accounts, papers, and other data in any medium (including electronically stored information), as well as any tangible thing and documentary evidence, and the attendance and testimony of witnesses necessary in the performance of the Attorney General under subsection (b). Such a subpoena, in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate district court of the United States.

“(d) **CIVIL ACTION BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.**—Whenever it shall appear to the attorney general of any State, or such other official as a State may designate, that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred within their State, the State attorney general or official, in the name of the State, may bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate equitable and declaratory relief to eliminate the pattern or practice. In carrying out the authority in this subsection, the State attorney general or official shall have the same subpoena authority as is available to the Attorney General under subsection (c).

“(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Attorney General under subsection (b) in any case in which a State attorney general has brought a civil action under subsection (d).

“(f) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—On the date that is one year after the enactment of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, and annually thereafter, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall make publicly available on an internet website a report on, during the previous year—

“(1) the number of preliminary investigations of violations of subsection (a) that were commenced;

“(2) the number of preliminary investigations of violations of subsection (a) that were resolved; and

“(3) the status of any pending investigations of violations of subsection (a).”.

(b) **GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General may award a grant to a State to assist the State in conducting pattern and practice investigations under section 210401(d) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601).

(2) **APPLICATION.**—A State seeking a grant under paragraph (1) shall submit an application in such form, at such time, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require.

(3) **FUNDING.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to the Attorney General for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2024 to carry out this subsection.

(c) **DATA ON EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE.**—Section 210402 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12602) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “The Attorney General” and inserting the following:

“(1) **FEDERAL COLLECTION OF DATA.**—The Attorney General”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **STATE COLLECTION OF DATA.**—The attorney general of a State may, through appropriate means, acquire data about the use of excessive force by law enforcement officers and such data may be used by the attorney general in conducting investigations under section 210401. This data may not contain any information that may reveal the identity of the victim or any law enforcement officer.”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) **LIMITATION ON USE OF DATA ACQUIRED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Data acquired under subsection (a)(1) shall be used only for research or statistical purposes and may not contain any information that may reveal the identity of the victim or any law enforcement officer.”.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT OF PATTERN OR PRACTICE RELIEF.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government that receives funds under the Byrne grant program or the COPS grant program during a fiscal year may not make available any amount of such funds to a local law enforcement agency if that local law enforcement agency enters into or renews any contractual arrangement, including a collective bargaining agreement with a labor organization, that—

(1) would prevent the Attorney General from seeking or enforcing equitable or declaratory relief against a law enforcement agency engaging in a pattern or practice of unconstitutional misconduct; or

(2) conflicts with any terms or conditions contained in a consent decree.

SEC. 104. INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION.**—The term “independent investigation” means a criminal investigation or prosecution of a law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force, including one or more of the following:

(i) Using an agency or civilian review board that investigates and independently reviews all allegations of use of deadly force made against law enforcement officers in the jurisdiction.

(ii) Assigning of the attorney general of the State in which the alleged use of deadly force was committed to conduct the criminal investigation and prosecution.

(iii) Adopting a procedure under which an independent prosecutor is assigned to investigate and prosecute the case, including a procedure under which an automatic referral is made to an independent prosecutor appointed and overseen by the attorney general of the State in which the alleged use of deadly force was committed.

(iv) Adopting a procedure under which an independent prosecutor is assigned to investigate and prosecute the case.

(v) Having law enforcement agencies agree to and implement memoranda of understanding with other law enforcement agencies under which the other law enforcement agencies—

(I) shall conduct the criminal investigation into the alleged use of deadly force; and

(II) upon conclusion of the criminal investigation, shall file a report with the attorney general of the State containing a determination regarding whether—

(aa) the use of deadly force was appropriate; and

(bb) any action should be taken by the attorney general of the State.

(vi) Any substantially similar procedure to ensure impartiality in the investigation or prosecution.

(B) **INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT STATUTE.**—The term “independent investigation of law enforcement statute” means a statute requiring an independent investigation in a criminal matter in which—

(i) one or more of the possible defendants is a law enforcement officer;

(ii) one or more of the alleged offenses involves the law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force in the course of carrying out that officer’s duty; and

(iii) the non-Federal law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force resulted in a death or injury.

(C) **INDEPENDENT PROSECUTOR.**—The term “independent prosecutor” means, with respect to a criminal investigation or prosecution of a law enforcement officer’s use of deadly force, a prosecutor who—

(i) does not oversee or regularly rely on the law enforcement agency by which the law enforcement officer under investigation is employed; and

(ii) would not be involved in the prosecution in the ordinary course of that prosecutor’s duties.

(2) **GRANT PROGRAM.**—The Attorney General may award grants to eligible States and Indian Tribes to assist in implementing an independent investigation of law enforcement statute.

(3) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible for a grant under this subsection, a State or Indian Tribe shall have in effect an independent investigation of law enforcement statute.

(4) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General \$750,000,000 for fiscal years 2022 through 2024 to carry out this subsection.

(b) **COPS GRANT PROGRAM USED FOR CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARDS.**—Part Q of title I of the of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(b) (34 U.S.C. 10381(b))—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (22) and (23) as paragraphs (23) and (24), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (23), as so redesignated, by striking “(21)” and inserting “(22)”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following:

“(22) to develop best practices for and to create civilian review boards;”; and

(2) in section 1709 (34 U.S.C. 10389), by adding at the end the following:

“(8) ‘civilian review board’ means an administrative entity that investigates civilian complaints against law enforcement officers and—

“(A) is independent and adequately funded;

“(B) has investigatory authority and subpoena power;

“(C) has representative community diversity;

“(D) has policy making authority;

“(E) provides advocates for civilian complainants;

“(F) may conduct hearings; and

“(G) conducts statistical studies on prevailing complaint trends.”.

Subtitle B—Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act

SEC. 111. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2021”.

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION.**—The term “community-based organization” means a grassroots organization that monitors the issue of police misconduct and that has a local or national presence and membership, such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), UnidosUS, the National Urban League, the National Congress of American Indians, or the National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium (NAPALC).

(2) **LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCREDITATION ORGANIZATION.**—The term “law enforcement accreditation organization” means a professional law enforcement organization involved in the development of standards of accreditation for law enforcement agencies at the national, State, regional, or Tribal level, such as the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA).

(3) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The term “law enforcement agency” means a State, local, Indian tribal, or campus public agency engaged in the prevention, detection, investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of violations of criminal laws.

(4) **PROFESSIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSOCIATION.**—The term “professional law enforcement association” means a law enforcement membership association that works for the needs of Federal, State, local, or Indian tribal law enforcement agencies and with the civilian community on matters of common interest, such as the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association (HAPCOA), the National Asian Pacific Officers Association (NAPOA), the National Black Police Association (NBPA), the National Latino Peace Officers Association (NLPOA), the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE), Women in Law Enforcement, the Native American Law Enforcement Association (NALEA), the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the National Sheriffs’ Association (NSA), the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), or the National Association of School Resource Officers.

(5) PROFESSIONAL CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT ORGANIZATION.—The term “professional civilian oversight organization” means a membership organization formed to address and advance civilian oversight of law enforcement and whose members are from Federal, State, regional, local, or Tribal organizations that review issues or complaints against law enforcement agencies or officers, such as the National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE).

SEC. 113. ACCREDITATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) STANDARDS.—

(1) INITIAL ANALYSIS.—The Attorney General shall perform an initial analysis of existing accreditation standards and methodology developed by law enforcement accreditation organizations nationwide, including national, State, regional, and Tribal accreditation organizations. Such an analysis shall include a review of the recommendations of the Final Report of the President's Taskforce on 21st Century Policing, issued by the Department of Justice, in May 2015.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM STANDARDS.—After completion of the initial review and analysis under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall—

(A) recommend, in consultation with law enforcement accreditation organizations and community-based organizations, the adoption of additional standards that will result in greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies and an increased focus on policing with a guardian mentality, including standards relating to—

- (i) early warning systems and related intervention programs;
- (ii) use of force procedures;
- (iii) civilian review procedures;
- (iv) traffic and pedestrian stop and search procedures;
- (v) data collection and transparency;
- (vi) administrative due process requirements;
- (vii) video monitoring technology;
- (viii) youth justice and school safety; and
- (ix) recruitment, hiring, and training; and

(B) recommend additional areas for the development of national standards for the accreditation of law enforcement agencies in consultation with existing law enforcement accreditation organizations, professional law enforcement associations, labor organizations, community-based organizations, and professional civilian oversight organizations.

(3) CONTINUING ACCREDITATION PROCESS.—The Attorney General shall adopt policies and procedures to partner with law enforcement accreditation organizations, professional law enforcement associations, labor organizations, community-based organizations, and professional civilian oversight organizations to—

(A) continue the development of further accreditation standards consistent with paragraph (2); and

(B) encourage the pursuit of accreditation of Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies by certified law enforcement accreditation organizations.

(b) USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENTS.—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to assist law enforcement agencies of the applicant, including campus public safety departments, gain or maintain accreditation from certified law enforcement accreditation organizations in accordance with section 113 of the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2021.”.

(c) ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN GRANT FUNDS.—The Attorney General shall, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law, allocate Department of Justice discretionary grant funding only to States or units of local government that require law enforcement agencies of that State or unit of local government to gain and maintain accreditation from certified law enforcement accreditation organizations in accordance with this section.

SEC. 114. LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.

(a) USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as amended by section 113, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to study and implement effective management, training, recruiting, hiring, and oversight standards and programs to promote effective community and problem solving strategies for law enforcement agencies in accordance with section 114 of the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2021.”.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS.—The Attorney General may make grants to community-based organizations to study and implement—

(1) effective management, training, recruiting, hiring, and oversight standards and programs to promote effective community and problem solving strategies for law enforcement agencies; or

(2) effective strategies and solutions to public safety, including strategies that do not rely on Federal and local law enforcement agency responses.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant amounts described in paragraph (8) of section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as added by subsection (a) of this section, and grant amounts awarded under subsection (b) shall be used to—

(1) study management and operations standards for law enforcement agencies, including standards relating to administrative due process, residency requirements, compensation and benefits, use of force, racial profiling, early warning and intervention systems, youth justice, school safety, civilian review boards or analogous procedures, or research into the effectiveness of existing programs, projects, or other activities designed to address misconduct; and

(2) develop pilot programs and implement effective standards and programs in the areas of training, hiring and recruitment, and oversight that are designed to improve management and address misconduct by law enforcement officers.

(d) COMPONENTS OF PILOT PROGRAM.—A pilot program developed under subsection (c)(2) shall include implementation of the following:

(1) TRAINING.—The implementation of policies, practices, and procedures addressing training and instruction to comply with accreditation standards in the areas of—

(A) the use of deadly force, less lethal force, and de-escalation tactics and techniques;

(B) investigation of officer misconduct and practices and procedures for referring to prosecuting authorities allegations of officer use of excessive force or racial profiling;

(C) disproportionate contact by law enforcement with minority communities;

(D) tactical and defensive strategy;

(E) arrests, searches, and restraint;

(F) professional verbal communications with civilians;

(G) interactions with—

(i) youth;

(ii) individuals with disabilities;

(iii) individuals with limited English proficiency; and

(iv) multi-cultural communities;

(H) proper traffic, pedestrian, and other enforcement stops; and

(I) community relations and bias awareness.

(2) RECRUITMENT, HIRING, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION OF DIVERSE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Policies, procedures, and practices for—

(A) the hiring and recruitment of diverse law enforcement officers who are representative of the communities they serve;

(B) the development of selection, promotion, educational, background, and psychological standards that comport with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.); and

(C) initiatives to encourage residency in the jurisdiction served by the law enforcement agency and continuing education.

(3) OVERSIGHT.—Complaint procedures, including the establishment of civilian review boards or analogous procedures for jurisdictions across a range of sizes and agency configurations, complaint procedures by community-based organizations, early warning systems and related intervention programs, video monitoring technology, data collection and transparency, and administrative due process requirements inherent to complaint procedures for members of the public and law enforcement.

(4) YOUTH JUSTICE AND SCHOOL SAFETY.—Uniform standards on youth justice and school safety that include best practices for law enforcement interaction and communication with children and youth, taking into consideration adolescent development and any disability, including—

(A) the right to effective and timely notification of a parent or legal guardian of any law enforcement interaction, regardless of the immigration status of the individuals involved; and

(B) the creation of positive school climates by improving school conditions for learning by—

(i) eliminating school-based arrests and referrals to law enforcement;

(ii) using evidence-based preventative measures and alternatives to school-based arrests and referrals to law enforcement, such as restorative justice and healing practices; and

(iii) using school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports.

(5) VICTIM SERVICES.—Counseling services, including psychological counseling, for individuals and communities impacted by law enforcement misconduct.

(e) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may provide technical assistance to States and community-based organizations in furtherance of the purposes of this section.

(2) MODELS FOR REDUCTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT MISCONDUCT.—The technical assistance provided by the Attorney General may include the development of models for States and community-based organizations to reduce law enforcement officer misconduct. Any development of such models shall be in consultation with community-based organizations.

(f) USE OF COMPONENTS.—The Attorney General may use any component or components of the Department of Justice in carrying out this section.

(g) APPLICATIONS.—An application for a grant under subsection (b) shall be submitted in such form, and contain such information, as the Attorney General may prescribe by rule.

(h) PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.—

(1) MONITORING COMPONENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each program, project, or activity funded under this section shall contain a monitoring component, which shall be developed pursuant to rules made by the Attorney General.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—Each monitoring component required under subparagraph (A) shall include systematic identification and collection of data about activities, accomplishments, and programs throughout the duration of the program, project, or activity and presentation of such data in a usable form.

(2) EVALUATION COMPONENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Selected grant recipients shall be evaluated on the local level or as part of a national evaluation, pursuant to rules made by the Attorney General.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—An evaluation conducted under subparagraph (A) may include independent audits of police behavior and other assessments of individual program implementations. For community-based organizations in selected jurisdictions that are able to support outcome evaluations, the effectiveness of funded programs, projects, and activities may be required.

(3) PERIODIC REVIEW AND REPORTS.—The Attorney General may require a grant recipient to submit biannually to the Attorney General the results of the monitoring and evaluations required under paragraphs (1) and (2) and such other data and information as the Attorney General determines to be necessary.

(4) REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF FUNDING.—If the Attorney General determines, as a result of monitoring under subsection (h) or otherwise, that a grant recipient under the Byrne grant program or under subsection (b) is not in substantial compliance with the requirements of this section, the Attorney General may revoke or suspend funding of that grant, in whole or in part.

(5) CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “civilian review board” means an administrative entity that investigates civilian complaints against law enforcement officers and—

- (1) is independent and adequately funded;
- (2) has investigatory authority and subpoena power;
- (3) has representative community diversity;
- (4) has policy making authority;
- (5) provides advocates for civilian complainants;
- (6) may conduct hearings; and
- (7) conducts statistical studies on prevailing complaint trends.

(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2021 to carry out the grant program authorized under subsection (b).

SEC. 115. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO CONDUCT STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall conduct a nationwide study of the prevalence and effect of any law, rule, or procedure that allows a law enforcement officer to delay the response to questions posed by a local internal affairs officer, or review board on the investigative integrity and prosecution of law enforcement misconduct, including pre-interview warnings and termination policies.

(2) INITIAL ANALYSIS.—The Attorney General shall perform an initial analysis of existing State laws, rules, and procedures to determine whether, at a threshold level, the effect of the type of law, rule, or procedure that raises material investigatory issues that could impair or hinder a prompt and thorough investigation of possible misconduct, including criminal conduct.

(3) DATA COLLECTION.—After completion of the initial analysis under paragraph (2), and considering material investigatory issues, the Attorney General shall gather additional data nationwide on similar laws, rules, and procedures from a representative and statistically significant sample of jurisdictions, to determine whether such laws, rules, and procedures raise such material investigatory issues.

(b) REPORTING.—

(1) INITIAL ANALYSIS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(A) submit to Congress a report containing the results of the initial analysis conducted under subsection (a)(2);

(B) make the report submitted under subparagraph (A) available to the public; and

(C) identify the jurisdictions for which the study described in subsection (a)(3) is to be conducted.

(2) DATA COLLECTED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the data collected under this section and publish the report in the Federal Register.

SEC. 116. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2022, in addition to any other sums authorized to be appropriated—

(1) \$25,000,000 for additional expenses relating to the enforcement of section 210401 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601), criminal enforcement under sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, and administrative enforcement by the Department of Justice of such sections, including compliance with consent decrees or judgments entered into under such section 210401; and

(2) \$3,300,000 for additional expenses related to conflict resolution by the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service.

SEC. 117. NATIONAL TASK FORCE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OVERSIGHT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department of Justice a task force to be known as the Task Force on Law Enforcement Oversight (hereinafter in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Task Force shall be composed of individuals appointed by the Attorney General, who shall appoint not less than 1 individual from each of the following:

- (1) The Special Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (2) The Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (3) The Federal Coordination and Compliance Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (4) The Employment Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (5) The Disability Rights Section of the Civil Rights Division.
- (6) The Office of Justice Programs.
- (7) The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS).
- (8) The Corruption/Civil Rights Section of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (9) The Community Relations Service.
- (10) The Office of Tribal Justice.
- (11) The unit within the Department of Justice assigned as a liaison for civilian review boards.

(c) POWERS AND DUTIES.—The Task Force shall consult with professional law enforcement associations, labor organizations, and community-based organizations to coordinate the process of the detection and referral of complaints regarding incidents of alleged law enforcement misconduct.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year to carry out this section.

SEC. 118. FEDERAL DATA COLLECTION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT PRACTICES.

(a) AGENCIES TO REPORT.—Each Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agency shall report data of the practices enumerated in subsection (c) of that agency to the Attorney General.

(b) BREAKDOWN OF INFORMATION BY RACE, ETHNICITY, AND GENDER.—For each practice enumerated in subsection (c), the reporting law enforcement agency shall provide a breakdown of the numbers of incidents of that practice by race, ethnicity, age, and gender of the officers of the agency and of members of the public involved in the practice.

(c) PRACTICES TO BE REPORTED ON.—The practices to be reported on are the following:

- (1) Traffic violation stops.
- (2) Pedestrian stops.
- (3) Frisk and body searches.
- (4) Instances where law enforcement officers used deadly force, including—

(A) a description of when and where deadly force was used, and whether it resulted in death;

(B) a description of deadly force directed against an officer and whether it resulted in injury or death; and

(C) the law enforcement agency's justification for use of deadly force, if the agency determines it was justified.

(d) RETENTION OF DATA.—Each law enforcement agency required to report data under this section shall maintain records relating to any matter reported for not less than 4 years after those records are created.

(e) PENALTY FOR STATES FAILING TO REPORT AS REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For any fiscal year, a State shall not receive any amount that would otherwise be allocated to that State under section 505(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10156(a)), or any amount from any other law enforcement assistance program of the Department of Justice, unless the State has ensured, to the satisfaction of the Attorney General, that the State and each local law enforcement agency of the State is in substantial compliance with the requirements of this section.

(2) REALLOCATION.—Amounts not allocated by reason of this subsection shall be reallocated to States not disqualified by failure to comply with this section.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

TITLE II—POLICING TRANSPARENCY THROUGH DATA**Subtitle A—National Police Misconduct Registry****SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL POLICE MISCONDUCT REGISTRY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a National Police Misconduct Registry to be compiled and maintained by the Department of Justice.

(b) CONTENTS OF REGISTRY.—The Registry required to be established under subsection (a) shall contain the following data with respect to all Federal and local law enforcement officers:

(1) Each complaint filed against a law enforcement officer, aggregated by—

(A) complaints that were found to be credible or that resulted in disciplinary action against the law enforcement officer, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling (as such term is defined in section 302);

(B) complaints that are pending review, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling; and

(C) complaints for which the law enforcement officer was exonerated or that were determined to be unfounded or not sustained, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling.

(2) Discipline records, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling.

(3) Termination records, the reason for each termination, disaggregated by whether the complaint involved a use of force or racial profiling.

(4) Records of certification in accordance with section 202.

(5) Records of lawsuits against law enforcement officers and settlements of such lawsuits.

(6) Instances where a law enforcement officer resigns or retires while under active investigation related to the use of force.

(c) **FEDERAL AGENCY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter, the head of each Federal law enforcement agency shall submit to the Attorney General the information described in subsection (b).

(d) **STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter in which a State receives funds under the Byrne grant program, the State shall, once every 180 days, submit to the Attorney General the information described in subsection (b) for the State and each local law enforcement agency within the State.

(e) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REGISTRY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In establishing the Registry required under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall make the Registry available to the public on an internet website of the Attorney General in a manner that allows members of the public to search for an individual law enforcement officer's records of misconduct, as described in subsection (b), involving a use of force or racial profiling.

(2) **PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede the requirements or limitations under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Privacy Act of 1974").

SEC. 202. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR HIRING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government, other than an Indian Tribe, may not receive funds under the Byrne grant program for that fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government has not—

(1) submitted to the Attorney General evidence that the State or unit of local government has a certification and decertification program for purposes of employment as a law enforcement officer in that State or unit of local government that is consistent with the rules made under subsection (c); and

(2) submitted to the National Police Misconduct Registry established under section 201 records demonstrating that all law enforcement officers of the State or unit of local government have completed all State certification requirements during the 1-year period preceding the fiscal year.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.**—The Attorney General shall make available to law enforcement agencies all information in the registry under section 201 for purposes of compliance with the certification and decertification programs described in subsection (a)(1) and considering applications for employment.

(c) **RULES.**—The Attorney General shall make rules to carry out this section and section 201, including uniform reporting standards.

Subtitle B—PRIDE Act

SEC. 221. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Police Reporting Information, Data, and Evidence Act of 2021" or the "PRIDE Act of 2021".

SEC. 222. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.**—The term "local educational agency" has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) **LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term "local law enforcement officer" has the meaning given the term in section 2, and includes a school resource officer.

(3) **SCHOOL.**—The term "school" means an elementary school or secondary school (as those terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).

(4) **SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER.**—The term "school resource officer" means a sworn law enforcement officer who is—

(A) assigned by the employing law enforcement agency to a local educational agency or school;

(B) contracting with a local educational agency or school; or

(C) employed by a local educational agency or school.

SEC. 223. USE OF FORCE REPORTING.

(a) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act and each fiscal year thereafter in which a State or Indian Tribe receives funds under a Byrne grant program, the State or Indian Tribe shall—

(A) report to the Attorney General, on a quarterly basis and pursuant to guidelines established by the Attorney General, information regarding—

(i) any incident involving the use of deadly force against a civilian by—

(I) a local law enforcement officer who is employed by the State or by a unit of local government in the State; or

(II) a tribal law enforcement officer who is employed by the Indian Tribe;

(ii) any incident involving the shooting of a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer described in clause (i) by a civilian;

(iii) any incident involving the death or arrest of a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer;

(iv) any incident during which use of force by or against a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer described in clause (i) occurs, which is not reported under clause (i), (ii), or (iii);

(v) deaths in custody; and

(vi) uses of force in arrests and booking;

(B) establish a system and a set of policies to ensure that all use of force incidents are reported by local law enforcement officers or tribal law enforcement officers; and

(C) submit to the Attorney General a plan for the collection of data required to be reported under this section, including any modifications to a previously submitted data collection plan.

(2) **REPORT INFORMATION REQUIRED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The report required under paragraph (1)(A) shall contain information that includes, at a minimum—

(i) the national origin, sex, race, ethnicity, age, disability, English language proficiency, and housing status of each civilian against whom a local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer used force;

(ii) the date, time, and location, including whether it was on school grounds, and the zip code, of the incident and whether the jurisdiction in which the incident occurred allows for the open-carry or concealed-carry of a firearm;

(iii) whether the civilian was armed, and, if so, the type of weapon the civilian had;

(iv) the type of force used against the officer, the civilian, or both, including the types of weapons used;

(v) the reason force was used;

(vi) a description of any injuries sustained as a result of the incident;

(vii) the number of officers involved in the incident;

(viii) the number of civilians involved in the incident; and

(ix) a brief description regarding the circumstances surrounding the incident, which shall include information on—

(I) the type of force used by all involved persons;

(II) the legitimate police objective necessitating the use of force;

(III) the resistance encountered by each local law enforcement officer or tribal law enforcement officer involved in the incident;

(IV) the efforts by local law enforcement officers or tribal law enforcement officers to—

(aa) de-escalate the situation in order to avoid the use of force; or

(bb) minimize the level of force used; and

(V) if applicable, the reason why efforts described in subclause (IV) were not attempted.

(B) **INCIDENTS REPORTED UNDER DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT.**—A State or Indian Tribe is not required to include in a report under subsection (a)(1) an incident reported by the State or Indian Tribe in accordance with section 20104(a)(2) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12104(a)(2)).

(C) **RETENTION OF DATA.**—Each law enforcement agency required to report data under this section shall maintain records relating to any matter so reportable for not less than 4 years after those records are created.

(3) **AUDIT OF USE-OF-FORCE REPORTING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, each State or Indian Tribe described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) conduct an audit of the use of force incident reporting system required to be established under paragraph (1)(B); and

(B) submit a report to the Attorney General on the audit conducted under subparagraph (A).

(4) **COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE.**—Prior to submitting a report under paragraph (1)(A), the State or Indian Tribe submitting such report shall compare the information compiled to be reported pursuant to clause (i) of paragraph (1)(A) to publicly available sources, and shall revise such report to include any incident determined to be missing from the report based on such comparison. Failure to comply with the procedures described in the previous sentence shall be considered a failure to comply with the requirements of this section.

(b) **INELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For any fiscal year in which a State or Indian Tribe fails to comply with this section, the State or Indian Tribe, at the discretion of the Attorney General, shall be subject to not more than a 10-percent reduction of the funds that would otherwise be allocated for that fiscal year to the State or Indian Tribe under a Byrne grant program.

(2) **REALLOCATION.**—Amounts not allocated under a Byrne grant program in accordance with paragraph (1) to a State for failure to comply with this section shall be reallocated under the Byrne grant program to States

that have not failed to comply with this section.

(3) **INFORMATION REGARDING SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS.**—The State or Indian Tribe shall ensure that all schools and local educational agencies within the jurisdiction of the State or Indian Tribe provide the State or Indian Tribe with the information needed regarding school resource officers to comply with this section.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF DATA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall publish, and make available to the public, a report containing the data reported to the Attorney General under this section.

(2) **PRIVACY PROTECTIONS.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to supersede the requirements or limitations under section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Privacy Act of 1974”).

(d) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall issue guidance on best practices relating to establishing standard data collection systems that capture the information required to be reported under subsection (a)(2), which shall include standard and consistent definitions for terms.

SEC. 224. USE OF FORCE DATA REPORTING.

(a) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible law enforcement agencies to be used for the activities described in subsection (c).

(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section a law enforcement agency shall—

(1) be a tribal law enforcement agency or be located in a State that receives funds under a Byrne grant program;

(2) employ not more than 100 local or tribal law enforcement officers;

(3) demonstrate that the use of force policy for local law enforcement officers or tribal law enforcement officers employed by the law enforcement agency is publicly available; and

(4) establish and maintain a complaint system that—

(A) may be used by members of the public to report incidents of use of force to the law enforcement agency;

(B) makes all information collected publicly searchable and available; and

(C) provides information on the status of an investigation related to a use of force complaint.

(c) **ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.**—A grant made under this section may be used by a law enforcement agency for—

(1) the cost of assisting the State or Indian Tribe in which the law enforcement agency is located in complying with the reporting requirements described in section 223;

(2) the cost of establishing necessary systems required to investigate and report incidents as required under subsection (b)(4);

(3) public awareness campaigns designed to gain information from the public on use of force by or against local and tribal law enforcement officers, including shootings, which may include tip lines, hotlines, and public service announcements; and

(4) use of force training for law enforcement agencies and personnel, including training on de-escalation, implicit bias, crisis intervention techniques, and adolescent development.

SEC. 225. COMPLIANCE WITH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General

shall conduct an audit and review of the information provided under this subtitle to determine whether each State or Indian Tribe described in section 223(a)(1) is in compliance with the requirements of this subtitle.

(b) **CONSISTENCY IN DATA REPORTING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any data reported under this subtitle shall be collected and reported—

(A) in a manner consistent with existing programs of the Department of Justice that collect data on local law enforcement officer encounters with civilians; and

(B) in a manner consistent with civil rights laws for distribution of information to the public.

(2) **GUIDELINES.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(A) issue guidelines on the reporting requirement under section 223; and

(B) seek public comment before finalizing the guidelines required under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 226. FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORTING.

The head of each Federal law enforcement agency shall submit to the Attorney General, on a quarterly basis and pursuant to guidelines established by the Attorney General, the information required to be reported by a State or Indian Tribe under section 223.

SEC. 227. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as are necessary to carry out this subtitle.

TITLE III—IMPROVING POLICE TRAINING AND POLICIES

Subtitle A—End Racial and Religious Profiling Act

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “End Racial and Religious Profiling Act of 2021” or “ERRPA”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COVERED PROGRAM.**—The term “covered program” means any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under—

(A) a Byrne grant program; and

(B) the COPS grant program, except that no program, project, or other activity specified in section 1701(b)(13) of part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381 et seq.) shall be a covered program under this paragraph.

(2) **GOVERNMENTAL BODY.**—The term “governmental body” means any department, agency, special purpose district, or other instrumentality of Federal, State, local, or Indian Tribal government.

(3) **HIT RATE.**—The term “hit rate” means the percentage of stops and searches in which a law enforcement agent finds drugs, a gun, or something else that leads to an arrest. The hit rate is calculated by dividing the total number of searches by the number of searches that yield contraband. The hit rate is complementary to the rate of false stops.

(4) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.**—The term “law enforcement agency” means any Federal, State, or local public agency engaged in the prevention, detection, or investigation of violations of criminal, immigration, or customs laws.

(5) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENT.**—The term “law enforcement agent” means any Federal, State, or local official responsible for enforcing criminal, immigration, or customs laws, including police officers and other agents of a law enforcement agency.

(6) **RACIAL PROFILING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “racial profiling” means the practice of a law en-

forcement agent or agency relying, to any degree, on actual or perceived race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, gender identity, or sexual orientation in selecting which individual to subject to routine or spontaneous investigatory activities or in deciding upon the scope and substance of law enforcement activity following the initial investigatory procedure, except when there is trustworthy information, relevant to the locality and timeframe, that links a person with a particular characteristic described in this paragraph to an identified criminal incident or scheme.

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a tribal law enforcement officer exercising law enforcement authority within Indian country, as that term is defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code, is not considered to be racial profiling with respect to making key jurisdictional determinations that are necessarily tied to reliance on actual or perceived race, ethnicity, or tribal affiliation.

(7) **ROUTINE OR SPONTANEOUS INVESTIGATORY ACTIVITIES.**—The term “routine or spontaneous investigatory activities” means the following activities by a law enforcement agent:

(A) Interviews.

(B) Traffic stops.

(C) Pedestrian stops.

(D) Frisks and other types of body searches.

(E) Consensual or nonconsensual searches of the persons, property, or possessions (including vehicles) of individuals using any form of public or private transportation, including motorists and pedestrians.

(F) Data collection and analysis, assessments, and predicated investigations.

(G) Inspections and interviews of entrants into the United States that are more extensive than those customarily carried out.

(H) Immigration-related workplace investigations.

(I) Such other types of law enforcement encounters compiled for or by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics.

(8) **REASONABLE REQUEST.**—The term “reasonable request” means all requests for information, except for those that—

(A) are immaterial to the investigation;

(B) would result in the unnecessary disclosure of personal information; or

(C) would place a severe burden on the resources of the law enforcement agency given its size.

PART I—PROHIBITION OF RACIAL PROFILING

SEC. 311. PROHIBITION.

No law enforcement agent or law enforcement agency shall engage in racial profiling.

SEC. 312. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **REMEDY.**—The United States, or an individual injured by racial profiling, may enforce this part in a civil action for declaratory or injunctive relief, filed either in a State court of general jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States.

(b) **PARTIES.**—In any action brought under this part, relief may be obtained against—

(1) any governmental body that employed any law enforcement agent who engaged in racial profiling;

(2) any agent of such body who engaged in racial profiling; and

(3) any person with supervisory authority over such agent.

(c) **NATURE OF PROOF.**—Proof that the routine or spontaneous investigatory activities of law enforcement agents in a jurisdiction have had a disparate impact on individuals with a particular characteristic described in section 302(6) shall constitute prima facie evidence of a violation of this part.

(d) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In any action or proceeding to enforce this part against any governmental body, the court may allow a prevailing plaintiff, other than the United States, reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs, and may include expert fees as part of the attorney's fee. The term "prevailing plaintiff" means a plaintiff that substantially prevails pursuant to a judicial or administrative judgment or order, or an enforceable written agreement.

PART II—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 321. POLICIES TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Federal law enforcement agencies shall—

(1) maintain adequate policies and procedures designed to eliminate racial profiling; and

(2) cease existing practices that permit racial profiling.

(b) POLICIES.—The policies and procedures described in subsection (a)(1) shall include—

(1) a prohibition on racial profiling;

(2) training on racial profiling issues as part of Federal law enforcement training;

(3) the collection of data in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General under section 341;

(4) procedures for receiving, investigating, and responding meaningfully to complaints alleging racial profiling by law enforcement agents; and

(5) any other policies and procedures the Attorney General determines to be necessary to eliminate racial profiling by Federal law enforcement agencies.

PART III—PROGRAMS TO ELIMINATE RACIAL PROFILING BY STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 331. POLICIES REQUIRED FOR GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An application by a State or a unit of local government for funding under a covered program shall include a certification that such State, unit of local government, and any law enforcement agency to which it will distribute funds—

(1) maintains adequate policies and procedures designed to eliminate racial profiling; and

(2) has eliminated any existing practices that permit or encourage racial profiling.

(b) POLICIES.—The policies and procedures described in subsection (a)(1) shall include—

(1) a prohibition on racial profiling;

(2) training on racial profiling issues as part of law enforcement training;

(3) the collection of data in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General under section 341; and

(4) participation in an administrative complaint procedure or independent audit program that meets the requirements of section 332.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 332. INVOLVEMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.

(a) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and in consultation with stakeholders, including Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and community, professional, research, and civil rights organizations, the Attorney General shall issue regulations for the operation of administrative complaint procedures and independent audit programs to ensure that such procedures and programs provide an appropriate response to allegations of racial profiling by law enforcement agents or agencies.

(2) GUIDELINES.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall contain guidelines

that ensure the fairness, effectiveness, and independence of the administrative complaint procedures and independent auditor programs.

(b) NONCOMPLIANCE.—If the Attorney General determines that the recipient of a grant from any covered program is not in compliance with the requirements of section 331 or the regulations issued under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall withhold, in whole or in part (at the discretion of the Attorney General), funds for one or more grants to the recipient under the covered program, until the recipient establishes compliance.

(c) PRIVATE PARTIES.—The Attorney General shall provide notice and an opportunity for private parties to present evidence to the Attorney General that a recipient of a grant from any covered program is not in compliance with the requirements of this part.

SEC. 333. DATA COLLECTION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR DATA COLLECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, through competitive grants or contracts, carry out a 2-year demonstration project for the purpose of developing and implementing data collection programs on the hit rates for stops and searches by law enforcement agencies. The data collected shall be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, and religion.

(2) NUMBER OF GRANTS.—The Attorney General shall provide not more than 5 grants or contracts under this section.

(3) ELIGIBLE GRANTEEES.—Grants or contracts under this section shall be awarded to law enforcement agencies that serve communities where there is a significant concentration of racial or ethnic minorities and that are not already collecting data voluntarily.

(b) REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—Activities carried out with a grant under this section shall include—

(1) developing a data collection tool and reporting the compiled data to the Attorney General; and

(2) training of law enforcement personnel on data collection, particularly for data collection on hit rates for stops and searches.

(c) EVALUATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall enter into a contract with an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) to analyze the data collected by each of the grantees funded under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out activities under this section—

(1) \$5,000,000, over a 2-year period, to carry out the demonstration program under subsection (a); and

(2) \$500,000 to carry out the evaluation under subsection (c).

SEC. 334. DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.

(a) USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENT.—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as amended by sections 113 and 114, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 10 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to develop and implement best practice devices and systems to eliminate racial profiling in accordance with section 334 of the End Racial and Religious Profiling Act of 2021."

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—Grant amounts described in paragraph (9) of section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime

Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall be for programs that include the following:

(1) The development and implementation of training to prevent racial profiling and to encourage more respectful interaction with the public.

(2) The acquisition and use of technology to facilitate the accurate collection and analysis of data.

(3) The development and acquisition of feedback systems and technologies that identify law enforcement agents or units of agents engaged in, or at risk of engaging in, racial profiling or other misconduct.

(4) The establishment and maintenance of an administrative complaint procedure or independent auditor program.

SEC. 335. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as are necessary to carry out this part.

PART IV—DATA COLLECTION

SEC. 341. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO ISSUE REGULATIONS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with stakeholders, including Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and community, professional, research, and civil rights organizations, shall issue regulations for the collection and compilation of data under sections 321 and 331.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations issued under subsection (a) shall—

(1) provide for the collection of data on all routine and spontaneous investigatory activities;

(2) provide that the data collected shall—

(A) be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, disability, and religion;

(B) include the date, time, and location of such investigatory activities;

(C) include detail sufficient to permit an analysis of whether a law enforcement agency is engaging in racial profiling; and

(D) not include personally identifiable information;

(3) provide that a standardized form shall be made available to law enforcement agencies for the submission of collected data to the Department of Justice;

(4) provide that law enforcement agencies shall compile data on the standardized form made available under paragraph (3), and submit the form to the Civil Rights Division and the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics;

(5) provide that law enforcement agencies shall maintain all data collected under this subtitle for not less than 4 years;

(6) include guidelines for setting comparative benchmarks, consistent with best practices, against which collected data shall be measured;

(7) provide that the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(A) analyze the data for any statistically significant disparities, including—

(i) disparities in the percentage of drivers or pedestrians stopped relative to the proportion of the population passing through the neighborhood;

(ii) disparities in the hit rate; and

(iii) disparities in the frequency of searches performed on racial or ethnic minority drivers and the frequency of searches performed on nonminority drivers; and

(B) not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter—

(i) prepare a report regarding the findings of the analysis conducted under subparagraph (A);

(ii) provide such report to Congress; and
 (iii) make such report available to the public, including on a website of the Department of Justice, and in accordance with accessibility standards under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.); and

(8) protect the privacy of individuals whose data is collected by—

(A) limiting the use of the data collected under this subtitle to the purposes set forth in this subtitle;

(B) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, limiting access to the data collected under this subtitle to those Federal, State, or local employees or agents who require such access in order to fulfill the purposes for the data set forth in this subtitle;

(C) requiring contractors or other non-governmental agents who are permitted access to the data collected under this subtitle to sign use agreements incorporating the use and disclosure restrictions set forth in subparagraph (A); and

(D) requiring the maintenance of adequate security measures to prevent unauthorized access to the data collected under this subtitle.

SEC. 342. PUBLICATION OF DATA.

The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the Department of Justice shall provide to Congress and make available to the public, together with each annual report described in section 341, the data collected pursuant to this subtitle, excluding any personally identifiable information described in section 343.

SEC. 343. LIMITATIONS ON PUBLICATION OF DATA.

The name or identifying information of a law enforcement agent, complainant, or any other individual involved in any activity for which data is collected and compiled under this subtitle shall not be—

(1) released to the public;

(2) disclosed to any person, except for—

(A) such disclosures as are necessary to comply with this subtitle;

(B) disclosures of information regarding a particular person to that person; or

(C) disclosures pursuant to litigation; or

(3) subject to disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), except for disclosures of information regarding a particular person to that person.

PART V—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REGULATIONS AND REPORTS ON RACIAL PROFILING IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 351. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO ISSUE REGULATIONS AND REPORTS.

(a) REGULATIONS.—In addition to the regulations required under sections 333 and 341, the Attorney General shall issue such other regulations as the Attorney General determines are necessary to implement this subtitle.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on racial profiling by law enforcement agencies.

(2) SCOPE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a summary of data collected under sections 321(b)(3) and 331(b)(3) and from any other reliable source of information regarding racial profiling in the United States;

(B) a discussion of the findings in the most recent report prepared by the Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics under section 341(b)(7);

(C) the status of the adoption and implementation of policies and procedures by Federal law enforcement agencies under section 321 and by the State and local law enforcement agencies under sections 331 and 332; and

(D) a description of any other policies and procedures that the Attorney General believes would facilitate the elimination of racial profiling.

Subtitle B—Additional Reforms

SEC. 361. TRAINING ON RACIAL BIAS AND DUTY TO INTERVENE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall establish—

(1) a training program for law enforcement officers to cover racial profiling, implicit bias, and procedural justice; and

(2) a clear duty for Federal law enforcement officers to intervene in cases where another law enforcement officer is using excessive force against a civilian, and establish a training program that covers the duty to intervene.

(b) MANDATORY TRAINING FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The head of each Federal law enforcement agency shall require each Federal law enforcement officer employed by the agency to complete the training programs established under subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government may not receive funds under the Byrne grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not require each law enforcement officer in the State or unit of local government to complete the training programs established under subsection (a).

(d) GRANTS TO TRAIN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ON USE OF FORCE.—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(I) Training programs for law enforcement officers, including training programs on use of force and a duty to intervene.”.

SEC. 362. BAN ON NO-KNOCK WARRANTS IN DRUG CASES.

(a) BAN ON FEDERAL WARRANTS IN DRUG CASES.—Section 509 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 879) is amended by adding at the end the following: “A search warrant authorized under this section shall require that a law enforcement officer execute the search warrant only after providing notice of his or her authority and purpose.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government may not receive funds under the COPS grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not have in effect a law that prohibits the issuance of a no-knock warrant in a drug case.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “no-knock warrant” means a warrant that allows a law enforcement officer to enter a property without requiring the law enforcement officer to announce the presence of the law enforcement officer or the intention of the law enforcement officer to enter the property.

SEC. 363. INCENTIVIZING BANNING OF CHOKEHOLDS AND CAROTID HOLDS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “chokehold or carotid hold” means the application of any pressure to the throat or windpipe, the use of maneuvers that restrict blood or oxygen flow to the brain, or carotid artery restraints that prevent or hinder breathing or reduce intake of air of an individual.

(b) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins

after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, a State or unit of local government may not receive funds under the Byrne grant program or the COPS grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not have in effect a law that prohibits law enforcement officers in the State or unit of local government from using a chokehold or carotid hold.

(c) CHOKEHOLDS AS CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.—

(1) SHORT TITLE.—This subsection may be cited as the “Eric Garner Excessive Use of Force Prevention Act”.

(2) CHOKEHOLDS AS CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.—Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following: “For the purposes of this section, the application of any pressure to the throat or windpipe, use of maneuvers that restrict blood or oxygen flow to the brain, or carotid artery restraints which prevent or hinder breathing or reduce intake of air is a punishment, pain, or penalty.”.

SEC. 364. PEACE ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Police Exercising Absolute Care With Everyone Act of 2021” or the “PEACE Act of 2021”.

(b) USE OF FORCE BY FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) DEESCALATION TACTICS AND TECHNIQUES.—The term “deescalation tactics and techniques” means proactive actions and approaches used by a Federal law enforcement officer to stabilize the situation so that more time, options, and resources are available to gain a person’s voluntary compliance and reduce or eliminate the need to use force, including verbal persuasion, warnings, tactical techniques, slowing down the pace of an incident, waiting out a subject, creating distance between the officer and the threat, and requesting additional resources to resolve the incident.

(B) NECESSARY.—The term “necessary” means that another reasonable Federal law enforcement officer would objectively conclude, under the totality of the circumstances, that there was no reasonable alternative to the use of force.

(C) REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “reasonable alternatives” means tactics and methods used by a Federal law enforcement officer to effectuate an arrest that do not unreasonably increase the risk posed to the law enforcement officer or another person, including verbal communication, distance, warnings, deescalation tactics and techniques, tactical repositioning, and other tactics and techniques intended to stabilize the situation and reduce the immediacy of the risk so that more time, options, and resources can be called upon to resolve the situation without the use of force.

(ii) DEADLY FORCE.—With respect to the use of deadly force, the term “reasonable alternatives” includes the use of less lethal force.

(D) TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES.—The term “totality of the circumstances” means all credible facts known to the Federal law enforcement officer leading up to and at the time of the use of force, including the actions of the person against whom the Federal law enforcement officer uses such force and the actions of the Federal law enforcement officer.

(2) PROHIBITION ON LESS LETHAL FORCE.—A Federal law enforcement officer may not use any less lethal force unless—

(A) the form of less lethal force used is necessary and proportional in order to effectuate an arrest of a person who the officer has probable cause to believe has committed a criminal offense; and

(B) reasonable alternatives to the use of the form of less lethal force have been exhausted.

(3) PROHIBITION ON DEADLY USE OF FORCE.—A Federal law enforcement officer may not use deadly force against a person unless—

(A) the form of deadly force used is necessary, as a last resort, to prevent imminent and serious bodily injury or death to the officer or another person;

(B) the use of the form of deadly force creates no substantial risk of injury to a third person; and

(C) reasonable alternatives to the use of the form of deadly force have been exhausted.

(4) REQUIREMENT TO GIVE VERBAL WARNING.—When feasible, prior to using force against a person, a Federal law enforcement officer shall identify himself or herself as a Federal law enforcement officer, and issue a verbal warning to the person that the Federal law enforcement officer seeks to apprehend, which shall—

(A) include a request that the person surrender to the law enforcement officer; and

(B) notify the person that the law enforcement officer will use force against the person if the person resists arrest or flees.

(5) GUIDANCE ON USE OF FORCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with impacted persons, communities, and organizations, including representatives of civil and human rights organizations, victims of police use of force, and representatives of law enforcement associations, shall provide guidance to Federal law enforcement agencies on—

(A) the types of less lethal force and deadly force that are prohibited under paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(B) how a Federal law enforcement officer can—

(i) assess whether the use of force is appropriate and necessary; and

(ii) use the least amount of force when interacting with—

(I) pregnant individuals;

(II) children and youth under 21 years of age;

(III) elderly persons;

(IV) persons with mental, behavioral, or physical disabilities or impairments;

(V) persons experiencing perceptual or cognitive impairments due to use of alcohol, narcotics, hallucinogens, or other drugs;

(VI) persons suffering from a serious medical condition; and

(VII) persons with limited English proficiency.

(6) TRAINING.—The Attorney General shall provide training to Federal law enforcement officers on interacting people described in subclauses (I) through (VII) of paragraph (5)(B)(ii).

(7) LIMITATION ON JUSTIFICATION DEFENSE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1123. Limitation on justification defense for Federal law enforcement officers

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It is not a defense to an offense under section 1111 or 1112 that the use of less lethal force or deadly force by a Federal law enforcement officer was justified if—

“(1) that officer’s use of use of such force was inconsistent with section 364(b) of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021; or

“(2) that officer’s gross negligence, leading up to and at the time of the use of force, con-

tributed to the necessity of the use of such force.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the terms ‘deadly force’ and ‘less lethal force’ have the meanings given such terms in section 2 and section 364 of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021; and

“(2) the term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given such term in section 115.”.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1122 the following:

“1123. Limitation on justification defense for Federal law enforcement officers.”.

(c) LIMITATION ON THE RECEIPT OF FUNDS UNDER THE EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) LIMITATION.—A State or unit of local government, other than an Indian Tribe, may not receive funds that the State or unit of local government would otherwise receive under a Byrne grant program for a fiscal year if, on the day before the first day of the fiscal year, the State or unit of local government does not have in effect a law that is consistent with subsection (b) of this section and section 1123 of title 18, United States Code, as determined by the Attorney General.

(2) SUBSEQUENT ENACTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If funds described in paragraph (1) are withheld from a State or unit of local government pursuant to paragraph (1) for 1 or more fiscal years, and the State or unit of local government enacts or puts in place a law described in paragraph (1), and demonstrates substantial efforts to enforce such law, subject to subparagraph (B), the State or unit of local government shall be eligible, in the fiscal year after the fiscal year during which the State or unit of local government demonstrates such substantial efforts, to receive the total amount that the State or unit of local government would have received during each fiscal year for which funds were withheld.

(B) LIMIT ON AMOUNT OF PRIOR YEAR FUNDS.—A State or unit of local government may not receive funds under subparagraph (A) in an amount that is more than the amount withheld from the State or unit of local government during the 5-fiscal-year period before the fiscal year during which funds are received under subparagraph (A).

(3) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with impacted persons, communities, and organizations, including representatives of civil and human rights organizations, individuals against whom a law enforcement officer used force, and representatives of law enforcement associations, shall make guidance available to States and units of local government on the criteria that the Attorney General will use in determining whether the State or unit of local government has in place a law described in paragraph (1).

(4) APPLICATION.—This subsection shall apply to the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 365. STOP MILITARIZING LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, the Department of Defense is authorized to provide excess property to local law enforcement agencies. The Defense Logistics Agency, administers such section

by operating the Law Enforcement Support Office program.

(2) New and used material, including mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles and weapons determined by the Department of Defense to be “military grade” are transferred to Federal, Tribal, State, and local law enforcement agencies through the program.

(3) As a result local law enforcement agencies, including police and sheriff’s departments, are acquiring this material for use in their normal operations.

(4) As a result of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, military equipment purchased for, and used in, those wars has become excess property and has been made available for transfer to local and Federal law enforcement agencies.

(5) In Fiscal Year 2017, \$504,000,000 worth of property was transferred to law enforcement agencies.

(6) More than \$6,800,000,000 worth of weapons and equipment have been transferred to police organizations in all 50 States and four territories through the program.

(7) In May 2012, the Defense Logistics Agency instituted a moratorium on weapons transfers through the program after reports of missing equipment and inappropriate weapons transfers.

(8) Though the moratorium was widely publicized, it was lifted in October 2013 without adequate safeguards.

(9) On January 16, 2015, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13688 to better coordinate and regulate the federal transfer of military weapons and equipment to State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies.

(10) In July, 2017, the Government Accountability Office reported that the program’s internal controls were inadequate to prevent fraudulent applicants’ access to the program.

(11) On August, 28, 2017, President Donald Trump rescinded Executive Order 13688 despite a July 2017 Government Accountability Office report finding deficiencies with the administration of the 1033 program.

(12) As a result, Federal, State, and local law enforcement departments across the country are eligible again to acquire free “military-grade” weapons and equipment that could be used inappropriately during policing efforts in which people and taxpayers could be harmed.

(13) The Department of Defense categorizes equipment eligible for transfer under the 1033 program as “controlled” and “uncontrolled” equipment. “Controlled equipment” includes weapons, explosives such as flash-bang grenades, mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles, long-range acoustic devices, aircraft capable of being modified to carry armament that are combat coded, and silencers, among other military grade items.

(b) LIMITATION ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TRANSFER OF PERSONAL PROPERTY TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2576a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “counterdrug, counterterrorism, and border security activities” and inserting “counterterrorism”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “, the Director of National Drug Control Policy,”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(7) the recipient submits to the Department of Defense a description of how the recipient expects to use the property;

“(8) the recipient certifies to the Department of Defense that if the recipient determines that the property is surplus to the needs of the recipient, the recipient will return the property to the Department of Defense;

“(9) with respect to a recipient that is not a Federal agency, the recipient certifies to the Department of Defense that the recipient notified the local community of the request for personal property under this section by—

“(A) publishing a notice of such request on a publicly accessible Internet website;

“(B) posting such notice at several prominent locations in the jurisdiction of the recipient; and

“(C) ensuring that such notices were available to the local community for a period of not less than 30 days; and

“(10) the recipient has received the approval of the city council or other local governing body to acquire the personal property sought under this section.”;

(C) by striking subsection (d);

(D) by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (o) and (p), respectively; and

(E) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsections:

“(d) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION ACCOUNTING FOR TRANSFERRED PROPERTY.**—(1) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress certification in writing that each Federal or State agency to which the Secretary has transferred property under this section—

“(A) has provided to the Secretary documentation accounting for all controlled property, including arms and ammunition, that the Secretary has transferred to the agency, including any item described in subsection (f) so transferred before the date of the enactment of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021; and

“(B) with respect to a non-Federal agency, carried out each of paragraphs (5) through (8) of subsection (b).

“(2) If the Secretary does not provide a certification under paragraph (1) for a Federal or State agency, the Secretary may not transfer additional property to that agency under this section.

“(e) **ANNUAL REPORT ON EXCESS PROPERTY.**—Before making any property available for transfer under this section, the Secretary shall annually submit to Congress a description of the property to be transferred together with a certification that the transfer of the property would not violate this section or any other provision of law.

“(f) **LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS.**—(1) The Secretary may not transfer to Federal, Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agencies the following under this section:

“(A) Firearms, ammunition, bayonets, grenade launchers, grenades (including stun and flash-bang), and explosives.

“(B) Vehicles, except for passenger automobiles (as such term is defined in section 32901(a)(18) of title 49, United States Code) and bucket trucks.

“(C) Drones.

“(D) Controlled aircraft that—

“(i) are combat configured or combat coded; or

“(ii) have no established commercial flight application.

“(E) Silencers.

“(F) Long-range acoustic devices.

“(G) Items in the Federal Supply Class of banned items.

“(2) The Secretary may not require, as a condition of a transfer under this section, that a Federal or State agency demonstrate the use of any small arms or ammunition.

“(3) The limitations under this subsection shall also apply with respect to the transfer of previously transferred property of the Department of Defense from one Federal or State agency to another such agency.

“(4)(A) The Secretary may waive the applicability of paragraph (1) to a vehicle described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (other than a mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicle), if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is necessary for disaster or rescue purposes or for another purpose where life and public safety are at risk, as demonstrated by the proposed recipient of the vehicle.

“(B) If the Secretary issues a waiver under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(i) submit to Congress notice of the waiver, and post such notice on a public Internet website of the Department, by not later than 30 days after the date on which the waiver is issued; and

“(ii) require, as a condition of the waiver, that the recipient of the vehicle for which the waiver is issued provides public notice of the waiver and the transfer, including the type of vehicle and the purpose for which it is transferred, in the jurisdiction where the recipient is located by not later than 30 days after the date on which the waiver is issued.

“(5) The Secretary may provide for an exemption to the limitation under subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) in the case of parts for aircraft described in such subparagraph that are transferred as part of regular maintenance of aircraft in an existing fleet.

“(6) The Secretary shall require, as a condition of any transfer of property under this section, that the Federal or State agency that receives the property shall return the property to the Secretary if the agency—

“(A) is investigated by the Department of Justice for any violation of civil liberties; or

“(B) is otherwise found to have engaged in widespread abuses of civil liberties.

“(g) **CONDITIONS FOR EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year may not be obligated or expended to carry out this section unless the Secretary submits to Congress certification that for the preceding fiscal year that—

“(1) each Federal or State agency that has received controlled property transferred under this section has—

“(A) demonstrated 100 percent accountability for all such property, in accordance with paragraph (2) or (3), as applicable; or

“(B) been suspended from the program pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(2) with respect to each non-Federal agency that has received controlled property under this section, the State coordinator responsible for each such agency has verified that the coordinator or an agent of the coordinator has conducted an in-person inventory of the property transferred to the agency and that 100 percent of such property was accounted for during the inventory or that the agency has been suspended from the program pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(3) with respect to each Federal agency that has received controlled property under this section, the Secretary of Defense or an agent of the Secretary has conducted an in-person inventory of the property transferred to the agency and that 100 percent of such property was accounted for during the inventory or that the agency has been suspended from the program pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(4) the eligibility of any agency that has received controlled property under this section for which 100 percent of the property was not accounted for during an inventory described in paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable, to receive any property transferred under this section has been suspended; and

“(5) each State coordinator has certified, for each non-Federal agency located in the State for which the State coordinator is responsible that—

“(A) the agency has complied with all requirements under this section; or

“(B) the eligibility of the agency to receive property transferred under this section has been suspended; and

“(6) the Secretary of Defense has certified, for each Federal agency that has received property under this section that—

“(A) the agency has complied with all requirements under this section; or

“(B) the eligibility of the agency to receive property transferred under this section has been suspended.

“(h) **PROHIBITION ON OWNERSHIP OF CONTROLLED PROPERTY.**—A Federal or State agency that receives controlled property under this section may not take ownership of the property.

“(i) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF PROPERTY DOWNGRADES.**—Not later than 30 days before downgrading the classification of any item of personal property from controlled or Federal Supply Class, the Secretary shall submit to Congress notice of the proposed downgrade.

“(j) **NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF PROPERTY CANNIBALIZATION.**—Before the Defense Logistics Agency authorizes the recipient of property transferred under this section to cannibalize the property, the Secretary shall submit to Congress notice of such authorization, including the name of the recipient requesting the authorization, the purpose of the proposed cannibalization, and the type of property proposed to be cannibalized.

“(k) **QUARTERLY REPORTS ON USE OF CONTROLLED EQUIPMENT.**—Not later than 30 days after the last day of a fiscal quarter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on any uses of controlled property transferred under this section during that fiscal quarter.

“(l) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 days after the last day of a fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the following for the preceding fiscal year:

“(1) The percentage of equipment lost by recipients of property transferred under this section, including specific information about the type of property lost, the monetary value of such property, and the recipient that lost the property.

“(2) The transfer of any new (condition code A) property transferred under this section, including specific information about the type of property, the recipient of the property, the monetary value of each item of the property, and the total monetary value of all such property transferred during the fiscal year.”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any transfer of property made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 366. PUBLIC SAFETY INNOVATION GRANTS.

(a) **BYRNE GRANTS USED FOR LOCAL TASK FORCES ON PUBLIC SAFETY INNOVATION.**—Section 501(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10151(a)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **LOCAL TASK FORCES ON PUBLIC SAFETY INNOVATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A law enforcement program under paragraph (1)(A) may include the development of best practices for and the creation of local task forces on public safety innovation, charged with exploring and developing new strategies for public safety, including non-law enforcement strategies.

“(B) **DEFINITION.**—The term ‘local task force on public safety innovation’ means an administrative entity, created from partnerships between community-based organizations and other local stakeholders, that may develop innovative law enforcement and non-law enforcement strategies to enhance just and equitable public safety, repair breaches of trust between law enforcement agencies

and the community they pledge to serve, and enhance accountability of law enforcement officers.”.

(b) **CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAMS.**—Section 501(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In the case of crisis intervention teams funded under subsection (a)(1)(H), a program assessment under this subsection shall contain a report on best practices for crisis intervention.”.

(c) **USE OF COPS GRANT PROGRAM TO HIRE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO ARE RESIDENTS OF THE COMMUNITIES THEY SERVE.**—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (23) and (24) as paragraphs (26) and (27), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (26), as so redesignated, by striking “(22)” and inserting “(25)”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

“(23) to recruit, hire, incentivize, retain, develop, and train new, additional career law enforcement officers or current law enforcement officers who are willing to relocate to communities—

“(A) where there are poor or fragmented relationships between police and residents of the community, or where there are high incidents of crime; and

“(B) that are the communities that the law enforcement officers serve, or that are in close proximity to the communities that the law enforcement officers serve;

“(24) to collect data on the number of law enforcement officers who are willing to relocate to the communities where they serve, and whether such law enforcement officer relocations have impacted crime in such communities;

“(25) to develop and publicly report strategies and timelines to recruit, hire, promote, retain, develop, and train a diverse and inclusive law enforcement workforce, consistent with merit system principles and applicable law;”.

Subtitle C—Law Enforcement Body Cameras PART 1—FEDERAL POLICE CAMERA AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

SEC. 371. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the “Federal Police Camera and Accountability Act”.

SEC. 372. REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REGARDING THE USE OF BODY CAMERAS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MINOR.**—The term “minor” means any individual under 18 years of age.

(2) **SUBJECT OF THE VIDEO FOOTAGE.**—The term “subject of the video footage”—

(A) means any identifiable Federal law enforcement officer or any identifiable suspect, victim, detainee, conversant, injured party, or other similarly situated person who appears on the body camera recording; and

(B) does not include people who only incidentally appear on the recording.

(3) **VIDEO FOOTAGE.**—The term “video footage” means any images or audio recorded by a body camera.

(b) **REQUIREMENT TO WEAR BODY CAMERA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Federal law enforcement officers shall wear a body camera.

(2) **REQUIREMENT FOR BODY CAMERA.**—A body camera required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) have a field of view at least as broad as the officer’s vision; and

(B) be worn in a manner that maximizes the camera’s ability to capture video footage of the officer’s activities.

(c) **REQUIREMENT TO ACTIVATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Both the video and audio recording functions of the body camera shall be activated whenever a Federal law enforcement officer is responding to a call for service or at the initiation of any other law enforcement or investigative stop (as such term is defined in section 373) between a Federal law enforcement officer and a member of the public, except that when an immediate threat to the officer’s life or safety makes activating the camera impossible or dangerous, the officer shall activate the camera at the first reasonable opportunity to do so.

(2) **ALLOWABLE DEACTIVATION.**—The body camera shall not be deactivated until the stop has fully concluded and the Federal law enforcement officer leaves the scene.

(d) **NOTIFICATION OF SUBJECT OF RECORDING.**—A Federal law enforcement officer who is wearing a body camera shall notify any subject of the recording that he or she is being recorded by a body camera as close to the inception of the stop as is reasonably possible.

(e) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the following shall apply to the use of a body camera:

(1) Prior to entering a private residence without a warrant or in non-exigent circumstances, a Federal law enforcement officer shall ask the occupant if the occupant wants the officer to discontinue use of the officer’s body camera. If the occupant responds affirmatively, the Federal law enforcement officer shall immediately discontinue use of the body camera.

(2) When interacting with an apparent crime victim, a Federal law enforcement officer shall, as soon as practicable, ask the apparent crime victim if the apparent crime victim wants the officer to discontinue use of the officer’s body camera. If the apparent crime victim responds affirmatively, the Federal law enforcement officer shall immediately discontinue use of the body camera.

(3) When interacting with a person seeking to anonymously report a crime or assist in an ongoing law enforcement investigation, a Federal law enforcement officer shall, as soon as practicable, ask the person seeking to remain anonymous, if the person seeking to remain anonymous wants the officer to discontinue use of the officer’s body camera. If the person seeking to remain anonymous responds affirmatively, the Federal law enforcement officer shall immediately discontinue use of the body camera.

(f) **RECORDING OF OFFERS TO DISCONTINUE USE OF BODY CAMERA.**—Each offer of a Federal law enforcement officer to discontinue the use of a body camera made pursuant to subsection (e), and the responses thereto, shall be recorded by the body camera prior to discontinuing use of the body camera.

(g) **LIMITATIONS ON USE OF BODY CAMERA.**—Body cameras shall not be used to gather intelligence information based on First Amendment protected speech, associations, or religion, or to record activity that is unrelated to a response to a call for service or a law enforcement or investigative stop between a law enforcement officer and a member of the public, and shall not be equipped with or employ any facial recognition technologies.

(h) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Federal law enforcement officers—

(1) shall not be required to use body cameras during investigative or enforcement stops with the public in the case that—

(A) recording would risk the safety of a confidential informant, citizen informant, or undercover officer;

(B) recording would pose a serious risk to national security; or

(C) the officer is a military police officer, a member of the United States Army Criminal Investigation Command, or a protective

detail assigned to a Federal or foreign official while performing his or her duties; and

(2) shall not activate a body camera while on the grounds of any public, private or parochial elementary or secondary school, except when responding to an imminent threat to life or health.

(i) **RETENTION OF FOOTAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Body camera video footage shall be retained by the law enforcement agency that employs the officer whose camera captured the footage, or an authorized agent thereof, for 6 months after the date it was recorded, after which time such footage shall be permanently deleted.

(2) **RIGHT TO INSPECT.**—During the 6-month retention period described in paragraph (1), the following persons shall have the right to inspect the body camera footage:

(A) Any person who is a subject of body camera video footage, and their designated legal counsel.

(B) A parent or legal guardian of a minor subject of body camera video footage, and their designated legal counsel.

(C) The spouse, next of kin, or legally authorized designee of a deceased subject of body camera video footage, and their designated legal counsel.

(D) A Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage, and their designated legal counsel, subject to the limitations and restrictions in this part.

(E) The superior officer of a Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage, subject to the limitations and restrictions in this part.

(F) Any defense counsel who claims, pursuant to a written affidavit, to have a reasonable basis for believing a video may contain evidence that exculpates a client.

(3) **LIMITATION.**—The right to inspect subject to subsection (j)(1) shall not include the right to possess a copy of the body camera video footage, unless the release of the body camera footage is otherwise authorized by this part or by another applicable law. When a body camera fails to capture some or all of the audio or video of an incident due to malfunction, displacement of camera, or any other cause, any audio or video footage that is captured shall be treated the same as any other body camera audio or video footage under this part.

(j) **ADDITIONAL RETENTION REQUIREMENTS.**—Notwithstanding the retention and deletion requirements in subsection (i), the following shall apply to body camera video footage under this part:

(1) Body camera video footage shall be automatically retained for not less than 3 years if the video footage captures an interaction or event involving—

(A) any use of force; or

(B) an stop about which a complaint has been registered by a subject of the video footage.

(2) Body camera video footage shall be retained for not less than 3 years if a longer retention period is voluntarily requested by—

(A) the Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage, if that officer reasonably asserts the video footage has evidentiary or exculpatory value in an ongoing investigation;

(B) any Federal law enforcement officer who is a subject of the video footage, if that officer reasonably asserts the video footage has evidentiary or exculpatory value;

(C) any superior officer of a Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the video footage or who is a subject of the video footage, if that superior officer reasonably asserts the video footage has evidentiary or exculpatory value;

(D) any Federal law enforcement officer, if the video footage is being retained solely and exclusively for police training purposes;

(E) any member of the public who is a subject of the video footage;

(F) any parent or legal guardian of a minor who is a subject of the video footage; or

(G) a deceased subject's spouse, next of kin, or legally authorized designee.

(k) **PUBLIC REVIEW.**—For purposes of subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G) of subsection (j)(2), any member of the public who is a subject of video footage, the parent or legal guardian of a minor who is a subject of the video footage, or a deceased subject's next of kin or legally authorized designee, shall be permitted to review the specific video footage in question in order to make a determination as to whether they will voluntarily request it be subjected to a minimum 3-year retention period.

(l) **DISCLOSURE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), all video footage of an interaction or event captured by a body camera, if that interaction or event is identified with reasonable specificity and requested by a member of the public, shall be provided to the person or entity making the request in accordance with the procedures for requesting and providing government records set forth in the section 552a of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The following categories of video footage shall not be released to the public in the absence of express written permission from the non-law enforcement subjects of the video footage:

(A) Video footage not subject to a minimum 3-year retention period pursuant to subsection (j).

(B) Video footage that is subject to a minimum 3-year retention period solely and exclusively pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) or (2) of subsection (j).

(3) **PRIORITY OF REQUESTS.**—Notwithstanding any time periods established for acknowledging and responding to records requests in section 552a of title 5, United States Code, responses to requests for video footage that is subject to a minimum 3-year retention period pursuant to subsection (j)(1)(A), where a subject of the video footage is recorded being killed, shot by a firearm, or grievously injured, shall be prioritized and, if approved, the requested video footage shall be provided as expeditiously as possible, but in no circumstances later than 5 days following receipt of the request.

(4) **USE OF REDACTION TECHNOLOGY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever doing so is necessary to protect personal privacy, the right to a fair trial, the identity of a confidential source or crime victim, or the life or physical safety of any person appearing in video footage, redaction technology may be used to obscure the face and other personally identifying characteristics of that person, including the tone of the person's voice, provided the redaction does not interfere with a viewer's ability to fully, completely, and accurately comprehend the events captured on the video footage.

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The following requirements shall apply to redactions under subparagraph (A):

(i) When redaction is performed on video footage pursuant to this paragraph, an unedited, original version of the video footage shall be retained pursuant to the requirements of subsections (i) and (j).

(ii) Except pursuant to the rules for the redaction of video footage set forth in this subsection or where it is otherwise expressly authorized by this Act, no other editing or alteration of video footage, including a reduction of the video footage's resolution, shall be permitted.

(m) **PROHIBITED WITHHOLDING OF FOOTAGE.**—Body camera video footage may not be withheld from the public on the basis that it is an investigatory record or was compiled for law enforcement purposes where any person under investigation or whose conduct is under review is a police officer or other law enforcement employee and the video footage relates to that person's conduct in their official capacity.

(n) **ADMISSIBILITY.**—Any video footage retained beyond 6 months solely and exclusively pursuant to subsection (j)(2)(D) shall not be admissible as evidence in any criminal or civil legal or administrative proceeding.

(o) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—No government agency or official, or law enforcement agency, officer, or official may publicly disclose, release, or share body camera video footage unless—

(1) doing so is expressly authorized pursuant to this part or another applicable law; or

(2) the video footage is subject to public release pursuant to subsection (l), and not exempted from public release pursuant to subsection (l)(1).

(p) **LIMITATION ON FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER VIEWING OF BODY CAMERA FOOTAGE.**—No Federal law enforcement officer shall review or receive an accounting of any body camera video footage that is subject to a minimum 3-year retention period pursuant to subsection (j)(1) prior to completing any required initial reports, statements, and interviews regarding the recorded event, unless doing so is necessary, while in the field, to address an immediate threat to life or safety.

(q) **ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS.**—Video footage may not be—

(1) in the case of footage that is not subject to a minimum 3-year retention period, viewed by any superior officer of a Federal law enforcement officer whose body camera recorded the footage absent a specific allegation of misconduct; or

(2) divulged or used by any law enforcement agency for any commercial or other non-law enforcement purpose.

(r) **THIRD PARTY MAINTENANCE OF FOOTAGE.**—Where a law enforcement agency authorizes a third party to act as its agent in maintaining body camera footage, the agent shall not be permitted to independently access, view, or alter any video footage, except to delete videos as required by law or agency retention policies.

(s) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If any Federal law enforcement officer, or any employee or agent of a Federal law enforcement agency fails to adhere to the recording or retention requirements contained in this part, intentionally interferes with a body camera's ability to accurately capture video footage, or otherwise manipulates the video footage captured by a body camera during or after its operation—

(A) appropriate disciplinary action shall be taken against the individual officer, employee, or agent;

(B) a rebuttable evidentiary presumption shall be adopted in favor of a criminal defendant who reasonably asserts that exculpatory evidence was destroyed or not captured; and

(C) a rebuttable evidentiary presumption shall be adopted on behalf of a civil plaintiff suing the Government, a Federal law enforcement agency, or a Federal law enforcement officer for damages based on misconduct who reasonably asserts that evidence supporting their claim was destroyed or not captured.

(2) **PROOF COMPLIANCE WAS IMPOSSIBLE.**—The disciplinary action requirement and rebuttable presumptions described in paragraph (1) may be overcome by contrary evi-

dence or proof of exigent circumstances that made compliance impossible.

(t) **USE OF FORCE INVESTIGATIONS.**—In the case that a Federal law enforcement officer equipped with a body camera is involved in, a witness to, or within viewable sight range of either the use of force by another law enforcement officer that results in a death, the use of force by another law enforcement officer, during which the discharge of a firearm results in an injury, or the conduct of another law enforcement officer that becomes the subject of a criminal investigation—

(1) the law enforcement agency that employs the law enforcement officer, or the agency or department conducting the related criminal investigation, as appropriate, shall promptly take possession of the body camera, and shall maintain such camera, and any data on such camera, in accordance with the applicable rules governing the preservation of evidence;

(2) a copy of the data on such body camera shall be made in accordance with prevailing forensic standards for data collection and reproduction; and

(3) such copied data shall be made available to the public in accordance with subsection (l).

(u) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FOOTAGE AS EVIDENCE.**—Any body camera video footage recorded by a Federal law enforcement officer that violates this part or any other applicable law may not be offered as evidence by any government entity, agency, department, prosecutorial office, or any other subdivision thereof in any criminal or civil action or proceeding against any member of the public.

(v) **PUBLICATION OF AGENCY POLICIES.**—Any Federal law enforcement agency policy or other guidance regarding body cameras, their use, or the video footage therefrom that is adopted by a Federal agency or department, shall be made publicly available on that agency's website.

(w) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this part shall be construed to preempt any laws governing the maintenance, production, and destruction of evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions.

SEC. 373. PATROL VEHICLES WITH IN-CAR VIDEO RECORDING CAMERAS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AUDIO RECORDING.**—The term “audio recording” means the recorded conversation between a Federal law enforcement officer and a second party.

(2) **EMERGENCY LIGHTS.**—The term “emergency lights” means oscillating, rotating, or flashing lights on patrol vehicles.

(3) **ENFORCEMENT OR INVESTIGATIVE STOP.**—The term “enforcement or investigative stop” means an action by a Federal law enforcement officer in relation to enforcement and investigation duties, including traffic stops, pedestrian stops, abandoned vehicle contacts, motorist assists, commercial motor vehicle stops, roadside safety checks, requests for identification, or responses to requests for emergency assistance.

(4) **IN-CAR VIDEO CAMERA.**—The term “in-car video camera” means a video camera located in a patrol vehicle.

(5) **IN-CAR VIDEO CAMERA RECORDING EQUIPMENT.**—The term “in-car video camera recording equipment” means a video camera recording system located in a patrol vehicle consisting of a camera assembly, recording mechanism, and an in-car video recording medium.

(6) **RECORDING.**—The term “recording” means the process of capturing data or information stored on a recording medium as required under this section.

(7) **RECORDING MEDIUM.**—The term “recording medium” means any recording medium for the retention and playback of recorded

audio and video including VHS, DVD, hard drive, solid state, digital, or flash memory technology.

(8) **WIRELESS MICROPHONE.**—The term “wireless microphone” means a device worn by a Federal law enforcement officer or any other equipment used to record conversations between the officer and a second party and transmitted to the recording equipment.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Federal law enforcement agency shall install in-car video camera recording equipment in all patrol vehicles with a recording medium capable of recording for a period of 10 hours or more and capable of making audio recordings with the assistance of a wireless microphone.

(2) **RECORDING EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—In-car video camera recording equipment with a recording medium capable of recording for a period of 10 hours or more shall record activities—

(A) whenever a patrol vehicle is assigned to patrol duty;

(B) outside a patrol vehicle whenever—

(i) a Federal law enforcement officer assigned that patrol vehicle is conducting an enforcement or investigative stop;

(ii) patrol vehicle emergency lights are activated or would otherwise be activated if not for the need to conceal the presence of law enforcement; or

(iii) an officer reasonably believes recording may assist with prosecution, enhance safety, or for any other lawful purpose; and

(C) inside the vehicle when transporting an arrestee or when an officer reasonably believes recording may assist with prosecution, enhance safety, or for any other lawful purpose.

(3) **REQUIREMENTS FOR RECORDING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A Federal law enforcement officer shall begin recording for an enforcement or investigative stop when the officer determines an enforcement stop is necessary and shall continue until the enforcement action has been completed and the subject of the enforcement or investigative stop or the officer has left the scene.

(B) **ACTIVATION WITH LIGHTS.**—A Federal law enforcement officer shall begin recording when patrol vehicle emergency lights are activated or when they would otherwise be activated if not for the need to conceal the presence of law enforcement, and shall continue until the reason for the activation ceases to exist, regardless of whether the emergency lights are no longer activated.

(C) **PERMISSIBLE RECORDING.**—A Federal law enforcement officer may begin recording if the officer reasonably believes recording may assist with prosecution, enhance safety, or for any other lawful purpose; and shall continue until the reason for recording ceases to exist.

(4) **ENFORCEMENT OR INVESTIGATIVE STOPS.**—A Federal law enforcement officer shall record any enforcement or investigative stop. Audio recording shall terminate upon release of the violator and prior to initiating a separate criminal investigation.

(c) **RETENTION OF RECORDINGS.**—Recordings made on in-car video camera recording medium shall be retained for a storage period of at least 90 days. Under no circumstances shall any recording made on in-car video camera recording medium be altered or erased prior to the expiration of the designated storage period. Upon completion of the storage period, the recording medium may be erased and reissued for operational use unless otherwise ordered or if designated for evidentiary or training purposes.

(d) **ACCESSIBILITY OF RECORDINGS.**—Audio or video recordings made pursuant to this section shall be available under the applicable provisions of section 552a of title 5, United States Code. Only recorded portions

of the audio recording or video recording medium applicable to the request will be available for inspection or copying.

(e) **MAINTENANCE REQUIRED.**—The agency shall ensure proper care and maintenance of in-car video camera recording equipment and recording medium. An officer operating a patrol vehicle must immediately document and notify the appropriate person of any technical difficulties, failures, or problems with the in-car video camera recording equipment or recording medium. Upon receiving notice, every reasonable effort shall be made to correct and repair any of the in-car video camera recording equipment or recording medium and determine if it is in the public interest to permit the use of the patrol vehicle.

SEC. 374. FACIAL RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGY.

No camera or recording device authorized or required to be used under this part may be equipped with or employ facial recognition technology, and footage from such a camera or recording device may not be subjected to facial recognition technology.

SEC. 375. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on Federal law enforcement officer training, vehicle pursuits, use of force, and interaction with citizens, and submit a report on such study to—

(1) the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(3) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 376. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall issue such final regulations as are necessary to carry out this part.

SEC. 377. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this part shall be construed to impose any requirement on a Federal law enforcement officer outside of the course of carrying out that officer's duty.

PART 2—POLICE CAMERA ACT

SEC. 381. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the “Police Creating Accountability by Making Effective Recording Available Act of 2021” or the “Police CAMERA Act of 2021”.

SEC. 382. LAW ENFORCEMENT BODY-WORN CAMERA REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **USE OF FUNDS REQUIREMENT.**—Section 502(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153(a)), as amended by section 334, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(10) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant will use not less than 5 percent of the total amount of the grant award for the fiscal year to develop policies and protocols in compliance with part OO.”.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART OO—LAW ENFORCEMENT BODY-WORN CAMERAS AND RECORDED DATA

“SEC. 3051. USE OF GRANT FUNDS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Grant amounts described in paragraph (10) of section 502(a) of this title—

“(1) shall be used—

“(A) to purchase or lease body-worn cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers (as defined in section 2503);

“(B) for expenses related to the implementation of a body-worn camera program in order to deter excessive force, improve ac-

countability and transparency of use of force by law enforcement officers, assist in responding to complaints against law enforcement officers, and improve evidence collection; and

“(C) to implement policies or procedures to comply with the requirements described in subsection (b); and

“(2) may not be used for expenses related to facial recognition technology.

“(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A recipient of a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title shall—

“(1) establish policies and procedures in accordance with the requirements described in subsection (c) before law enforcement officers use of body-worn cameras;

“(2) adopt recorded data collection and retention protocols as described in subsection (d) before law enforcement officers use of body-worn cameras;

“(3) make the policies and protocols described in paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public; and

“(4) comply with the requirements for use of recorded data under subsection (f).

“(c) **REQUIRED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—A recipient of a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title shall—

“(1) develop with community input and publish for public view policies and protocols for—

“(A) the safe and effective use of body-worn cameras;

“(B) the secure storage, handling, and destruction of recorded data collected by body-worn cameras;

“(C) protecting the privacy rights of any individual who may be recorded by a body-worn camera;

“(D) the release of any recorded data collected by a body-worn camera in accordance with the open records laws, if any, of the State; and

“(E) making recorded data available to prosecutors, defense attorneys, and other officers of the court in accordance with subparagraph (E); and

“(2) conduct periodic evaluations of the security of the storage and handling of the body-worn camera data.

“(d) **RECORDED DATA COLLECTION AND RETENTION PROTOCOL.**—The recorded data collection and retention protocol described in this paragraph is a protocol that—

“(1) requires—

“(A) a law enforcement officer who is wearing a body-worn camera to provide an explanation if an activity that is required to be recorded by the body-worn camera is not recorded;

“(B) a law enforcement officer who is wearing a body-worn camera to obtain consent to be recorded from a crime victim or witness before interviewing the victim or witness;

“(C) the collection of recorded data unrelated to a legitimate law enforcement purpose be minimized to the greatest extent practicable;

“(D) the system used to store recorded data collected by body-worn cameras to log all viewing, modification, or deletion of stored recorded data and to prevent, to the greatest extent practicable, the unauthorized access or disclosure of stored recorded data;

“(E) any law enforcement officer be prohibited from accessing the stored data without an authorized purpose; and

“(F) the law enforcement agency to collect and report statistical data on—

“(i) incidences of use of force, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, and age of the victim;

“(ii) the number of complaints filed against law enforcement officers;

“(iii) the disposition of complaints filed against law enforcement officers;

“(iv) the number of times camera footage is used for evidence collection in investigations of crimes; and

“(v) any other additional statistical data that the Director determines should be collected and reported;

“(2) allows an individual to file a complaint with a law enforcement agency relating to the improper use of body-worn cameras; and

“(3) complies with any other requirements established by the Director.

“(e) REPORTING.—Statistical data required to be collected under subsection (d)(1)(D) shall be reported to the Director, who shall—

“(1) establish a standardized reporting system for statistical data collected under this program; and

“(2) establish a national database of statistical data recorded under this program.

“(f) USE OR TRANSFER OF RECORDED DATA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Recorded data collected by an entity receiving a grant under a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title from a body-worn camera shall be used only in internal and external investigations of misconduct by a law enforcement agency or officer, if there is reasonable suspicion that a recording contains evidence of a crime, or for limited training purposes. The Director shall establish rules to ensure that the recorded data is used only for the purposes described in this paragraph.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), an entity receiving a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title may not transfer any recorded data collected by the entity from a body-worn camera to another law enforcement or intelligence agency.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION.—An entity receiving a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title may transfer recorded data collected by the entity from a body-worn camera to another law enforcement agency or intelligence agency for use in a criminal investigation if the requesting law enforcement or intelligence agency has reasonable suspicion that the requested data contains evidence relating to the crime being investigated.

“(B) CIVIL RIGHTS CLAIMS.—An entity receiving a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title may transfer recorded data collected by the law enforcement agency from a body-worn camera to another law enforcement agency for use in an investigation of the violation of any right, privilege, or immunity secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

“(g) AUDIT AND ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this part, the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management shall perform an assessment of the use of funds under this section and the policies and protocols of the grantees.

“(2) REPORTS.—Not later than September 1 of each year, beginning 2 years after the date of enactment of this part, each recipient of a grant under subpart 1 of part E of this title shall submit to the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management a report that—

“(A) describes the progress of the body-worn camera program; and

“(B) contains recommendations on ways in which the Federal Government, States, and units of local government can further support the implementation of the program.

“(3) REVIEW.—The Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Management shall evaluate the policies and protocols of the grantees and take such steps as the Director of the Office of Audit, Assessment, and Man-

agement determines necessary to ensure compliance with the program.

“SEC. 3052. BODY-WORN CAMERA TRAINING TOOLKIT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish and maintain a body-worn camera training toolkit for law enforcement agencies, academia, and other relevant entities to provide training and technical assistance, including best practices for implementation, model policies and procedures, and research materials.

“(b) MECHANISM.—In establishing the toolkit required to under subsection (a), the Director may consolidate research, practices, templates, and tools that been developed by expert and law enforcement agencies across the country.

“SEC. 3053. STUDY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Police CAMERA Act of 2021, the Director shall conduct a study on—

“(1) the efficacy of body-worn cameras in deterring excessive force by law enforcement officers;

“(2) the impact of body-worn cameras on the accountability and transparency of the use of force by law enforcement officers;

“(3) the impact of body-worn cameras on responses to and adjudications of complaints of excessive force;

“(4) the effect of the use of body-worn cameras on the safety of law enforcement officers on patrol;

“(5) the effect of the use of body-worn cameras on public safety;

“(6) the impact of body-worn cameras on evidence collection for criminal investigations;

“(7) issues relating to the secure storage and handling of recorded data from the body-worn cameras;

“(8) issues relating to the privacy of individuals and officers recorded on body-worn cameras;

“(9) issues relating to the constitutional rights of individuals on whom facial recognition technology is used;

“(10) issues relating to limitations on the use of facial recognition technology;

“(11) issues relating to the public's access to body-worn camera footage;

“(12) the need for proper training of law enforcement officers that use body-worn cameras;

“(13) best practices in the development of protocols for the safe and effective use of body-worn cameras;

“(14) a review of law enforcement agencies that found body-worn cameras to be unhelpful in the operations of the agencies; and

“(15) any other factors that the Director determines are relevant in evaluating the efficacy of body-worn cameras.

“(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the study required under subsection (a) is completed, the Director shall submit to Congress a report on the study, which shall include any policy recommendations that the Director considers appropriate.”.

TITLE IV—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act of 2021”.

SEC. 402. PROHIBITION ON ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTS WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2243 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following: **“or by any person acting under color of law”**;

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) OF AN INDIVIDUAL BY ANY PERSON ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever, acting under color of law, knowingly engages in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any Federal law enforcement officer, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘sexual act’ has the meaning given the term in section 2246.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In a prosecution under subsection (c), it is not a defense that the other individual consented to the sexual act.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 2246 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given the term in section 115.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by amending the item related to section 2243 to read as follows:

“2243. Sexual abuse of a minor or ward or by any person acting under color of law.”.

SEC. 403. ENACTMENT OF LAWS PENALIZING ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTS WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year that begins after the date that is one year after the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of a State or unit of local government that does not have in effect a law described in subsection (b), if that State or unit of local government that would otherwise receive funds under the COPS grant program, that State or unit of local government shall not be eligible to receive such funds. In the case of a multi-jurisdictional or regional consortium, if any member of that consortium is a State or unit of local government that does not have in effect a law described in subsection (b), if that consortium would otherwise receive funds under the COPS grant program, that consortium shall not be eligible to receive such funds.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAW.—A law described in this subsection is a law that—

(1) makes it a criminal offense for any person acting under color of law of the State or unit of local government to engage in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any law enforcement officer; and

(2) prohibits a person charged with an offense described in paragraph (1) from asserting the consent of the other individual as a defense.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A State or unit of local government that receives a grant under the COPS grant program shall submit to the Attorney General, on an annual basis, information on—

(1) the number of reports made to law enforcement agencies in that State or unit of local government regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law during the previous year; and

(2) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under

color of law was reported during the previous year.

SEC. 404. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) the information required to be reported to the Attorney General under section 403(b); and

(2) information on—

(A) the number of reports made, during the previous year, to Federal law enforcement agencies regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law; and

(B) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported.

(b) REPORT BY GAO.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on any violations of section 2243(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 402, committed during the 1-year period covered by the report.

SEC. 405. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term “sexual act” has the meaning given the term in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application of such a provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the application of the remaining provisions of this Act to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 502. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit legal or administrative remedies under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), section 210401 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12601), title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.), or title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.);

(2) to affect any Federal, State, or Tribal law that applies to an Indian Tribe because of the political status of the Tribe; or

(3) to waive the sovereign immunity of an Indian Tribe without the consent of the Tribe.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1280.

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 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, last summer, millions of Americans all across the country

took to the streets to demand fundamental change in the culture of law enforcement and to call for meaningful accountability for officers who commit misconduct.

The catalyst for these protests was the tragic and brutal death of George Floyd. None of us can forget the image of that officer's knee pinned to his neck for nearly 8 agonizing minutes, or the sound of his anguished pleas of “I can't breathe” that were ignored until his final breath was taken from him.

After his death, the world awoke to daily indignities, and sometimes the brutality, that too many people—disproportionately Black, Latinx, and indigenous people, people living in poverty, and people with disabilities—face in their interactions with law enforcement throughout the country.

We value and respect the many brave and honorable police officers who put their lives on the line every day to protect us and our communities. We know that most law enforcement officers do their jobs with dignity, selflessness, and honor, and they are deserving of our respect and gratitude for all they do to keep us safe. But we must also acknowledge that there are too many exceptions.

The reality for too many Americans, especially many Black Americans, is that police officers are perceived as a threat to their liberties; to their dignity; and, too often, to their safety. Sadly, our country's history of racism and racially motivated violence continues to haunt our Nation.

We see it in the rates of COVID deaths, in our system of mass incarceration, and in the vast chasm of economic inequality, all of which fall disproportionately on the backs of African Americans. And we see it in the harassment and excessive force that many people of color routinely experience by law enforcement.

That is why we must act today. The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act would allow for meaningful accountability in cases of police misconduct. It also effectively bans choke holds, ends racial and religious profiling, ends no-knock warrants in drug cases, and limits the militarization of local policing.

It encourages departments to meet a gold standard in training and other best practices to reduce police bias and violence. It requires significant data collection, including the first-ever national database on police-misconduct incidents to prevent the movement of dangerous officers from department to department.

In addition, this legislation creates a process to reimagine how public safety could work in a truly equitable and just way in each community.

Last summer, within weeks of the protests that galvanized the Nation, the House passed the legislation before us today. Unfortunately, the pleas for justice that rang out in the streets fell on deaf ears in the Senate.

Since then, over 600 more people—disproportionately people of color—

have been killed by law enforcement officers.

The time for action is now.

I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) for crafting this bold, yet responsible, legislation.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a retired police officer.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

With something as important as police reform, it is important to garner many perspectives. The JUSTICE Act, legislation Senator SCOTT and I introduced, is a product of my perspective as a law enforcement officer from Minnesota and Senator SCOTT's perspective as a Black man from South Carolina.

The JUSTICE Act increases body cameras and implements duty to intervene and deescalation training. It improves hiring and recruitment practices. It reinvigorates the principles of community policing to rebuild the relationships between law enforcement officers and the communities that they serve.

The JUSTICE Act, which received bipartisan support last Congress, includes several critical provisions that are supported by Democrats: the Walter Scott Notification Act, the National Criminal Justice Commission Act, and the Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act. It even includes legislation that Vice President HARRIS introduced, the Justice for Victims of Lynching Act.

Unfortunately, we are not considering the JUSTICE Act today. We are, instead, once again, exploring political gamesmanship through H.R. 1280.

Now, when we voted on this legislation last year, the Democrats knew it was dead upon passage, but my good friends and I in the Problem Solvers Caucus decided that this conversation was too important to let go. So we worked for months with Representatives from both sides of the aisle, with Representatives from the Congressional Black Caucus, with Representatives from law enforcement and legal backgrounds, on areas where we could find compromise between the Justice in Policing Act and my bill, the JUSTICE Act.

We discussed no-knock warrants, the 1033 program, use of force, record retention, and so much more. We were making such great headway. I truly believed that we could have put together a bipartisan package of reforms for our American communities that have been calling for change.

Unfortunately, the other side walked away. As the election drew near, the priorities of my Democratic colleagues shifted. Their fight to retain power became more important than providing police reform for the American people.

So now we are here again, Mr. Speaker, to vote on the exact same bill without a single change; a bill that has zero

input from Republicans, zero input or support from our law enforcement community. And I will repeat that. Zero input or support from our law enforcement community.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that will, no doubt, make our communities less safe. We all want police reform and we all want change, but until such time as we work together, this legislation is just another mesaging bill from my Democrat colleagues.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago today, Rodney King was viciously beaten by police officers in Los Angeles. It would be the first time the world would witness what African Americans had been organizing, marching, and trying to change for over 100 years.

Personally, I was hopeful that once everyone saw what happens in Black communities, policing in America would change. I was certain no one would deny what they saw with their own eyes and that the officers would be convicted. But they were acquitted. Some were even hired by other police departments.

The sad truth was, when people told their stories of abuse or even murder at the hands of police officers, they were simply not believed. The story was always the same: I was in fear of my life. I thought they had a gun. The person was resisting arrest. The individual attempted to assault me.

That is all that was needed for the beating or murder to be discounted, dismissed. The individuals' lives had little value.

Even children. These are children here. This is an 8-year-old, a 10-year-old, a mother, and another child placed on the ground because the mother was suspected of stealing a car.

Several years after Rodney King's beating, cell phone cameras were invented. It has taken technology and active citizen involvement to document and expose this reality. And now there are many tapes, many examples of individuals being shot and killed by officers, yet transformation of policing in America has still not happened.

Passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act will be a critical first step—just a first step—to transform policing in America. The bill raises the standards for policing and holds those officers accountable who fail to uphold the ethic of protecting and serving their communities.

□ 1830

Now, I know that change is difficult, but I am certain that police officers who risk their lives every day are concerned about their profession, and they

don't work in an environment where they are chastised for intervening when they see a fellow officer abuse a citizen or use deadly force when it is not necessary. And I am certain that police officers want to make sure that they are trained in the best practices in policing.

To support officers, this legislation will create the first-ever national accreditation standards for the operation of police departments, set national standards for officers, and establish best practices in training, hiring, deescalation strategies, and bystander duty.

For example, if officers had better training, maybe they would understand that just because someone can verbally express "I can't breathe," does not mean they are faking and the officer can continue to press on the person's chest, back, or neck. And despite our best intentions, there will be some officers who cross over the line.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this bill also includes strong accountability measures, both as a matter of simple justice, and to keep unfit officers off the street. A profession where you have the power to kill should be a profession that requires highly trained officers who are accountable to the public. That is what this bill accomplishes.

Police officers are the first to say it is unfair that they are not trained to be social workers or healthcare providers.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Justice in Policing Act reinvests in our communities.

If this legislation had been the law of the land several years ago, Eric Garner and George Floyd would be alive today, because the bill bans choke holds.

If the bill had been law last year, Breonna Taylor would not have been shot to death in her sleep, because no-knock warrants for drug offenses would have been illegal.

And if a national registry had been in effect, it would have been revealed that the officer who killed 12-year-old Tamir Rice—

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office confirmed earlier this week that the Justice in Policing Act contains an unfunded mandate by requiring onerous data collection reporting from State and local law enforcement. This includes granular data collection on such basic law enforcement activities, like traffic stops. CBO estimates

that this unfunded mandate placed on State and local law enforcement will cost several hundred million dollars.

The consequences of H.R. 1280 are clear. It will drain resources away from important public safety activities. Instead, law enforcement officers will have to spend their time reporting data to Washington, D.C., from behind a desk. Make no mistake. This bill defunds the police.

Additionally, any Member who is opposed to defunding the police should be opposing this bill. This legislation will also lower the mens rea standard when charging an officer with criminal misconduct. It removes qualified immunity, which will result in an ineffectual police force and leave our communities vulnerable to crime, and it also severely limits the Department of Defense's 1033 program.

Mr. Speaker, but make no mistake, regardless of whatever else you may feel about this bill, this bill defunds police. We can never forget that. If you oppose defunding the police, you should be opposing this bill, like I am.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of George Floyd has awakened the Nation, the world.

Last summer, in response to a call for action from righteous protestors across the Nation, we had to stand up. And we know that 8 minutes and 46 seconds are printed and imprinted in the brains of those around the world. There is no defunding of the police. It is standing up the police and the community.

Today, we are honored that the George Floyd family did not turn to bitterness, but they turned to justice. Their parents, Larcenia and George; his daughter, Gianna; his siblings, Philonise, Zsa Zsa Williams, LaTonya Floyd, Rodney Floyd, Bridgett Floyd, Terrence Floyd, and a nephew, Brandon Williams.

We know that we will be ending racial profiling now. We know that we will have qualified immunity for justice in the courts. We know that there will be training on racial bias. We will ban no-knock. We will ban choke holds. We will make sure that we end the racial profiling that caused George to come out of a grocery store and have someone's knee on his neck for 8 minutes and 46 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the world has stood up and justice is about to be rained on us.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as an original co-sponsor of the legislation, and the author of several of its key legislative provisions, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, which marks a defining turning point in our country.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that any questions that there continues to exist today racial double-standards, disparities, and system racism in policing and the administration of justice were conclusively laid to rest by

what social scientists would regard as a “natural experiment” that took place in Washington, D.C., beginning in the summer and culminating with the January 6, 2021, insurrection and siege of the U.S. Capitol by Trump seditious incited by the 45th President of the United States.

Mass protests and political rallies took place in Washington, D.C., started May 29, 2020, four days after George Floyd died in Minnesota after a Minneapolis police officer knelt on his neck for more than eight minutes.

By the millions, Americans took to the streets in protest to affirm that no longer will the people of this country tolerate or acquiesce in horrible policing practices that include excessive and unnecessary uses of lethal force that has diminished community trust of policing practices across the country and has angered and terrified communities of color who are overwhelmingly and disproportionately its innocent victims.

Within days of the demonstrations, U.S. Attorney General Bill Barr announced that multiple law enforcement agencies, including the National Guard, Secret Service and Federal Bureau of Investigation, would “flood the zone” in D.C.

Thousands of law enforcement officials, armed with tear gas, rubber bullets and firearms were deployed to protect the city.

Hundreds of people were arrested, D.C. police records show.

More than 300 were arrested on June 1, 2020, the day Attorney General Barr ordered law enforcement to forcefully clear peaceful protesters from a perimeter near the White House, making room for President Trump to pose for cameras while waving a Bible in front of St. John's Episcopal Church.

It was the largest number of arrests recorded for any day during the summer of events.

Across the nation, law enforcement made an estimated 14,000 arrests in 49 U.S. cities during anti-racism protests in the summer of 2020, according to the Washington Post.

Following the November 3, 2020, election of Joe Biden and running mate KAMALA HARRIS, large groups of Trump supporters held rallies in the city, where they clashed with counter-protesters.

Police made 20 arrests during the so-called Million MAGA March on November 14, 2020, an event in which Trump-supporters, including White nationalists, far-right extremist groups, and conservative politicians gathered in D.C. to protest the election results.

And, incredibly, only 61 arrests were made of rioters, who were overwhelming white and who used violence, that stormed the Capitol on January 6, an attack that claimed the lives of at least six persons, injured hundreds of others, caused horrific damage to property and national treasures, and inflicted emotional scars that will not heal for generations.

But most of these arrests are related to charges involving curfew violations—D.C. mayor Muriel Bowser announced a 6 p.m. curfew, though mobs had broken into the Capitol hours earlier, around 1:30 p.m.

There were only four non-curfew-related arrests, compared to 40 non-curfew-related arrests during Black Lives Matter protests on June 1, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, the horrifying killing of George Floyd on May 25, 2020 by a Minneapolis po-

lice office shocked and awakened the moral consciousness of the nation.

Untold millions saw the terrifying last 8:46 of life drained from a Black man, George Floyd, taking his last breaths face down in the street with his neck under the knee of a police officer who, along with his three cohorts, was indifferent to his cries for help and pleas that he “can't breathe.”

In direct response, for past several months civil protests against police brutality have occurred nightly in cities large and small all across the nation.

These protests were a direct reaction to the horrific killing of George Floyd but are most motivated by a deep-seated anger and frustration to the separate and unequal justice African Americans receive at the hands of too many law enforcement officers.

The civil disobedience witnessed nightly in the streets of America were also in memory of countless acts of the inequality and cruelty visited upon young African American men and women no longer with us in body but forever with us in memory.

Beloved souls like Breanna Taylor in Louisville, Kentucky; Eric Garner and Sean Bell in New York City; 12-year old Tamir Rice in Cleveland; and Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri.

They remember the senseless killings as well of Ahmaud Arbery and Trayvon Martin by self-appointed vigilantes.

Stephon Clark, was an unarmed 22-year-old African American male from Sacramento, California, who was shot 23 times and killed by two uniformed members of the Sacramento Police Department on Sunday afternoon, March 18, 2018, in his grandmother's backyard, leaving behind two small children because police officers claim that he had a gun but no weapon was found at the scene, only a cell phone.

In August 2019, Elijah McClain, a 23-year-old African American man, was simply listening to music while walking home from a convenience store when he was stopped without basis by officers of the Aurora, Colorado Police Department, put into a carotid hold and given multiple doses of ketamine, which caused cardiac arrest from which he fell into a coma and died three days later.

And the continuing need for their activism was reflected in the recent outrage, which began on June 12, 2020, and ended in the senseless slaughter of Rayshard Brooks, who was simply sleeping in his car at a local Wendy's restaurant, by a uniformed officer of the Atlanta Police Department.

It was reflected again on August 23, 2020, when a Kenosha Police Department officer shot Jacob S. Blake, a 29-year-old black man, in the back seven times—yes seven—as he attempted to enter his SUV where three of his young sons were in the back seat.

We know the pain and heartbreak in my home state of Texas and the City of Houston where Robbie Tolan's promising Major League Baseball was career was cut short after being shot by Bellaire Police Department officer in the front yard of his parents' home.

And Sandra Bland, a 28-year-old African American female who was arrested after a traffic stop just outside of Houston, Texas, and found dead in a Waller County jail cell three days later.

Or Pamela Turner, an unarmed 44-year old African American mother of three who suffered

from paranoid schizophrenia, who was killed outside her home in Baytown, Texas, by an officer of the Baytown Police Department, on Monday, May 13, 2019, the day after Mother's Day.

Or Jordan Baker, an unarmed 26-year-old African American male from Houston, Texas, who was shot to death by an off-duty uniformed member of the Houston Police Department in the parking lot of a Harris County shopping mall on January 16, 2014.

Or Danny Ray Thomas, an unarmed 34-year-old African American male, who was shot to death by a uniformed officer of the Harris County Sheriffs Department on March 22, 2018, in Houston, Texas.

Indeed, the history goes back much further, past Amidou Diallo in New York City, past the Central Park Five, past Emmitt Till, past the racist abuse of law enforcement power during the struggle for civil rights and equal treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the times we are in demand that action be taken and that is precisely what my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, on this committee, and Congressional Democrats did in introducing H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2020.

And we are taking the next bold action today in voting to pass this legislation and send it to the Senate and on to the White House for presidential signature and enactment.

I support this bold legislation not just as a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, who also served on the House Working Group on Police Strategies, but also a mother of a young African American male who knows the anxiety that African American mothers feel until they can hug their sons and daughters who return home safely, and on behalf of all those relatives and friends who grieve over the loss a loved one whose life and future was wrongly and cruelly interrupted or ended by mistreatment at the hands of the police.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021 is designed to destroy the pillars of systemic racism in policing practices that has victimized communities of color, and especially African Americans for decades, is overdue, too long overdue.

This legislation puts the Congress of the United States on record against racial profiling in policing and against the excessive, unjustified, and discriminatory use of lethal and force by law enforcement officers against persons of color.

The legislation means no longer will employment of practices that encourage systemic mistreatment of persons because of their race be ignored or tolerated.

With our vote today to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, the government of the United States is declaring firmly, forcefully, and unequivocally that Black Lives Matter.

It is true all lives matter, they always have.

But that Black lives matter too, and in so many other areas of civic life, this nation has not always lived up to its promise but that the promise is worthy of fulfilling.

Every African American parent, and every African American child, knows all too well ‘The Talk’ and the importance of abiding by the rules for surviving interactions with the police.

While many police officers take this responsibility seriously and strive to treat all persons

equally and with respect, their efforts are too often undermined by some of their colleagues who abuse the enormous trust and confidence placed in them.

And systemically racist systems and practices left in place can corrupt even the most virtuous police officers.

So, the most important criminal justice reforms needed to improve the criminal justice system are those that will increase public confidence and build trust and mutual respect between law enforcement and the communities they swear an oath and are willing to risk their lives to protect and serve.

That is the overriding purpose and aim of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021, which contains numerous provisions to weed out and eliminate systemic racism in police practices.

Specifically, this legislation holds police accountable in our courts by:

Amending the *mens rea* requirement in federal law (18 U.S.C. Section 242) to prosecute police misconduct from “willfulness” to a “recklessness” standard;

Reforming qualified immunity so that individuals are not barred from recovering damages when police violate their constitutional rights;

Incentivizing state attorneys general to conduct pattern and practice investigations and improving the use of pattern and practice investigations at the federal level by granting the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division subpoena power;

Incentivizing states to create independent investigative structures for police involved deaths; and

Creating best practices recommendations based on the Obama 21st Century Policing Task force.

As recognized by scholars at Cato—the conservative think tank Cato—the time has come to abolish qualified immunity.

According to Cato, “qualified immunity is a legally baseless judicial invention” that has “proven unworkable as a matter of judicial doctrine,” and “routinely denies justice to the victims of egregious misconduct and undermines public accountability across the board, especially for members of law enforcement.”

I am particularly pleased that the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act includes the End Racial Profiling Now Act, which I introduced to ban the pernicious practice of racial profiling.

In addition, I am proud that this legislation includes as Title I, Subtitle B, the bipartisan and bicameral George Floyd Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act, which I introduced with Congressman JASON CROW of Colorado in the 116th Congress as H.R. 7100.

This legislation provides incentives for local police organizations to voluntarily adopt performance-based standards to ensure that incidents of deadly force or misconduct will be minimized through appropriate management and training protocols and properly investigated, should they occur.

The legislation directs the Department of Justice to work cooperatively with independent accreditation, law enforcement and community-based organizations to further develop and refine the accreditation standards and grants conditional authority to the Department of Justice to make grants to law enforcement agencies for the purpose of obtaining accreditation from certified law enforcement accreditation organizations.

As I have stated many times, direct action is vitally important but to be effective it must

be accompanied by political, legislative, and governmental action, which is necessary because the strength and foundation of democratic government rests upon the consent and confidence of the governed.

Effective enforcement of the law and administration of justice requires the confidence of the community that the law will be enforced impartially and that all persons are treated equally without regard to race or ethnicity or religion or national origin.

As the great jurist Judge Learned Hand said: “If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: thou shalt not ration justice.”

Equal justice is the proud promise America makes to all persons; the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021 will help make that promise a lived reality for African Americans, who have not ever known it to be true in the area of community-police relations.

And when Black Lives Matter, then and only then can it truthfully be said that all lives matter.

Finally, let me say a few words in memory of the man whose sacrifice of his inalienable right to life has galvanized the world and awakened the sleeping giant of moral decency.

Mr. Speaker, let me pay tribute to the person for whom this legislation is named and to his family.

George Floyd, also known lovingly as “Big Floyd,” “Perry,” or “The Gentle Giant,” loved life, his family, friends, and community and throughout his life used his love of sports and music to leave a positive impact on this world.

Mr. Speaker, rather than giving in to bitterness and hate, the family of George Floyd has channeled the pain and heartbreak of the tragic loss of their beloved George into the creation of a force for good: The George Floyd Memorial Foundation, Inc., a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, to promote global awareness about racial injustice and provide opportunities for others to contribute to the unification of our communities and touch the world.

Let me thank each member of the Floyd family and list them by name: his parents, Larcenia Jones-Floyd and George Perry Floyd, Sr.; his daughter, Gianna Floyd; his siblings Philonise Floyd, Zsa Zsa Williams, LaTonya Floyd, Rodney Floyd, Bridget Floyd, Terrence Floyd; and nephew, Brandon “WOO” Williams.

Mr. Speaker, in Acts 2:23 of the Scriptures it is written that “This man was handed over to you by God’s deliberate plan and foreknowledge; and you with the help of wicked men, put him to death by nailing him to the cross.”

Duty calls us to do improve the quality of policing in America.

We cannot agitate for change one day and then allow things to remain the same, to allow wicked men to keep committing this crime against humanity.

This behavior did not begin with George Floyd; there is a 400-year history here, from slave patrols, to Jim Crow to Bull Connor to the modern-day lynching of George Floyd by Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin.

But the good news is that right is on our side; God has stepped in.

In John 1:46 it is said, “can anything good come out of Nazareth?”

When he was growing up, I am sure there were people who saw George Floyd and asked can anything good come out of the Third Ward of Houston?

We now know the answer is clearly yes.

George Floyd was here in service to God’s divine plan.

And as his daughter Gianna said, her Daddy changed the world.

Thank you, George Floyd for what you have done for us, for helping us find our voice and our resolve.

We will not let you down; we will finish the job.

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

The gentlewoman just said that there was no defunding of the police. I would just point out Democrat-controlled cities around the country:

Austin, Texas, \$150 million cut;
Baltimore, Maryland, \$22 million;
Boston, \$12 million;
Burlington, \$1 million;
Columbus, \$23 million;
Denver, \$55 million;
Eureka, California, \$1.2 million;
Hartford, \$2 million;
Los Angeles, \$175 million;
Madison, Wisconsin, \$2 million;
Minneapolis, \$8 million;
New York, \$1 billion;
Norman, \$865,000;
Oakland, \$14.6 million;
Oklahoma City, \$5.5 million;
Philadelphia, \$33 million;
Portland, Oregon, \$15 million;
Salt Lake City, \$5.3 million;
San Francisco, \$120 million;
Seattle, \$69 million;
Washington, D.C., \$15 million cut.

That is what Democrats have done over the last year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1280.

I spent the last week talking to law enforcement officers in Utah. These men and women are heroes. They are good, honest officers who risk their lives every day to keep us safe.

I asked them about H.R. 1280, and this is what they said:

“This will destroy public safety.”

“We haven’t done anything to earn this type of distrust.”

“This will push good law enforcement out of the business.”

“Utah is an amazing place. We have the right people protecting us. Let’s keep them here.”

Mr. Speaker, police reform is necessary. We need to give officers the tools they need to fairly enforce the law. But this legislation paints a target on the back of every police officer in America.

In Salt Lake City, we saw a 38 percent increase in homicides. At the same time, Salt Lake cut \$5.3 million from the police department’s budget. It should be no surprise that voluntary resignations doubled. This bill will make good officers flee the profession when we need them most.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats won’t say this, but this bill simply defunds the police. Not in Utah’s Fourth District; not now; not ever.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that this bill does

not—all the cities that we talked about, it does not mention any cities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

I started my career as the legal adviser to the Memphis Police Department. There were many fine policemen, and most of them never used a choke hold, never used their gun, and operated admirably. Some did not.

The disproportionate share that African Americans have suffered from killings by police shows we need to act. You can't think about George Floyd being choked with a knee and killed for 8 minutes. You can't think of Eric Garner being wrestled down like a prize trophy animal and killed in Staten Island, or young Tamir Rice, shot without an officer taking a second to think about it.

Mr. Speaker, these deaths require us to act. This is not defund the police. This is reform the police and save human lives. We need to pass this bill today. We should have passed it 40 years ago when I was a police attorney. Pass it now.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to the efforts by you and your colleagues to defund our police.

This week we will be voting on H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. This bill is named after a man who was murdered by a police officer. The officer responsible should have never been allowed to don a badge and act on behalf of the agency sworn to protect its citizens. He should and is being held accountable.

Now, as a member of a first responder family, I can say definitively on behalf of our officers that there is absolutely nothing, nothing that a good cop hates more than a bad cop. And as the wife of a first responder, this issue could not be more personal to me.

Mr. Speaker, my husband serves our local community as a firefighter and a SWAT medic for our local sheriff's department. And next to me here today, you see one of his SWAT vests.

This is the same vest that he wore for 14 hours while on a massive manhunt for a man who had just been released from prison, who promptly raped and killed his girlfriend.

It is the same vest that he wore while responding to a man who had barricaded himself with weapons, threatening to kill his own children.

These are just some of the scenes that this vest and my husband have seen, like so many of our LEOs. But the real threat here is not the dangerous situations that my husband has seen in protecting his community, it is the fact that this bill—and by extension, you, Mr. Speaker—want to take this vest off my husband's back be-

cause, yes, what this bill does is take this kind of equipment off the backs of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues who are considering voting for this bill:

Are you waking up at 2 a.m. to respond to a gruesome murder?

Are you missing your children's birthday parties to respond to gang shootings?

There is absolutely room for us to improve. There is absolutely room and a necessity for us to do better. But the answer is not to defund the police. It is not the answer. What this bill ultimately does is defund the police.

You want a better trained, more responsive police force in your hometown? Fully fund the police. You say this is a reform bill, and I say that is BS.

Mr. Speaker, your own conference members have been advocating for the defunding of our local police officers, calling them names that I cannot and will not repeat here today. In fact, many of your members have made it a top priority of their platforms.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, George Floyd died under the knee of a police officer 302 days ago. In the time since then, 797 people—more than 2½ every day—have died during encounters with law enforcement.

Black Americans are 2½ times as likely as White Americans to be killed by the police. Police use of force is now the sixth-leading cause of death for young Black men in this country. This cannot continue. It is time to address systemic racism in policing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will begin to do that. It ends choke holds. It will hold bad officers accountable, combat racial profiling, and demilitarize police departments. This bill is about ensuring accountability and restoring trust between law enforcement and their communities. Both the police and the community deserve that and will benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a co-sponsor, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

And I would say, there has been a lot of discussion about defunding the police. The only party in this Chamber defunding the police are the Republicans, who just voted against billions of dollars to support local and State government, first responders, police officers. We supported that. We are funding the police. They voted to defund it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill restores relationships between the police and the community, and I urge its passage.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ).

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this egregious, so-called police reform bill. The process used to craft this bill is nonsense.

In a normal functioning Congress, the Speaker would bring together Re-

publicans and Democrats to discuss ways to push needed police reforms. But in this dysfunctional Congress, we got a bill that strips our frontline police officers from qualified immunity, that will weaken and possibly destroy our communities' police forces.

Mr. Speaker, as mayor and sheriff of Miami-Dade County, and a former SWAT medic myself, I was actually responsible for ensuring my community was kept safe from lawlessness. I understand firsthand the importance of qualified immunity for police officers to carry out their jobs.

Officers perform vital tasks requiring split-second decisions under intense circumstances. Taking away qualified immunity will lead to police officers not taking the decisive actions and rendering it impossible for them to do their job. Without this security, officers will resign and deplete our police force, leaving our communities—the very ones who need a strong police force the most—less safe and costing the lives of countless Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to vote against this dangerous bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act and to say Black Lives Matter.

I rise for Charleena Lyles, Che Taylor, Manuel Ellis, Tommy Le, Tony McDade, George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Eric Garner, Atatiana Jefferson, Ezell Ford, Tanisha Anderson, Tamir Rice, Walter Scott, Philando Castile, Gabriella Nevarez, Botham Jean.

I rise for all of our Black siblings who have been killed by law enforcement, because there are far too many to say all of their names.

I rise for the Black Lives Matter protestors who were met with aggression, tear gas, and force while White domestic terrorists were met with none of these things.

I rise to answer the call of millions of people led by Black voices who have taken to the streets demanding transformative change.

I rise because that change begins today by once again passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

□ 1845

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our Nation's law enforcement. Blessed are the peacemakers for they will be called children of God.

Mr. Speaker, since last summer, members of law enforcement have faced attacks and dangerous rhetoric, even from Members of this body. As officers put their lives on the line to protect all of us, our communities, and our families, we have seen nothing but

dangerous attempts from the left to defund, dismantle, and disband the police even as we stand here today, surrounded by razor wire, the National Guard and increased police presence to protect you, but you don't want them to protect our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would end qualified immunity. Qualified immunity is only applicable when they follow their training and protocol and protects officers from being personally sued for official actions. If we repeal qualified immunity, we will not find anyone willing to serve as police officers because they can be sued out of everything they own for doing their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not enough, this bill would threaten our officers' physical safety by denying them protective gear and equipment. The Democrats and radical left are going to defund and dismantle departments and take away officers' liability protection for doing their job. Then they are going to take away their physical protection from harm. We will be lucky to have a police force in America in 10 years.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of our many officers in Georgia's Sixth Congressional District, here in the Capitol, and those nationwide who do all that they can to keep our families safe.

They have the trust of their communities and, as a result, are better at ensuring everyone's safety. These officers know the people that they serve. They see them as brothers, sisters, and neighbors. They serve with honor and respect the dignity of every citizen.

This bill is about making sure that every officer and every department is held to the same standard as has been set by the officers in my own district.

Mr. Speaker, by passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, we invest in our departments, end harmful profiling, and provide grants to communities finding new and innovative ways to improve safety.

This bill ensures all of our police officers have the resources to become our very best police officers, and that they are all working to make sure that every single one of us is safer.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, whenever the left takes control of local law enforcement, the result is predictable and catastrophic. They act to defund the police, deliberately withhold police protection from law-abiding shopkeepers and citizens, declare sanctuaries for criminal illegal aliens, decline to charge criminals, and prevent law-abiding citizens from protecting themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we are now suffering the result: skyrocketing homicides, shootings, and other violent crimes, preying most of all upon the decent citizens of our inner cities. Now, after

their summer of love and lawlessness, look at the results. Their storefronts are boarded up. Their buildings are burned out. Their streets are increasingly surrendered to the lawless.

Frankly, the Democrats in Congress that have applauded these policies would not be my first choice to micro-manage every police department across our country as this bill does; just saying.

The ultimate target of the left is not isolated abuses by law enforcement officers but, rather, law enforcement itself. As we can now see, without law enforcement, there is no law.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times the other side says that this bill will defund the police, it does not make it true.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it would be an irresponsible policy to defund the police. We are not for that.

Hear me. You can say it over and over and over again. It will be a lie. No matter how well it serves your political purposes, it will be a lie.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I want to thank Representative BASS and members of the Congressional Black Caucus for their leadership last year and now. I also want to thank my friend, Chairman NADLER, and the Judiciary Committee for their hard work.

I am proud to be an original sponsor. If I thought this defunded the police, I would not be for it. Now, that won't affect you and your debate, I understand that, any more than it affected you in recognizing the legitimacy of the Presidential election.

I am proud to be an original sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, the House passed this bill because we recognized that something had to change. Change could not wait. Change waited too long in the Jim Crow South. Change has waited too long throughout this country—North, East, West, and South.

Mr. Speaker, when we mournfully say the names of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Philando Castile, Freddie Gray, with a list that goes on and on and on and on, enough, my colleagues, enough.

We must change the psychology of how we treat people. I don't mean police alone. I mean all of us, but all of us don't carry guns. All of us have not been given extraordinary authority by the public we serve. Because we give certain people in this country extraordinary authority to take our freedom away and, yes, to take our lives away, we must ensure accountability for the use of that power, just as the voters ought to ensure accountability for the power that they give to us.

When we hear about African American parents having to teach their sons how to act during encounters with police so that they, too, don't become victims, it is time for change. When we

feel the energy of many millions of Americans of every race, every faith, and every age taking peacefully to the streets in protest against injustice, we know that change must come now.

I know how you lament the use of violence. I saw that on January 6.

Mr. Speaker, peaceful demonstrations, Martin Luther King was locked up. Rosa Parks was locked up. For a crime? Of course, Parks sat in the front of the bus. That was illegal. As King said, an illegal law ought not to be obeyed.

Mr. Speaker, they paid the consequences. They had the courage and fortitude to do that.

That is why we took action last year, passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. This legislation addresses police choke holds like the kind that took George Floyd's life. Stand if you can justify that action.

Mr. Speaker, it addresses no-knock warrants like the one that led to the tragic and preventable death of Breonna Taylor. It would condition Federal funding and resources to police departments on ending racial profiling. Content of character, did we not learn that lesson? It is not the color of your skin, the cut of the cloth you wear, or the part in your hair.

Mr. Speaker, we ask them to follow best practices with that power and authority we have given them, best practices in police training that help ensure the rights of those who encounter police, as well as the safety of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also brings justice to victims and their families by facilitating, under appropriate circumstances, their ability to seek redress of grievances.

This bill is not only intended to protect people who encounter the police, but it is meant to help keep police safe as well, to help them do the difficult job of keeping their communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this body, I think I can safely say, who has attended more frequently the annual National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund ceremony. I am local, but I dare say that no Member in this body has attended that more frequently, been more supportive of law enforcement, or been more supportive of my local sheriffs and police departments. They are critically important. Of course, we don't want to defund them. We have to have a safe society if democracy is going to prevail. That is why we have law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from so many law enforcement officials who are deeply concerned about misconduct and racial bias in policing, just as each one of us ought to be concerned about a politician who commits a crime. Why? It reflects on all of us. All of those politicians are crooks. Somebody out there is saying amen.

That is why this is important, because there are so many hundreds of thousands of honest, hardworking, courageous, dedicated police officers, sheriffs, and constables in this country.

Mr. Speaker, most police officers are good and decent men and women, serving with honor. They want to know that their ranks are free from those who would apply bias and sow mistrust that endangers their and their colleagues' safety. This is just the beginning of a larger effort to reform policing, which will require the Senate and White House to work with us to ensure that victims of misconduct and their families get the justice they deserve, while police departments have the support, the funding, if you will, they need to keep our communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, when we passed this bill last year, the Republican-controlled Senate refused even to consider it. They were in charge. They put no bill of their own on the floor. I apologize. I retract that. Mr. JORDAN is correct.

Now, however, with this Democratic Senate majority, I hope I can see action, work with Senator SCOTT, and come to a resolution, because this problem will not go away if we don't help it. We will not save lives if we don't act.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is a top priority for Senate Democrats, as well as for President Biden and Vice President Harris. So, I hope that we will not only see the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act pass the House today but also be signed into law this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is a necessary bill to respond to a crisis throughout our country, certainly not by every member of law enforcement, but by the minority of law enforcement officers, just as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are a credit to the service in this House, not all, but the overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this bill. Let's act for justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to each other.

□ 1900

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader just said: Enough, my colleagues, enough.

I couldn't agree more.

Last summer, Democrats called for unrest in the streets. They raised bail money for rioters. They called antifa a myth. They voted and pushed for defunding the police all across this country.

Guess what? When you call for unrest in the streets while there is unrest in the streets, guess what happens?

You get more unrest in the streets.

When you raise money to bail out rioters, guess what happens?

You get more rioters.

When you call antifa a myth, guess what happens?

You get more attacks on property and on people.

Guess what also happens when you call for defunding the police?

You get more crime.

And when you fail to condemn violence—all violence, whether it happens on January 6 or last summer—you get more violence.

Everyone understands that. Everyone should understand that, but it seems Democrats don't.

We had a bill in the House, just like Senator SCOTT's bill, and Representative STAUBER was the sponsor. Last year, when we had a markup, we offered 12 amendments in committee. They wouldn't take any of them. Some of the amendments, the Democrats actually supported them. But nope, nope, got to be this bill.

They didn't want to work with us to deal with the real concern, because we all know what happened to Mr. Floyd was as wrong as wrong could be. We were willing to work, but, no, they wouldn't take any of our amendments and said the things they said last summer. We should work together on this, but they don't want to. They don't want to do it.

They want their own bill. They don't want Republicans to vote for it. They want to play politics. We would actually like to solve the problem. We would actually like to solve the problem.

You know what else happens when you call for defunding the police?

The police retire. There is a 72 percent increase in retirement of police officers in New York City alone. Think of what it is like around the country. That is what happens when you send the message that Democrats sent all last summer. It is wrong. We shouldn't stand for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, Officer Tiffany-Victoria Enriquez, Officer Kaulike Kalama, Sheriff Sheldon Gordon Whiteman, Officer Katherine Mary Thyne, I could go on and on 113 times with the names of law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty, who were killed last year in 2020—113.

And we are on the floor of the House of Representatives with a bill gutting the qualified immunity that helps protect our law enforcement officers without so much as a hearing, without so much as coming back to talk to us and work with us since last June.

Why?

Because this is all political. This is all political.

We talk about defunding. I am from Austin, Texas; \$150 million cut from the police budget there.

And what did my Democrat colleagues do last Friday?

Jammed through \$500 billion for State and local governments, funding the very Democratic cities that are gutting our law enforcement officers, taking away what they need to be able to exist.

And with what happened in Austin, a 50 percent increase in murder rate. We lost the greatest cadet class we had.

This bill is a sham. We should oppose it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times Republicans may say the contrary, Democrats have never called for defunding the police.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, we respect every single officer who has died in the line of duty.

The question is: Why don't you respect those Black and Latino individuals who were shot in the back, choked to death, beaten nearly unconscious, or have a knee to the neck, strangling the life out of them for 8 minutes and 46 seconds? Why don't you respect them?

That is what the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is all about.

We respect police officers, those who protect and serve; but we have a challenge with police violence, police brutality. The police abuse of force cannot be denied, video after video after video. Don't believe us, believe your own eyes.

Thirty years ago, Rodney King was beaten on this very day, and we thought it would be different. But 30 years later, nothing has changed in terms of accountability and reining in those officers who cross the line.

It is time to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, and do it now.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, this bill ignores the harm that anti-law enforcement rhetoric and unchecked violence have inflicted on our communities and our police.

Since last year, we have seen businesses and communities terrorized, burned, and looted by criminal gangs and thugs, while some elected officials justified the violence, called for defunding the police, and moved to tie the hands of law enforcement. In essence, lawlessness prevailed and accountability failed. This legislation doubles down on that failed policy.

In my home State of Wisconsin, we watched city officials in Madison, Kenosha, and Milwaukee stand by as violent rioters destroyed property, monuments, shops, and livelihoods. Sheriffs in my home State tell me they are having significant retention and recruiting issues. This will only exacerbate that. It is a back door to the misguided defund the police efforts. Defunding the police does not make the police safer.

Mr. Speaker, this bill empowers criminals, while stripping cops of the tools they need to do their jobs and due process guaranteed to them by the Constitution. It exposes law enforcement officers and their families to potential retribution by criminals.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I, like so many in my community of Minneapolis, are still traumatized. I watched horrified for 8 minutes and 46 seconds as George Floyd's life was

taken from him, another innocent Black man murdered by the police in our community.

Time and time again, we have witnessed the people who are sworn to protect our communities abuse their power. My city is not an outlier, but, rather, an example of the inequalities our country has struggled with for centuries. Brutality against unarmed Black men and women is not a new phenomenon.

Today, we find ourselves at a crossroad. Will we have the moral courage to pursue justice and secure meaningful change? Or will we succumb to this moment?

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH).

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again: about to vote on a divisive bill being pushed through by the majority without any Republican input. Disguised as accountability, this bill hinders law enforcement's ability to do their jobs, limits the readiness of law enforcement, and demonizes an entire profession for the actions of a few.

A bill from my Minnesota colleague, Mr. STAUBER, a former police officer himself, accomplishes many of the aims of this bill before us today, and has bipartisan support from the stakeholders involved; but Democrats rejected it, picking partisanship over real reform to help and improve law enforcement.

We do not deny there is work to be done, but the path to getting it done is working together to ensure that law enforcement developed the necessary tools to keep our communities safe and protect the rights of people they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and to work on a bill that will really help law enforcement and the citizens.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, any man's death diminishes me. We will never forget, the world will never forget, as we watched as a police officer knelt on George Floyd's neck for more than 8 minutes.

George Floyd cried out for his mother, saying "Mama, mama, mama, mama, mama, mama, mama, I can't breathe. I love you. Tell my kids I love them. I am dead."

As he was murdered by an officer sworn to protect and serve, Americans of all races and backgrounds flooded the streets all across this Nation, demanding long overdue accountability so that no one has to live in fear of the police.

They demanded that we recognize George Floyd's death and the deaths of so many others at the hands of the police. These killings have left the Black community and, much more importantly, our entire community trauma-

tized and scared. Wounds cannot heal without accountability.

This is not an anti-police bill. The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is for Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, Breonna Taylor, Elijah McClain, and so many more.

Any man's death diminishes me.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280 and defunding the police.

When vandalism and violence plagued cities across the country last summer, our law enforcement officers were the thin blue line protecting us. The violence reached communities from New York City to Portland. It even hit places in my district, and we saw our local law enforcement act heroically.

Unfortunately, as both the son and father of law enforcement officials, this bill is a step in the wrong direction. The bill substantially reduces due process for police officers, restricts access to needed equipment, and makes it more difficult to get critical funding.

Our law enforcement officers need more funding, not less. More funding will help our officers get additional training to deescalate conflicts and get more equipment to keep all parties safe. Instead of focusing on how we can help the police build trust in the communities, this bill focuses on how we can take from the police.

Clearly, the bill is designed to satisfy those that seek to defund and dismantle the police. None of this bill serves to build trust between law enforcement and their communities. Like every occupation, law enforcement has bad apples that must be held accountable.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee, for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

I commend Congresswoman KAREN BASS for her great leadership in this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, nearly 1 year ago, George Floyd gasped his last words, "I can't breathe," and ignited a nationwide reckoning on the racial injustice and police brutality in America.

Americans from every corner of the country took to the streets to peacefully protest violence against Black Americans: waving Black Lives Matter flags, chanting the names of the murdered, repeating George Floyd's dying words, "I can't breathe." They turned their agony into action.

But, tragically, despite these mass protests, the injustice, the killing, continues. Those protests were global. They were all over the world.

Here, as Members of Congress, and as Americans, we cannot accept this epidemic of injustice. We cannot stay silent when our most vulnerable and historically marginalized communities—people of color, those living in poverty, Americans with disabilities—are being targeted and sometimes killed.

That is why today the House will again pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act and send it to the Senate and the President's desk, so that it can finally become the law of the land.

□ 1915

I salute Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who has been relentless, persistent, and absolutely courageous in her leadership on this legislation. I thank the Congressional Black Caucus and its chairperson, JOYCE BEATTY; and Judiciary chair, JERRY NADLER.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act fundamentally transforms the culture of policing with strong, unprecedented reform. This legislation will not erase centuries of systemic racism and excessive policing in America. It will not bring back George Floyd, Breonna Taylor—say her name, Breonna Taylor—Ahmaud Arbery, or the countless other men and women who died or were senselessly injured. But it will take a tremendous step forward to stop the violence, stem the suffering, and start to build a healthier and better relationship between law enforcement and communities that they protect.

All of us here salute and are profoundly grateful for our law enforcement heroes. I grew up in a public service family. My father, my whole life at home, was the mayor of Baltimore. My brother was mayor later, Thomas D'Alesandro, in Baltimore. They had a motto about the police: Be true to the men in blue.

Of course, this was a long time ago. Be true to the men in blue. I was raised with that respect.

But then, prayerfully, these people, our men and women—now men and women—in uniform, whether they are police or fire, but addressing police here, our first responders left home when they left to go to work, not knowing, and their families not knowing, if they would return home because they were risking their lives to save lives and to protect all of us. So it was with great prayerful gratitude to most of the men and women in blue that we, sadly, have to say that our appreciation for them cannot lapse into apathy or acceptance of actions that are fundamentally incompatible with the purpose of policing.

Of course, there is not anyone on our side of the aisle who has advocated any policy in this body to defund the police, contrary to misrepresentations that are coming forth. All of us here, again, salute and are profoundly grateful for our law enforcement heroes.

As the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives writes:

The passage of this act is paramount in achieving the fundamental principle of a police force that "protects and serves" every

citizen of their community with fairness, accountability, and transparency in their actions.

The Democratic Congress, together with the Biden-Harris administration, is committed to not only ensuring that this legislation becomes law, but to take further action to end violence and advance justice in America. Let us ensure that the passage of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is the first of many steps in this direction.

The family of George Floyd, who came here when the bill was being reviewed by Chairman NADLER's committee, asked me: Madam Speaker, will you name this bill for our brother?

His brother asked that question. The gentleman remembers that day. We couldn't be in the committee room because of COVID.

I said: Only if you think it is worthy of your brother.

I think of George Floyd at least once a day and sometimes more.

Do you know why?

Not just because of the sadness of it all, but I think of him because they tell us that, in order to be safe from COVID, we must wash our hands for 20 seconds. So as I'm washing my hands for 20 seconds, after about 8 or 9 seconds, I am thinking that this is taking forever; I can't do this for 20 seconds; it takes too long. Then I think of George Floyd—8 minutes and 46 seconds. It is a long time. It is a long time, as Congresswoman DEAN said, calling out for his mother and extending love to his family.

Let us ensure that George's brother, Philonise, when he said that George's name means something; and that as his daughter, Gianna, said, "Daddy changed the world," with this legislation, let us take an important step in changing the world for George's family, for all communities of color, for all Americans, and for the whole world.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote in the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, and I thank KAREN BASS, again, for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, nearly one year ago, George Floyd gasped his last words—"I can't breathe"—and ignited a nationwide reckoning on the racial injustice and police brutality in America.

Americans from every corner of the country took to the streets to peacefully protest violence against Black Americans: waving Black Lives Matter flags, chanting the names of the murdered, repeating George Floyd's dying words.

They turned their agony into action, but tragically, despite these mass protests, the injustice—the killing—continues.

Last year, 1,127 people were killed by police, far more than in the year before. In the months following George Floyd's murder, 645 people were killed—and hundreds more were attacked and assaulted, including Jacob Blake: shot seven times in the back in front of his three children.

As George Floyd's brother Philonise recently said, "As a Black man in the United States, I want to be able to go outside and protest, because at this time, I don't know who is going to survive or not."

As Members of Congress and as Americans, we cannot accept this epidemic of injustice. We cannot stay silent, when our most vulnerable and historically marginalized communities—people of color, those living in poverty, Americans with disabilities—are being targeted and killed.

That is why, today, the House will again pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act—and send it to the Senate and the President's desk, so that it can finally become law.

I salute Congresswoman KAREN BASS, who has been relentless, persistent and absolutely courageous in her leadership on this legislation. Thank you to the CBC and Chair JOYCE BEATTY, and Judiciary Chair JERRY NADLER.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act fundamentally transforms the culture of policing with strong, unprecedented reforms, including: banning chokeholds; stopping no-knock warrants; ending the court-created qualified immunity doctrine; combating racial profiling; and establishing strong new standards and protections to prevent and combat police misconduct.

This legislation will not erase centuries of systemic racism and excessive policing in America.

It will not bring back George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery or the countless other men and women who died or were senselessly injured.

But it will take a tremendous step forward to stop the violence, stem the suffering and start to build a healthier, better relationship between law enforcement and the communities that they protect.

All of us here salute and are profoundly grateful for our law enforcement heroes. But our appreciation cannot lapse into apathy or acceptance of actions that are fundamentally incompatible with the purpose of policing.

As the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives writes, "The passage of this act is paramount in achieving the fundamental principle of a police force that 'protects and serves' every citizen of their community, with fairness, accountability and transparency in their actions."

The Democratic Congress, together with the Biden-Harris Administration, is committed to not only ensuring that this legislation becomes law—but to taking further action to end violence and advance justice in America.

Let us ensure that the passage of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is the first of many steps in this mission.

And let us ensure that, as George's brother said, "George's name means something"; and that, as his daughter Gianna said, "Daddy changed the world."

With this legislation, let us take a small step to "changing the world"—for George's family, for all communities of color, and for all Americans.

With that, I urge a strong, bipartisan vote for the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I will just point out that the Speaker of the House said we should respect the police, but the Speaker of the House named an individual to conduct a review of the breach of the Capitol on January 6, and that individual has insulted the very police who protect us.

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

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1280.

Do you know what is terrifying to the American people?

Watching Democrats try to pass a defund the police bill; the same Democrats who cheered on and supported riots that burned American cities, and the same Democrats who shared Minnesota Freedom Fund bail bond links supporting criminals and helping them get out of jail.

This bill is atrocious. Shame on all of you. This hurts our police officers.

April 29, 2010, my friend, Jonathan Edwards, was shot in the line of duty. If that happened today and this bill is passed, getting rid of qualified immunity allows the criminal who shot him to be able to sue him simply because they are upset that they were arrested.

This same bill will also allow that criminal who shot him to be able to put his name on a national hit list that will be made public, whether police officers are found to have done wrong or not.

This is shameful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. OMAR). Members are reminded to direct remarks to the Chair and not each other.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is a critical step towards ensuring a country where Black people are treated as equal citizens, not just in theory, but in real life. This bill weaves into our laws the truism that Black Lives Matter. This bill will help build trust between law enforcement and the communities that they are sworn to protect and serve.

"Equal Justice Under the Law" may be etched atop the entrance to this Nation's highest court, but it is not a privilege enjoyed by each of us. We must act now to ensure that we protect the humanity of every person. Stand up for the principle of equal justice for all.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to vote "yes" for the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, the death of George Floyd last year led to communities across the Nation to come together to speak out against injustices, call for additional accountability and transparency in policing, and advocate for solutions that could move us forward together as a nation.

But instead of working with Republicans to find a bipartisan solution, the Democrat majority has, once again, written a partisan bill to ram through the House with no committee markup,

no open amendments, and no meaningful bipartisan collaboration. That is not what the American people sent us here to do.

This legislation will impede the ability of good police officers to do their jobs effectively and uphold the rule of law. Our dedicated police officers who serve our communities work tirelessly to ensure that lawlessness does not prevail in our streets and neighborhoods.

The effect of this bill on law enforcement is to levy unfunded mandates on local governments, force law enforcement to leave the profession, and, yes, defund the police.

Madam Speaker, as you said, defund the police is not a slogan, but a policy demand.

Madam Speaker, I will vote “no” on this, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California, KAREN BASS, for her leadership; as well as the Congressional Black Caucus for always speaking truth to power.

Madam Speaker, today we take a stride towards ending racism in policing. But this is just the beginning. We must recognize that systemic racism extends well beyond law enforcement. Systemic racism is the way governments have deliberately impoverished Black families, then condition necessary medical care on our ability to pay.

It is the way we fund our public schools, a property tax-based system that concentrates tens of billions more dollars in White communities than in Black and Brown communities.

In America, it is the way we run our elections, purging Black voters, especially in Southern States, from the rolls and closing the polls in Black neighborhoods. We can't stop until we have eradicated systemic racism in all of its forms.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the insidious and false pretext for this legislation endangers and ends lives. The bill rests on a false premise and promotes a false narrative that police are racists and use their power to advance racist ends. This narrative is a false and despicable slander.

Police officers do not leave their loved ones and risk their own lives every shift to oppress or discriminate. They do it to serve. They do it without fanfare and for little pay, and they have come to anticipate abuse in place of the respect that they deserve. They do it to save lives.

But the reckless “defund the police” rhetoric behind this legislation is forcing

police to retreat and to leave the vulnerable at the mercy of those who prey upon them.

Madam Speaker, you should run from that rhetoric, as you are. Madam Speaker, you called the police “rotten to the root” and called for it to be “dismantled.”

That rhetoric is killing people. Please stop the political games. Stop slandering law enforcement, and stop endangering our communities. Back the blue.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, no matter how many times Republicans say that this bill defunds the police, it doesn't change the fact that it does not defund the police.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH).

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, first of all, we shouldn't be talking about good police and bad police. There should just be police who are doing their job to serve and protect the people. So let's make that clear.

There is no such thing as good police. There is no good nursing. When you go get food, you don't go look for: This place has a good chef; this one has the bad chef; I am going to go where the bad chef is.

We don't need this good police/bad police. We need police if we are going to have police. But I will move on.

Madam Speaker, St. Louis and I rise on behalf of the more than 788 people who have been killed by law enforcement over the last year. We rise 30 years to the day after the ruthless beating of Rodney King. We rise in honor of Breonna Taylor, who was brutally gunned down by police in her home last March. We rise for George Floyd and all those who have been killed by police since his torture and murder.

Those names: William Burgess, Mark Brewer, Dion Johnson, Tony McDade, Rayshard Brooks, Modesto Reyes, Ruben Smith, David McAtee, Kamal Flowers, Robert Harris, Joseph Denton, Vincent Truitt, Sincere Pierce, Jeremy Southern, Angelo Crooms, and Amir Johnson.

Madam Speaker, St. Louis and I rise on behalf of the more than 788 people who have been killed by law enforcement over the last year. We rise 30 years to the day after the ruthless beating of Rodney King. We rise in honor of Breonna Taylor who was brutally gunned down by police in her home last March.

We rise for George Floyd and all those who've been killed by police since his torture and murder:

1. William Burgess III
2. Mark Brewer
3. Dion Johnson
4. Tony McDade
5. Rayshard Brooks
6. Modesto Reyes
7. Ruben Smith III
8. Jarvis Sullivan
9. David McAtee
10. Kamal Flowers
11. Michael Thomas
12. Robert Harris

13. Rasheed Moorman
14. Ky Johnson
15. Kevan Ruffin
16. Joseph Denton
17. The more than 100 people whose names have been withheld by police
18. Erroll Johnson
19. Malik Canty
20. Richard Price
21. Hakim Littleton
22. Vincent Truitt
23. Aaron Hudson
24. Darius Washington
25. Vincent Harris
26. Jeremy Southern
27. David Brooks Jr.
28. Darrien Walker
29. Ashton Broussard
30. Amir Johnson
31. Julian Lewis
32. Rafael Minniefield
33. Kendrell Watkins
34. Anthony McClain
35. Adrian Roberts
36. Trayford Pellerin
37. Damian Daniels
38. Michael Harris
39. Name withheld by police
40. Robert Jackson
41. Dijon Kizzee
42. Deon Kay
43. Steven D. Smith
44. Major Carvel Baldwin
45. Steve Gilbert
46. Jonathan Darsaw
47. Robert Coleman
48. Caine Van Pelt
49. Darrell Zemault Sr.
50. Aloysius Keaton
51. Charles Eric Moses Jr.
52. Dearian Bell
53. Kurt Reinhold
54. Salaythis Melvin
55. Willie Shropshire Jr.
56. DeMarco Riley
57. Jonathan Price
58. Tyran Dent
59. Momodou Lamin Sisay
60. Stanley Cochran
61. Anthony Jones
62. Kevin Carr
63. Brandon Gardner
64. Donald Ward
65. Terron Jammal Boone
66. Skyleur Young
67. Dana Mitchell Young Jr.
68. Fred Williams III
69. Akbar Muhammad Eaddy
70. Dominique Mulkey
71. Marcellis Stinnette
72. Rodney Arnez Barnes
73. Gregory Jackson
74. Mark Matthew Bender
75. Ennice “Lil Rocc” Ross Jr.
76. Jakerion Shmond Jackson
77. Walter Wallace Jr.
78. Maurice Parker
79. Kevin Peterson Jr.
80. Name withheld by police
81. Justin Reed
82. Reginald Alexander Jr.
83. Tutuila Pine Koonwaiyou
84. Fredrick Cox Jr.
85. Rodney Eubanks
86. Brandon Milburn
87. Sincere Pierce
88. Angelo “AJ” Crooms
89. Tracey Leon McKinney
90. Name withheld by police
91. Shane K. Jones
92. Shawn Lequin Braddy
93. Javon Brice
94. Kenneth Jones
95. Rodney Applewhite
96. Rondell Goppy
97. Ellis Frye Jr.
98. Terrell Mitchell
99. Mickee McArthur

100. James David Hawley
101. Julius Paye Kehyei
102. Kevin Fox
103. Dominique Harris
104. Andre K. Sterling
105. Casey Christopher Goodson Jr.
106. Kwamaine O'Neal
107. Donald Edwin Saunders
108. Joshua Feast
109. Bennie Edwards
110. Charles E. Jones
111. Jeremy Maurice Daniels
112. Larry Taylor
113. Andre Maurice Hill
114. Sheikh Mustafa Davis
115. Shamar Ogman
116. Marquavious Rashod Parks
117. Larry Hamm
118. Jaquan Haynes
119. Jason Cooper
120. Dolal Idd
121. Carl Dorsey III
122. Tre-Kedrian Tyquan White
123. La Garion Smith
124. Vincent Belmonte
125. Robert "Lil Rob" Howard
126. Matthew Oxendine
127. Jason Nightengale
128. Patrick Warren Sr.
129. Heba Momtaz Alazhari
130. Lymond Maurice Moses
131. Kershawen Geiger
132. Zonterious Johnson
133. Christopher Harris
134. Eusi Malik Kater Jr.
135. Tyree Kajawn Rogers
136. Roger D. Hipskind
137. Karl Walker
138. Marvon Payton Jr.
139. Chazz Halley
140. Patches Vojon Holmes Jr.
141. Treyh Webster
142. Dontae Green
143. Andrew Hogan
144. Dustin Demaurean Powell
145. Gregory Taylor
146. Joe Louis Castellanos
147. Robert Avitia
148. John Alvarado
149. Name withheld by police
150. Rommel Mendoza
151. Jorge Gomez
152. Sean Monterrosa
153. Eric Anthony Galvan
154. Erik Salgado
155. Juan Carlos Alvarez
156. Anthony Angel Armenta
157. Andres Guardado
158. Michael Kristopher Torres
159. Kevin Pulido
160. Martin Humberto Sanchez Fregoso
161. Leonardo Hurtado Ibarra
162. Nick Costales
163. James "Jay" Porter Garcia
164. Axel Perez
165. Carlos Baires
166. Name withheld by police
167. Antonio Mancinone
168. Julio Jaramillo
169. Cristhian Eliud Ramos-Murillo
170. Julio Cesar Virula
171. Ray Adrian Lara
172. Gabriel Salinas
173. Ramon Timothy Lopez
174. Roberto Hernandez Jr.
175. Name withheld by police
176. Ryan Shane Hinojo
177. Americo C. Reyes Jr.
178. Jose Vallejos
179. Name withheld by police
180. Daniel Rivera
181. Ronnie Kong
182. Jose Manuel Castro
183. Santos Anthony Villegas
184. Everardo Gonzalez Santana
185. Marco Antonio Sigala Jr.
186. Samuel Mata
187. Cesar Sanchez Ruiz
188. Name withheld by police
189. Jesus Alvarez Pulido
190. Julio Cesar Moran-Ruiz
191. Jesse David Nava
192. Miguel Vega
193. Marco Antonio Benito
194. Christopher Escobedo
195. Ricardo Miguel Munoz
196. Name withheld by police
197. Victor Sanchez
198. Angel Benitez
199. Isaiah Pama
200. Name withheld by police
201. Jason Rodriguez
202. Diego Eguino-Alcala
203. Juan Adrian Garcia
204. Nick Burgos
205. Douglas Sanchez
206. Cesar Vargas
207. Matthew Montoya
208. Jose Marcos Ramirez
209. Miguel A. Nevarez Jr.
210. Yoel Arnaldo Mejia Santel
211. Edwin Morales
212. Alberto Rivas
213. Jose Alfredo Castro-Gutierrez
214. Emmett Cocreham
215. George Cocreham
216. Francisco Danny Flores
217. Daniel Angel Villalobos-Baldovinos
218. Marc Nevarez
219. Name withheld by police
220. Charles Robert Arviso
221. Justin Esqueda
222. Rodolfo "Rudy" Martinez-Cortez
223. Luis Robert Zaragoza Barbosa
224. Augustine Morales
225. Pedro Martinez
226. Anthony Arias
227. Stavian Rodriguez
228. Nicolas Segura
229. Michael Anthony Pena
230. Adam Lee Mendez
231. Dolores Hernandez
232. Christian Juarez
233. Evelia Rivera
234. Luis Manuel Vasquez Gomez
235. Reno E. Casanova
236. Andrew Mansilla
237. Leonel Salinas
238. Paul Peraza
239. Christopher Cuevas
240. Name withheld by police
241. Jesus Perez
242. Bryan Cruz-Soto
243. Rodolfo Caraballo Moreno
244. Frank Gonzales
245. David Tovar Jr.
246. Felix Santos
247. Omar Felix Cueva
248. Josue Drumond-Cruz
249. Edwin Adan Velasquez
250. Juan Carlos Pena-Noda
251. Erick Mejia
252. Henry Barnes Jr.
253. Brandon R. Laducer
254. Antonio Black Bear
255. Nicholas Morales-Bessannia
256. Cole F. Stump
257. Trifton Stacy Wacoche
258. Ernie Teddy Serrano
259. Caillen Paoakea Gentzler
260. Peter K. England
261. Christian Hall
262. Reyamar Gagarin
263. John A. Vik
264. Gary P. Dorton
265. Justin Mink
266. Name withheld by police
267. Kenneth Bennett
268. Alexander Scott
269. Name withheld by police
270. James Pharr
271. Gerard John
272. Ray Lee Jim
273. Gregory Lee Turnure
274. Donald L. Hunter
275. Jeffrey McClure
276. Michael Seltzer
277. Richard L. Mason
278. Phillip Dibenedetto
279. Jerry M. Bethel
280. Tiffany T. Bingham
281. Brandeis Codde
282. Name withheld by police
283. David Guillen
284. Jason James Kruzic
285. Robert Wenman
286. Matthew L. Fox
287. Julie Colon
288. Louis Lane
289. Lance Bowman
290. Kevin Lee Catlett
291. Name withheld by police
292. Doug Diamond
293. Rodney Liveringhouse
294. Name withheld by police
295. Name withheld by police
296. Taylor Christian Warner aka Tylor Warner
297. Joey Hoffman
298. Eduardo Martinez
299. Kanavis Dujuan Glass
300. Daniel Matheson
301. Michael Joseph Culbertson
302. Marcos Reyes
303. Rodney Morrison
304. Arlan Kaleb Schultz
305. Glynn Farse Young
306. Antwane Burrise
307. Name withheld by police
308. Malcolm Comeaux
309. Grant King
310. David Angulo
311. Deborah White
312. Name withheld by police
313. Name withheld by police
314. Dane Norris
315. Samuel Solomon Cochran Jr.
316. Jacob Wilbur Wright
317. Jason Matthew Henke
318. Winston Joseph Latour III
319. Giovanni Cedano-Amaro
320. Juan Rene Hummel Jr.
321. Gary Hardy Jr.
322. Colin E. Davis
323. William Sears
324. Ronald Pope
325. Cryus D. Carpenter
326. Name withheld by police
327. Melissa Halda
328. Christopher Lawings
329. Andrew S. Gwynn
330. Name withheld by police
331. Name withheld by police
332. Anthony Budduke
333. Name withheld by police
334. Donald Anderson
335. Robert Land
336. Lyana Gilmore
337. Name withheld by police
338. Name withheld by police
339. Donald Timothy Miller
340. Name withheld by police
341. Fred John Henry Arcera
342. Name withheld by police
343. Trevor Edwards
344. Ronald Stuart Chipman
345. Name withheld by police
346. Hasani Best
347. Christopher Walker
348. Mark Dawson Jr.
349. Gearil Leonard Williams
350. Corey Lee Cutler
351. Name withheld by police
352. Charles Garland
353. Casper Brown
354. Kurt Phelps
355. Arthur Zalman Ferrel
356. Fernando Napoles
357. Shaon Jermy Ochea Walker
358. Verlon Billy Stiles
359. Refugio Reynaldo Olivo
360. Matthew Patton
361. Samuel Herrera Jr.
362. Robert Samuel Craig Lusk

363. Joshua Clayton Brant
364. Name withheld by police
365. Derek Cooper
366. Julia Anne Moss
367. Randy Fedorchuk
368. Jessie A. Hudnall
369. Name withheld by police
370. James Lucachevitz
371. Kirby Joseph Michael Hengel
372. Name withheld by police
373. Mickel Erich Lewis Sr.
374. John Aycoth
375. Austin Manzano
376. Christopher Ulmer
377. Andrew A. Williams
378. Chester McDonald
379. Justin Caldwell
380. Ariel Esau Lujan
381. Shawn Campbell
382. Name withheld by police
383. Name withheld by police
384. Jason Edward Galliard
385. Name withheld by police
386. Name withheld by police
387. Name withheld by police
388. Ethan Freeman
389. Paul Sulkowski
390. Joey Hoffman
391. Name withheld by police
392. Name withheld by police
393. Steven Belville
394. Keith Beecroft
395. Name withheld by police
396. Michael Nichols
397. Name withheld by police
398. Name withheld by police
399. John Lipski
400. Name withheld by police
401. Bruce Allan Shumaker
402. Michael K. Nelson
403. Clifton Gorman Spencer
404. Brandon Keith Davis
405. Matthew Daniel Johnston
406. Jason S. Cline
407. Thomas Celona
408. Caleb Slay
409. Name withheld by police
410. Jason Neo Bourne
411. Name withheld by police
412. John Wesley Seymour
413. Name withheld by police
414. Name withheld by police
415. Name withheld by police
416. Javier Magana
417. David Viveros
418. Steven Campos
419. Rodriguez Duandre Pam
420. Terry David Fox
421. Name withheld by police
422. Ronny Dunning
423. Daniel David Reyes
424. Vusumuzi Kunene
425. Daron Jones
426. Chris Mellon
427. Eric Lyn Clark
428. Henry Frankowski
429. Name withheld by police
430. Name withheld by police
431. Name withheld by police
432. Christina Markwell
433. Name withheld by police
434. Terrell Smith
435. Duane Scott Murray
436. Peter Russell
437. Jordan D. Patterson
438. Name withheld by police
439. Douglas Hatfield
440. Name withheld by police
441. Nicholas Cory Kausshen
442. Name withheld by police
443. Lorenzo Aguilar
444. Name withheld by police
445. Alonzo Leroy Landy
446. Cory Donell Truxillo
447. Name withheld by police
448. Maurice Jackson
449. Larry Eugene Boyd
450. Nancy King
451. Randy Ward
452. Name withheld by police
453. Estavon Dominic Eliooff
454. Name withheld by police
455. Thomas Reeder III
456. Nathaniel Sironen
457. Brad Tyler Masters
458. Joseph R. Crawford
459. Whitney J. Crawley
460. Kurtis Kay Frevert
461. Earl Robert Caperton
462. Name withheld by police
463. Name withheld by police
464. Name withheld by police
465. Joseph Evans
466. Name withheld by police
467. Johnny Bolton
468. Tyquarn Graves
469. Nicholas Ellingson
470. Name withheld by police
471. Name withheld by police
472. Daniel Russell
473. Name withheld by police
474. Mark Clermont
475. Michael Brandon Joyner
476. Name withheld by police
477. Helen Jones
478. Name withheld by police
479. Name withheld by police
480. Alaina Burns
481. Shyheed Robert Boyd
482. Samuel Lorenzo
483. Jeffrey Marvin
484. Name withheld by police
485. Isaac Matheney
486. Name withheld by police
487. Micahel Romo
488. Name withheld by police
489. Jose Guzman
490. Alexander Gonzales
491. Benicio Vasquez
492. Jacob Ryan McDuff
493. Kwamena Ocran
494. Charles Edward Williams
495. Paul Bolden
496. Xzavier D. Hill
497. Mark Bivins
498. Allen Mirzayan
499. Joseph W. Howell
500. Name withheld by police
501. Antonio Carbajal
502. Gary Rodriguez Jr.
503. Name withheld by police
504. Reginald Johnson
505. Name withheld by police
506. Name withheld by police
507. Daniel Young
508. Daniel Canales Jr.
509. Robert Laudell Bull
510. Bradley Alexander Lewis
511. Name withheld by police
512. Name withheld by police
513. Harmony Wolfram
514. Name withheld by police
515. Javier Magdaleno
516. Kenneth Michael Dallas
517. Name withheld by police
518. Ezekiel Meza
519. Franklin Gray
520. Kevin Hayes
521. Andrew Scott Kislek
522. Name withheld by police
523. Joshua Crites
524. Name withheld by police
525. Anthony Andrew Reunart
526. Name withheld by police
527. Name withheld by police
528. Name withheld by police
529. Kevin Costlow
530. Dennis Denham
531. Anthony Greco
532. Keenan Sailer
533. Brooke Leann Blair
534. Brian Gregory Scott
535. Demarko Montez Henderson
536. Cortez Lee Bogon
537. Name withheld by police
538. Jacob Aaron Thomas
539. Jonathan Turner
540. Name withheld by police
541. Name withheld by police
542. Name withheld by police
543. Adam Bruce Connors
544. Phillip N. Davenport
545. Bruce Diehl
546. Name withheld by police
547. Name withheld by police
548. Name withheld by police
549. Richard Councilman
550. Tracy Drowne
551. John Allen Dunaway III
552. Jason Jesse Gallegos
553. Channing Lamar Spivey
554. Joshua Blessed aka Sergei Jourev
555. Steven Edward Ferguson
556. Sarah Grossman
557. Robert Anthony “Jordan” Whitehead
558. John Benedict Coleman
559. Name withheld by police
560. Caleb Rule
561. Israel Berry
562. Thomas Jeffery Sutherland
563. Ryan Emblem Moore
564. Robert James Lyon
565. Scott Hutton
566. Mary Lawrence
567. Gregory W. Hallback
568. Benjamin Ballard
569. Jarrid Hurst
570. Morgan James Davis
571. Marcus James Uribe
572. Mason James Lira
573. Gregorio Cruz Vanloo
574. William Slyter
575. Hannah R. Fizer
576. Nicholas Hirsch
577. Troy Willey
578. Keith William Brunelle
579. Jack Harry
580. David Lee Jacobs
581. Kellen Fortune
582. Buddy Edward Weeks
583. Cody W. Cook
584. Sabastian S. Noel
585. Benjamin Paul Brooks
586. Aaron Wesley Keller
587. Bonnie Jo Figueroa-Ortiz
588. Michael Pelley
589. James Tober Sr.
590. John Parks
591. Wade Russell Meisberger
592. Brittany S. Teichroeb
593. Jason Noble Snow
594. Wade Protus Phillips
595. Constantin Filan
596. Erick Gilmore
597. Paul Eugene Armstrong
598. Adam Lucas Carroll
599. Kevin Michael Norton
600. Terena Nicole Thurman
601. Sean Ernest Ruis
602. Tim O’Shea
603. Tyler Blevens
604. Name withheld by police
605. Chase Rountree
606. Name withheld by police
607. Kyle Elrod
608. Scott M. Kontowicz
609. John Karl Sieger
610. Christopher Poor
611. Andrew Jacob Preece
612. Howard Owens
613. James Justin Munro Jr.
614. Russell Van Liddell
615. Adrean Stephenson
616. Christopher Kimmons Craven
617. David Lee Rigg
618. David James Pruitte
619. Nicholas Kocolis
620. Jeffrey Scott Haarsrma
621. Johnathan Randell
622. Aaron Michael Griffin
623. Matthew Hilbelink
624. Earl Barton Jr.
625. Chris Minor
626. Joshua Squires

627. Kenneth Reiss
 628. Joshua Gay
 629. Rick Lee Miller
 630. Jeffrey Hubbard
 631. Thomas Moles
 632. Jimmy Ferrer
 633. Keith Allen Fileger
 634. Erik Jon Perez
 635. Jack Lamar Harris
 636. Jeffrey Wratten
 637. Shiloh D. Smith
 638. Nathan Harrington
 639. Scott Huffman
 640. Joey Middleton
 641. Damien Evans
 642. Nikolas Frazier
 643. Albert Wheeler
 644. Timothy Clevenger
 645. Michael Forest Reinoehl
 646. Joshua Beedie
 647. Andrew Blowers
 648. Seth Holliday
 649. Jeffrey Meyer
 650. Chad Busby
 651. Robert Ray Doss Jr.
 652. Glenn "G" Alvin Eldridge
 653. Clay A. Reynolds
 654. Name withheld by police
 655. Matthew Lyvon Paul
 656. Scott Heisler
 657. Rickey Wayne Riney
 658. Matthew C. Knowlden
 659. Joshua Sarrett
 660. Andrea Chuma
 661. Jeffery Ryan Blunk
 662. Christopher Michael Straub
 663. Matthew Nocerino
 664. Erik "Ace" Mahoney
 665. Jarred Kemp
 666. James Edward Baker
 667. Eric Marc-Matthew Allport
 668. Justin Lee Tofte
 669. Crystal Renee Starling McClinton
 670. John Hare
 671. Shayne Allen Sutherland
 672. William Sendelbach
 673. Kalun Purucker
 674. Anthony Michael Legato
 675. Sylvia Kirchner
 676. Julie Fandino
 677. Rodney Ross
 678. Jason Arpad Peters
 679. Steven Vest
 680. Christopher Allen Kanouff
 681. William Earl Lane
 682. Justin Dawley
 683. Bradley Pugh
 684. Darren W. Randolph
 685. Paul Bailey
 686. Gregory Putnik
 687. Christopher John Kitts
 688. Bryan Selmer
 689. James Collins
 690. Brandon Evans
 691. Richard "RJ" James Jones
 692. Paul Sarver
 693. Ryan Fallo
 694. Isaac Lemoine Christensen
 695. Bennie Biby
 696. Frank Murphy
 697. John Pacheco Jr.
 698. Quincy Ivan Bishop
 699. John Mellone
 700. Guy Brady Able
 701. Justin Hammack
 702. Michael Moza
 703. Jacob Rucker
 704. Wendy Jones
 705. Jesse James Kale Brown
 706. Douglas E. Rash
 707. Charles Craig Meeks
 708. Cody William Amman
 709. Jake Settle
 710. David Donovan
 711. Joshua D. Evans
 712. Dustin James Acosta
 713. James Horton
 714. Michael Dansby

715. Matthew Thomas
 716. Brittany Nicole Yoder
 717. Brian Allen Thurman
 718. Joshua Lee LaPlace
 719. Duane W. Rich
 720. Ethan Tyler Calton
 721. Craig Steven Wright
 722. Leonard Francis Kieren
 723. Dylan Ray Scott
 724. Kenneth Dale Miller
 725. Eric Drake Feenstra
 726. David John Donelli
 727. Name withheld by police
 728. Adam Robertson
 729. Benjamin Marley Manley aka Christopher Reeves
 730. Joshua Hoffpauir
 731. Jacob E. McClure
 732. William A. Riley-Jennings
 733. Joseph Tanner Casten
 734. Tara Rae Liubakka
 735. Cole Blevins
 736. Jordan Crawford
 737. Trevor Seever
 738. Jason Williams
 739. Henry Martinez Jr.
 740. James Reising
 741. Amanda Faulkner
 742. Michael Conlon
 743. Ashli Babbitt
 744. John R. Neitling
 745. Brian Andren
 746. Betty Francois
 747. Brian Williams
 748. Junius Thomas
 749. Daryl Dye
 750. Ty Walvatne-Donahey
 751. Joshua Van Machado
 752. Jeffrey D. Kite
 753. Justin Pegues
 754. Robert Stephen Calderon
 755. Kevin Darion Wells
 756. Christopher Austin Dockery
 757. Ryan Daniel Stallings
 758. Brian Richard Abbott
 759. Steven Verdane
 760. Caleb McCree
 761. John Eric Ostbye
 762. Edward Bittner
 763. Mark Meza
 764. Chase Coats
 765. Keith Scales
 766. Chad William Songer
 767. Richard Fenton Thomas
 768. Tracy Hope Walter-Hensley
 769. Nicholas Pingel
 770. Tilford "TJ" Barton
 771. Ariella Sage Eloise Crawford
 772. Clay Tatum
 773. Shae Estelle Jones
 774. Joseph Johnson
 775. Trey Bartholomew
 776. Clifford E. Wilbur Jr.
 777. Eric J. Porter
 778. Brian D. Ellis
 779. Gregory Chandler Metz
 780. Royce Robertson
 781. Lewis Ruffin Jr.
 782. Derrick Thompson
 783. Name withheld by police
 784. Name withheld by police
 785. Name withheld by police
 786. Name withheld by police
 787. Name withheld by police

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, the chairman of the committee has said several times that Democrats are not for defunding the police, but I would just point out the individual presiding over this session said that defunding the police is not a slogan, it is a policy demand.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

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

Madam Speaker, the Justice in Policing Act was crafted in response to George Floyd's murder. Almost no one believes that that was justifiable. Partisans have snatched this moment of unity to further divide our Nation.

How have they done that?

Look at this debate. Speaker after speaker has hurled insults falsely claiming that no Republican supports reform. Now, it is true that we don't support this reform, but the majority has refused to even consider amendments or alternatives to this partisan bill.

An essential component of any justice in policing bill would correct current injustices. I only have time to mention one: warrantless surveillance of American citizens is wrong.

Get a warrant.

Last year, conservatives and progressives united around this point, and the Speaker blocked debate or amendment to FISA reauthorization. Now the same tactics are being employed. Every single Member of Congress is here to represent American citizens, and denying us amendments denies all Americans a voice.

Don't politicize something that can heal and unite us. Vote "no" on this bill. Insist on regular order.

□ 1930

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, 8 minutes, 46 seconds on George Floyd's neck. 'I can't breathe.'

Say their names, Madam Speaker.

Breonna Taylor, Casey Goodson, Jr., Andre Hill, Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, and so many more.

While we can never bring them back and we cannot undo the pain their families, friends, and communities have felt, we can do everything in our power if we unite and pass this bill.

As the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join us.

Our power, our message, is to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

The right should read the bill. The right should quote from the bill. Show me those words in the bill to defund the police.

I will show you accountability. I will show you transparency. I will show you justice.

The American people are calling on Congress to act. Yes, Black Lives Matter.

Let's meet the moment and turn agony into action. Let's pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), a former sheriff.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill.

This bill should be a balefire, a warning to America that there are those

across the aisle who wish to attempt to federalize State and local law enforcement. I would like to focus specifically, though, on this move to eliminate qualified immunity. This is a betrayal of law enforcement. This alone is enough reason to vote against this bill.

There is a myth, a lie, perpetrated by those who want to do away with qualified immunity, that qualified immunity gives officers free rein on the job. This is not true. This is not sovereign immunity; it is qualified immunity.

The way that an officer qualifies for that immunity and for it to apply in an action that he has taken, he must follow the law, he must follow his agency's policies, and he has to act as he has been appropriately trained. If he violates any one of those three, he is on his own; qualified immunity does not apply.

Madam Speaker, law enforcement is a dangerous profession that deals in split-second decisions. Most people in this room have no idea what it is like to determine, in a high-stress, life-threatening—

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I was 11 years old when the police beat the crap out of me. Eleven years old, sixth grade; what threat did I pose, other than that of a child who was horse-playing in the street?

My mother and I did not feel empowered to take any recourse, because in our community, the police, unfortunately, operate as an occupying force.

I thank God that I am alive to tell this story. Unfortunately, George Floyd is not alive. Philando Castile is not alive. Tamir Rice is not alive. Aiyana Jones slept in her apartment on her couch. She was 7 years old. Police came in with a no-knock warrant and murdered her.

This is about transparency and accountability, and we should pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act in a bipartisan way.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this bill, and that is a shame, because this is an area that is ripe for bipartisan compromise.

But the House continues to spend its time forcing through another Democratic package that had zero Republican input. We considered this very same bill last Congress, but it only passed the House with three Republican votes in support.

Meanwhile, my colleagues, Representative PETE STAUBER and Senator

TIM SCOTT, have proposed the JUSTICE Act to positively reform police to serve all Americans equally.

However, their sincere efforts have not even been considered by those across the aisle. That bill would improve law enforcement transparency, require more detailed records on the use of force, provide funds for body cameras, ban choke holds, and improve training to intervene in situations and deescalate. These are all things we agree upon.

Yet, instead of equipping our law enforcement for success, we are considering this bill that would make it harder for our police officers to keep our communities safe.

Every community is different and dictating policy from Washington will only constrain our law enforcement heroes who put their lives on the line.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

My dear friends, you say you have a bill. Where was your bill when you had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and you could have passed it?

You say you have a bill. The same bill that you had to replace the Affordable Care Act that you never passed?

The same bill that you had to rebuild the infrastructure across the length and breadth of this country that you never passed?

Where is the invisible bill?

I rise to support this bill that will deal with elimination of deadly force racism that can take the lives of Black people with impunity.

I rise against your invisible bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded again to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to each other.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, Senator SCOTT had legislation, good legislation, but the Democrats wouldn't take it up; they filibustered.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, what happened to George Floyd is atrocious, it is criminal, and the policeman will be held accountable; he has got to be.

But that has nothing to do with eliminating immunity for countless policemen across the country. This bill does not properly address or prevent what happened in poor George Floyd's case.

Why would we have a bill that eliminates immunity for anybody charging the Capitol, breaking in illegally? They would be able to sue the police in the future, tie them up in court. Why would we do that? Because if we do this—follow the money—then the unions will be selling a lot of liability insurance; it will be the biggest fundraiser they have ever had.

Let's get together and come together on a bill that will not just raise money, not just hire more lawyers, but will solve the problem of the death, as criminal as it was, of George Floyd.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, this bill isn't about what we just heard. This bill is a moment of potential redemption for a country riven by racial division, riven by a history of racism going back to slavery, the Reconstruction era, post-Reconstruction, Jim Crow, the violent oppression of people because of the color of their skin.

We, in this body, have an opportunity to redeem our country and its history. Let us unite behind that cause and that opportunity at redemption.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021.

The peaceful protests for racial justice last summer compelled a long overdue reckoning for our country to take action to fulfill America's promise of equality no matter the color of your skin.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor this proposal to end police brutality and address the systemic racism that has marred American law enforcement for generations.

With this legislation, we finally say enough is enough: We've had enough of racial and religious profiling; Enough of no-knock warrants and chokeholds; and Enough of police using military-grade equipment on our American streets.

We are a country crying out for an end to the centuries-long scourge of racist brutality that has stolen so many black lives from our communities.

The Justice in Policing Act will help erode the culture of impunity within too many of our police forces by bringing much-needed accountability and transparency to our law enforcement institutions.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280, a purely partisan bill, developed with zero Republican input, that would defund the police and hamstring the ability of our law enforcement agencies to keep our communities safe.

This bill would lower the legal threshold to criminally prosecute a police officer for deprivation of rights, which would, at best, lead to a torrent of frivolous cases against officers and, at worst, discourage them from doing their jobs.

Our officers are already forced to work in difficult environments. Countless officers have already simply quit or retired early, while morale has plummeted for those who stay. It will continue if this bill passes.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1280, a bill that defunds the police.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, Eric Garner, George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, all Black men and women who were killed by police.

It is in their memory that I rise today in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, because we cannot live up to our ideals of justice for all while BIPOC Americans are disproportionately killed by police.

We need to pass this bill to save lives, to reform qualified immunity, to ban no-knock warrants like the one that contributed to the death of Breonna Taylor, to end the use of choke holds that killed Eric Garner and George Floyd.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting to pass this long overdue bill, to join me in this work to make this country a safer, more just place for all Americans. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, death and destruction at this Capitol from recent Trump-instigated violence shows the result of insufficient policing. The deaths of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor, and in my area, Mike Ramos and Javier Ambler, and too many more, from misconduct, show the result of insufficient justice. As the name of this bill, "Justice in Policing," indicates this bill is not about removing the police; it is about removing the injustice. It seeks accountability.

It seeks equal justice under the law by our law enforcers, particularly for people of color, who have too often been victimized by systemic racism. Instead of working with us to make it better and secure our communities and more justice for all, many of today's Republican opponents are only spouting the poisonous slogans of Trumpism. Because Black and Brown lives do matter, let's approve this bill to achieve greater justice for all in an America that is safer for all.

□ 1945

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, which represents the worst of Washington: defunding police in a surprise vote in the middle of the night.

This bill advances the far-left Democrat platform, and would defund the police through unfunded mandates that cost State and local departments millions of dollars.

If this weren't bad enough, the bill advances an antipolice agenda with

Washington-knows-best regulations, and puts a target on the backs of everyday officers by creating a national database of complaints that have not been adjudicated.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the bill. I stand with law enforcement, and I am grateful for those who serve on the thin blue line.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES).

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, as a person of color who has seen in my own life the dehumanizing effect of stop-and-frisk policing in New York City, I know firsthand that the Achilles' heel of American policing is the absence of accountability.

We, as a country, have a choice. We can either choose police accountability or choose qualified immunity, but we cannot choose both.

The purpose of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is not to second-guess officers who act in good faith. The objective is to hold liable officers who repeatedly abuse their power and who rarely, if ever, face consequences for their repeat abuses.

If you are a good officer, you have nothing to fear. But if you are a bad officer, you have accountability to fear, and fear accountability, you should.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS).

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, what we saw happen to George Floyd was not an isolated incident. It was a modern-day lynching caught on camera, and it must stop.

Black men, women, and children are done dying. We are done dying at the hands of police.

Law enforcement should protect and serve. But in communities of color, we don't have the luxury of making that assumption. Many Black people get the talk, instructions on how to act when encountering police to increase the likelihood of returning home alive. These are survival tactics that my husband and I don't want to have to pass on to my young Black son, but we must.

For Black and Brown people everywhere, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. Let's affirm our commitment to root out police brutality and ensure accountability in policing.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in loving memory of Aiyana Jones, who was only 7 years old when she was killed by Detroit police.

The fact that the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act could have been named after countless other people murdered by police shows that this is

long overdue. It is important to note this bill is a start, not the end, of our movement to transform what it means to feel safe in our country.

We must demand true accountability, justice, and reparations for the generations of police brutality against our Black communities. We must invest in the social programs that we know will give our communities the opportunity to thrive.

This is the justice that Aiyana Jones and George Floyd and many other lives lost to police violence deserve.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, there is an old African proverb that says: Until the lions tell their own story, the tales of the hunt will always glorify the hunter.

Who are the lions? They are the victims. They are Black and Brown and indigenous. They have suffered, endured, and survived 200 years of brutality, slavery, racism, Jim Crow, oppression, deprivation, degradation, denial, and disprivilege.

We have learned in this country one thing, that justice comes in small steps. And when we consider the enslavement of the Negro, the extermination of the Indian, the annexation of the Hispanic, our Nation that we love had an iniquitous conception.

So these small steps, no matter how painful they are, must be taken. This bill helps move us toward a more perfect Union. I urge passage of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, as a representative of more than a quarter of NYPD's 36,000 active officers, and thousands more retirees and first responders, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1280 and every piece of legislation that aims to cripple or degrade our law enforcement.

Instead of working with Republicans, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to push forth yet another partisan bill that will diminish public safety and prevent our law enforcement officers from serving and protecting our communities, all while trying to hold them personally liable. The brave men and women who put on the uniform every day deserve better.

We have offered real solutions to increase transparency, accountability, and performance so our Nation's law enforcement officers can better serve and protect all.

But make no mistake, this bill you are about to pass today defunds the police. The Congressional Budget Office

has confirmed that the unfunded mandates contained in this bill will drain the resources of State and local law enforcement to the tune of several hundred million dollars. This is negligence.

As a resident of New York City who has seen our police department's budget slashed by a billion dollars by politicians who think they know more than the officers doing the job on the street, I can tell you that there are serious ramifications.

Crime has skyrocketed. Last year, shootings increased by 97 percent, and murders increased by 44 percent. We have seen livelihoods and properties destroyed by rioters and looters in cities across America.

Government's number one responsibility to its citizenry is to keep them safe. Defunding law enforcement is an abdication of that responsibility.

Tonight, I call on every Member of this body to cosponsor my Right to Remain Safe Act, which holds local governments responsible should someone become a victim of a crime due to government's negligence.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit today, we will instruct the Judiciary Committee to consider my amendment to H.R. 1280 to include a simple, straightforward sense of Congress strongly rejecting efforts to defund the police.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues say they don't support defunding the police. Well, here is their chance to show it.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the millions of Americans who peacefully put this bill on the agenda.

It was nowhere last year until we saw 8 minutes and 46 seconds of a man being murdered, a Black man, George Floyd. People—White, Black, all different colors—took to the streets, and they said, "No more." I want to thank those activists and ordinary people who said we don't have to tolerate this.

The bill passed last year, and it is going to pass again because the American people are tired of this racism and the killing and killing and killing of Black people.

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

Madam Speaker, you said: Defunding the police is not a slogan; it is a policy demand.

Over 20 cities in this great country enacted that. They did that to the tune of \$1.7 billion taken from the brave

men and women who protect us all. That is our concern.

We would have loved to have worked with the other side. We had a bill. Senator SCOTT worked tirelessly on it. Representative STAUBER, former police officer STAUBER, on our side worked night and day on it. But Democrats wouldn't work with us, wouldn't take any of our amendments.

This is a partisan, political bill, unfortunately. That is why I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which bans police choke holds, creates a national police misconduct registry, and eliminates qualified immunity, among other needed provisions.

I grieved when first watching George Floyd's murder by a cop, and I grieve still over the continued loss of so many Blacks killed by cops. There have been 149 Black men killed at the hands of police since George Floyd's murder. I have been fighting against this police brutality since my first days as a member of the California State Assembly.

But here we are, mourning the victims of police choke holds, Blacks being shot in the back, fathers being killed in front of their children and their families. We Blacks are under siege by rogue cops, who we pay to protect and serve us, and White supremacists and domestic terrorists.

We have to resist this. We have to say to bad cops in blue that we are going to fight you. Or proud boys in yellow gear, we are going to fight you. We are going to resist you.

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

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, a comprehensive bill to address systemic racism in law enforcement.

Today's legislation is named for George Floyd, whose senseless death at the hands of a police officer shocked the conscience of millions of Americans and sparked a long-overdue reckoning on race in America and a movement demanding racial justice. Congress has heard this call for justice, and in response, Congresswoman KAREN BASS and the Congressional Black Caucus have written this critical legislation to hold police accountable, change the culture of law enforcement, and build trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act takes these challenges head on by banning chokeholds, mandating racial bias training, ending qualified immunity, restricting the sale of military-grade weapons to local police departments, and establishing a National Police Misconduct Registry. While the inequities in our criminal justice system are immense, this legislation is a bold step to address systemic racism in law enforcement, and the time has come to make these reforms the law of the land.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to affirm my support as an original cosponsor for H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021.

This is not a new issue. But one that we continue to revisit over. And over. And over.

Madam Speaker, how many times will my Republican colleagues affirm that Black Lives Matter as the blood of Black Lives cry out from American cities and streets?

Despite what my Republican colleagues are purporting, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act will not defund the police.

But what it will do is bring us one step closer to justice by: banning chokeholds; prohibiting no-knock warrants; ending the qualified immunity doctrine that is a barrier to holding police officers accountable for wrongful conduct; Combating racial profiling; Mandating there be data collection of these incidences for tracking, including body cameras and dashboard cameras; and; establishing new standards for policing.

George Floyd's death should not be in vain. And as a mother of a black son. Grandmother to three black grandsons, I do not want to have to worry about their safety when they encounter the police who are sworn to protect and serve. Not be the judge, jury, and onsite executioner.

Black lives matter, Madam Speaker, and it is past time that the laws of our nation reflect it. That is why I am urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. It goes without saying that I strongly encourage its immediate consideration and passage in the Senate.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 179, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Malliotakis moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1280 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Ms. MALLIOTAKIS is as follows:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents):

SEC. 503. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the House—

(1) recognizes and appreciates the dedication and devotion demonstrated by the men and women of law enforcement who keep our communities and our nation safe; and

(2) condemns calls to "defund", "disband", "dismantle", or "abolish" the police.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 219, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—208

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

NAYS—219

Adams	Bourdeaux	Casten
Aguilar	Bowman	Castor (FL)
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Castro (TX)
Auchincloss	F.	Chu
Axne	Brown	Cicilline
Barragán	Brownley	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bush	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Bustos	Cleaver
Bera	Butterfield	Clyburn
Beyer	Carbajal	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson	Cooper
Blunt Rochester	Cartwright	Correa
Bonamici	Case	Costa

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

NOT VOTING—4

□ 2043

Mr. CASTEN and Ms. TITUS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SIMPSON, ROSE, and BUDD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 59.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE

RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))	Deutch (Rice (NY))	Huffman (McNerney)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))	Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Buchanan	Gaetz (McHenry)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
(LaHood)	Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Krishnamoorthi (Brown)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Hastings (Wasserman)	Langevin (Lynch)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Schultz	
Larson (CT) (Courtney)	Lawson (FL)	Lee (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Lee (NV)	Lieu
Lee (NV)	Lieu	Lofgren
Lieu	Lofgren	Lowenthal
Lowenthal	Luria	Lynch
Lynch	Malinowski	Maloney,
Maloney,	Carolyn B.	Maloney, Sean
Maloney, Sean	Manning	Matsui
Manning	McBath	Strickland

Larson (CT) (Courtney)	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Lawson (FL)	Moulton	Ruiz (Aguilar)
(Evans)	(McGovern)	Rush
Lee (NV)	Napolitano (Correa)	(Underwood)
(Kuster)	Palazzo (Fleischmann)	Speier (Scanlon)
Lieu (Beyer)	Payne	Vargas (Correa)
Lowenthal	(Wasserman)	Watson Coleman
(Beyer)	Schultz	(Pallone)
Meng (Clark (MA))	Pingree (Kuster)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON). The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 212, not voting 0, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—220

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

Suoizzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)

Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velazquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—212

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert

Golden
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks

Mr. GOODEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was shown voting aye on rollcall No. 60. I intended to vote no.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)
Buchanan (LaHood)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Mullin
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (McHenry)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman)
Huffman (McNerney)
Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Krishnamoorthi (Brown)
Langevin (Lynch)
Larson (CT) (Courtney)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (McGovern)
Napolitano (Correa)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman)
Schultz
Pingree (Kuster)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann

Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar

Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes, will now resume. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 219, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—210

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack

Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald

Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado

NAYS—219

Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi

Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree

□ 2127

Mr. ARMSTRONG changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. KILMER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib

Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Bergman
Bowman

□ 2218

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. TRAHAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FORTENBERRY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)
Buchanan (LaHood)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (McHenry)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Huffman (McNerney)

Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Krishnamoorthi (Brown)
Langevin (Lynch)
Larson (CT) (Courtney)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)

Moulton (McGovern)
Napolitano (Correa)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 210, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—220

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal

Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver

Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele

Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pannetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters

Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—210

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartthorn
Chabot
Cheney

Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs

Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luettkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks

Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Oberholte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Bergman
Miller (IL)

□ 2302

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei (Kelly (PA))
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)
Buchanan (LaHood)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (McHenry)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Huffman (McNerney)

Kelly (IL) (Kuster)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Krishnamoorthi (Brown)
Langevin (Lynch)
Larson (CT) (Courtney)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lee (NV) (Kuster)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)

Moulton (McGovern)
Napolitano (Correa)
Palazzo (Fleischmann)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Speier (Scanlon)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1, FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 1, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

CONTRACT FOR USPS FLEET VEHICLES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise with great concern regarding the recently announced contract between the United States Post Office and Oshkosh Defense for the construction of 165,000 postal vehicles over the next decade, all new.

There is no doubt our postal fleet is aging. The Grumman LLV, in service since 1994, is gas powered and lacks basic safety equipment like airbags or air conditioning.

Unfortunately, this contract lacks any commitment to make these vehicles new age, either electric, hybrid, or advanced biofuels.

While new vehicles are said to be capable of incorporating an electric drivetrain, Postmaster General Louis DeJoy, who has been a disaster for the Postal Service, recently indicated only 10 percent of the new fleet will be electric. Ten percent? That makes no sense and flies in the face of the Biden administration's recent order to electrify the Federal fleet.

DeJoy's failed tenure calls into question the awarding of this contract.

As such, the administration and the Postal Service must delay the contract until a review is conducted to determine that there was not inappropriate political influence in the process and that the proposed contract is consistent with Biden's Executive Order on tackling the climate crisis.

This contract is a multi-billion-dollar opportunity to reimagine the Federal fleet and develop this critical domestic supply chain. We can't fumble this opportunity.

□ 2310

HONORING CENTENNIAL OF THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

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

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of the centennial of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The following is the resolution this body passed 100 years ago tomorrow, H.J. Res. 426.

"Providing for the bringing to the United States of the body of an unknown American, who was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces, who served in Europe and lost his life during the World War, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to cause to be brought to the United States the body of an American, who

was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces who served in Europe, who lost his life during the World War and whose identity has not been established, for burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Virginia.

"Such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of War."

Madam Speaker, they will not be forgotten.

DELIVERING RELIEF TO COMMUNITIES AND ESSENTIAL WORKERS

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

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to have been able to vote "yes" last week for the American Rescue Plan Act and join my House colleagues in sending this critically important legislation to the Senate.

It is past time that we enact bold relief that delivers critical resources to individuals, families, and communities throughout our Nation so that we can get back to work and past this health crisis.

I am pleased that this legislation includes vital health care provisions to support community vaccination sites, scale up testing and tracing, and address care disparities.

Further, this legislation includes significant resources to assist schools in reopening. We must continue to do all we can to support our intrepid teachers and the critical work that they are doing in this challenging time to engage students and prepare them with the life skills they need for their career endeavors.

Madam Speaker, the momentum is on our side to defeat this virus. I encourage my Senate colleagues to take the next step in approving this legislation as soon as possible so that we can provide all of our communities and our valiant essential workers with the resources they need.

CELEBRATING HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK CENTENNIAL

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Hot Springs National Park.

Nearly 5,500 acres of forested hills settle just above historic downtown Hot Springs, Arkansas, protecting 47 thermal water springs. Hot Springs National Park attracts millions of tourists each year with its rich multigenerational legacy of preserving history and conserving natural resources for public health, wellness, and enjoyment.

First named Hot Springs Reservation in 1832, the land was one of the first federally protected parcels of land in

the country. Its official National Park designation on March 4, 1921, led to the park quickly becoming a source of national intrigue. Bathhouse Row drew millions of people seeking health remedies in the thermal spring waters. Many of these bathhouses still stand today, offering visitors a glimpse into local history, art, and culture.

I take this time to honor the National Park Service's century of caretaking of one of Arkansas' most valuable natural treasures. I look forward to the next 100 years, and I invite the world to come to experience my home, beautiful Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas.

FIXING AN ALREADY SECURE ELECTION

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, my Democrat colleagues say that the 2020 election was the least corrupt and most secure in our Nation's history. But if that is true, Madam Speaker, then why are they pushing an 800-page bill to fix it?

ONE DOSE OF THE PFIZER VACCINE

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, thanks to Operation Warp Speed, we now have a pathway out of the pandemic using anti-COVID vaccines, but I want to share some more good news.

A new study published in the New England Journal of Medicine shows that just one dose of the Pfizer vaccine has an efficacy of close to 93 percent. The clinical difference between 92 percent and 95 percent of the two-dose regimen is minuscule.

If we gave everyone, except possibly the most vulnerable, just the first dose, we could possibly double our supply immediately and thus inoculate our citizens much faster. Using this strategy, we could possibly prevent the spread of new variants and mutants and effect a quicker end to this tragic pandemic, which has already cost hundreds of thousands of lives in this country.

Yesterday, I joined some of my fellow physician colleagues, asking the Health and Human Services Department to consider adopting this strategy.

Acting now could prevent the spread of new variants and the further spread of this tragedy, the kind of tragedy already felt and continuing to be felt by thousands across this country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge the Health Secretary to follow the science.

RECOGNIZING VENANGO MUSEUM OF ART, SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Venango Museum of Art, Science and Industry in Oil City, Pennsylvania.

The museum plays a big role in maintaining the culture and history of the region with educational programming and rotating exhibits.

Recently, the executive director of the museum, Betsy Kellner, reached out to my office to let us know of an exciting project the museum was able to complete thanks to funding provided by the Pennsylvania Humanities Council and the National Endowment for the Humanities through the CARES Act.

The museum is the proud owner of a 1928 Wurlitzer pipe organ, which was previously held in the historic Latonia Theater in Oil City. The museum was able to refurbish the organ, a feat that took thousands of volunteer hours and more than 600 different pipes.

After the organ was successfully refurbished, the Venango Museum of Art, Science and Industry hosted a virtual concert for residents to enjoy. The concert can also be viewed online at venangomuseum.org.

I would like to thank Betsy and the museum team for providing this enriching cultural experience for the residents of Venango County during the pandemic.

RESPECT DR. SEUSS BY FORGETTING CANCEL CULTURE

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

Mr. MOONEY. Madam Speaker, let's not attempt to steal knowledge of our Nation's history from our children, like the Grinch attempted to steal Christmas.

I rise to honor the legendary Dr. Seuss for Read Across America Day. Yesterday would also have been his 117th birthday.

Before he became a world-famous writer, Seuss attended Dartmouth College, my alma mater. He was also a member of the New Hampshire Alpha Chapter of the fraternity Sigma Phi Epsilon, of which I was also a member. We used to love showing Theodore Geisel's class photo on the wall to visitors.

But in the spirit of cancel culture, publishers have discontinued six of his books. Dr. Seuss was known as a progressive for his time. His famous story "The Lorax" was about protecting the environment.

My favorite, "Marvin K. Mooney Will You Please Go Now!" my 6-year-old daughter thinks was written just for

her. Children grow up dreaming about "Oh, the Places You'll Go!" a Dr. Seuss book with the lessons we find throughout our life's journey.

Madam Speaker, we should all respect and honor Dr. Seuss and forget this cancel culture nonsense.

□ 2320

TRANSFORMING SCHEDULE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, there needs to be comment about the way the schedule was totally transformed, once again.

What drove this change?

We were supposed to be debating the George Floyd bill tomorrow. George Floyd deserves a better bill than he got, a bipartisan bill that we would certainly be willing to work with the Democrats on, but they didn't want our help. We rushed through and did it tonight.

We asked: What was the reason for the dramatic change? Is somebody ashamed of what we are bringing and they want to do it late at night?

We were told: No. There is concern from somebody that the QAnon-announced inauguration will be tomorrow, so we need to get out of town.

Apparently, there is somebody that believes it. I don't know anybody on our side, but perhaps the Speaker and the majority leader are the believers in QAnon. Nobody else here that I know of.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MANNING) at 12 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(1)(B) of House Resolution 8, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 8, 2021, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-515. A letter from the Deputy Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments received February 2, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-516. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Certain Subordinate Organizations of State Savings Associations (RIN: 3064-AF37) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-517. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Transferred OTS Regulations Regarding Application Processing Procedures of State Savings Associations and Conforming Amendments to Other Regulations (RIN: 3064-AF36) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-518. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Removal of Transferred Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS) Regulations Regarding Nondiscrimination Requirements (RIN: 3064-AF35) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-519. A letter from the Associate Legal Counsel, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Update of Commission's Conciliation Procedures (RIN: 3046-AB19) received February 17, 2021, 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-520. A letter from the Legal Counsel, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's significant subregulatory guidance — Compliance Manual on Religious Discrimination (RIN: 3046-ZA01) received February 26, 2021, 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-521. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Schedule of Application Fees Set Forth in Sections 1.1102 through 1.1109 of the Commission's Rules [MD Docket No.: 20-270] received February 4, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-522. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rules Governing the Use of Distributed Transmission System Technologies [MB Docket No.: 20-74]; Authorizing Permissive Use of the "Next Generation" Broadcast Television Standard [GN Docket No.: 16-142] received February 4, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-523. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory

Commission, transmitting the Commission's final evaluation of vendor submittal — Endorsement of Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) Technical Report (TR) 3002019436 "Remote Source Verification During a Pandemic or Similar State of Emergency: Screening Criteria and Process Guidance" received February 22, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-524. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0584; Product Identifier 2020-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-21349; AD 2020-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-525. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-3343; Product Identifier 2015-SW-078-AD; Amendment 39-21353; AD 2020-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-526. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Yaborã Indústria Aeronáutica S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Embraer S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1122; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00972-T; Amendment 39-21357; AD 2020-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-527. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1108; Project Identifier AD-2020-01397-T; Amendment 39-21360; AD 2020-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-528. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Régional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1133; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01515-T; Amendment 39-21372; AD 2020-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-529. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1032; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00856-E; Amendment 39-21338; AD 2020-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-530. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1121; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01546-T; Amendment 39-21356; AD 2020-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-531. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0572; Product Identifier 2017-SW-056-AD; Amendment 39-21358; AD 2020-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-532. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aerostar Aircraft Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0574; Product Identifier 2019-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-21340; AD 2020-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-533. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0689; Product Identifier 2020-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-21359; AD 2020-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-534. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0592; Project Identifier AD-2020-00251-E; Amendment 39-21352; AD 2020-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-535. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0425; Project Identifier 2016-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-21346; AD 2020-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-536. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1031; Project Identifier AD-2020-00846-T; Amendment 39-21334; AD 2020-24-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-537. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket

No.: FAA-2020-0778; Product Identifier 2020-NM-097-AD; Amendment 39-21362; AD 2020-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-538. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0729; Project Identifier AD-2020-00620-E; Amendment 39-21355; AD 2020-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-539. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mineola and Kenedy, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0877; Airspace Docket No.: 20-ASW-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-540. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Marquette, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0880; Airspace Docket No.: 20-AGL-37] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-541. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Warroad, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0878; Airspace Docket No.: 20-AGL-35] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-542. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31345; Amdt. No.: 556] received February 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DELGADO, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. TORRES of

New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CRIST, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MANNING, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 6. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 1532. A bill to require a review of the effects of FHA mortgage insurance policies, practices, and products on small-dollar mortgage lending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1533. A bill to extend the deferment of EIDL loans made in response to COVID-19 from 1 year to 2 years; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CLOUD (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GUEST, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROY, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. HERRELL, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CLINE, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 1534. A bill to prohibit the President and the Secretary of Health and Human Services from declaring certain emergencies or disasters for the purpose of imposing gun

control; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. GUEST, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MAST, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 1535. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. RESCHENTHALER (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 1536. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include all members of the Armed Forces in the definition of "independent student" for purposes of determining the eligibility of such members for Federal financial assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 1537. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for terms and conditions for nonimmigrant workers performing agricultural labor or services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESCOBAR (for herself, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VELA, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1538. A bill to amend the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission Act, with respect to preparedness for COVID-19 and other infectious diseases in the border region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. PANETTA,

Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. KAHELE, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1539. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to develop and make available guidance relating to domestic preparedness for and collective response to terrorism regarding active shooter and mass casualty incident response assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. MENG, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 1540. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. AGUILAR (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. KAHELE, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide support to State and local governments in their efforts to counter violent extremist threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. BOST, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BACON, Mrs. HINSON, and Mrs. FISCHBACH):

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to provide grants for deployment of renewable fuel infrastructure, to finalize proposed rules relating to requirements for E15 fuel dispenser labeling and underground storage tank compatibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. BARR (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KELLER, Mr. CARL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TIFFANY, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. STEIL, Mr. BOST, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DUNN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. MANN, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. ROY, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1543. A bill to provide authorities to prohibit the provision of services by social media platforms to certain individuals and entities on the Specially Designated Nationals List and senior officials of governments of a state sponsor of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1544. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Center for Mental Health Services of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, to award grants to facilitate the funding of community-based mental health and substance use disorder services and peer support programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 1545. A bill to ensure that after a declaration of a major disaster affected States, local governments, and Indian tribal governments receive immediate approval for services and assistance provided under section 416 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1546. A bill to amend the Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016 to direct the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking to develop recommendations to address wildlife trafficking on the internet and on social media, and to direct the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to develop a strategy to address wildlife trafficking on the internet and on social media, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1547. A bill to improve the financial literacy of secondary school students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HILL, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. CASE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1548. A bill to establish a pilot program for native plant species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1549. A bill to establish the Advisory Committee on Climate Risk on the Financial Stability Oversight Council; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 1550. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a public awareness campaign with respect to human papillomavirus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER,

Ms. MENG, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of medical nutrition therapy services for individuals with eating disorders under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 1552. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 42 Main Street in Slatersville, Rhode Island, as the "Specialist Matthew R. Turcotte Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1553. A bill to provide for further comprehensive research at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke on unruptured intracranial aneurysms; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 1554. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for the research and development, production, or deployment of the nuclear-armed sea-launched cruise missile and its associated nuclear warhead; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 1555. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue final rules to promote and incentivize the widespread adoption of broadband consumer labels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 1556. A bill to require State and local governments to establish reopening plans as a condition of receiving funding under title VI of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. CRIST:

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain credits related to solar energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1558. A bill to reduce child poverty in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1559. A bill to direct the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to submit a report on

facilitating efficient, timely environmental reviews of nuclear reactors through expanded use of categorical exclusions, environmental assessments, and generic environmental impact statements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DEAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAI, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. WILD):

H.R. 1560. A bill to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Victims of Gun Violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GIBBS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 1562. A bill to prohibit the trading of the securities of certain Communist Chinese military companies on a national securities exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Armed Services, Education and Labor, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCIA of California (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mrs. STEEL, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 1563. A bill to extend the authorities under the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act of 2016 providing operational flexibility, drought relief, and other benefits to the State of California; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. GOMEZ (for himself and Mr. PASCARELL):

H.R. 1564. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from taxable income any student loan forgiveness or discharge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1565. A bill to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1566. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require that equitable distribution of assistance include equitable distribution to Indian tribes and tribal organizations and to increase amounts reserved for allotment to Indian tribes and tribal organizations under certain circumstances, and to provide for a Government Accountability Office report on child abuse and neglect in American Indian tribal communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1567. A bill to allow certain qualified law enforcement officers and retired law enforcement officers to carry a concealed firearm to protect children in a school zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1568. A bill to amend the Special Drawing Rights Act in order strengthen congressional oversight with respect to allocations of Special Drawing Rights by the International Monetary Fund, and to prohibit such allocations for perpetrators of genocide and state sponsors of terrorism without congressional authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1569. A bill to assist in the conservation of critically endangered species in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. CROW, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MFUME, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PA-

NETTA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. PHILLIPS):

H.R. 1570. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS of New York:

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide non-immigrant status for dairy workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1572. A bill to direct the Federal Election Commission to carry out a voucher pilot program under which individuals may use vouchers to make small dollar contributions to qualified candidates for election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1573. A bill to clarify the rights of all persons who are held or detained at a port of entry or at any detention facility overseen by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1574. A bill to suspend United States security assistance with Honduras until such time as human rights violations by Honduran security forces cease and their perpetrators are brought to justice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1575. A bill to repeal restrictions on the export and import of natural gas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1576. A bill to provide for a coordinated national research program to examine the nature, causes, consequences, and prevention of violence and unintended injury and death relating to gun ownership, use, and trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined

by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 1578. A bill to streamline nuclear technology regulatory permitting and licensing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY (for himself, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CLOUD, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1579. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress from purchasing or selling certain investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and 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. LATTA:

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit the use of certain psychological evaluation via telehealth for Medicare coverage of neurostimulation services for the treatment of chronic pain; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. YOUNG, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DEAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TTUS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WILD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. MENG, Ms. CHU, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JONES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 1581. A bill to support library infrastructure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1582. A bill to clarify and increase the restrictions on political activities that are applicable to the members of the Postal Service Board of Governors, including the Postmaster General and the Deputy Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1583. A bill to fully fund the Prevention and Public Health Fund and reaffirm the importance of prevention in the United States health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 1584. A bill to impose a limitation on taxation and fees on transactions by certain securities industry participants, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. LIEU, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. CHU, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CASE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. KUSTER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SIREs, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARSON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LAMB, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1585. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 1586. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a program under which an institution of higher education may elect to cosign Federal student loans made to students attending the institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 1587. A bill to provide certain coverage of audiologist services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in

addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 1588. A bill to modernize the hydropower licensing process and to promote next generation hydropower projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. ROSENDALE (for himself and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the exemption for re-hires for loan forgiveness under the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1590. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to add access to telecommunications and information services in Indian country and areas with high populations of Indian people to the universal service principle relating to access to such services in rural, insular, and high cost areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 1591. A bill to establish the United States Chief Manufacturing Officer in the Executive Office of the President with the responsibility of developing a National Manufacturing Strategy to revitalize the manufacturing sector, spur economic growth, and expand United States competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 1592. A bill to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 1593. A bill to provide for automatic acquisition of United States citizenship for certain internationally adopted individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SIREs, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to exclude certain evictions and information relating to such evictions from consumer reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 1595. A bill to require the continuation in effect of export controls with respect to Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

H.R. 1596. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Stigmatization, Criminalization, and Ongoing Exclusion and Inequity for LGBTQ Servicemembers and Veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. AMODEI):

H.R. 1597. A bill to provide for conservation and economic development in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to condition eligibility for grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1599. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to secure the supply of critical energy resources, including critical minerals and other materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1600. A bill to reduce methane emissions from flaring and venting natural gas during oil and natural gas production activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1601. A bill to increase the exempt amount applicable for the retirement earnings test for months in 2020 and 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CARL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. LOUDERMILK):

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that retired Lieutenant General Russel Honoré, United States Army, should immediately be relieved of his interim investigative role into the events of January 6, 2021; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H. Res. 185. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 3, 2021, as National Triple-Negative Breast Cancer Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FALLON, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. ROY, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H. Res. 186. A resolution calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United

States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to nine years in a Russian prison; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Res. 187. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of "World Hearing Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 6.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 1532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 1533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this constitution"

By Mr. CLOUD:

H.R. 1534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment to the Constitution

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 1535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H.R. 1536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One Section Eight

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 1538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18) THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS, CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 1541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 1542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 1544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 1545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 1549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 1551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 1552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 1553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 1555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 1556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: which gives Congress the authority, " . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: " . . . to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . ."

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 1557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 1560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of U.S. Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 1562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 1563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 1564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 1565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 & Clause 18

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution. Article I, Section 8, clause 3, the Interstate Commerce Clause, gives Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes. Article I, Section 8, clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause, gives Congress the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 1568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 1570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment 4 and Amendment 14, Section 5 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JACOBS of New York:

H.R. 1571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: "The Congress shall have the power . . . To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;"

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 1578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3 (Commerce Clause); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause).

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY:

H.R. 1579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 1581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 1585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 1587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 1588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. ROSENDALE:

H.R. 1589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 1591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 1593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 1594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S.C. Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 1598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to “provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CORREA, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 18: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 38: Mr. LATURNER.

H.R. 55: Mr. MFUME, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.

H.R. 160: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 164: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 174: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 255: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 256: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BUSH, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 288: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 305: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 347: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 403: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 410: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 457: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 463: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 471: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 475: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 485: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 492: Mr. DELGADO and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 498: Mr. FEENSTRA and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 508: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 525: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 554: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 564: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 586: Ms. WILD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 622: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 677: Mr. BENTZ, Mr. FALLON, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. COMER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 682: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BAIRD, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 695: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 707: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 708: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 729: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 746: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 812: Ms. HERRELL and Ms. VAN DUYN.

H.R. 814: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 824: Mr. JACOBS of New York.

H.R. 835: Ms. JACOBS of California.

H.R. 852: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 869: Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 890: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 909: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 959: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 995: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1013: Mr. KUSTOFF and Mrs. HINSON.

H.R. 1017: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 1022: Mr. DELGADO and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1026: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1035: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. GARBARINO.

H.R. 1068: Ms. CHU and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1113: Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. BOST, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 1115: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1140: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1145: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1159: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1179: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1193: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. MOONEY, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1195: Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. JONES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1210: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BRADY, and Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 1219: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1226: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1272: Mr. TRONE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1275: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1276: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. PANETTA,

Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1283: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1307: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1308: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 1344: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1346: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1347: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 1355: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1361: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1362: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1378: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. CHU, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 1379: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1381: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.

H.R. 1384: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROSS, Ms. CHU, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1393: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 1397: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 1406: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1446: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. JONES, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1453: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1454: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1457: Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1459: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. WILD, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1467: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1470: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1475: Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 1479: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1483: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1486: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 1498: Mr. OWENS and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1503: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1506: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1511: Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 1520: Mr. GIBBS.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.J. Res. 17: Mr. COHEN.

H.J. Res. 28: Ms. PINGREE.

H. Res. 108: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. JONES.

H. Res. 116: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H. Res. 118: Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H. Res. 130: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. MEIJER.

H. Res. 137: Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 151: Mr. SOTO, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H. Res. 153: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H. Res. 157: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H. Res. 161: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 162: Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H. Res. 173: Mr. ROSENDALE.

H. Res. 183: Mr. RYAN.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2021

No. 40

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of all nations, author of liberty, thank You for the gift of freedom.

Today, empower our lawmakers to protect and guard the foundations of our liberty so that America may be a blessing to the world. When our Senators are weary, replenish their spirits with the inspiration of Your presence. Lord, make them aware that You will never forsake them in their hour of need. Bellow the flickering embers of their hearts until our legislators feel the fires of patriotism, service, and hope.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a

Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUJÁN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR AN EXCEPTION TO A LIMITATION AGAINST APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS AS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WITHIN SEVEN YEARS OF RELIEF FROM ACTIVE DUTY AS A REGULAR COMMISSIONED OFFICER OF THE ARMED FORCES—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 11.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 11, a bill to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

SENATE SERGEANT AT ARMS STAFF

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I begin this morning with a very exciting announcement about critical leadership roles in the Senate Chamber. Three outstanding individuals are set to resume new responsibilities. LTG Karen Gibson will serve as the next Senate Sergeant at Arms, while Kelly

Fado will serve as Deputy Sergeant at Arms, and Jennifer Hemingway will serve as Chief of Staff.

The Senate Sergeant at Arms was established 223 years ago as an outgrowth of the Office of the Senate Doorkeeper, back when one of the biggest problems was making sure the Senate had a quorum. Today, the Sergeant at Arms is the Senate's chief administrative officer and chief law enforcement officer, so very important at this time. These offices have the enormous responsibility of keeping the trains running on time, while at the same time keeping everyone in the Capitol safe. As we have seen in recent weeks, the security component of the role is immensely important.

LTG Karen Gibson is the perfect person for this job, the job of Sergeant at Arms. She has spent 33 years in Active Duty in the military, much of it in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence as a senior intelligence officer, where she supported U.S. national security objectives in Iraq, Afghanistan, East Africa, Korea, the Pacific, and across the Middle East.

She is ready to hit the ground running because since January 6, she has been part of a weeklong review to identify actions that can be taken immediately—immediately—to improve the security of the Capitol and its Members. She is 100 percent committed to ensuring a safe and secure working environment for Senators, visitors, Capitol employees, Senate staff, press, and paying particular attention to staffers of color.

Lieutenant General Gibson has a big job ahead of her, but I have every confidence she will perform her duties at the same exemplary standard she set over the course of her heralded three-decade military career.

Kelly Fado and Jennifer Hemingway, meanwhile, are two of the most recognizable faces in the Capitol, Jennifer having recently filled in as the Acting Sergeant at Arms. Kelly has been part

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S999

of my team for many years, on the Rules Committee and in my leadership office. She has helped plan, coordinate, safeguard, and execute multiple Presidential inaugurations—and what a great job she has done in every one of them—and Capitol-wide ceremonies in general. She has been an indispensable resource to me and to my entire staff. I am very glad that Kelly is taking on this challenge.

One other note that I am very proud of—I think we all as Senators can be proud of—this will be the first time in the Senate's history that the Sergeant at Arms' leadership will be comprised entirely of women. I cannot think of a team better prepared than LTG Karen Gibson, Kelly Fado, and Jennifer Hemingway.

To all three of them: Congratulations on your new roles, and thank you for your many years of service to the Senate and to our country.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on the American Rescue Plan, as early as tonight, the Senate will move to take up the American Rescue Plan, a bill designed to immediately deliver help to American families, workers, and businesses struggling under the weight of the pandemic and to lay the foundation for our Nation's recovery, so needed.

Every day, we see signs of hope and signs of caution in our fight against the COVID pandemic. As of today, in good part because the Biden administration is really doing a good job, over 78 million doses of the COVID vaccine have been administered in the country and over 100 million have been shipped—well ahead of the rosiest expectations at the start of the year. Just yesterday, President Biden announced that there will be enough vaccines for every adult in the United States by the end of May—by the end of May—far sooner than most had thought. Again, President Biden and his team are doing a great job in moving the vaccine out quickly but fairly.

Still, the United States averages 66,000 cases of COVID per week. That exceeds anything we saw last summer during the worst months of the spread. So we cannot relax, and the need for the legislation that is before us is stronger than ever before.

It is a similar story with the economy. There are green shoots, but unemployment is still over 6 percent and 9 percent for African Americans. The economy has lost 10 million jobs compared to a year ago. Tens of millions of Americans report being thousands of dollars behind in rent and utilities. As Treasury Secretary Yellen and Federal Reserve Chair Powell have repeatedly warned us, our economy and its recovery remain deeply uncertain.

There are bumps but mainly because of the stimulus bills we have done. We did a bill in March, and the May and June numbers looked pretty good but

then sunk again over the summer and fall. We did a bill in December, and the January numbers looked pretty good. But that is not evidence that the economy is able to sustain things on its own; that is evidence that the Federal Government needs to continue its role to get us back on track.

We have come a long way, but we have a long way to go. The American Rescue Plan is designed to build on our early progress and finish the job, to help our country get through the final months of the crisis and then, equally important, bring our economy roaring back.

We cannot go through the situation we did back in 2009, where the stimulus wasn't strong enough and we stayed in recession for years. So just because the numbers are not as bad as they were doesn't mean we don't need a continued strong push to get us out of this ditch and go upward and forward.

Now, we had always hoped that this very important work would be bipartisan. Regrettably, it seems that too many of our Republican colleagues are resorting to the same predictable objections they raise about nearly every proposal supported by a Democrat. It doesn't matter what is in the bill; everything my colleagues oppose is "a liberal wish list". That is what many of them call it.

Let me tell you, this bill is not a liberal wish list; this is an American wish list. When people want checks to help them get out of the morass, that is not a liberal wish list; that is what the American people want. It is an American wish list. When people want resources to open schools quickly and safely, that is not a liberal wish list; that is an American wish list. When people want assistance for the hardest-hit small businesses, that is not a liberal wish list; that is an American wish list. Funding to keep teachers, firefighters, transit workers, first responders in Red States and Blue on the job, it is not a liberal wish list; it is an American wish list.

So many of the people affected by this bill are not liberals or Democrats. They may be Republicans, they may be Independents, they may be conservatives, but they are Americans who want some help to get out of this morass.

Money to expand the testing and speed of the distribution of vaccines, the cornerstone of ending this crisis once and for all—that is not a liberal wish list; that is an American wish list. Everyone wants the vaccine out there. Direct checks, as I mentioned, as promised to Americans struggling to keep up with expenses, to buy their groceries, medicine, to pay the rent and utilities—that is not a liberal wish list; that is an American wish list.

I would ask my Republican colleagues to go ask their constituents which of these things their constituents oppose. None. That is what the data shows.

The American Rescue Plan will be the single largest anti-poverty bill in

recent history, with crucial assistance for American families, particularly those struggling with the cost of childcare. It will give tax breaks for low-income workers, so when they work hard, they can afford the necessities of life.

So these things are "the liberal wish list" that Republicans are talking about—support for schools and jobs and families and workers and the vaccine? No way.

Ironically, the "liberal wish list" includes a whole bunch of bipartisan amendments that were accepted, including provisions to help restaurants, sponsored by Senators SINEMA and WICKER; a vaccine public awareness program, sponsored by Senators CARDIN and PORTMAN; and a provision to better target direct payments, sponsored by Senators MANCHIN and COLLINS.

Make no mistake, the American Rescue Plan is a very, very strong bill that will move our country forward in amazing ways. It should come as no surprise that support of the American Rescue Plan is coming from all over the country.

Hundreds of business leaders—not the most liberal bunch—have urged Congress to pass this bill. More than 435 mayors and State leaders, Democrats and Republicans, have said the same: They want the bill. As one Republican mayor from Michigan put it, "The need is real, and not just in Democratic communities." He went on to tell his fellow Republicans in Washington who oppose the bill to "talk to some of the Republican mayors."

But if my Republican colleagues here in the Senate don't want to listen to the words of their fellow Republican mayors and Governors, they can look at the polls, which show the vast majority of Americans, including a majority of Republicans, support this bill.

It seems like the only people who are dead set against this bill are Republican Senators—not Republicans out in the country, not Republican mayors, not Republican businesspeople, not Republican small businesses.

I guess all of this should be expected. COVID-19 is not a Red State or a Blue State crisis. Our Republican friends should know that. It is not a Democratic or Republican concern. They should know that too. COVID-19 is a menace to all of us, and we should be banding together to fight.

The economic crisis has affected all of us, and the plan that we are going to vote on this week is going to provide real, robust relief for all of us.

Whatever our Republican colleagues decide to do, the Senate majority is intent on going forward and helping the American people with bold action quickly.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last year, Congress rallied five times around historic bipartisan legislation to meet urgent and unprecedented needs. Our COVID-19 packages reinforced the healthcare frontlines, fueled the sprint for vaccines, and cast lifelines for the workers and small businesses hit hardest by shutdowns.

Together, those bills cost about \$4 trillion, but none of those measures passed the House of Representatives with less than a bipartisan supermajority of about 80 percent—completely overwhelming support.

Then, last week, House Democrats rammed through the American Rescue Plan Act on a razor-thin margin of 50.7 percent. The only thing bipartisan about their bill was the opposition to it. Their bill costs about \$2 trillion. That is roughly the same size as the entire CARES Act that saved our health system and economy through months of shutdowns last year. Even liberal experts admit this is far out of proportion to what is needed now, with vaccines going into arms and the economy already primed to literally roar back.

Amazingly, Democrats managed to allocate less than 9 percent—9 percent—of their massive bill to the entire healthcare response; 9 percent of the \$1.9 trillion related to the healthcare response, and—listen to this—even less than 1 percent of the \$1.9 trillion to the vaccines that will actually finish the fight.

They needed to save the other 91 percent of the borrowed money for a vast catalog of liberal spending with basically no relationship whatsoever to beating COVID-19. For example, they want to send wheelbarrows of cash to State and local bureaucrats to bail out mismanagement from before the pandemic. They are changing the previous

bipartisan funding formula in ways that will especially bias the money toward big blue States. This outraged a bipartisan group of Governors, largely from middle America, who went on record this week. There are generous new benefit packages for government employees. There are provisions to let abortion providers drain money from rescue programs that were built to save Main Street small businesses. There is a strange new Acela corridor kickback where they will make Medicare send more money to just New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Delaware.

Just looking at the timeframe for all of their spending belies any notion that this is an urgent rescue plan.

Take the K-12 funding which, contrary to science, Democrats say is a prerequisite for opening schools. Ninety-five percent of that supposedly urgent money would not be spent this fiscal year but, instead, over the next 7 years. Let me say that again. Ninety-five percent of the money for K-12 is not going to be spent this year, but over the next 7 years. That is not my definition of an emergency.

Grants for rural healthcare would be on a slow drip out through fiscal 2024. Agriculture-related funds would trickle out over the next—listen to this—over the next decade. It doesn't sound very urgent to me.

What the American people need are fast-acting plans to get schools reopened now, get laid-off workers back into jobs, and finish the fight against this virus right now. The Democrats have, instead, drawn up a liberal omnibus to fund miscellaneous government spending over the next decade.

We are adding all this money to the national debt, and they have a rescue package with most of the money being spent out far in the future. That is why there was bipartisan opposition over in the House. That is why aspects of the House bill are already dropping like flies before this thing even hits the Senate floor.

A pet project for the San Francisco Bay area is gone. Special upgrades for a bridge connecting New York to Canada, gone. Even CNN had to admit these were "controversial." Senator SANDERS' far-left minimum wage policy that would have killed 1.4 million jobs just as we try to recover appears to be gone, too—at least for now.

According to public reports, right now, as we speak, several of our Democratic colleagues are frantically trying to trim back other crazy provisions: the runaway government bailouts, the policies that will keep workers at home when we should be focusing on rehiring.

Just a few days ago, President Biden's Chief of Staff bragged that this smorgasbord of borrowed money will add up to "the most progressive domestic legislation in a generation."

So that is what you get when the Democratic leader persuades all of my distinguished friends across the aisle that their first undertaking as Senate

committee chairmen should be to outsource all their gavels to the House.

The Senate wrote the CARES Act. In the earliest days of the crisis, this Chamber took the bull by the horns. I personally assembled bipartisan task forces that crafted urgent solutions to help America weather the storm.

This time around, on the substance, the Senate has been largely missing in action. House Democrats are bristling and publicly pushing back if our Senate Democratic colleagues even try to make their mark on this partisan bill in small ways.

So these two radically different processes have generated two radically different pieces of legislation.

The Democrats had a choice. They chose to go it alone, tack to the left, leave families' top priorities on the cutting-room floor.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a completely different matter, just 6 weeks into unified Democratic government, we already have another crisis brewing on our southern border. In January, Customs and Border Protection logged more than 78,000 encounters on our southwest border, more than double the figure from January of 2020.

Last week, HHS sources told reporters we just logged the busiest February in the history of the Unaccompanied Alien Children Program. The number of kids turning up on our border with no parents is soaring, and everyone expects the numbers to keep climbing.

Now the Biden administration is reportedly planning to reopen the same kinds of emergency shelters over which Democrats vilified the Trump administration a couple of years back. Both President Biden and his Secretary of Homeland Security have said this week they don't think this is a crisis. Not a crisis, they say? Well, if this isn't a crisis, with unaccompanied kids pouring in and exceeding the capacity in a pandemic, I would hate to see what one looks like.

The cause of this emergency is not some mystery. It is not mysterious at all. Everybody knows exactly what happened. The new administration explicitly campaigned on weakening border security, and 6 weeks in, they have reversed the "Remain in Mexico" policy, begun letting more people in in a haphazard way, and broadcast confusing mixed messages.

The L.A. Times says: "Biden immigration policy stirs confusion at Mexico border." They interviewed one woman who crossed the Rio Grande "on a smuggler's raft" and was only briefly detained before being released into our country. She explained she had specifically come because of the new Biden administration: "That gave us the opportunity to come."

Another reporter put it this way: "The message received in Tijuana and other Mexican border cities was

simpl[e]: Joe Biden was now letting people in.”

We are not just talking about the fine details of border policy. The big backdrop behind this whole discussion is the sweeping leftwing amnesty plan that the Biden administration unveiled before they were even sworn in. They want to fast-track 11 million illegal immigrants into temporary legal status, then green cards, and then full citizenship.

The far left loves this approach, but so does a certain cross section of Big Business. There is a whole lot of cultural power and economic power pushing the liberal vision. As for the best interest of American workers, well, that is not as trendy a cause in certain circles.

The truth is that it is not helpful or compassionate to just open up our borders. It is not fair to American citizens and workers, but neither is it fair to the people who are being lured into a humanitarian crisis in the middle of a pandemic because they believe this Democratic administration just conspicuously turned on a neon “Vacancies” sign.

Republicans just spent 4 years making major headway on the security and humanitarian crisis at our border. It took serious policy changes. It took international diplomacy with multiple countries, and it took border enforcement.

The American people would be better served if the Biden administration had chosen to build on this progress instead of rapidly trying to tear it down.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MERRICK BRIAN GARLAND

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, history was made on Monday. Judge Merrick Garland finally got a vote before the Senate Judiciary Committee. It was a long time in coming. His nomination was approved by a bipartisan vote of 15 to 7. I am not surprised. He is superbly qualified to be the next Attorney General of the United States.

With experience, judgment, and integrity, he checks all the boxes. He served with distinction on the DC Circuit Court for 23 years and, in that time, developed a reputation for fidelity to the rule of law, a strict adherence to judicial independence, and a commitment to treat people with fairness, dignity, and respect. It is no surprise that he has been endorsed by 60 former Federal judges and by judges, of course, who have been appointed by Presidents of both political parties. In

addition to his experience on the bench, he is a longtime veteran of the Department of Justice, where he served before he ascended to the DC Circuit.

He is uniquely qualified at this moment in history to lead the Department and to investigate and prosecute, for example, the January 6 insurrection—the mob that invaded this Capitol Building. The reason he is qualified is that he led the investigation and prosecution of the Oklahoma City bombing. We remember that very well. That was clearly a case of domestic terrorism. His work on that project won praise from across the political spectrum.

He also personally understands the Department's role in protecting civil rights. I believe he is the person to restore honor and dignity to this Department. He has support from every major law enforcement organization in the country, from 150 former Justice Department officials of both parties, from the Nation's leading civil rights organizations, and from many others—left, right, and center. His credentials are second to none, and his character—in particular, his selflessness—is a model to us all.

When we held the markup on his nomination in the committee, the most significant witness may have been a lady by the name of Mrs. Tucker. She testified on the second panel. She is the mother of two DC public school students who were tutored and mentored by Judge Garland. After the first child had received his helping hand for several years, the second child asked if she could be included in the next round, and then they both won the help of Judge Garland. Doesn't it speak volumes of a man who has reached that station in life that he would be so humble as to sit down and help children whom he had never met before find their way through life? It was a touching moment when she testified. It really was an insight into his character.

So you would think, with a 15-to-7 vote, you would think with all of these endorsements, and you would think that the fact of there being four members on the Republican Senate side of the Senate Judiciary Committee behind him that this would be a nomination of an Attorney General so important to this Nation that it would be given expedited treatment on the floor of the Senate. No. Unfortunately, there was an objection to expediting his nomination so he could get to work for the Department of Justice, and, as a consequence, we face the Senate procedure, which means that it could be days, maybe even into next week, before he can take the job. That is unfortunate. We need him now more than ever. Even Republican Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has said he would support him. CHUCK GRASSLEY, my friend and the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, voted for him.

There is just no reason the Senate should not immediately hold a vote for Merrick Garland's nomination. He is

the last remaining member of President Biden's national security team to be chosen. It is time for him to take this job. The Attorney General is needed to fight the threat of domestic terrorism, which the FBI Director spoke to yesterday in the Senate Judiciary Committee, to reorganize this Department and get it moving in the right direction, and to face the many challenges when it comes to national security and the administration of justice.

We should confirm Merrick Garland immediately. I sincerely hope that whoever is holding his nomination on the other side can be persuaded to give him his chance.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on a different subject, I listened to the speeches of Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL about the American Rescue Plan—Joe Biden's proposal, his initial proposal as President—to deal with the pandemic, the state of the economy, and many other aspects of American culture and life that need to be addressed. Clearly, there is a difference of opinion.

I couldn't help but think, as Senator MCCONNELL was recounting our experience last year, that when it came to the CARES Act a year ago—the \$2 trillion plan to respond to the state of the pandemic and the economy, the plan that was engineered by Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, a member of the Trump administration, who argued and negotiated with Republicans and Democrats alike—that, when they finally agreed, the vote was 96 to nothing in this Chamber. Every Democrat voted for the proposed CARES Act that was engineered by the Trump administration. Party was pushed aside because the priority was our Nation. It happened again in December of last year. In President Trump's administration, with Treasury Secretary Mnuchin at the table and with Democrats and Republicans bargaining, the final vote was 92 to 6 in the Senate—not bad—and the 6 noes were all Republicans. Again, the Democrats stepped up and said: We will support this bipartisan effort because that is why we are here. The American people sent us here to do a job.

Now comes the new President, Joe Biden, who says: Good work last December, but that was temporary, and that was supposed to be a special effort. Now we have to finish the year. We have some deadlines coming. Just 2 weeks from now—or in less than 2 weeks—the unemployment insurance programs will be running out for millions of Americans, and the rental assistance program as well. Some will face eviction, and some will not have enough money to feed their families. So get to work. Pass the American Rescue Plan on a bipartisan basis.

We have yet to hear from one Republican Senator who will support President Biden's plan. Some of them have

legitimate differences with his policy, and I wish they would come to the table and be a part of the conversation, but none of them has really stepped up and said: We are in for the big effort that the President is calling for. That is what it will take. Unfortunately, because of that, in a 50–50 Senate, we will need every Democratic Senator to support the President's plan and to pass a version of what the House is sending over to us. We will go through an exercise called "reconciliation" in just a few days. It is not a pretty scene if you follow legislative history, but it is long overdue.

Do you know the one thing that should drive us on? It is not only the obvious need for this but the fact that the American people overwhelmingly support what President Biden has proposed. The American people believe, as he does, that we should be investing billions into more vaccines and more people to administer them. The American people believe that a cash payment to families is essential in some parts of this country. They would like to see the \$600 in last December's bill complemented with the \$1,400 in this proposal. They would like for us to put money on the table for people who are unemployed so they can put food on that same table, and they would like for us to get the schools ready to deal with reopening and classes that are safe for the kids and the teachers. There is no argument about that.

While 20 percent of the people may oppose it, 80 percent support it. Yet we can't find one Republican Senator to support President Biden's plan. They say it costs too much. Well, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Powell, a conservative Republican economist, has told us to be careful that you do too little. This economy is fragile. It needs to be strengthened. We need to inject into this economy enough of our resources so that people are back, purchasing again, and businesses are reopened. He has warned us, if you do too little and if you cut it off too soon, you are going to pay for it for years to come with unemployment and problems with the sluggish economy.

My Republican colleagues say it is just too much money. Well, I think they are wrong, and at this moment in history, I am prepared to err on the side of investing in the American people and American businesses and making certain that we have a fighting chance to put this behind us.

Our constituents know about the cost of this situation. They want us to provide the solutions. They want results from Congress. If we were to delay this payment, people would see their unemployment insurance lapse and hardships continue.

We shouldn't play politics with it either. In the two big bills last year, the Democrats were on board for plans engineered by the Trump administration. Economists believe that we need to move and move decisively.

According to an analysis by the Brookings Institution, passing a com-

prehensive plan like the American Rescue Plan could produce a 4-percent growth in U.S. GDP this year.

Moody's estimates that passing the same plan would create 7½ million American jobs. How about that?

We got good news over the weekend with the arrival of another safe and effective vaccine. This is the third one, the Johnson & Johnson vaccine, in our arsenal—perhaps more to follow. It holds the promise of finally getting America inoculated, vaccinated, and breaking the back of this pandemic.

This new vaccine prevents hospitalizations and deaths, stored at normal temperatures, a single shot—all good news.

But we need more than a promise of a vaccine. We need a plan. These vaccines are of no good to us sitting on a shelf or not being produced in volumes necessary.

President Biden's rescue plan, which not a single Republican supports, would provide 100 and—I think I have got the number right—\$160 billion in resources for the production of vaccines and the distribution. If we ever needed it, this was the moment.

Thankfully, President Biden's leadership has led to allocations to Illinois of vaccines that have increased by 70 percent since he took over as President. We still have our challenges at the local level.

I want to salute the Governor, JB Pritzker; the mayor of the city of Chicago, Lori Lightfoot; the Cook County Board President Preckwinkle; and all the others who are doing their best.

I announced with Senator DUCKWORTH just last Friday that we are going to put a new facility in the parking lot of the United Center, where the amazing Chicago Bulls play basketball from time to time, and it is going to be able to vaccinate thousands of people every single day.

It is Federal assistance that is making it happen, and it happens to be in a neighborhood where African Americans and Latinos are nearby, and we need to protect them with even more effectiveness than we have to date. They account for 33 percent of the population of that area, and only 16 percent have been vaccinated.

The American Rescue Plan provides \$20 billion to expand our vaccine distribution capacity. You would think that that would maybe attract one Republican supporter. It should. There are certainly some who argue against all vaccines and spending any money for it and all the rest, but they are such a small minority. The vast majority of Americans of both political parties understand that we have got to go to vaccinations as quickly as possible. The Biden rescue plan does that. I wish they would join us in supporting it.

There is also a need for money for education. There is \$128 billion in this bill for additional education funding K–12, and there have been arguments made on the floor here by the Republicans that we just don't need it. They

point to data showing that the school districts haven't spent the money that we provided in previous relief packages. Well, just talk to the principals and the teachers in your home State about that conclusion. You will find the money is desperately needed and that the money that has been appropriated before will be spent in an orderly way and not shoveled out the window.

We are looking ahead to the entire year and making certain that we have a real school year—perhaps the remainder of this year but certainly for next year. Illinois needs these funds and America does.

When it comes to State and local support, I have to tell you, we have paid a heavy price in our State of Illinois and our major cities. We have seen expenses go up and we have seen revenue go down and we need help, not unreasonable.

This helping hand will save jobs that are necessary for us—some of them healthcare jobs, some of them security and safety jobs, but they will save jobs, and that is why the State and the local resources included in this bill are so important and timely.

Over the past year, States and localities have lost 1.3 million jobs of their payrolls, far more than the 750,000 lost in the great recession. There is needed help from the Federal Government, and it is needed now.

We have recovered just 12 million of the 22 million jobs we have lost since the start of the pandemic.

According to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, more than 8 million rental households and 2 million homeowners were behind on housing payments at the end of last year. The burden is tough, and for those of us lucky enough to have escaped it, we may not know the feeling, the empty feeling of eviction or the loss of a home that you have paid a mortgage on for years.

I am going to close. I see one of my colleagues on the floor preparing to speak, but I would like to close with the story of Galen Hensen from Midlothian, IL.

For 34 years, Galen has supported touring artists through his work in live concert production for some of America's most iconic musicians. When the American economy was upended by the pandemic, his industry froze to save other lives and to avoid crowds.

Like so many others, Galen went on unemployment. Yet, even with the Federal \$600 supplement to State unemployment, he had only half of his regular income replaced. He struggles—still struggles to make ends meet. He wrote to me urging that we put aside our partisan differences and pass the American Rescue Plan. Let's listen to Galen, and let's listen to many others like him. They are counting on us.

I hope when all is said and done after all the speeches, that just as we came together on a bipartisan basis to pass the rescue plan twice last year—96 to

nothing, 92 to 6—under the Trump administration, with all Democrats supporting it, wouldn't it be great if we showed that same bipartisanship again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, less than 2 months ago, President Biden emphasized a theme of unity at his inauguration.

"Today, on this January day, my whole soul is in this," he said. "Bringing America together. Uniting our people. And uniting our nation."

Admirable words, but so far they haven't been met with much action. On the first big legislative test of his Presidency, coronavirus legislation, President Biden and Democrats in Congress have pursued a resolutely partisan course.

They have not only failed to invite Republican input in any meaningful way, they deliberately excluded it by passing their coronavirus package using budget reconciliation.

This allows them to pass the bill in the Senate by a simple majority vote, instead of requiring the concurrence of 60 Senators to move to a vote on the bill, which is typically how legislation is passed here in the Senate, including the five coronavirus bills that we passed last year, when the Republicans had the majority here in the Senate.

Now, Democrats' decision to use reconciliation might be understandable if Republicans had declared our opposition to any further coronavirus legislation, but, of course, that is not the case.

Republicans made it clear that we were willing to work with Democrats on additional coronavirus legislation. In fact, 10 Republican Senators put together a plan and met with President Biden for 2 hours to discuss a bipartisan agreement. But while the President listened to them graciously, Democrats and the President quickly made it clear that they intended to move forward without Republican input.

Two days after Republicans met with President Biden, the House passed its partisan budget resolution to pave the way for reconciliation here in the Senate. Two days later, the Senate followed suit.

Clearly, there were no plans to let negotiations with Republicans slow down the partisan juggernaut. In fact, Democrats have been pretty determined to make sure Republicans don't have a voice in this legislation at all.

During markups of the COVID relief package in House committees, Republicans offered a number of amendments: 245 amendments, to be exact. Out of those 245 amendments, Democrats accepted exactly one for the final bill—one.

Among the amendments House Democrats rejected were commonsense

proposals to tie school funding to the reopening of schools. There was an amendment to unfreeze funding for the Coronavirus Food Assistance Program for farmers and ranchers. There were amendments to target funding to overlooked rural communities and an amendment to protect healthcare providers from frivolous lawsuits.

The one thing that can be said for the House is at least it gave Members in the House a chance to review the bill in committee. Here in the Senate, Democrats' COVID package will come to the floor without any committee consideration. Senators are just supposed to accept whatever the House sent over or whatever changes the Senate Democratic leader makes, minus those items that are excluded from a reconciliation package by Senate budget rules.

Democrats' partisan course on COVID legislation is particularly disappointing because up until now, COVID relief has been a bipartisan process.

That is right. To date, Congress has passed five COVID relief bills, and every single one of those bills was overwhelmingly bipartisan.

The Republican-led Senate took up and passed COVID relief legislation by margins of 96 to 1, 90 to 8, 96 to 0, 92 to 6, and one even went by voice vote here in the Senate.

Back then, of course, Democrats thought that the minority party should have a voice in the process. In fact, the Democratic leader filibustered the original CARES Act, our largest COVID bill to date, multiple times until he got a version that he was satisfied with.

Now that the Democrats are in the majority, however, they have decided minority representation can be dispensed with. It is Democrats' way or the highway on COVID legislation. Republicans and the Americans that they represent will not be allowed to contribute.

I guess it is not surprising. After all, if the Democrats had pursued a bipartisan process, they would probably have had to eliminate some of the non-COVID-related provisions in this legislation, like the \$86 billion bailout of multiemployer pension plans, hardly a coronavirus emergency.

They might have been forced to trim their slush fund for States and ensure that the distribution formula wasn't weighted heavily in favor of blue States.

The Senator from Illinois was just down here talking about the importance of helping out the States. Well, under the formula that they have designed for this relief package, the dollars skew heavily, surprisingly, to States like New York, where the Democratic leader is from, or California, where the House Speaker is from, or Illinois, where the Senate Democratic whip is from.

It seems like a lot of States around the country sort of got left out when it

came to how to distribute what is going to be a huge amount of money that is going to go out to State and local governments if the Democrats have their way with this bill. They might have had to reject the measure to give labor unions and Planned Parenthood access to loans designed to help small businesses—again, hardly something that we ought to be doing in a coronavirus relief bill that is designed to make sure that small businesses stay viable, but it does satisfy a lot of Democrat special interest groups.

They might have had to tie funding for schools to school reopening—seems like a fair consideration. There was an amendment offered during the budget resolution when it was being considered on the floor of the Senate that would have required schools where every teacher had the vaccination to reopen in order to qualify for Federal assistance under this legislation, but there is nothing about that in this bill. There is nothing that, of all the money, the \$128 billion that will go out to schools—by the way, we put \$68 billion out there already, much of which hasn't been spent. But with all this money that would go out to schools, there is no stipulation anywhere in this legislation that would attempt to tie funding for schools to their reopening so that we can get our kids back to school and learning again in that environment.

In fact, it would be arguable, I think, that the schools, if the teachers can get vaccinated—and that was the very language of the amendment that was offered in the budget resolution by Republicans. It was defeated here in the Senate on a 50-50 vote. All Republicans voted for it, all Democrats against it. But again, all it simply said was that if you are going to get Federal funding under this bill and all of the teachers in your school are vaccinated against the coronavirus, then you have to reopen. If you don't reopen after all the teachers have been vaccinated, then you don't get funding under this bill. That seems like a fairly straightforward request, given the fact that so many schools across this country and so many of our kids continue to have to learn virtually at a time when we need to have them in the classroom. This is obviously something that wasn't included in this legislation.

I would argue that all the changes that I have just mentioned would have made the bill better, but they might not have made the Democrat allies as happy. This whole process could have been different. We could be here today with another bipartisan COVID bill that would speed up vaccination and help our country through the rest of the pandemic. In fact, as I said, there were lots of Republicans who were interested in negotiating, sitting down with Democrats to do just that.

The Democrat whip, the Senator from Illinois, was down here saying: Wouldn't it be great if this could be bipartisan like the other bills we have

done earlier that were bipartisan? I would simply point out the obvious, and that is that all of the bills that were done last year when Republicans had the majority here in the Senate were bipartisan because we did them under regular order. We did them under the 60-vote threshold that is required to move legislation through the Senate.

What the Democrat leadership has opted to do is to use a rarely used legislative vehicle here—budget reconciliation—to do a bunch of things that they could do simply with 51 votes, and it was pretty clear to me that they had no intention ever of including Republican ideas or involving Republicans in developing this legislation or, ultimately, having Republican support for at the end. In fact, that was probably made most clear by a statement made by the Chief of Staff to President Biden in the White House when he described this as “the most progressive domestic legislation in a generation,” suggesting, of course, that this is filled with all kinds of liberal priorities, most of which have very little to do with the coronavirus.

In fact, if you look at where the funding goes in this, the \$1.9 trillion, less than 10 percent—less than 10 percent—deals with funding for public healthcare; in other words, funding for vaccines, either for production or distribution; funding for providers; funding more mental health; funding for anything related to healthcare. If you look at the \$1.9 trillion, it is less than 10 percent. Less than 10 percent of it is actually directed at addressing the actual healthcare crisis that we are facing as a nation.

I would simply say that it is pretty clear to me that if Democrats had wanted to, they could have had—easily could have had—a bipartisan bill. There are 10 Republicans I know of today who would have voted for a bill that would include funding for vaccines, that would include funding for the Paycheck Protection Program, that would include funding for unemployment checks, that actually would have included funding for direct checks to go out, which I know is a very popular thing. But that consultation never occurred. That desire to get input never happened—that offer to allow the committees of jurisdiction to even have a voice or any input into this.

Frankly, if I am a Democrat here in the Senate, I would be outraged that my committees were bypassed completely. There was no consideration at any committee—any committee—here in the Senate about what the contents of this legislation should be or what the substance of it should look like in the end. It was literally ramrodded, coming from the House of Representatives, taken up by the Democratic leadership with no input from the committees—Republicans, for sure, but also Democrats, of all people, who you think would want to be heard. I mean, they got these chairmanships of these

committees for a reason. They finally got the majority, and they have committee gavels and all that, and here we are, talking about \$1.9 trillion in spending, and the committee chairs, the committees themselves had no action when it comes to shaping or in any way producing this legislation.

So to suggest, as the Democrat whip, Senator DURBIN, did earlier, that he really hopes that this will be bipartisan, I just—it is hard to take that even seriously, given how this is proceeding and how the Democrats opted to do this relative to how the other five coronavirus relief bills were passed last year under the Republican majority.

We are looking instead at a partisan bill that directs billions of taxpayer dollars to projects and policies that have nothing to do with overcoming COVID. And just as one observation—again, I made this point on the floor yesterday. But one thing that we need to remember here is that we are talking about real money here, and we are talking about it all being borrowed money. This is all money that goes on the debt. Every dollar that we are going to provide of the \$1.9 trillion that is proposed in this Democrat bill is a borrowed dollar. These are all dollars that go on the debt, the debt which has grown dramatically in this last year, in some cases because we had to move aggressively, as we did last year at this time in March with a bill that would get immediate assistance out there to people who desperately needed it. We were fighting at that time a major emergency, a major crisis. Well, here we are, a year later. We have a very different perspective on the world today than we did 12 months ago. But that \$1.9 trillion, when added to the other coronavirus relief bills, ends up being about \$6 trillion—\$6 trillion. That amount of money is absolutely hard to comprehend and hard to fathom. And we are talking about compounding the \$4 trillion or so already out there with another \$2 trillion with this bill, and as I pointed out yesterday, at some point—at some point—the chickens come home to roost. You cannot continue down this path without consequence on the economy.

Now, the argument in support of this legislation made by Democrats is that we need to do more; we have got to get this out there; we have got to stimulate the economy. My fear in a lot of respects right now is that the economy could be overstimulated. The Congressional Budget Office said just recently that without any additional assistance, the economy is going to grow in 2021 at 3.7 percent, and we are flooding the zone with so much money that the money supply numbers have been exploding.

The 2020 money supply was up—the M2 as they measure it—was up 26 percent. Year over year, from 2000 to 2019, it averaged about 6 percent. This year it is going to be up another 12 percent. There is a lot of money out there in the economy. What does that mean long-

term for our economy and for the individual workers in our economy? Well, first off, it means that as there are more and more dollars chasing fewer goods, you are going to get inflation. That is inevitable. When you get inflation, typically what happens is interest rates follow because those who are buying that debt, if it is being lost to inflation, want to make sure that they are getting a return on their investments, so interest rates start to go up.

When interest rates go up, the amount of money we borrow becomes even more expensive because we have to pay interest. We have to finance that debt. So the amount of interest—the amount of Federal tax dollars that we will be using to pay for interest on the debt will explode and will swamp—it will swamp, literally—the amount of tax revenue coming into this country. We know that because the debt is so large already, and we know that because interest rates have been low for a long time, which has lulled everybody into a sense of complacency that this is not going to have any impact, that there is no downside. We can just keep borrowing because interest rates are low.

Well, if you keep putting as much money out there as we are—another \$2 trillion out into the economy—I would argue that you are not only going to unleash inflation, which has a dramatic consequence for our fiscal situation as a country, but it also has a dramatic consequence for the personal financial situation of the American family because when inflation takes off, everything that people have to buy, from food to gasoline to clothing—all those things go up. Inflation pushes the prices of things higher, which means they are more expensive to the average family in this country.

Then the other effect, long-term, is when inflation starts to go up, as I said, interest rates start to follow. We are already starting to see some evidence of that. When interest rates go up, not only does the Federal Government fiscal picture get much, much worse because the amount of tax dollars that we have to spend to finance our debt grows dramatically, but the American consumer is also faced with higher interest rates. So mortgage payments go up if somebody is trying to finance a home. Interest rates on cars, automobiles, will go up. Interest rates on student loans go up. That also has a direct impact on the pocketbooks of people in this country.

Mr. President, I am going to conclude, but I think it is really important to point out—and I know that my State is not indicative of every State around the country. There are States that have legitimate, different financial situations. But in South Dakota right now, we have 3-percent unemployment. We have a growing economy. We have a State that has already benefited significantly from earlier coronavirus relief legislation to the point where there are dollars that they

are still trying to figure out how to use from the previous installations of Federal spending that we have put out there. It just seems to me that we ought to, given the potential adverse consequence of higher interest rates, higher inflation, higher debt and spending, think about that what we are doing here should be very targeted. It should be very specific.

We know now—we have a lot more insight into where the needs are in the economy than we did at this point last year, in March, when we did the first CARES package. We are at a time now when it is very clear where those needs are, and we could come up with a much more targeted bill. Those 10 Republicans that I have mentioned have come up with a bill that is in the \$600 billion to \$700 billion range, which addresses the healthcare issues, addresses the unemployment insurance issues, addresses the PPP program. It deals with direct checks, as I mentioned. It has got funding for education. I think some funding is in there for State and local governments, which, frankly, as I said, I am not for. I would rather see us take those dollars, if we are going to put them somewhere, put them toward something that is more targeted, at least a formula that makes more sense.

But let me just say that in my view it is really important right now that we be circumspect. We are talking about borrowed money. This is now—this is the house of dollars. This is not—this isn't just magic money that appears out of nowhere. Every single dollar that we are using is borrowed, will be added to the debt, will be a liability for somebody to have to pay back—for our kids and our grandkids. And if the potential economic impacts that I mentioned actually occur and interest rates start to tick up, it is going to be a lot more expensive money to finance in the future, and I think that is a very real consideration. It is something we ought to be thinking long and hard about, not just because of the fiscal situation that the country faces right now but because of the financial situation every American family, as they sit around the kitchen table and talk about these pocketbook issues, will be looking at. If we see higher inflation, if we see higher interest rates, it is going to affect their jobs; it is going to affect their cost of living; and it is going to make it that much harder for them to make ends meet.

Less than 2 months after the President committed himself to unity at his inauguration, the first major bill of his Presidency will be a resolutely partisan piece of legislation. I hope—I hope—that this is not a sign of things to come.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this week, my Democratic colleagues are poised to push through the Senate here an untargeted and unfocused \$1.9 trillion tax and spending package, and it is all being done under the guise of COVID relief. Some of it is very essential for COVID relief but a small part of it.

This whole act is very unfortunate because it didn't have to be this way. In the past year, Republicans and Democrats were able to work together to pass more than \$4 trillion in COVID relief, and it was all done with strong bipartisan support.

From the start of this year, my Republican colleagues and I have stood ready to engage in good-faith, bipartisan negotiations to provide further targeted relief. However, despite all the talk of unity and bipartisanship by President Biden, the new Senate majority hasn't even attempted to reach across the aisle. Bipartisanship worked 5 times over the last 12 months, starting about 1 year ago right now.

The majority, demonstrating their unwillingness to compromise, has resorted to using special budget procedures so that they may pass a partisan bill strictly along party lines. The result is going to be an unwieldy, nearly \$2 trillion package that isn't shaped according to current economic realities but strictly by a partisan liberal agenda.

In February, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, projected that even without any further stimulus, gross domestic product will return to its prepandemic levels by mid-2021, and, for the year, the economy will grow at 4.6 percent.

If those two points aren't strong enough, it was recently reported that retail sales jumped 5.6 percent during January, and the National Retail Federation is projecting retail sales for the year to grow at the fastest rate in two decades.

If those four points aren't enough, at the same time, personal income is reported to have risen by 10 percent, and the personal savings rate has surged from a historically high 13.4 percent to over 20 percent.

The American economy will soon be roaring without a \$2 trillion further stimulus. It is no longer March of 2020 when the economy was in free fall and businesses and places of employment were shut down. And how were they shut down? By those of us right here in the Congress of the United States, the Federal Government doing it by government edict.

While many individuals and certain sectors of our economy continue to struggle and, of course, deserve a helping hand, others have largely recovered and are no longer in need of assistance.

At this time, instead of \$2 trillion, two-thirds of it not needed, why not help those hurting and not pour gasoline on the inflationary fires? A COVID relief package should reflect this reality in both size and scope.

Even longtime Democratic economists, such as Obama's former Director of the National Economic Council, have raised concerns about enacting nearly a \$2 trillion stimulus package at this point when we are already in recovery. As former Secretary of Treasury Summers—I also referred to him as Director of the National Economic Council—this is what he says: "The proposed Biden stimulus is three times as large as" the gap between actual and potential output as estimated by the CBO.

Enacting a stimulus unmoored from economic reality poses real risks to our economy, including inflation and slower economic growth moving forward. In fact, a Penn Wharton Budget Model analysis of the President's proposal projects the proposed stimulus would result in a decrease in both GDP and wages in 2022 and over the next 2 decades.

While inflation has been subdued in recent years, we shouldn't let that lull in inflation lull us into a false sense of confidence that we can spend with impunity with no consequences. We are in uncharted waters with debt held by the public exceeding the size of our economy and trillion-dollar annual deficits.

Moreover, as economist John Greenwood and Steve Hanke, professor of economics at Johns Hopkins, recently warned:

The money supply will grow by nearly 12 percent this year. That's twice as fast as its average growth rate from 2000–19. It's a rate that spells trouble—inflation trouble.

And that is without another round of stimulus that we are going to be debating in the next few days here on the floor of the U.S. Senate and probably passing before the end of the week.

Concerns of inflation have been dismissed by the White House and by the Federal Reserve. This sounds too familiar to those of us who witnessed the stagflation of the 1970s. We were told by President Nixon and his advisers that they could spend their way to lower unemployment and economic growth without inflation. They were wrong. The Nixon administration's mistakes ushered in a decade of disastrous inflation. I have said for decades, if Nixon did something, we ought to learn from it, not repeat it.

It was with this background of stagflation that I first ran for Congress on a platform of fighting inflation. Inflation is a regressive stealth tax on every single American. It is particularly unfair to those who have very little money to begin with, and those who have lived beneath their incomes to save for the future only to see their hard work wiped out as the value of the dollars that they put away plunges. Hopefully, Nixon inflation is only history never to return.

But none of us can guarantee that inflation won't return. Not only is the size of this stimulus package detached from reality; so is the scope. A common adage for stimulus and economic relief measures is that they should be timely, they should be temporary, and they should be targeted. By this standard, the Democrats' stimulus is well wide of the mark.

More than one-third, or about \$700 billion, of the funding in the bill wouldn't even be spent until 2022 or beyond, according to the CBO. How does anybody know that we need a stimulus in 2022 and beyond? By what standard does the Biden administration say that we are going to need that? And doesn't that have something to do with the failure of this bill to accomplish what it wants to accomplish, or even the need for it, if some of this money won't be spent until the outer years?

I don't know about you, but I don't see how spending hundreds of billions of dollars years from now is either timely or targeted. As these economists talk about a stimulus, if it is going to be any good, it needs to be timely and targeted.

What does all this have to do with fighting the pandemic right now, with the people hurting right now? Are these same people going to be hurting in these out years when some of this money is going to be spent? If that is the case, this brand-new administration is already admitting that their policies of the future are a failure and a failure today.

Nearly a quarter of the package, or \$422 billion, is dedicated to direct payments to households with incomes up to \$200,000, all regardless of whether they have lost a job or experienced any loss of income. Such untargeted payments make little sense when just this past week it was reported that personal income was up 10 percent and personal savings rates soared to over 20 percent. We clearly shouldn't be using taxpayer dollars to pad the bank accounts of those with six-figure incomes when we ought to be targeting this toward those who are unemployed and those who are low income.

Then we have another \$350 billion of this package that is going to be allocated to bail out fiscally irresponsible States at the expense of States that have managed their State budgets wisely, like my home State of Iowa. This spending is hard to justify given recent reports indicating most States saw little to no drop in revenue between 2019 and 2020. And many States that were previously projecting shortfalls are now projecting budget surpluses.

The package also includes hundreds of billions of dollars in liberal wish-list priorities that have very little to do with the current pandemic. This includes enhancements to refundable tax credits, an expansion of ObamaCare subsidies, and an \$86 billion taxpayer bailout of poorly managed pension plans.

On poorly managed pension plans, that is something that I have been trying to reform over the last 2 years, and reform is necessary, as much as helping them with taxpayer dollars. But there are absolutely no reforms in this stimulus of those multiemployer pension plans. It is simply an \$86 billion bailout.

In the case of COVID, there are some things that no amount of money can address. Until the widespread immunity is achieved, many people will not feel comfortable eating out, going to a movie, taking in a concert, or traveling on a vacation. Spending trillions of dollars will not change the attitude of those people who are going to still be very cautious.

So here is what I would spend the money on—and a lot less money than \$1.9 trillion. Yes, let's prioritize funding for vaccine distribution, assistance for the unemployed, and aid for small businesses in the struggling sectors. And, by all means, let's open our schools. Doing this doesn't require \$2 trillion. Let's remove the pork in this bill. Let's set aside the long-term left-wing wish list and work together as we did before in those five bipartisan bills over the last 12 months. And they have passed both bodies overwhelmingly.

Several of my Republican colleagues approached the White House a few weeks ago with a long list of what I just said—maybe a longer list of items proposed by President Biden that could get Republican support with minimal tweaks. A bipartisan package along those lines could well have passed a few days ago. It is still not too late. I hope we can make a bipartisan effort happen again.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, first, I would like to associate myself with the outstanding remarks from the senior Senator from Iowa, whose long experience in this body is one that we all look to with great admiration and respect.

When he speaks on this, he is well known for his fundamental focus on taxpayer dollars and making sure money isn't wasted, making sure money is directed to the areas where it is supposed to go, where it is needed the most. When he points out how this is a bill basically piled on with pork—and he is from Iowa; he knows about pork—he points out how misguided this effort is, how expensive it is, and how misdirected it is.

I just want to associate myself with these wonderful remarks of the senior Senator from Iowa, and it is a pleasure and a privilege to serve with him.

ELECTIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I also come to the floor today to talk about the need for integrity in our elections.

In 2020, the American people voted for a 50–50 Senate. We are in that body

today. And they gave Republicans nearly a dozen more seats in the House of Representatives.

In the Presidential election, 37 electoral votes were decided by less than 1 percent in those States. Without those 37 electoral votes, President Biden would have failed to achieve a majority in the electoral college. This was a close election. The reason it is a close election is it is a closely divided country.

I am home every weekend in Wyoming and the two things I hear about is, one, this massive bill in front of the Senate right now—a \$1.9 trillion amount of money that is all going to be added to the debt—and the concern for that spending. And the other issue is the integrity of our elections.

So we have a close election. We have a closely divided country. If you would think anything, that should be a mandate to move to the middle, to find common ground, and to work for solutions. It is the kind of things that the President talked about in his inaugural address on January 20.

At a time like this, Americans want to make sure that our own elections are safe and secure and fair. I think voters, no matter what their political party or predisposition is—I think all voters deserve that, and they want it.

But when Republicans raise questions about the integrity of the election, well, we are attacked, and we have seen that now. In fact, earlier this very week, the majority leader of the U.S. Senate spoke of “the pernicious and nasty guise of election integrity.” “Pernicious and nasty guise of election integrity”—the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. He attacked the motives of millions of Americans who want to be confident in our elections. Every American ought to want to be confident in our elections.

But it looks like though some Democrats may accuse us of this, many Democrats share our concerns. I hear that from both sides of the aisle.

Democrats in Iowa, right now, are contesting a congressional race, and as I stand here, Democrats in the House are considering the most sweeping changes—and this is reason I am here—to election laws in decades.

Their bill is nearly 800 pages long. It is called H.R. 1, No. 1. To me, that means it is their No. 1 priority. Otherwise, why would they introduce it as their first bill and label it as H.R. 1? H.R. 1, for Democrats in the House, is not the coronavirus. It is not jobs. It is not schools. It is a change in the election process for the American people and is a big mandate coming out of Washington. So the No. 1 priority of House Democrats is not those key issues. Their No. 1 issue is elections and changing elections in our country.

The bill, interestingly, didn't go through a normal committee process as bills are supposed to do in the House or in the Senate. It went straight to the floor—from NANCY PELOSI's desk to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. Hundreds of pages are in there of

new mandates, and it tells each of our States how to hold elections. It doesn't read, "States, you do it." It tells the States how to do it. These aren't just any mandates. These are radical left-wing mandates that people in my home State of Wyoming view as scary and say would make the elections less secure. This bill is so radical that an earlier version of it was felt to be too liberal even for the ACLU, and the latest version is even more liberal than that. I am just going to mention a few of the mandates in this bill.

H.R. 1 would force every State—force every State—to give the vote to convicted felons. This would not be a State choice but a Federal mandate. One group of Democrats even tried to give the vote to felons who are still in prison right now, but that amendment failed.

H.R. 1 would force every State to allow same-day voter registration, online voter registration, and even automatic voter registration. Automatic voter registration? Voter registration is something somebody should have to do, register to vote. If the bill were to become law, you would be registered to vote automatically, without even knowing it, and when the States automatically register you, you are not allowed to find out how they got your information. They can't tell you. In effect, voter registration would be a thing of the past. A thing that we all did as young people, register to vote, would be a thing of the past.

H.R. 1 forces States to count provisional ballots statewide. So, if you vote Democrat in one district and are from another district, they will count it as a vote for the Democrat in your district. Mistakes like this shouldn't happen, let alone should your vote be able to be changed from the vote you actually cast.

The bill also doubles down on mail-in voting. The problems with that, I think people would agree, are obvious. Amazon—and many of us shop on Amazon, if not everyone—recently tried to restrict mail-in voting for a union election at one of its facilities. That is not because Amazon has conservative leadership; it is because they say it is harder to secure mail-in voting than it is to secure in-person voting. If you want an accurate vote, in-person voting is more accurate. The reason mail-in voting was expanded last year was because of the pandemic, but now the Democrats want to carve it into stone forever.

H.R. 1 would also take government funding and give it to political campaigns. The American people have some thoughts on that. The bill actually has a 6-to-1 match for campaign donations under \$200. So, if you were to donate \$100 to your favorite candidate, the Federal Government would take taxpayer dollars and give an additional \$600 of taxpayer money to that candidate who just got a \$100 check. Hard-working people would pay their taxes knowing that their hard-earned dollars would go to fund political activity,

even activity that they would not necessarily agree with.

Like so many liberal government programs, this is a system that could easily be defrauded. We see that now with the coronavirus bill as well. The Democrats know that they would still get their big corporate donations in New York and in San Francisco, but now they would get an added bonus—a 6-to-1 match—from taxpayers.

H.R. 1 would also give government-funded vouchers for people to donate to political campaigns. Political campaigns do not need taxpayer subsidies. People can decide how they want to spend their own money. The government shouldn't be redirecting it toward the party in power. The Democrats complain about money in politics all of the time. The solution, in seeing H.R. 1, apparently, is for there to be more money in politics as long as it is the taxpayers' money.

H.R. 1 ends the equal balance between the Republicans and Democrats on the Federal Election Commission. It ends it. The Democrats want to politicize the Commission that enforces our election laws. They want to make it a partisan organization. That is just another idea that would make it easier to commit fraud.

H.R. 1 doesn't just politicize the Federal Election Commission; it politicizes the Internal Revenue Service, the IRS. The Democrats want to break down the guardrails that currently keep the IRS out of politics. H.R. 1 gets rid of any of the limits on the IRS when giving tax exemptions to nonprofits. Now, think about this. Remember the scandal at the IRS under the Obama-Biden administration—a scandal, headlines. People are well aware. Well, H.R. 1 enshrines that into law. H.R. 1 gives a big stamp of approval to Lois Lerner and her behavior in the way she worked the IRS. Every Democrat who votes for the bill is saying that he or she will endorse what happened at the IRS under President Obama.

There is more, a lot more. The bill goes on and on. It is 800 pages. It is hard to believe too many Democrats have actually read it.

The bottom line is this: H.R. 1 would not reform our elections; it would deform our elections, change them dramatically. H.R. 1 makes our elections harder to secure, easier to defraud, and will cast doubt on every election into the future. That is the last thing we need in this country.

This is no time to sow doubt about our elections. People want confidence in the elections. That is why I am joined with Senator SCOTT of Florida, Senator HYDE-SMITH, and Senator LUMMIS to introduce a better proposal. Our bill would make our elections safe and secure and fair. It would give people more confidence in our elections.

Our bill says: no automatic registration. The House bill repeals all voter ID laws. Our bill says, if you want to register to vote, let's make sure you are a citizen. We need to make sure of

your identification. Let's make sure you have a Social Security number. Those are the sorts of things to provide integrity in the election process.

Under our bill, States can't just send out ballots in the mail based on old information, and that happened all around the country this year. You can still vote by mail. You just need to request a ballot so your information is up to date. It is the way we have done it in Wyoming. We send out requests to say, if you would like a ballot, apply for your absentee ballot, and people do. There is no question about the integrity of that system. It was in a number of States in which ballots were mailed out based on old information and without a request by a voter for that ballot that led to so many concerns about the abuse and fraud.

Our bill bans vote harvesting. It means you can't drop off somebody else's ballot.

The collection boxes they have need to be monitored. When you turn in your ballot to a ballot box, that ought to be monitored.

When votes are being counted, our bill makes sure that both sides are watching.

Our bill prohibits delays or pauses in ballot counting.

We require an audit of ballot counting systems within 30 days after the election.

Now, these are basic, commonsense measures to protect against fraud and error. You want it to be accurate. You want it to be fair.

The differences between our bill and the House's 800-page bill could not be more clear. The Republican bill makes it harder to commit fraud. The Democratic bill makes it easier to commit fraud. The Republican bill costs almost nothing. The Democratic bill costs billions. The Republican bill strengthens the protections of our elections. The Democratic bill weakens those protections and even gets rid of some of them.

This shouldn't be a partisan issue. We should all be against voter fraud. We should make it as hard to commit fraud as we possibly can. So I urge my colleagues to join me with Senators SCOTT and LUMMIS and HYDE-SMITH. Let us stand for integrity in our elections. Let us give every American citizen confidence and the peace of mind that our system works.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this Saturday will mark 1 year since Congress passed our first response to the COVID-19 virus.

That legislation, you will recall, received overwhelming support. It passed by a vote of 96 to 1 here in the Senate and 415 to 2 in the House, and we know that it was not just a one-off. Each of the five pandemic relief bills that were

signed into law last year received overwhelming bipartisan support.

That is not to say that everybody was in perfect agreement about the size and shape of the bills. We had more than our fair share of disagreements along the way, but both sides of the aisle understood the most pressing challenges facing our country and the types of support that were needed to sustain that fight both when it came to public health and when it came to the economic fallout and recession that resulted: resources for hospitals and healthcare workers, support for the hardest hit families, assistance for small businesses, and, of course, the development, manufacturing, and distribution of vaccines. Not only did we agree on what should be in the bills, but we, actually, also agreed on what should not be in the bills.

We were all guided, I believe, by an understanding that the focus should remain on COVID-19 and that pandemic relief bills were no place to inject unrelated or partisan preferences, but now that our Democratic friends control the House and the Senate and the White House, they have tossed that principle in the trash.

The Democrats have drafted their so-called COVID-19 relief bill without the input, the ideas, or the support of a single Republican. Now, that is not because folks on this side of the aisle were unwilling. As I remember, there were 10 Republican Senators who met with President Biden at the White House and offered a \$600 billion alternative that would enjoy broad bipartisan support. This partisan legislation was a choice, not a necessity—a choice, a conscious choice.

Last year, the House majority whip referred to this crisis as a “tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit our vision.” That was Mr. CLYBURN. The Democrats knew that a bipartisan bill would limit the scope of discussions of policies that were actually relevant to the pandemic. So, rather than maintain that relevance to the pandemic, they chose to go it alone. This opportunity to restructure, as Mr. CLYBURN said, has been months in the making, and now that the Democrats have the numbers they need to make the law without having the support of anybody but their own party, they have tacked on an entire liberal wish list and tried to call it COVID-19 relief, but nobody believes it or should believe it.

You see, these are some of the things that are in the so-called COVID-19 relief bill of \$1.9 trillion when hundreds of billions of dollars of money that we appropriated just in December haven't even been spent yet. Here is what is in the Trojan horse, otherwise known as the Democrats' COVID-19 relief bill: funding for climate justice. At a time when many Americans are asking “When can I get the vaccine?” and “How long until my children can safely return to school?” our Democratic colleagues are pushing funding to support

President Biden's unilateral climate Executive orders.

And then there is the funding—the backdoor funding—for Planned Parenthood. It is responsible for the most abortions of any other organization in America. Now, that is a personal choice for people to make, but asking taxpayers to fund Planned Parenthood so it can perform more abortions is simply irrelevant to COVID-19 relief. It is exploiting another emergency for special interest purposes.

This bill expands the criteria for the Paycheck Protection Program, one of the most successful parts of the CARES Act that we passed last March. It was designed specifically to keep small businesses afloat, but now Planned Parenthood can take advantage of the funding—something they were precluding from doing under bipartisan agreement previously.

There is another big political ally for our Democratic friends that would be newly eligible for these small business loans—the labor unions. So now labor unions can apply for and receive money that was otherwise previously directed toward mom-and-pop businesses so they could keep their doors open, so they could keep their employees on the payroll. But now it includes labor unions.

Many of the labor unions' pension plans in particular have been in dire financial straits for years, long before COVID-19 even existed. Up until now, our Democratic colleagues have not been able to find a way to bail out these mismanaged pension funds. As you can imagine, using taxpayer dollars to cover the mistakes of union bosses is incredibly unpopular, and that is because it is wrong. But the authors of this bill have found a couple of workarounds which they have tucked into this so-called pandemic relief bill.

In addition to making labor unions eligible for the paycheck protection loans, the COVID-19 relief bill also creates a taxpayer fund to bail out underfunded union pension funds. That is not to help the public generally; that is to help labor union members, which is certainly their issue. I understand why it is important, but I don't understand why my taxpayers in Texas should have to bail out underfunded labor pension funds in other States. Union bosses who have mismanaged these funds and made bad choices will be rewarded with a taxpayer-funded check.

While there is a range of provisions to line the pockets of our friends on the other side of the aisle across the country, the authors of this bill also tried to sneak in more localized fixes, two of which have already been dropped from this bill.

In one of the most audacious examples of tone-deaf Washington politics, one of these was an underground rail system in the Speaker's home State of California—an underground rail system. That has nothing to do with COVID-19.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit expansion has been in the works for years,

and Californians have raised concerns over the rising cost. In 2018, it was projected to cost nearly \$4.7 billion, and that estimate has already jumped to \$6.9 billion from \$4.7 billion.

Despite the fact that this rail system has absolutely nothing to do with the pandemic and would serve only the people of one of the wealthiest areas in the country, our Democratic friends provided more than \$100 million for this project in their so-called COVID-19 relief bill. Well, fortunately, not any thanks to our Democratic friends who wrote the bill, this completely unrelated project has now been removed from the bill because it violates Senate rules. You are not supposed to be able to appropriate money and authorize transportation projects in a budget reconciliation bill. That is why it is gone, not because our Democratic friends were embarrassed or had second thoughts after it was pointed out to them the hypocrisy of including that in the bill but because it violates the Senate rules.

Another portion of the bill would have provided money for a bridge from New York to Canada. Let me think for a minute which Senator would have stuck money for a bridge from New York to Canada in the bill. Well, there are two Senators, one of whom is the majority leader from the State of New York. Well, that has now been struck by our colleagues because it received so much blowback. It was such an embarrassing, irresponsible money grab that it is no longer in the bill.

Well, we will see if this trend continues and more of the completely unrelated partisan projects are eliminated because the long list of unnecessary spending does not end there.

This legislation also establishes a bureaucrat bailout, an exclusive paid leave fund just for Federal employees. If their kids aren't in school full time because of the pandemic, these employees could take home up to \$1,400 a week in paid leave. That is roughly equivalent to \$70,000 a year, all to stay home and not work. And these benefits would last for months. Federal employees could take home up to 600 hours of paid leave until September 30 even though President Biden said every adult who wants to get vaccinated will be vaccinated by the end of May. This benefit, this ridiculous money grab, would last until the end of September, long after people had gained antibodies and immunity from COVID-19 as a result of having been vaccinated.

Across the country, only about 35 percent of school districts have returned to fully in-person instruction. If the parents of children at the other 65 percent of school districts happen to work for the Federal Government, they can claim these benefits. Even if a school offers in-person instruction but maintains the option to learn virtually, the parent can still get paid to stay home and not perform any work. Well, parents in my State who don't work for the Federal Government

aren't receiving these same benefits. This is clearly cherry-picking to benefit Federal employees, to pay them not to work.

I respect the work that Federal employees do. I respect the work that all government employees do. But to give them preferential treatment in the midst of this pandemic by paying them not to work and using tax dollars from other States and other places that don't enjoy that benefit is simply grossly unfair.

Over the last year, countless numbers of parents have balanced the impossible: work and remote learning for their children. It has been hard. I understand that. Many parents turned their kitchen tables into makeshift offices and classroom spaces until their children were able to physically return to school. Today, less than 7 percent of the school districts in Texas are fully remote. Seven percent are fully remote, and two-thirds are fully in-person in my State. They have found a way to safely return to the classroom. There is no reason why the Texans who have made that tough juggling act, working and learning remotely, should now have to pay Federal employees who have not had to make that tough choice.

It is simply false advertising to call this a COVID-19 relief bill. It is deceptive and outrageously so. Only \$160 billion dollars—8 percent of the total cost—is directly related to combating COVID-19. Eight percent. The rest of the bill, as I have tried to point out, is a variety of—it is a grab bag, really, of partisan priorities, wasteful spending, and counterproductive policy.

What is worse, this restructuring, according to Mr. CLYBURN's language, to fit the vision of the Democratic Party will cost taxpayers nearly \$2 trillion. That is on top of the \$4 trillion we already spent last year. Two trillion more.

Well, somebody is going to have to pay that money back, and I fear it will not be us because we will be long gone. It will be our children and grandchildren, and at this rate of reckless spending, our great-grandchildren will have to be the ones to pay the money back.

This bill is not the answer to the real challenges that face our country posed by the pandemic. We have shown our willingness to work together in a bipartisan way to enthusiastically support the need to provide real relief both from the public health consequences and the economic fallout associated with the virus, but this bill doesn't even attempt to do that.

Fortunately, as a result of the work we did last year, including last December—and by the way, only about 20 percent of the money that we appropriated just a few weeks ago—actually, a couple of months ago in December—has actually been spent. Only about 20 percent has been spent, and here we are being asked to appropriate \$1.9 trillion more.

But the good news is, the money we spent last year is having real results. The money we invested in treatments and research and development of vaccines and now the distribution of vaccines—it is actually making a real difference. We are vaccinating roughly 3 million people a day in America. More than 70 million people have had shots in arms, and we are doing our best to try to get it in people's arms as fast as we safely can. President Biden said we will get that job done by the end of May. That is wonderful news.

The other wonderful news is that unemployment rates are going down and State revenue is going back up. School districts across the country have safely resumed in-person learning. One in five adults in America has now received a dose of the vaccine, and a third vaccine has now been approved, so that number will climb faster and faster and faster.

Every day we are moving closer to the light at the end of the tunnel, and now is not the time to squander the good will and trust that the American people have had in us to be good stewards of the public health and our economy by engaging in this sort of embarrassing partisan exercise.

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. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wanted to speak in particular terms about the American Rescue Plan and in particular about the provision of home- and community-based services. We know that when we speak of these kinds of services, we are talking about services that benefit seniors across the country as well as Americans with disabilities. We are also concerned as well for the heroic frontline workers who provide those services, most of whom—virtually all of whom have been underpaid and, frankly, underappreciated for far too long.

Let me start with the provision of these home- and community-based services in terms of the people who are benefiting from these services. Right now, about 4 million Americans receive home care and home health services in their own homes or apartments. Receiving these services at home reduces the likelihood that that older American will be infected by the virus.

Serving and supporting older adults and people with disabilities reduces pressure on nursing homes and other congregate settings. We know that these kind of services, the home- and

community-based services, make sure that seniors and people with disabilities have a chance to continue to live where they want to live, as opposed to living in a congregate setting. In many cases, that means they will have more contact with their families, reducing the loneliness and social isolation that can be damaging to their mental health. So this American Rescue Plan includes temporary Federal funding to States to increase Medicaid home- and community-based services.

If the bill were to pass, an additional \$9.3 billion would be made available to States to ensure that workers who provide these services have the protection and resources they need to provide the care and to provide the services.

More than 200 organizations from around the country wrote to Congress in support of these new dollars. For months, SEIU, one of the great unions in America representing workers—healthcare workers; the disability community, as well; advocates for older adults like AARP and others—have rallied around the need for this funding.

This funding can be used to increase wages for direct-service providers, the workers. It can be used to secure additional personal protective equipment and testing supplies for workers and those that they support. Home- and community-based funds can also be used to help people transition from congregate settings back to their homes. It can also be used to provide services for the 800,000 Americans waiting for this kind of help.

For example, Ira Hall from Westmoreland County, PA, just right in the southwestern corner of our State, next to Pittsburgh, in that county, Ira will continue to receive services, and he will receive that service from his direct service worker, Ray Williams. I was able to visit both of these individuals last May during a virtual home visit.

Home- and community-based services make it possible for Ira, who has a developmental disability, to live in his own apartment. Ray, who is his direct service worker, helps Ira plan his day and helps him throughout his workday and helps him find the resources he needs to meet his goals.

During the pandemic, Ray's support made it possible for Ira to remain in his home and to be safe from contracting the virus. The services Ray provides also helps Ira maintain his physical and mental health. We know that the American Rescue Plan makes it possible for services like those Ira receives and Ray provides. It will also mean the agencies providing these services will continue to operate and provide essential home- and community-based services throughout the public health crisis.

Passage of the bill would be a down payment on securing strong and comprehensive home- and community-based services infrastructure, but it is only a down payment. This pandemic has revealed a fragile home care and home health system. These funds

should be the first step in creating home- and community-based services infrastructure that can serve seniors and all people with disabilities who want to live in their own homes and remain in their communities with their families, friends, and neighbors.

With the passage of this American Rescue Plan, we will be able to address the immediate pandemic needs of older adults, as well as people with disabilities. Let's work to ensure this first step starts to create the path to a robust, comprehensive home care and home health network in every State for every senior and every American with a disability.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Ohio.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I worked with my colleague from Pennsylvania on some of these home care options, and I think it is a very positive thing. In fact, it saves a lot of cost for the system, but the question is, What is it doing in a COVID relief bill?

You know, I just have to say, having been involved in a bipartisan way on five different COVID relief packages over the last year, I am just so discouraged that we can't sit down, Republicans and Democrats alike, and work out a targeted, focused bill on COVID, and, by the way, then move on to other things, including healthcare reform, including issues that traditionally have also been bipartisan, like infrastructure and broadband expansion, like retirement security or dealing with China and supply chain issues.

But this is not the way to start. We are looking at a \$1.9 trillion package, the second largest ever written by Congress. The first one went through last year. And there was no input—virtually no input—from anybody on our side of the aisle because the administration decided they didn't want it. They wanted to jam this thing through without our participation. And it is too bad, because they will end up with a product that is not going to be as focused and targeted, but, also, it is just getting off on the wrong foot and making it more difficult for us to figure out how to come together on other issues.

It is really the opposite. This process is really the opposite of what President Biden talked about. He talked about it in his campaign. I mean, he won a campaign, including in his primary, saying he wanted to work across the aisle; he wanted to change the tone in Washington. That was pretty brave of him to say, really.

And, then, in his inaugural address, he did the same thing; didn't he? He talked about the need for unity. He talked about wanting to get people together and to work with Democrats and Republicans alike and kind of get back to that. This is exactly the opposite of that. I just don't get it. I have to tell you, I am mystified why they want to start off this way.

I was one of the 10 Republicans who went down to the White House to meet with President Biden about this a few weeks ago, and we offered our own proposal and said we would like to work with you and negotiate with you. And, you know, there has been no interest, to be honest, and I wish it weren't the case.

And \$4 trillion has already been allocated to the COVID-19 issue, and it was needed. It is a crisis. It still is. It is not over yet, although things are getting a lot better, both in terms of the healthcare crisis and in terms of the economy. But we did that, again, five different times—over \$4 trillion, five different times in a bipartisan way.

So we know we can do it. It is hard for us to do it on other issues—let's face it—like taxes or even healthcare, but it is not with regard to COVID-19. At least it hasn't been until now.

The most recent \$900 billion COVID relief package passed at the end of December by a 92 to 6 vote—92 to 6. I came out to the floor to give speeches on this Senate floor over 20 times in the months prior to that legislation finally being passed, urging Congress to come out of our partisan corners, Democrats and Republicans alike, and to come up with a COVID relief package, because I saw so much middle ground. And we found it by the end of December. I was part of a group of five Democrats and five Republicans who sat down over a month-long period or so. We actually wrote a bill. The “908 Coalition,” we called ourselves because we wrote a bill for \$900 billion that was the basis for that \$900 billion legislation that eventually passed. So I have been there. I have done it. We have done it. We can do it. Yet we are looking here at an entirely different process and, unfortunately, a product that is not targeted, not focused.

It is interesting to note that of the \$900 billion that we appropriated just a couple of months ago, at the end of the year, more than half of that, we are told, has not been spent yet. So while we are starting a \$1.9 trillion new spending project, about half of what we just did has yet to be spent. So how do we know how much is needed? It is very hard to know.

I will say that it is troubling to me that this bill is loaded up with provisions that don't relate to addressing the COVID-19 pandemic, because we should be targeted and focused like a laser on that issue and not on other things. In fact, when you look at the healthcare part of this, most people would think: OK, what would you do with a COVID-19 bill? You would focus on the coronavirus. You would focus on the testing and the tracing. You would focus on the vaccine development and distribution. You would focus on the healthcare side, including healthcare providers.

Unfortunately, that is a very small part of the funding of this bill. It is \$160 billion out of \$1.9 trillion, so less than 10 percent of the bill is focused on

that. And, by the way, the alternative I mentioned that we offered to President Biden—\$160 billion. We totally believe in that part of the bill, and that we should put all of that in there, particularly with regard to the vaccines.

So it is frustrating because not only is the process not what we have done in the past and is best for this country, but also the substance of this bill is just not targeted on COVID-19. How do I tell hard-working families in my State of Ohio that there is a provision in the bill that asks Medicare to spend more money in New Jersey, Delaware, and Rhode Island but not in Ohio and other States? How do I explain that we need to set aside hundreds of millions of dollars that are in this bill in additional Federal funds for the arts? We can have that debate on the arts, but it has nothing to do with COVID-19. We have the highest deficit, as a share of GDP, since World War II—the highest debt as a share of GDP. You know, I don't think we should be spending that kind of money on things that don't relate to COVID-19.

Beyond these kinds of unrelated provisions, there are also proposals in this stimulus that are directed at important issues, but, based on what is needed to respond to the current challenges, are simply unnecessary and add up to more wasteful spending.

For example, we reached a point in this pandemic where the CDC, or the Centers for Disease Control, has said that schools can start to open safely with the right measures in place—thank goodness. We want to get our kids back to school. That should be a cause for celebration. But the plan here, the \$1.9 trillion, doesn't reflect those findings. Last year, we appropriated \$113 billion for schools to help navigate the pandemic, but, as of now, of that \$113 billion, only \$15 billion has been spent. So, roughly, \$100 billion is left over from last year with regard to schools.

If we are already opening classes safely with that amount, why does this \$1.9 trillion plan instead call for an additional investment of \$130 billion in our schools, but especially when we are told that most of that \$130 billion will not be spent in this calendar year? Nobody thinks that next year, at this time, we are going to have the crisis we have now, and yet the \$130 billion of new money will not be spent until the end of 2028.

By the way, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that about half of the funds in the entire proposal won't even be spent in this calendar year. That is their analysis—objective, nonpartisan. No one expects, again, that we will be in this crisis at that time. So it just doesn't seem to make sense to me.

There are other provisions in this bill that seem to actually take solutions we have come up with in the past COVID-19 package and make them worse. Unemployment insurance is a good example. Republicans and Democrats alike believe there needs to be

some expanded help in terms of those who have been hit hardest by the pandemic and have lost a job, and the last bipartisan spending agreement reflected that consensus. But now, after finally reaching an agreement on expanded unemployment insurance, one that got people the help they need without creating a disincentive to work, Democrats want to jam through another UI proposal that increases the \$300 per week that we just agreed to in December to \$400 a week. Now, again, that is in the context of the healthcare crisis getting better and the economy getting better and the unemployment numbers going down that we are going to put more into unemployment insurance.

That creates a problem because it will mean if you go up to \$400 a week, then more than half of the workers on unemployment insurance will be earning more on unemployment than they would staying employed. We want to get people back to work. That is what we all should want, at least. So why would you do that? We shouldn't want that. It is going to result in fewer people getting to work as unemployment continues to go down, as the vaccines are more widely available. That is the opposite of what we should want.

At the same time, a new provision in this bill would allow employees who are Federal employees to take 600 hours of taxpayer-funded emergency leave this fiscal year. To put that in perspective, 600 hours is about half of the total number of working hours remaining in this fiscal year.

There are plenty of problems with the way this plan is written. To give you one example, a Federal employee with children in school would be eligible for this leave program as long as the school is offering a remote learning option, even if the kids are going to the classroom every day for in-person learning. Federal employees would also be eligible for this leave if they are feeling unwell, even if they don't have COVID-19, and with no oversight, no doctor's note, and no supervisory approval.

This is far beyond the responsible bipartisan family leave proposal we did include, because we should have, in the Family First Coronavirus Response Act, which offered 80 hours of sick leave, about one-seventh of the time off in this new proposal, and which applies to millions of private and public sector employees, in addition to the Federal employees who are only covered by this new proposal.

When none of us knew exactly how long we would be faced with the COVID-19 crisis, we decided, on a bipartisan basis, that 80 hours was sufficient. But now that we have this new proposal, at seven times that leave with no test necessary, it is at a time when we are actually turning the tide on this virus, and we all acknowledge that. When more of us are being tested and vaccinated, our numbers are going down—thank goodness—and we have a

much better understanding of the dangers of COVID-19. So why does this make sense?

Furthermore, Federal jobs are pretty secure. Why should taxpayers pay for Federal employees to get 600 hours of leave when private sector employees are suffering more job losses than the public sector? It hardly seems like a good use of taxpayer dollars. It is also disappointing in this bill, which all of us are expected to vote on here in the coming days, because the end result is so different than the last five. As I said, the last five times, we put it together in a bipartisan basis.

The process has been frustrating, and I know many colleagues who were part of the group of five Republicans and five Democrats agree with that. We are, in effect, for the sake of expediency and partisan victory, forgetting about thoughtful policy and bipartisan ship.

We have to show that we have enough Republicans to work with Democrats to get this done. I understand that. That is why 10 of us went down to the White House, because along with 50 Democrats, that would be 60, which is the magic number needed. But there is more than 10 Republicans who want to work with Democrats. There have been every time we have taken this up over the past year.

We proposed the \$618 billion counterproposal that shares a lot of common ground with the Biden plan—not \$1.9 trillion but \$618 billion. Again, we take care of all the healthcare response to the virus. This is in the Biden plan. We have a similar approach on stimulus checks: Make it a little more targeted, which everyone, I think, agrees is a good idea.

Again, with regard to schools, we don't waste the money, which we talked about earlier, but we would be focused on getting kids back to school. The main difference in our bill is we take a more targeted approach to address the most urgent healthcare and economic needs.

We heed the advice of prominent Democratic economist Larry Summers and so many others who have now said that the \$1.9 trillion Biden stimulus is not just wasting taxpayer money; it risks overheating an already recovering economy, leading to higher inflation, hurting middle-class families, and threatening long-term growth.

But rather than the counterproposal leading to this productive type of bipartisan negotiations we had last year, this time we have been told Democrats want to go it alone.

We will keep talking to the President's people. We will keep talking to Democrats in Congress, hoping they will follow through on the campaign message and the inaugural promise because that is what we should be doing as a Congress, not just on this issue but so many other issues as well. We shouldn't be going it alone.

Reconciliation has allowed Democrats to take what is essentially a "my

way or the highway" approach to a response package that would be among the most expensive pieces of legislation in our country's history. As a result, dozens of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are being shut out of providing their input on this bill, and we are going to be left with a partisan bill that fails to meet the most urgent and pressing needs.

In fact, because all of these unrelated spending measures we talked about and others are directed toward traditional Democratic constituencies, I would argue that this bill has not just been my way or the highway, but it has been my way and the highway.

The bottom line is, at the end of the road of this reconciliation process, we will have a bill that underdelivers in many respects and is overpriced, and that is sad to me. It didn't have to be this way. Again, we have done it before five times together, made it inclusive, listened to each other to come up with a bipartisan result. Let's put a stop to this runaway train that is going to add to the deficit unnecessarily and put a damper on the prospects for the bipartisanship promised by this new administration.

Wanting to heal the wounds is something all of us should want. Wanting to work together is something all of us should want. Getting back to an era where we actually sit down, debate things, work them out, and help bring the country together is something all of us should want.

I agree with what President Biden said in his campaign and the inaugural address about the need for unity. Let's do it. Let's not have rhetoric; let's have action.

We can work together to get this done. We won't get there if we continue to operate like this. It hurts not just our new President and his hopes for getting things done; it hurts the country and the ability for us to continue to work together to deal with this crisis and get back to a more normal life.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. RES. 88

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, America is in crisis. Today, the Federal debt sits at a staggering \$27 trillion, and it has grown by more than \$4 trillion in just the last year. Now, Congress is debating whether to spend another \$1.9 trillion, raising our debt to nearly \$30 trillion.

Less than 10 percent of this massive \$1.9 trillion package actually goes directly to COVID relief, and just 1 percent is dedicated to vaccine-related programs. The rest is filled with wasteful liberal priorities.

Speaker PELOSI and Leader SCHUMER, bridges and tunnels have no business being included in a COVID relief bill. It is shameful. Only in Washington can people throw these numbers and ideas

around without a care for what it means for our future. It is dangerous, and it is time to get serious.

Congress has the responsibility to thoroughly review how every single tax dollar is spent by the Federal Government and make sure we are spending wisely. Sadly, this is rare behavior in Washington. Congress spends with reckless abandon and rarely considers how today's foolishness will impact our children and grandchildren, and we are seeing President Biden and Senate Democrats continue this dangerous behavior. For them, the Obama-era thinking of "Never let a crisis go to waste" is alive and well.

Estimates show that there is roughly \$1 trillion in enacted but unspent COVID-19 stimulus funding. Last month, I wrote to President Biden's Acting Director for the Office of Management and Budget requesting any documents related to enacted but currently unspent COVID-19 stimulus funding. The response: None. Total silence.

Here is what that means: The Senate has no idea how States are spending their allocated funds, and we don't know what the actual needs are. It would be completely irresponsible and an abdication of our duty as stewards of American tax dollars if the Senate continues to approve further spending without more information.

That is why my colleagues and I are introducing a resolution calling on President Biden to inform the Senate of how much unspent funds are left over from the previous COVID spending bills. We want to be very clear. This resolution only asks for information from the President that will help the Senate make an informed decision.

I am proud to be joined today by Senator LANKFORD and Senator ERNST to ask for transparency.

It is pretty simple. Ever since the pandemic started, I have wanted the Federal Government to step in and help those who are hurting and have lost their jobs. I will completely agree that we need to do more to help families and small businesses that continue to suffer from the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic. Relief is needed, but it has to be targeted. We have to consider our debt and do only what is necessary for those in need.

I grew up in public housing and watched my parents struggle to find work and make ends meet. I saw my dad's car get repossessed twice. I never want a family to go through what mine did growing up. But before another dollar is spent, especially dollars going to liberal initiatives that have nothing to do with COVID relief, there needs to be a full and clear accounting of all enacted but unspent funding. The decisions we make today have serious impacts on our children and grandchildren.

But before I continue, I yield to my colleagues from Iowa and Oklahoma and thank them for their effort.

I now yield to Senator ERNST.

Ms. ERNST. Thank you to the Senator from Florida as well and for sharing his personal story and why it is so important that we have transparency on bills like this COVID package.

Over the course of the pandemic, Congress has worked together—Republicans and Democrats—to pass five overwhelmingly bipartisan bills providing COVID-19 relief to the American people, and I think we would all agree that that relief was much needed.

Now, in March, we passed the largest stimulus package in American history. And just a few months ago, we passed the second largest. But what the Democrats aren't telling you is that much of the \$900 billion we passed in the most recent relief package, and even some of the CARES Act money, has yet to be spent. And, frankly, folks, we don't even know exactly who has spent what money Congress has doled out over the last year.

I have long said, the American taxpayer deserves to know where and how their money is being spent. Bottom line, we need transparency and to know what has and has not been spent so far.

This commonsense effort will help us get this information. Until we have those details, we should not continue throwing money to Washington bureaucrats, and we certainly should not support this partisan \$1.9 trillion package that includes many items that are completely unrelated to COVID-19.

I agree with my colleagues that there is more that we can do to help expedite the vaccine distribution and promote access to childcare so our parents can return to work. But, folks, this is not Monopoly money. This is real money.

We have a moral obligation to our future generations to spend responsibly. Iowans and all Americans deserve transparency before we add trillions of dollars to their tab.

With that, I will yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, Senator SCOTT, Senator ERNST, and I are not trying to ask for something that the American people aren't already asking for as well and, quite frankly, the Senate and this White House haven't already said that they wanted to be able to do: basic transparency, efficient spending.

It is Wednesday afternoon right now. We are about to take up a bill for, we think, \$1.9 trillion. And I say "we think" because none of us has seen the text of this bill yet, not one of us on either side of the aisle. And the debate was supposed to begin on it today, but none of us has seen the text for this.

Supposedly, we are supposed to start voting on it tomorrow night, though no one has seen the text of the bill yet. In addition to that, last year, this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, passed five COVID relief bills totaling over \$4 trillion. Every dollar of that \$4 trillion was borrowed, every dollar. None of that was budgeted. But there was bi-

partisan agreement as we walked through the process to determine that this is an emergency; this is a global pandemic. To help stabilize our economy from going into free fall, we have to do some very difficult things. But in the middle of all of that, we also said we don't need to borrow a dollar more than what we need to borrow. Let's borrow what we need to but not more than we need to.

Interestingly enough, of the five bills and \$4 trillion that was allocated for COVID last year, only \$3 trillion of that \$4 trillion has actually been spent yet. We still have over \$1 trillion unspent of the money from last year.

But before that last trillion dollars, which imagine just how big that really is—to give you an example, every single Agency in the Federal Government, the total budget for a year, is \$1 trillion. So this "little \$1 trillion" that is left would cover the total budget for every Agency in the Federal Government for all of next year.

With this \$1 trillion that is still unspent, the Biden administration and my Democratic colleagues are saying: We want an additional \$2 trillion. Basically, near the end of the pandemic, they want a bill as large as what we had the very first month of the pandemic a year ago, when we knew we were in economic free fall.

All we are asking are a couple of things: One is, hey, can we read the bill? No. 2, can we get real numbers of what is unspent and anything that is unspent that we can reallocate for something in the future? Let me give you an example. The best I can tell, we have about \$6 billion still left in the vaccine line item left over from last year—\$6 billion just for vaccine, and that is vaccine purchases. There is another \$17 billion left over just for all the distribution process for vaccines. That is a lot of money.

Just yesterday, President Biden announced we will have all the vaccines available for every adult in America by the end of May. It is paid for, set aside, ready to go. Yet this bill that I understand is coming tomorrow—maybe later today—has tens of billions of dollars more in vaccine money. Why are there tens of billions of dollars more in vaccine money, when just yesterday the President announced we have all the purchases done all the way through toward the end of May to vaccinate every adult in America? And there are billions of dollars still left over in the two vaccine accounts even after that. Why are we asking for tens of billions of dollars more? Where is that money going? That shouldn't be an unreasonable question. That should be a question everybody should ask. Why are we asking for tens of billions of dollars more in vaccine money when we have already purchased everything related to vaccines? Is this foreign aid vaccines? We don't know.

There is \$170 billion being requested for education expenses. All of us want to take care of education, but \$170 billion is twice as much as what the

American people spend on education in a year. The total education budget is \$67 billion for the entire year for all of the Federal education budget—\$67 billion. This is now very close to three times what the annual budget is for all of spending just for COVID. And, by the way, still unspent in the education amount from last year's budget, we understand, is about \$68 billion. So there is still \$68 billion unallocated in education entities that hasn't even been touched yet.

Hey, listen, before everybody jumps up and says, you Republicans are just being a blockade, can we just ask a question? How much money is unspent, and what is the money going toward that we are asking for? That shouldn't be an unreasonable question. That should be a reasonable question. We are not trying to be obstructionists; we are just trying to get information.

And, quite frankly, when our team calls over to the White House and says: Can you give us the details of what is unspent in this amount—I know it is early in their Presidency, and they are still getting organized, but most of the time their answer is: We will get back to you, and they never do.

We need to know what is still left over of this \$1 trillion that has already been allocated before we allocate another \$2 trillion, knowing every single dollar of that is borrowed from China or somewhere else.

This is a real issue. We should resolve this before we move to spending another \$2 trillion. And I thank very much Senator SCOTT for his leadership in this area and asking some very basic questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I thank Senator LANKFORD and Senator ERNST.

Passing this resolution will show the American people that Congress can be both responsive to the needs of American families and small businesses hurt by this pandemic while also remaining fully accountable for the proper stewardship of tax dollars.

This is about basic transparency and getting the facts. If this resolution passes and the administration shares the information I have been requesting, it will go a long way in helping Congress craft a targeted bill that directly addresses the real needs in our Nation today.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 88, submitted earlier today. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I certainly appreciate the Senator from Florida's interest in oversight of the coronavirus emergency relief funds. This funding has been and continues to be critical to the American people throughout the pandemic.

I also appreciate the Senator's support for the creation of the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee when he voted for the CARES Act. This was a provision that I authored to ensure that we would have strong oversight of coronavirus relief dollars.

I agree wholeheartedly that we must be faithful stewards of taxpayer money. That is why the CARES Act directed the Government Accountability Office, our congressional watchdog, to oversee coronavirus spending. We are fortunate to receive consistent, detailed reporting and recommendations on these issues. The Senator's resolution, however, will not strengthen these oversight mechanisms, nor will it deliver any form of relief to families who are hurting and small businesses that are struggling.

If the Senator from Florida wants an update on the current status of funding from previous coronavirus relief bills, I am happy to provide one to him.

Let's first look at the first coronavirus relief measures, all of which were passed in March and April of last year. To date, approximately 93 percent of those funds have been obligated and 88 percent have been outlaid. After accounting for benefits that are, by design, continuing to be paid out over time, there is less than \$100 billion of uncommitted funds left, and approximately half of that is in the Provider Relief Fund for struggling medical providers, whose needs continue to be extremely high.

For the legislation signed into law on December 27, 2020, more than half of this funding has already been committed, but if we set aside expanded unemployment benefits, which expire next month; small business relief; and the tax credit portion of the economic impact payments, which will be disbursed over time, less than 12 percent of the funding from December remains unobligated.

We know the status of funds from past COVID relief bills. This information is not being kept secret in any way. In addition to reports from the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee and the Government Accountability Office, we have a monthly SF 133 report from the Office of Management and Budget.

Coronavirus-related spending is also publicly tracked—publicly tracked—on both USASpending.gov and on the website of the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee.

We don't need more reports right now; we need action. We have been fighting a public health and economic crisis, neither of which will magically disappear without additional Federal action. We can't wait until more small businesses close or hospitals run into

the red. We know how badly Americans are hurting, and they are hurting right now.

We are a full year into this pandemic that has taken the lives of over 515,000 Americans. And this pandemic is not over. It is continuing to ravage communities all across our Nation.

Let's look at where we are right now. Upwards of 2,000 Americans are dying each and every day. Daily cases are at the same levels we saw during the last surge in July, with over 50,000 Americans testing positive for COVID-19 every day. We are also facing the new threat of emerging variants like the UK and South African strains, which unfortunately could lead to even more cases.

The economic toll continues to go on. Millions of Americans remain out of work. In January, the unemployment rate was nearly double that of prepandemic levels, and unemployment claims are still more than double prepandemic levels. We all have friends, family members, and neighbors who are hurting right now. Small businesses have had to slash their hours, cutting into their own bottom line and employees' paychecks.

We need to help struggling families by providing rental assistance, stimulus checks, and unemployment benefits. We need to help kids by supporting our schools so we can get back to in-person learning. We need to invest in the public health infrastructure necessary to combat this virus by increasing testing capacity, implementing vaccine education campaigns, and tracking and containing the new COVID variants that we see springing up.

We are starting to see a glimpse of light at the end of this very long—far too long—tunnel, but we must keep moving forward. The American Rescue Plan will finally allow us to control the virus, improve the lives of all Americans, and get us out of this crisis.

We should not be wasting time on partisan resolutions that will neither deliver relief nor meaningfully improve oversight of COVID relief efforts. We must come together and provide the relief that families and small businesses all across our country so desperately need.

Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I am extremely disappointed in my colleague's decision to block this resolution. My colleagues and I wouldn't be doing this resolution if we were receiving the information that my colleague said we were receiving.

This has nothing to do with whether Senate Republicans want to provide relief. We want to provide relief. We want to do it in a targeted manner, and we want to make sure that we don't waste taxpayer dollars.

This objection just blocked the Senate from requesting basic information

that will help us do our basic jobs. Senate Democrats just objected to transparency. This means they are against giving us the facts, against ensuring accountability, and against getting targeted help to the right people. My colleague is choosing to prevent the Senate from receiving information that is pertinent to our ongoing negotiations.

Senate Republicans believe in relief of those hurt by COVID-19. We want to help our small businesses. We want to help those who have lost their jobs. We want to make sure families are able to survive this crisis and come out on the other side with their health and livelihood.

My colleague's objection shows that Senate Democrats are not actually interested in finding a bipartisan solution to our Nation's problems. Instead, they want to blindly spend money on provisions completely unrelated to COVID, as if there are no consequences to racking up more debt and spending beyond our means.

I am thinking about the kids who are just like me, growing up in public housing, with parents who are barely scraping by. We need to help those families. In order to do that, we need to better understand where the need is.

I am disappointed in my colleague's decision, and I hope he reconsiders.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Utah.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the bill before the Senate this week is not really about COVID relief; it is about politics. Before this, COVID relief has not been a terribly partisan issue. In fact, we have passed 5 relief bills, each with at least 90 votes. That means they are overwhelmingly broad-based and bipartisan efforts. So if this one were to pass, it would be the first of those to have passed that has been highly controversial. Why? Because, in the first place, it borrows and spends another \$1.9 trillion when there are still hundreds of billions of dollars of unspent relief money from past COVID-19 relief packages. The new spending authorizes money to go to projects in States and local governments, including many that may not even need it.

The fight against the pandemic has, of course, fundamentally changed in the months since this plan was first devised and proposed. It is already outdated. Now, as we are here, into the month of March, the circumstances have changed, yet the plan remains largely the same as it was. So it feels a little bit, to me, like we are fighting the last war using the last war's battle plan, leaving us unprepared for the battle actually in front of us.

This is a bill that will worsen our national debt and weaken our economy in the long run without even doing much to help small businesses and American families in the short term.

This is not without consequence. In fact, as the book by Drs. Reinhart and Rogoff, published nearly 10 years ago—a book known as “This Time Is Different”—notes, once we get into this cycle, once we get accustomed to spending this much and acquiring this much of a debt-to-GDP ratio, we find ourselves in dire circumstances—circumstances in which it is even more difficult to raise the same revenue based on the same tax structure or even while tweaking that tax structure, it can be very difficult to pull out of the tailspin that could be produced when we start spending in sums this large and perpetuating a debt-to-GDP ratio that is, frankly, unsustainable.

This \$1.9 trillion package has very, very little to do with COVID-19. In fact, only 1 percent of the spending in this bill will go toward accelerating vaccine distribution; just 5 percent is focused on public health. Instead, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, three times as much money will go toward partisan priorities that are “not directly related to the current crisis.”

What are some of the examples of this type of spending? Well, we have \$1.5 billion more set aside for Amtrak, which is itself already sitting on \$1 billion of unspent bailout money. What this has to do with the virus and why the virus somehow justifies giving them an additional \$1.5 billion when they are already sitting on \$1 billion of still unspent bailout money is beyond my comprehension. There is \$50 million in funding for environmental justice projects, also difficult to connect that up to COVID; \$200 million for the Institute of Museum and Library Services; \$135 million for the National Endowment for the Arts; \$135 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities; \$86 billion in a pension bailout for private sector workers.

The list goes on and on, but you get the idea. You get money that goes to projects, as well as a significant amount to State and local governments. We will get back to that in a moment. When there is as much as \$63 billion leftover in unspent funds, this money will not necessarily even help schools to reopen.

And \$350 billion in aid goes to State and local governments, even though total losses to date have mostly been covered by the \$360 billion that Congress has already provided in aid for State and local governments over the last year. While there is some disparity among and between the States and how they have responded to the COVID pandemic and how they fared as far as their revenues, State and local revenue has mostly recovered, and while 26 States saw general revenue decline, 21 States actually saw revenue gains. In fact, my home State of Utah, as well as some other States, is running surpluses. Utah's sacrifice and good governance should not go to bail out other profligate States to the tune of \$350 billion.

I think about hard-working moms and dads in Utah, struggling to make ends meet while paying their Federal and State taxes. They are told over and over and over again that they have to be giving more. They are told that what they have spent and the time they have allotted—weeks or months out of every year just to pay their Federal tax alone—still somehow isn't enough, isn't nearly enough because, in addition to the money that they have worked so hard to earn and give to the Federal Government, there is so much more that has to be spent, like \$1.5 billion going to Amtrak, even though it is already sitting on \$1 billion of unspent bailout relief.

These same moms and dads throughout Utah are not pleased when they are made to understand that, in addition to bailing out Amtrak again when Amtrak is already sitting on this \$1 billion in unspent bailout relief money, they are also going to have to bail out other States; they are going to have to bail out State and local governments that haven't been managed well, as Utah's government has. This isn't fair to them. This is a matter of fundamental fairness to them and to countless Americans, not only in Utah but in every State.

Some States still have unspent funding that they have gotten from previous COVID relief packages. California alone has \$8 billion in unspent funding, and New York has up to \$5 billion. In this bill, we are acting like States are facing a fiscal catastrophe that is specifically from COVID when they are not.

At the same time, we are acting like the unprecedented magnitude of Federal debt is a nonissue. It is not. We have got this situation exactly backward.

Look, any new relief funding just needs to be targeted, and it needs to be temporary, and it needs to be directly tied to COVID relief. This package is, instead, about fulfilling the political wish list of one political party over another and has very little, if anything, to do with the pandemic. It is offensive, and, yes, it is inappropriate for one political party—the political party that clings to the narrowest of margins of a majority in this body—to push its own political wish list onto an opportunity to provide COVID relief for the American people, and it would be equally inappropriate for Republicans to use it as an opportunity to push their own wish list.

Look, we haven't seen this before. We haven't seen anything like this before. We didn't, in the past, see any of the previous COVID relief packages pushed through reconciliation. There are a number of reasons for that, one of which was it is wrong. It is not an appropriate use of reconciliation. Another was, it wasn't necessary because we made it bipartisan, not just mildly bipartisan with a few straggler votes here or there but overwhelmingly so.

This one is different. I am not opposed to discussing what role government should play in providing actual relief from the pandemic. We can and should have that debate. I welcome it. I would love to have it right now. In fact, that is a question that I think merits its own debate. This bill is not about that, not anything close to that. It is riddled with poor economic reasoning and rank political favoritism. It will only worsen our debt and our economic health in the long run. It doesn't help America's small businesses and families in the short run. It doesn't do anything to materially advance the cause of getting our children back to school at a time when they have suffered so greatly, not only academically but socially and in so many other ways. That is where we ought to be focused.

This bill comes nowhere close to addressing that issue, and, instead, it directs itself in other directions that are not only helpful, but in many cases they are the opposite of that.

It is sad. It is disappointing. And on that basis, I can't support this bill but would urge my colleagues to figure out ways to make it better. We don't have to do it this way. It doesn't have to be a deeply partisan vote. We can still choose a different path. I, for one, hope we will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, the circumstances that we face today in the Senate are so disturbing. This is really, really unbelievable. I mean, there is so much good news out there on the healthcare front, on the pandemic front, on the economic front. But what we are going to do in this Chamber is absolutely, absolutely appalling.

The Members of this Chamber came together five times last year and passed overwhelmingly bipartisan bills to deal with this pandemic, to deal with the economic crisis that came from the lockdown that we experienced—five times, about \$4 trillion, completely unprecedented in scope and scale, the nature of it. Never imagined before, but we did it. We did it because we needed to, and we came together. I think it was the biggest of the bills passed—the biggest by far—without a single “no” vote in this whole Chamber, completely bipartisan.

So President Biden gets elected, gives a great speech, a great inaugural speech, about uniting the country, coming together: We don't have to be divided the way we have been. We can work together and find common ground.

So 10 Republican Senators go down to the White House and say: Well, Mr. President, I know you would like to do \$1.9 trillion, whatever it is, but we think there is a good case for \$600 billion.

Now, I don't happen to agree with those 10 Republican Senators, as it happens. I don't think even that is appropriate, but they did. And the reason that is significant is that there were 10 of them, which just so happens to be exactly the minimum number needed of Republican Senators to join with the Democrats to pass anything they want on a bipartisan basis. So there, handed to him on a silver platter, to the President, was the opportunity to do a bipartisan bill to figure out where that common ground was. The Republicans were offering to negotiate from there. This probably could have ended easily at \$1 trillion or so after just weeks before passing a \$1 trillion bill. The President could have gotten so much of what he wanted, but President Biden didn't want any part of that. You have to ask yourself, why is that when he campaigned as the guy who is going to unify America, and he had every Republican vote he needed sitting in his office, asking him to work this out? He said: No, not interested. Effectively, that is what he said.

Well, when you look at the bill, it is clear why President Biden chose this path, because there is no justification for this bill. There is no medical justification. There is no pandemic justification. There is no economic justification. This isn't about coming together and doing something about a crisis; this is about a partisan leftwing wish list. And, of course, Republicans aren't interested in that kind of political gesturing that is going to do economic damage.

I am reminded of the words of Rahm Emanuel, who famously said: “You never want a serious crisis to go to waste.” Rahm Emanuel must be very proud of our Democratic colleagues and President Biden because what they have done is they have taken a crisis that is rapidly receding—let's be honest—and they decided this is their chance to make one last mad dash to the door with a staggering amount of money and presumably claim credit for the recovery that is already well underway.

The good news is—there is a lot of good news, right? We went through one of the most trying times we have been through in a very long time in this country. This pandemic was devastating. It was deadly, it was scary, and the economic crisis was very, very real. But now we have over 100 million doses of vaccines that have gone into people's arms. You figure that we might very well have 100 million Americans who have had the disease and recovered. We have to have well over half of the American population who has either recovered or been vaccinated and is therefore no longer at risk to this disease—not a significant risk. That is fantastic news.

By the way, the vaccine administration is accelerating. Following that, we are unsurprisingly seeing this terrific collapse in the number of new cases. The daily count of new cases of the

coronavirus, of COVID-19, peaked at around 250,000 new cases in a single day. We were running at that pace. By the time we got to the inauguration of President Biden, we were down to 185,000, and yesterday was about 60,000. So we are less than a quarter of the number of new cases on a daily basis that we were experiencing at the peak, and it continues to drop. It is going to continue to decline probably very rapidly as we continue to roll out these vaccines. That is terrific.

There is a sort of parallel recovery of the economy underway. If you go back to April of 2020, when it was at its worst, the unemployment rate was almost 15 percent, 14.8 percent. That is a terrible, terrible unemployment rate. As of January of this year, just a few months ago, the unemployment rate was 6.3 percent, less than half of where we were. We are not back to the fantastic economy we had a year ago just before this pandemic broke, but we are getting there. Eighteen States across the country have unemployment rates below 5 percent, so we are going to get there.

The economy is growing. After a collapse in the second quarter of last year, the third quarter came roaring back, and the fourth quarter grew. The Congressional Budget Office thinks that in this whole calendar year of 2021, our economy will grow almost 5 percent. Most private economists think it will be more than that. There is a lively debate about whether we will even reach 6 or 7 or more percent growth. We were told never again to expect to see 3 percent. But that is how strong this economic recovery is because of the resiliency of the American people, the tremendous ingenuity of the private sector to come up with vaccines that are incredibly effective—several of them—and do it in a record time, I mean a fraction of what was the previous record time. It is amazing.

And yes, you know what, we played a role in this too. I think we did. The bipartisan cooperation of Congress to pass one bill after another on a huge scale—like I said, five bills. The biggest was without a single dissenting—actually, I am not sure any of them had a dissenting vote in the Senate. And there was almost a trillion dollars in December, leaving tens of billions of dollars that we approved that haven't even been spent yet. The intended beneficiaries haven't gotten the money yet. It takes a little while to get the money out the door.

Given this context, given this history, this is why it is so dispiriting to see our Democratic colleagues insisting on a bill that has almost nothing to do with COVID. That is the truth. It is not about reopening the economy; it is a partisan leftwing spending binge. That is what it is. Let's take a look at some of the individual items.

We have these so-called stimulus checks—I never heard anything more inaptly named—\$414 billion. The fact is, real, personal income in the country

today is higher than it was just before the pandemic. Disposable, real, per capita income rose at its highest rate since 1984. Personal savings rate hit an alltime record high in 2020. Why? Because we more than replaced lost income through all of the bills that we passed. What about that data suggests we need another round of universal payments to people? It is not going to stimulate the economy. Even the last check—60 percent of that money went to savings accounts or paying down debt. According to a Penn Wharton study, about 75 percent of these checks are going to go into savings.

Why in the world are we sending so many checks to tens of millions of people who never had any lost income? Under this bill, the Federal Government is going to send out \$5,600 to a family of four—\$5,600 to a family of four who makes \$160,000 a year and never had a dime of income loss, no interruption of income, no loss of income. They are going to get \$5,600. By the way, that is on top of the \$5,800 they already got last year, with no need, no demonstrated problem here. So \$11,400 of money that we don't have, we are going to send to people who never had a dime of lost income. That is a big chunk of this bill.

It may not be the worst. It may be that the worst is the \$350 billion we are going to send to State and local governments to bail out the mismanaged blue States and cities. The amazing thing is, you can't possibly make the case that they need the bailout. They don't even need it. Why do I say that? Well, if you look in 2020—the books are closed now. We know what we didn't know early in the year of 2020. We are in 2021 now. We know what happened in 2020.

What happened was States and municipalities in the aggregate brought in more revenue in 2020 than they did in 2019, which was a record year. So they set an alltime new record for tax revenue collected—alltime new record. And that does not include the \$500 billion we sent them anyway. I mean, these States are loaded with cash. I don't know what they are going to do with it.

There is \$60 billion in rainy day funds. We heard: Oh my goodness, these States are going to have to cut essential services. All the teachers are going to be laid off. The firemen and the police officers are all done.

How is that when they have taken in more revenue than they ever have before in their history and then we sent them another \$500 billion? Now we are going to send them yet another \$350 on top of this? How does this make any sense at all? We are going to borrow or print this money so we can send it to a bunch of States, many of which are sitting on so much cash, they are going to probably cut taxes. It is just unbelievable.

Then there is the ObamaCare expansion. What does that have to do with COVID? This is just a decade-long goal

of our Democratic colleagues to continue the endless expansion of ObamaCare. There is \$45 billion in this bill to pay insurance companies more money to cover people who already have health insurance. That is what they are doing. Sixty-three percent of these new subsidies will go to people who already have health insurance through ObamaCare. By the way, it includes huge numbers of people who make over \$100,000 a year. Never miss a chance to make more people dependent on government.

It has policies, big policies, that will absolutely slow the economic recovery. Let me be clear. This bill will slow down the economic recovery underway. Why do I say that? Well, the bill insists on adding \$400 a week on top of whatever States are paying in unemployment benefits. Well, what does that mean? It means that more than half of everyone who is unemployed is going to get paid more not to work than they get paid working. Who could even think this up?

We have had unemployment insurance for decades in this country. We have never said: Let's systematically make sure that people can make more money not working than they can make if they go to work.

I hear some of my colleagues talk about the dignity of work. I think there is a lot of dignity in work. What is our message to people about the dignity of work when we say: You are worth more to us sitting on the couch than you are at your job. That is what this is. It is a terrible idea.

How do you know for sure that nobody on the other side is even pretending that this is really about the economic recovery? Well, you know for sure because the Congressional Budget Office has told us that only a fraction—a small fraction—of this money is even going to be spent this year. How long do we think the pandemic is going to be with us as a pandemic? How long do we think we are going to have these lockdowns? We are going to be out of the woods pretty soon here.

As I said, half of all Americans have already been either vaccinated or recovered from this. But the school numbers are a good illustration, the elementary and secondary education. This bill has \$128 billion—\$128 billion—and \$6.5 billion is going to be spent in 2021. The rest gets dribbled out for years and years. How long do they think before schools can reopen? Oh, by the way, this bill doesn't require schools to reopen. You don't even have to reopen. Just throw billions and billions of dollars at schools whether or not they are actually having kids in the school.

Some of these provisions are so blatantly unrelated to COVID or the economy that it is really just hard to even read them with a straight face.

There is \$86 billion to bail out multiemployer pension plans without any reform whatsoever. Look, we all know we have a multiemployer pension problem in this country, and there has been a

lot of discussion about what do you do about these grossly underfunded pension plans and how do you fix this. The conversation has always been, what kinds of reforms come with what kind of cash so that these errors of the past are corrected? There are no reforms here. None. Nothing. Just a big pile of cash. It is a clear message that you don't have to fix anything. You don't have to reform the flaws of these programs that got us here. And by the way, it is the same message to the insolvent public pension plans of most of the major cities in many States: Don't worry. Look what Congress will do if the Democrats have their way. They will just send you so much cash, you don't have to worry about the insolvency you are dealing with.

What a terrible message.

There is \$270 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. That is COVID-related. Thank goodness that is there.

There is \$91 million for "outreach" to student loan borrowers. I don't even know what that means.

There is \$50 million for environmental justice grants. I have no idea what that means.

But this one is really rich. There is about \$4 billion for "socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers." I say "about \$4 billion" because it says "such sums as may be necessary." Here is what the money is for. It is going to pay off 120 percent of the debt of these farmers and ranchers, 120 percent of the borrowings.

So what in the world are the requirements to have 120 percent of your debt paid off? Well, you actually have to have debt. OK, so you have to have borrowed money from the USDA farm loan. There are tens of billions of dollars out there. They lend a lot of money. And you have to be a member of one of the following groups: African American, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islanders, refugees, or immigrants.

As long as you are in one of those categories of mostly racial and ethnic groups, then the taxpayers are going to pay off 120 percent. It is not the whole loan but more than the whole loan—120 percent.

The thing that is so disturbing about this is that the essential criterion is your skin color. The essential criterion is your race. This is unbelievable to me. By the way, there is no income test and no asset test for the underlying loans. There is no requirement whatsoever that COVID caused any problem—caused any lost income or any other problem. It is not mentioned.

So what is the effect of this?

This means that, if you have a wealthy Hispanic rancher who has a \$1 million loan from the USDA, he is going to get \$1.2 million and pay off the loan—200,000 bucks with which to do whatever he likes. Meanwhile, if you are a poor White farmer in rural Pennsylvania and you have a \$100,000 loan, you get nothing, exactly nothing. How

is that even remotely fair? I don't even know how that could be constitutional. It is, certainly, not in any way COVID related.

There was an amendment in the House that would have limited the payment. It would have allowed the program, which I object to, but it would have allowed this repayment of debt but only for debt incurred during the COVID crisis. The Democrats all voted that down. That failed. This is unbelievable stuff.

Even the provisions that purport to be about public health are completely divorced from any reality. As I think I mentioned earlier, we are administering almost 2 million doses of vaccines every day now. That is terrific. It is actually the highest daily rate of doses administered anywhere in the world. The government has already purchased 700 million doses. Now, we have fewer than 350 million Americans, and not all Americans are going to need two doses. You can do the math: We have bought more vaccine doses than we need to administer, and that is fine. Yet how many more do you need to buy when you have already bought more than enough for every single American?

That is not all we paid for. Through the previous bills that we passed, we paid for the research and development. We paid for the production. We paid for the transportation. We paid for all of the accompanying supplies, like the syringes, the vials, and the dry ice. We paid for all of that, and we should have. That was the right thing to do. Insurance covers the cost of the administering of the vaccines. Between Medicare and Medicaid and private insurance, it is free. What is left to spend money on? I am all ears, but I haven't heard what we need to spend money on.

So what do we have in this bill?

We have no justification for it in terms of public health. We certainly have no justification for it in terms of the economy. We certainly have no justification for it in terms of basic fairness. Frankly, it is going to do more harm than good, but you don't have to take my word for it. We could take the word of prominent liberal Democrat economist Larry Summers. He was the Treasury Secretary under President Clinton, and he was the Director of the National Economic Council under President Obama.

He said about this bill:

[M]acroeconomic stimulus on a scale closer to World War II levels than normal recession levels will set off inflationary pressures of a kind we have not seen in a generation.

Or consider the words of Steve Rattner, who is a liberal economist. President Obama named him the "czar." You may recall him administering that program.

He said of the American Rescue Plan, which is, apparently, what they call this:

The American Rescue Plan is also partly a legislative Trojan horse—an enormous aid package aimed at addressing needs that, in

some cases, go well beyond the immediate challenges of COVID. Some of the most expensive provisions are the least well targeted to help the neediest.

That is from a liberal Democrat who, I think, supports the bill, but at least he is being honest in his description of it.

So my suggestion, my plea, to my Democratic colleagues and to the new President is to listen to some of the things you have said. Try an approach that is actually informed by the facts on the ground—the health facts, the economic facts, the reality. Look at what the science is currently telling us about the course that this virus has been taking. What about actually attempting to bring people together—the path of unity—after we demonstrated five times last year that we can work together and do something on a bipartisan basis?

I urge my colleagues: Don't push through this radically partisan bill that will probably, in the end, do more harm than good.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, let me first say that I wish this Chamber were full of our colleagues who had listened to my Republican colleague's description—the Senator from Pennsylvania—of what this bill is and what this bill isn't. It is not a COVID relief bill. Senator TOOMEY did an excellent job. I am hoping that people are watching it on their TV screens. They really can't be reading the bill yet because it is not constructed. I don't want to repeat all of the excellent points the Senator from Pennsylvania made, but I wanted to come down because I think we have grown immune to these vast amounts of money.

I always knew we were going to be in big trouble when we stopped talking about hundreds of billions of dollars and switched to talking about trillions of dollars. When we talk about \$1 trillion or \$2 trillion, it just doesn't sound like as much as \$200 billion or \$800 billion, which was in the stimulus package under the Obama administration. The fact of the matter is we have already authorized \$4 trillion in COVID relief. That is 18 percent of last year's GDP, and, roughly, \$1 trillion is yet to be spent. Some of that isn't even obligated, and we are going to be debating, over the next couple of days, \$1.9 trillion. So I just wanted to come down here to the floor and try to illustrate what a massive amount of money \$1.9 trillion is. You have to use analogies. Again, the human mind really can't contemplate what "a trillion" is.

I found this first analogy—my wife talked to me about it—in terms of time. This one is simply talking about, if I would give the Presiding Officer \$1 per second, how long would it take me to give her \$1 million? You see the

chart here. It would take 11.6 days. Again, with \$1 per second, how long would it take to give her \$1 million? 11.6 days.

The next question: How long would it take you to accumulate \$1 billion?

Again, when you do the math, you find out it would take 31.7 years. That was back when the Chinese had their protests in Tiananmen Square.

The next question: What about \$1 trillion?

This is what becomes mind-boggling. If I gave you \$1 every second and I wanted to give you \$1 trillion, it would take 31,688 years to give you \$1 trillion. That takes us back to beyond the last glaciation period, a period in time when Wisconsin was under a mile-thick glacier.

By the way, as a quick aside for my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, since that point in time, about 20,000 years ago, the water level in the San Francisco Bay has increased 390 feet. Now, that is global warming—that is a rise in sea level—but that is what happened through natural causes. That was an aside.

How long would it take to accumulate \$1.9 trillion? Over 60,000 years. Again, put that in context. The human race began to develop language about 50,000 years ago. So that is the time analogy.

Another way of looking at this is through distance and volume. So here is the calculation. I should have brought a \$1 bill to just demonstrate its thickness, but the thickness of a \$1 bill is 4.3-thousandths-of-an-inch thick. To illustrate how much \$1 trillion is, let's start with \$1 million. If you stacked a million dollar bills on top of each other, they would stack up to be 358 feet high. You can see the calculation here. That is about a 30- to 35-foot-story building.

How big would a stack of a billion dollar bills be? It would be 67.86 miles.

Now, there is something called the Karman line. I think I am pronouncing that right. That is the point at which the atmosphere ends and outer space begins. That is 62 miles. So a stack of a billion dollar bills would actually exceed the atmosphere and extend into outer space—62 miles.

Then, the next question is: How big would a stack be of a trillion dollar bills? Well, it would be 1,000 times that. So it would be 67,866 miles high. That is an astonishingly large stack of dollar bills that equals \$1 trillion.

Again, we are not just talking about \$1 trillion. We are not talking just about 67,000 miles worth. We are talking about \$1.9 trillion, which would stack up to be 135,732 miles high. The distance to the Moon is 238,900 miles. So that stack of \$1.9 trillion worth of \$1 bills would be more than halfway to the Moon. That is what we are debating spending—a stack of dollar bills that extends more than halfway the distance to the Moon. This is at a point in time when we are about \$28 trillion in debt. That single stack would be

over 1.9 million miles or, if you were to put it relative to the Moon, there would be eight stacks—seven stacks that go directly to the Moon and one further stack that would be 95 percent of the way there.

These are astonishing sums that we are talking about, and the majority party here wants to jam this through using the reconciliation process—no consultation with our side. They want to just blow it through here with 20 hours of debate, a vote-arama, pass \$1.9 trillion in spending, and go home, having no consideration whatsoever about the fact that we are mortgaging our children's futures. At some point in time, there will be a day of reckoning—a debt crisis—and it won't be pretty.

My suggestion, at least as we consider this, is to actually have a debate. Let's have a discussion. Let's consider the amendments. Let's not do this in 20, 24, 30 hours. Let's take the time to seriously consider what we are doing to our children in contemplating spending a stack of dollar bills over 135 miles high, extending more than halfway to the Moon.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION SYSTEM

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Madam President. This week, we have an opportunity to finally deliver for millions of retirees and workers and small businesses by saving America's pensions. The multiemployer pension system is on the verge of collapse, threatening the livelihoods of more than a million Americans and thousands of small businesses from New Hampshire to Ohio, across the country. This affects more than 100,000 workers and retirees in my State alone and millions more around the country. These pension plans were in danger before. Now the economic emergency we are in has accelerated the crisis even further.

Multiemployer pension plans receive contributions based on the hours worked. As workers have been laid off during the pandemic, their employers no longer contribute to the pension plans, while current retirees continue receiving their earned benefits, making the plan even more likely to fail. And if that happens, it won't just be retirees feeling the pain.

Current workers will be stuck paying into pension funds for benefits they will never receive. Small businesses will be left drowning in pension liability they can't afford to pay. Small businesses that have been in the family for generations could face bankruptcy, and workers will lose jobs in businesses which have been forced to close up shop. The effect will ripple across the

entire economy at a time when we can least afford it.

The Chamber of Commerce has said:

The multiemployer pension system is an integral part of [our] economy.

It is not only union businesses that participate in these plans that will close their doors. This will devastate small communities across the industrial heartland. Small businesses in these communities are already hurting because of the virus. That is why we have to get this done.

After a lifetime of hard work and service to our country, these workers and retirees have already waited far too long for Congress to do the job we should have done. We have been trying to solve this for years. Unions, the Chamber of Commerce, small businesses pretty much agree we need to get this done.

The House has done its part. They have passed a solution multiple times. Every time it stopped because of MITCH MCCONNELL and the U.S. Senate. He has deliberately blocked it. We have continued to try. The House does it year after year. People like the Presiding Officer and others have fought for this in the Finance Committee, have fought for this on the Senate floor, and we simply haven't been able to move it.

Now that Senator MCCONNELL is out of the way, we can finally keep the promise to these workers and their families. They spent years working on assembly lines, bagging groceries, driving trucks, working to keep our economy going, and money came out of every single one of their paychecks to earn these pensions.

People in this town don't always understand the collective bargaining process. People give up dollars at the bargaining table today for the promise of a secure retirement with healthcare and a pension. That is what collective bargaining is. Union workers sit down with each other and their employer, talk about giving up wages. They are willing to give up wages today to have a more secure future. What is more American than that?

For years now, they have lived in fear of drastic cuts. One retiree from Michigan told us he would lose two-thirds of his income and that "at 71 years old, there's no jobs out there that we could get to recover what we'd lose."

He said:

Pass the Butch Lewis Act so . . . we can take this weight off of us, and retire with the dignity that we earned for 30, 40, 50 years of hard working labor.

It is always the same story. When Wall Street is in trouble, there is a bailout. When corporations need something, the stock market is in trouble, the Washington elite drop everything to help. But these workers, they are not asking for a bailout; they are not asking for a handout; they are just asking for what they earned.

These workers have been in the fight for years. Their activism has gotten us

this far. They have traveled all day and all night on buses. They have rallied outside in the bitter cold, in the hot DC summer, all trying to get people in this town to listen.

Let's finally deliver for them. Let's give them peace of mind. Let's keep this promise. It comes back to the dignity of work. When work has dignity, we honor the retirement security people earned. When work has dignity, we honor their retirement security that they gave up at the bargaining table in collective bargaining.

I urge my Republican colleagues in this body—colleagues with healthcare and retirement plans paid for by taxpayers, including these taxpayers that have been paying into their own pension funds for years. I urge my Republican colleagues to think about these retired workers and think about the small business owners. Companies like Smucker's—there is a baker in Navarre, OH. Think of the candy company, Spangler, in Bryan, OH—companies like that. Think about these retired workers. Think about these small business owners and think about the stress they are facing.

I have listened to my colleagues' speeches for years, extolling the values of hard work and the virtue of small businesses. This is your chance to live up to your own words, to show Americans if you work hard all your life, your government will, in fact, be there for you.

Join us, and let's pass a solution that really indeed does honor the dignity of work.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ELLEN HODGES AND ELIZABETH BATES

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, it is that time of the week that our pages—when we had them—used to always look forward to. It is the time of the week that I come down on the floor and talk about someone in Alaska who is making a huge impact on my State, a lot of times for the country. These two Alaskans I am going to talk about actually have gotten national news for the great work they are doing, somebody we call our Alaskan of the Week. It is usually about a group of individuals, one, two, maybe a group of people who are helping make Alaska what, in my view, is the greatest State in the country—resilient, tough, generous, kind, unique.

Like so many States, this pandemic has really hit Alaska hard—tourism for sure. The oil and gas sector last year was really hit hard with low prices. Unfortunately, this year, with the Biden

administration's attacks on this sector of the United States and Alaska's economy, it is tough; commercial fishing, tough. It has been a tough year economically. But an area of good news during the pandemic, one that I am very proud of for all of my constituents, involves how we in Alaska have responded on the health side. Vaccines, testing, death rates—we have consistently been the top State rated in all of these categories throughout the pandemic, which is kind of amazing given that we are a very, very big State with a very small population.

I know that so many Americans watching right now want to get back out, visit Alaska. Our Governor, Mike Dunleavy, recently tweeted:

With the best vaccination efforts [in the country] & some of the lowest COVID numbers in the country, Alaska is open for business . . . safe for travelers!

So come on, America, get back up to Alaska. Love to have you.

So this is all very true. Our vaccination efforts are viewed as the best in the United States of America, and the great lengths that so many in Alaska have gone through to make it so have captured the country's imagination. These efforts just in the last couple of weeks have been featured all across the country—USA TODAY, “Good Morning America,” the Washington Post, the New York Times, a great piece by Bloomberg News, and so many others. So big thanks to the press corps, the national press corps, for featuring my State's efforts and importantly the heroic work being done to distribute lifesaving vaccines to a State that is more than 2½ times the size of Texas. Sorry there, Senator CORNYN, Senator CRUZ. It is true.

Most of the geography of Alaska is dotted with small villages without roads in freezing-cold temperatures. I was in Fairbanks last weekend—just a couple of weeks ago in Fairbanks. It almost hit 40 below. That is cold.

All across Alaska, our healthcare workers are jumping on boats, single-prop airplanes, snow machines, and, yes, in a couple of cases, dog sleds to bring the vaccine and hope to their fellow Alaskans. And it shows.

As of a few days ago, close to 160,000 Alaskans had received at least their first vaccine dose. That is about 21 percent of our State's population.

Now, in Southwest Alaska, what we called the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, or the YK Delta—those are two giant rivers that come together—these efforts have been particularly impressive. That is largely thanks to the amazing people at the YK Health Corporation, or YKHC, which is the YK Delta's Tribal health provider. The whole organization, consisting of just about 90 healthcare professionals, serves around 28,000 people in the YK region, which is about the size of Oregon, so a huge area, not a lot of people.

Prior to the vaccine, the YK Delta had been stricken by COVID-19 with one of the highest infection rates in

the country, in a very far-flung place in terms of the dispersal of the population. It is the efforts of two women there in the YK Delta, Drs. Ellen Hodges and Elizabeth Bates, who are our Alaskans of the Week, who have been in charge of getting the vaccine to roughly 50 remote villages in Southwestern Alaska. Spread out over a territory, as I said, about the size of Oregon, the village populations in the YK Delta range from about 1,200 people to as small as 10 in terms of population.

Let's start with Dr. Hodges. She is the chief of staff at YKHC. She grew up in rural Minnesota. After graduating from the University of Minnesota Medical School, Dr. Hodges came to Anchorage as a resident in 2002, eventually making her way to Bethel, which is the hub village. It is a big community, the biggest in the YK Delta. She absolutely fell in love with the area. She said it has everything—very friendly people, authentic. It is beautiful. Soon enough, her patients turned into her family. Also soon enough, she was—according to Tricia Franklin, Alaska's director of the State Office of Rural Health Division—“the go-to person for how things are working in rural communities” and how to get things done.

She worked in the emergency room tending cuts, bruises, broken bones. She delivered babies. She worked tirelessly to contain a number of tuberculosis outbreaks in the region. And then the virus hit, and as I mentioned, it hit the YK Delta region very hard with some of the highest COVID rates in America.

There are reasons for that: the multigenerational housing, very crowded housing in this region; communal lifestyle; and also—here is a big one, and it should be a shock for every American listening—about 50 percent of the households in this region of America lack running water. Let me say that again. Some of the most patriotic communities in the country, as Alaska Natives serve at higher rates in the military than any other ethnic group in the country, live in communities that don't have running water or flushed toilets—American citizens.

It is wrong. It is wrong. And we need—we the U.S. Senate, Congress—to continue to work on this issue. How do you wash your hands five times a day, as the CDC wants you to do during the pandemic, when you don't have running water or flushed toilets? We need to keep working on this. It is a disgrace, to be honest.

So what happened when COVID hit in this region? Because of a lack of sanitation and many other problems, precious lives were being lost. Elders, who are vital to pass on the traditional wisdom of the Native Alaskan culture and heritage, were being lost. Because of a lack of functioning sanitation, even young people, whom this virus doesn't really impact, were starting to have respiratory illnesses and getting sick, and some were even dying. That is hor-

rible. It was terrifying, particularly for an area that is still dealing with the multigenerational trauma of previous pandemics, particularly the Spanish flu of 1918, which in several Alaskan Native communities wiped out entire communities; 60, 70 percent mortality rates from that flu. So we needed to get to work fast, particularly in this region.

Enter another intrepid doctor and our Alaskan of the Week, Dr. Elizabeth Bates. Dr. Bates arrived in Bethel in December of 2018—just a little over 2 years ago—and she found a community that she loved. She had experience working in women's health and infection control and emergency care and disaster relief. She has great experience across the country—really, across the world. As a doctor, she worked with patients during 9/11, Hurricane Katrina, and has spent time even in refugee camps in Rwanda.

In Bethel, she was in charge of setting up testing centers for the region. Working hand in glove with Dr. Hodges, she started one of the first drive-through and airport testing sites in rural Alaska, much of it outside in the cold weather under tarps.

But we all know that testing alone, particularly, as I said, when people are living so closely together and don't live in places where you can wash your hands frequently, wasn't nearly enough. They tried everything—public service announcements, reaching out to villagers, helping them use bleach to sanitize. It was a 24/7 effort, but, as I said, it wasn't enough. The virus was spreading rapidly. They were losing. People were dying.

Then on December 18, a few days before winter solstice—the darkest day of the year—hope came to Bethel, AK, because the first vaccines arrived. Thanks to the great work of so many scientists, government workers, private sector workers, Operation Warp Speed, the vaccine arrived on December 18 to the YK Delta. These two intrepid doctors I have been talking about cried. They had seen a lot of death and struggles in the region, and like a Christmas miracle, this vaccine arrived. They hugged each other, and then they got to work.

As I said, there are roughly 50 remote villages in the YK Delta spread out over a territory about the size of many States in our country—as a matter of fact, bigger than most States in our country—so they traveled on small planes, trucks, on ice roads, snow machines, dog sleds.

Their operation, Project Togo, is named in reference to one of the famous sled dogs that helped carry the diphtheria serum to Nome, which, of course, is the original inspiration for the Iditarod Sled Dog Race. Sometimes it was so cold that they had to keep the syringes filled with COVID serum under their clothes, lest the serum froze.

The operation that they initiated and organized has hit every single village,

all 50 in the YK Delta, bringing the vaccine to pretty much anyone who wants it. In some villages, they have been able to vaccinate as much as half the population. As a result, the numbers of COVID infections and deaths are plummeting in this region, and hope is spreading.

This great team, Drs. Hodges and Bates, as well as all in the community and all working at YKHC, have made a huge difference, and this team has created a special bond that nobody will forget.

Dr. Bates, a relative newcomer to Alaska, says that the experience has made her fall in love with the YK Delta region even more. She bought a home. She intends on staying. She describes the beauty of the region, something that she appreciates even more now, as "Our sky is huge. . . . We have a front-row seat to the entire universe."

These two doctors also have a front-row seat in providing a front-row seat to hope during this pandemic.

So I want to thank both of them again, Dr. Hodges and Dr. Bates, and all those across Alaska who are helping distribute the vaccine.

As I mentioned, right now, Alaska is the No. 1 State in the country per capita in terms of vaccine distribution and the No. 1 State per capita in terms of testing and has one of the lowest death rates. This is really amazing, really, when you see how big and widespread and harsh the weather conditions can be in the great State of Alaska.

Our fellow Alaskans are tough, resilient, and innovative, and Dr. Hodges and Dr. Bates are a huge and essential part of this effort. That is why I want to congratulate them and thank them again for being our Alaskans of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

ADVANCING EDUCATION ON BIOSIMILARS ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 164 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 164) to educate health care providers and the public on biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 164) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 164

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 "Advancing Education on Biosimilars Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. EDUCATION ON BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

Subpart 1 of part F of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 352A. EDUCATION ON BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.

"(a) INTERNET WEBSITE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may maintain and operate an internet website to provide educational materials for health care providers, patients, and caregivers, regarding the meaning of the terms, and the standards for review and licensing of, biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products.

"(2) CONTENT.—Educational materials provided under paragraph (1) may include—

"(A) explanations of key statutory and regulatory terms, including 'biosimilar' and 'interchangeable', and clarification regarding the use of interchangeable biosimilar biological products;

"(B) information related to development programs for biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products and relevant clinical considerations for prescribers, which may include, as appropriate and applicable, information related to the comparability of such biological products;

"(C) an explanation of the process for reporting adverse events for biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products; and

"(D) an explanation of the relationship between biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products licensed under section 351(k) and reference products (as defined in section 351(i)), including the standards for review and licensing of each such type of biological product.

"(3) FORMAT.—The educational materials provided under paragraph (1) may be—

"(A) in formats such as webinars, continuing education modules, videos, fact sheets, infographics, stakeholder toolkits, or other formats as appropriate and applicable; and

"(B) tailored for the unique needs of health care providers, patients, caregivers, and other audiences, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

"(4) OTHER INFORMATION.—In addition to the information described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall continue to publish—

"(A) the action package of each biological product licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351; or

"(B) the summary review of each biological product licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351.

"(5) CONFIDENTIAL AND TRADE SECRET INFORMATION.—This subsection does not authorize the disclosure of any trade secret, confidential commercial or financial information, or other matter described in section 552(b) of title 5.

"(b) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—The Secretary shall advance education and awareness among health care providers regarding biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products, as appropriate, including by developing or improving continuing education programs that advance the education of such providers on the prescribing of, and relevant clinical consider-

ations with respect to, biological products, including biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biosimilar biological products."

FOOD ALLERGY SAFETY, TREATMENT, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 578, which was introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 578) to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 578) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 578

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 "Food Allergy Safety, Treatment, Education, and Research Act of 2021" or the "FASTER Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. FOOD ALLERGY SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(qq)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(qq)(1)) is amended by striking "and soybeans" and inserting "soybeans, and sesame".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any food that is introduced or delivered for introduction into interstate commerce on or after January 1, 2023.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) descriptions of ongoing Federal activities related to—

(A) the surveillance and collection of data on the prevalence of food allergies and severity of allergic reactions for specific food or food ingredients, including the identification of any gaps in such activities;

(B) the development of effective food allergy diagnostics;

(C) the prevention of the onset of food allergies;

(D) the reduction of risks related to living with food allergies; and

(E) the development of new therapeutics to prevent, treat, cure, and manage food allergies; and

(2) specific recommendations and strategies to expand, enhance, or improve activities described in paragraph (1), including—

(A) strategies to improve the accuracy of food allergy prevalence data by expanding and intensifying current collection methods, including support for research that includes the identification of biomarkers and tests to validate survey data and the investigation of the use of identified biomarkers and tests in national surveys;

(B) strategies to overcome gaps in surveillance and data collection activities related to food allergies and specific food allergens; and

(C) recommendations for the development and implementation of a regulatory process and framework that would allow for the timely, transparent, and evidence-based modification of the definition of "major food allergen" included in section 201(qq) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(qq)), including with respect to—

(i) the scientific criteria for defining a food or food ingredient as a "major food allergen" pursuant to such process, including recommendations pertaining to evidence of the prevalence and severity of allergic reactions to a food or food ingredient that would be required in order to establish that such food or food ingredient is an allergen of public health concern appropriate for such process; and

(ii) opportunities for stakeholder engagement and comment, as appropriate, in considering any such modification to such definition.

(b) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall make the report under subsection (a) available on the internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services.

MAKING A TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO THE ALS DISABILITY INSURANCE ACCESS ACT OF 2019

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 579, which was introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 579) to make a technical correction to the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 579) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows

S. 579

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

SECTION 1. RETROACTIVE ACCESS TO SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY BENEFITS INDIVIDUALS WITH AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS (ALS).

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b) of the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-250) is amended by striking "applications for disability insurance benefits filed after the date of enactment of this Act" and inserting "applications for disability insurance benefits approved after the date that is 5 months before the date of enactment of this Act".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-250).

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 90, S. Res. 91, S. Res. 92, and S. Res. 93.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 94, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 94) designating the week beginning February 28, 2021, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

REMEMBERING BILL NIGHBERT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, earlier this year, my home State of Kentucky said goodbye to Bill Nighbert, a longtime public servant and a kindhearted friend. Both as a local mayor and a statewide official, Bill was instrumental to the achievements of communities across our Com-

monwealth. Today, I would like to recognize his lifetime of contributions to Kentucky.

As the Gateway to the Cumberland, the city of Williamsburg holds a special significance not just in Southeastern Kentucky but for the entire Commonwealth. Bill worked several jobs for the city he loved before being elected mayor in 1993. For the next decade, the people of Williamsburg put their trust in him. In return, Bill worked around the clock to deliver for his community. Even in the city's top job, Bill could still be found helping plow snow, deliver goods, or any other job that needed doing. A beloved local splash park is just one tangible example of Bill's leadership and vision for his city.

As a successful mayor, Bill's reputation grew across the Commonwealth. He was elected president of the Kentucky League of Cities in 2002, using his talents to improve communities throughout the Bluegrass. Bill left city hall when Governor Ernie Fletcher tapped him to be deputy commissioner of the Department of Local Government and later the secretary of the Transportation Cabinet. Even as Bill served the entire Commonwealth in Frankfort, he still took care of Whitley County. For instance, he was a driving force in the construction of a new interchange over I-75 near Williamsburg.

Apart from his professional work, Bill was legendary for his ability to make a friend in any situation. I guess you don't become the president of the Optimists Club without a sunny disposition. He was a role model and a little league coach, lending whatever free time he could find to a variety of local organizations.

Of course, Bill's greatest achievement was the love he shared with his wife of 34 years, Susan, as well as his children and their spouses, Brad and Monica, Renee and Chris, and Benton. Anyone who was lucky enough to know Bill could see the immense pride he had in his children and grandchildren. He said they were the reasons he dedicated so much of his life to public service. On behalf of the Senate, I send sincere condolences to Bill's friends and loved ones. We are grateful they shared him with us for so many years. Kentucky was made better as a result.

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN78-2, the nomination of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services having been referred to the Committee on Finance, the Committee, with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

(1) on the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed, 14 ayes to 14 noes; and

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."

RON WYDEN.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PRINT DISABLED

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled on its 90th anniversary. The National Library Service, or NLS, is an important part of the Library of Congress, an institution that has long been committed to serving readers with disabilities. The concept of a national library for the blind was introduced in 1897 by the seventh Librarian of Congress, John Russell Young, who established a reading room for the blind that included more than 500 books and music items in raised characters.

In 1913, Congress began to require that one copy of each book be made in raised characters and deposited in the Library of Congress for educational use; however, as impressive as this collection was, it was only available to people who were able to visit in person.

In 1930, legislation was introduced in both the House and the Senate to fund a Library of Congress program to provide service to blind readers on a national scale. This led to passage of the Pratt-Smoot Act which, on March 3, 1931, established what we now know as the National Library Service for the Blind and Print Disabled. The act has been amended several times, not only increasing funding for the program, but also expanding service to children and people with physical and reading disabilities and adding what is now the world's largest accessible music materials collection.

Missouri has wonderful local libraries that play a key role in connecting the NLS program to my constituents across the State. NLS and the Wolfner Talking Book and Braille Library serve nearly 6,500 individuals and more than 600 intuitions in Missouri, providing daily access to all the incredible resources NLS has to offer.

NLS is continuing its innovative and adaptive approach to serving Americans with disabilities. NLS has a vibrant history that spans phonograph records, cassette tapes, flash memory cartridges, and the internet, all while continuing to supply hardcopy and digital braille materials. With its modernization efforts underway, NLS no doubt has a very exciting future ahead.

Today, it is my pleasure to congratulate NLS on its 90th anniversary. I wish the wonderful staff at NLS continued success as they work to ensure the NLS mission "that all may read."

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTOPHER PICKENS

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Mr. Christopher Pickens, a Knauss Sea Grant fellow on the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. Pickens has had a significant impact during his time as a fellow. His expertise on fisheries management and ocean sciences has meaningfully contributed to the committee's efforts. He has worked on several pieces of legislation that have passed the Senate or have become law, such as the FLOODS Act and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Officer Corps Amendments Act. His contributions will help improve ocean and flood monitoring to keep Americans safe, promote deep sea ocean exploration, and inform the stewardship of our Nation's marine resources.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Mr. Pickens for all of the fine work he has done and wish him luck in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VERMONT STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY CONTEST FINALISTS

• Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD some of the finalists' essays written by Vermont High School students as part of the 11th annual "State of the Union" essay contest conducted by my office.

The material follows:

FINALISTS

EMILY BORRAZZO, SOUTH BURLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, SOPHOMORE

Supporting Our Veterans

Every day, men and women in the military risk their lives for the protection of their fellow citizens. The ideology of our nation depends on their service. Yet every day, veterans across the country face issues regarding claim approvals, mental health, and post-service employment.

The lengthy claim approval process and 36% claim granting rate is something that many veterans encounter. The issue is not the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs' generous budget, but how the money is spent, and the efficiency/availability of the benefits being offered. The VA should hire more people to process claims in order to shorten the processing time, which is currently four months or longer on average. Hiring veterans in these positions would also address unemployment issues. Additionally, more guidance should be given on how to file a claim. This includes identifying the quickest claim type and specifying what medical information should be given. Lastly, the VA only approves claims for illnesses and injuries which they deem to be a direct cause of service. Extending this to all serious illnesses and injuries throughout life, or at least partial financial and medical support, would be extremely beneficial to veterans and could even improve their mental health.

Studies have shown that veterans have a higher risk for alcohol/drug abuse, and suicide. One in five veterans suffer from mental

health problems like PTSD, depression, and severe anxiety. Veterans account for 13.8% of the suicides in America, and for over a decade 17-18 veterans have died daily from suicide. We cannot take away their experiences, but offering more support in their recovery is the least we can do. Many veterans with mental health problems are not aware of their condition, or are too embarrassed to ask for help. Educating veterans (especially while serving) about signs and effects of mental health problems, and the care and treatment available to them, could save lives. Additionally, implementing a mental health scan for veterans every few years could be very effective in identifying these issues early on, and opening thousands of veterans' eyes to the care available to them. Enforcing quality-of-care standards for treatment in all mental health care facilities would also benefit the nation.

American veterans receive very effective military training and preparation, but are rarely prepared for post-service employment. Studies suggest the unemployment rate for veterans is considerably higher than their civilian counterparts. This can be attributed to the rarity of higher education and the numerous mental health issues among veterans. Increasing accessibility and lowering costs for college education would broaden the post-service career opportunities for countless veterans. Lower tuition rates for veterans could be paid for by the VA, with the extra money resulting from having to offer less veterans unemployment benefits.

Our nation cannot forget the selfless sacrifices our soldiers and military families make. Brave women and men have been taking care of this nation for almost 250 years. It's time we start taking care of them.

LING BUSHEY, BELLOWS FREE ACADEMY, FAIRFAX, SENIOR

The sexual health education and curriculum in America is not adequate to our current society, and should be focused on immensely to ensure better health in our youth population. Kids are not educated on the topics revolving around sexual health, and this leads to struggling mental health effects and potentially life changing decisions that teens should be informed on.

Ignorance on sexual orientation, contraceptives, and diseases leads to a dangerous society, where teens are unaware of consequences and ignorant to possible solutions of preventions. According to the USC Department of Nursing, nearly 750,000 teenagers in the United States will become pregnant this year; and half of the 20 million new cases of sexually transmitted diseases will be diagnosed in young people ages 15 to 24. Being informed about the physical, mental, and emotional changes in a teenagers' life and environment will benefit not only the person learning, but relationships surrounding them for years to come. By starting to educate kids in middle school will normalize these discussions to be had later on, and create a more open and unjudged environment. According to the United Nations, understanding one's own body is a human right, and the US needs to address a human's right to learn about their body and have legislature and youth service providers fund and educate a coherent and inclusive sexual education across the nation.

A guaranteed cohesive program or set curriculum addressing sexual health, will also allow for schools to help inform kids in the LGBTQ community, what the subject is and how to respect and support members that are a part. The importance of educating a positive outlook sexual orientation, and safe hetero and homosexual activities is crucial. Only 24 states mandate sex education, which is unacceptable. America needs to educate

teens on the opposite sex's changes during puberty, and normalize these changes as they are inevitable. Mandating sexual education in schools will give students a coherent safe space to learn about these topics, which might not be offered and found from other inaccurate sources which leads to false information and misinterpretations.

While this might be a tedious and drawn out process, our legislature should mandate sexual education across the nation by making a federal law. This law would teach an all inclusive comprehensive curriculum across all states. Overall this would positively affect teens all across America and would take a step towards a brighter and better future. Along with this federal mandate we need to make teens and young adults have access to a planned parenthood or a trusted medically accurate source to trust and rely on for information. Especially during these strenuous times during this pandemic, the availability of these sources are more crucial than ever.

FATIMA KHAN, ESSEX HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

July 17, 2014: "I Can't Breathe." These were the last words of Eric Garner. A 43-year-old father of six children. A man who was known as the "neighborhood peacemaker." Eric Garner was an unarmed black man, who was choked to death by Daniel Pantaleo, a New York City police officer, as he repeatedly pleaded for him to stop.

May 25, 2020: "I Can't Breathe." These were the last words of George Floyd. A 46-year-old father of one daughter. A man who wanted to "touch the world." George Floyd was an unarmed black man, who died when Minneapolis police officer, Derek Chauvin, pressed his knee into his neck, for 8 minutes and 46 seconds, as he repeatedly pleaded for him to stop.

The murder of Eric Garner, in 2014, ignited fierce emotions and propelled people into action, all over the country. A developing project which began as a response to the murder of Trayvon Martin, was beginning to receive national attention. It was known as Black Lives Matter. Today, BLM is one of the most influential social movements today, and among many human rights issues, it has awakened the eyes of the nation to the issue of police brutality.

Although we have come a long way in our work against police brutality since 2014, there is still plenty of work to do. Black Americans are disproportionately affected by police violence across the US. According to Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, black Americans are 3.23 times more likely than white Americans to be killed by police. In order to truly combat this issue, there needs to be a reformation of our police departments.

To do so, the responsibilities of police officers relating to mental health, homelessness, and drug abuse, needs to be pared back. According to the US Department of Justice, there are over 10 million arrests, annually. Only a small fraction of those are violent crimes. This makes the US the world's largest jailer, housing about 25 percent of the world's prisoners. Police departments are overworked and our jails are overcrowded. Overcriminalization has led to mass incarceration in our criminal justice system. To address overcriminalization, policymakers should consider what offenses result in conviction and prison time, and reduce arrestable offenses. More resources should be put into education and training for officers, not arrests. Additionally, more mental health professionals should be deployed as first responders.

We also have to hold every police officer accountable to the law. Too many times, police officers who have broken the law, haven't faced adequate consequences for

their actions, because of qualified immunity. Qualified immunity has protected police officers in cases where they have disgustingly abused their power. Victims whose constitutional rights have been violated have been denied justice. By altering this doctrine, we can ensure that nobody is above the law. Increasing the consequences of misconduct, will weed out the bad apples in our police departments.

By critically reforming our police departments, we can ensure a more equitable future for all Americans.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, 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 appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13660 OF MARCH 6, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—PM 4

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, and the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in

Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13692 OF MARCH 8, 2015, WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN VENEZUELA—PM 5

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2021.

The situation in Venezuela continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13692 with respect to the situation in Venezuela.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13288 OF MARCH 6, 2003, WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ZIMBABWE AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE ZIMBABWE'S DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS—PM 6

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United

States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021.

President Emmerson Mnangagwa has not made the necessary political and economic reforms that would warrant terminating the existing targeted sanctions program.

Throughout the last year, government security services routinely intimidated and violently repressed citizens, including members of opposition political parties, union members, and journalists. The absence of progress on the most fundamental reforms needed to ensure the rule of law, democratic governance, and the protection of human rights leaves Zimbabweans vulnerable to ongoing repression and presents a continuing threat to peace and security in the region.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288, as amended, with respect to Zimbabwe and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 2, 2021.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Finance.

*Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

*Adewale O. Adeyemo, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LEE:

S. 553. A bill to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to estimate the value of electromagnetic spectrum assigned or otherwise allocated to Federal entities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 554. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study on the establishment of, and the potential land that could be included in, a unit of the National Forest System in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 555. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage for employers with at least \$1,000,000,000 in annual revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 556. A bill to establish a Federal Advisory Council to Support Victims of Gun Violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 557. A bill to establish a pilot program for native plant species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 558. A bill to establish a national integrated flood information system within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 559. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 560. A bill to improve coverage of maternal oral health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 561. A bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.2 percent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 562. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to citizen petitions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs.

CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAPO, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 563. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain financial service providers who deny fair access to financial services from using taxpayer funded discount window lending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 564. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress from purchasing or selling certain investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 565. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation-exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 566. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 42 Main Street in Slatersville, Rhode Island, as the "Specialist Matthew R. Turcotte Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 567. A bill to provide for conservation and economic development in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 568. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to certify, before removing an entity from the entity list, that the entity is no longer involved in activities contrary to the national security or foreign policy interests of the United States and that removing the entity from the list does not pose a threat to allies of the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 569. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SASSE):

S. 570. A bill to prohibit the trading of the securities of certain Communist Chinese military companies on a national securities exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 571. A bill to fully fund the Prevention and Public Health Fund and reaffirm the importance of prevention in the United States healthcare system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 572. A bill to provide for the water quality restoration of the Tijuana River and the New River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. LEE):

S. 573. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 574. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to promote the investigation of fraudulent claims against certain trusts, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties against fraudulent claims against certain trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 575. A bill to provide Federal criminal penalties for lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 576. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 577. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 578. A bill to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 579. A bill to make a technical correction to the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019; considered and passed.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 580. A bill to reauthorize the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 581. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve access to adult vaccines under Medicaid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINÉ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. OSSOFF, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 582. A bill to prohibit the imposition of the death penalty for any violation of Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 583. A bill to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 584. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of medical nutrition therapy services for individuals with eating disorders under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 585. A bill to reauthorize the United States Anti-Doping Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KAINÉ (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LEE, Mr. COONS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. DURBIN):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 87. A resolution recognizing that the United States needs a Marshall Plan for Moms in order to revitalize and restore mothers in the workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 88. A resolution requesting that the President transmit to the Senate not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President relating to the amount of funding previously enacted under certain public laws and currently unspent; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 89. A resolution honoring the humanitarian work of Dr. Aristides de Sousa Mendes do Amaral e Abranches to save the lives of French Jews and other persons during the Holocaust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. Res. 90. A resolution designating the week of February 1 through 5, 2021, as "National School Counseling Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KAINÉ (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. Res. 91. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Career and Technical Education Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 92. A resolution designating March 5, 2021, as "National Speech and Debate Education Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. Res. 93. A resolution congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 94. A resolution designating the week beginning February 28, 2021, as "National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 243

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 243, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts to include rollovers for charitable life-income plans for charitable purposes.

S. 253

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana.

S. 319

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to strengthen the

conspicuous statement required on certain informational materials, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes.

S. 401

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 401, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against health care providers that do not participate in abortion.

S. 450

At the request of Ms. SMITH, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to award posthumously the Congressional Gold Medal to Emmett Till and Mamie Till-Mobley.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, *supra*.

S. 454

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 454, a bill to provide health care and benefits to veterans who were exposed to toxic substances while serving as members of the Armed Forces at Karshi Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to extend the authority for Federal contractors to reimburse employees unable to perform work due to the COVID-19 pandemic from March 31, 2021, to September 30, 2021.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.

S. 495

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to prioritize the allocation of H-2B visas for States with low unemployment rates.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from taxable income any student loan forgiveness or discharge.

S. 547

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 547, a bill to provide relief for multiemployer and single employer pension plans, and for other purposes.

S. 548

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 548, a bill to convey land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, and for other purposes.

S. 549

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 549, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 550

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 550, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 34, a resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

S. RES. 81

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 81, a resolution honoring Las Damas de Blanco, a women-led non-violent movement in support of freedom and human rights in Cuba, and calling for the release of all political prisoners in Cuba.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 554. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study on the establishment of, and the potential land that could be included in, a unit of the National Forest System in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that requires the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study on the establishment of, and the potential land that could be included in, a unit of the National Forest System in the State of Hawaii.

The U.S. Forest Service currently oversees more than 150 National forests that receive Federal funding for water-

shed protection, wildlife conservation, enhancement of recreational access, wildfire prevention, among other things. Despite having unique forest ecosystems found nowhere else in the Nation, Hawaii is currently among the few States that do not have a National Forest. If warranted, a National Forest designation in Hawaii could provide additional Federal research and management resources.

This bill directs the U.S. Department of Agriculture Secretary, acting through the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, to conduct a study in coordination with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, and in consultation with the Hawaii Department of Agriculture as well as other State and local stakeholders, on the islands of Hawaii, Oahu, Kauai, Molokai, Lanai, and Maui.

This study would, among other things, assess unique vegetation types, opportunities to improve and protect forest resources, secure favorable water flows, and opportunities for visitor use.

The Secretary of Agriculture is given three years to conduct the study and report the results to Congress. Information from that report will then inform which lands in Hawaii, if any, would be suitable for inclusion in a National Forest. This bill is supported by the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 557. A bill to establish a pilot program for native plant species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Native Plant Species Pilot Program Act. I am pleased to be partnering with Senator CANTWELL on this initiative. Our bipartisan bill would create a new pilot program at the National Park Service to support the use of native plants, and would direct the Park Service to review existing data and study the cost-effectiveness of using native plants.

Native plants are species found naturally in regions and can add beauty and value to our National Park System. Benefits range from using less water and pesticides, purifying the air, and recharging groundwater in wetlands. By using native species, the Park Service can also improve habitat for wildlife and restore important species of birds and butterflies to their natural environment.

In Acadia National Park, native plants are an important part of the ongoing conservation efforts undertaken by Superintendent Kevin Schneider and all those who work to encourage the use of native plants. Acadia National Park protects more than 900 plant species, including some that are globally, nationally, and locally rare.

Acadia is home to the vibrant rhodoras that flower along wetland edges in the spring and stunning wood lilies that bloom on the mountain tops

in August, helping to attract the more than 3.5 million visitors a year to the seventh most-visited national park in the United States. The Wild Gardens of Acadia, located at Sieur de Monts, are a collection of more than 400 native plants maintained almost exclusively by park volunteers and represent the natural plant communities found within Acadia National Park. This partnership project with Friends of Acadia allows visitors to easily step through the park's myriad habitats and learn about the splendor of Acadia's native plant species. The Wild Gardens celebrates its 60th anniversary in 2021.

Native plants, however, face many threats, such as non-native pests, non-native plants, diseases, and a changing climate. Today, almost one quarter of Acadia National Park's species are non-native to the park. The red spruce, iconic to Acadia, is projected to lose a substantial amount of its habitat in coming decades because of climate change. In addition, invasive pests, such as the Emerald Ash Borer and the hemlock woolly adelgid are affecting northern forests and have expanded into Maine. Hemlock woolly adelgid recently infested hemlock trees just outside of the park on Mount Desert Island.

Our bipartisan bill has earned endorsements from the Garden Club of America, Friends of Acadia, Scenic America, and the Native Plant Center at Westchester Community College. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to help protect the natural landscapes at our national parks for years to come.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 569. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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. 569

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 "Gilt Edge Mine Conveyance Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "Federal land" means all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 266 acres of National Forest System land within the Gilt Edge Mine Superfund Boundary, as generally depicted on the map.

(2) **MAP.**—The term "map" means the map entitled "Gilt Edge Mine Conveyance Act" and dated August 20, 2020.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(4) **STATE.**—The term "State" means State of South Dakota.

SEC. 3. LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the terms and conditions described in this Act, if the State submits to the Secretary an offer to acquire the Federal land for the market value, as determined by the appraisal under subsection (c), the Secretary shall convey the Federal land to the State.

(b) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) subject to valid existing rights;

(2) made by quitclaim deed; and

(3) subject to any other terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) **APPRAISAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Before submitting an offer under subsection (a), the State shall complete an appraisal to determine the market value of the Federal land.

(2) **STANDARDS.**—The appraisal under paragraph (1) shall be conducted in accordance with—

(A) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(B) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(d) **MAP.**—

(1) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate office of the Forest Service.

(2) **CORRECTION OF ERRORS.**—The Secretary may correct any errors in the map.

(e) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the State shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the market value of the Federal land, as determined by the appraisal under subsection (c).

(f) **SURVEY.**—The State shall prepare a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary of the exact acreage and legal description of the Federal land to be conveyed under subsection (a).

(g) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—As a condition on the conveyance under subsection (a), the State shall pay all costs associated with the conveyance, including the cost of—

(1) the appraisal under subsection (c); and

(2) the survey under subsection (f).

(h) **PROCEEDS FROM THE SALE OF LAND.**—Any proceeds received by the Secretary from the conveyance under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act") (16 U.S.C. 484a); and

(2) available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation, for the maintenance and improvement of land or administration facilities in the Black Hills National Forest in the State.

(i) **ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS.**—Notwithstanding section 120(h)(3)(A) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)(A)), the Secretary shall not be required to provide any covenant or warranty for the Federal land conveyed to the State under this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 572. A bill to provide for the water quality restoration of the Tijuana River and the New River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to re-introduce the "Border Water Quality Restoration and Protection Act."

For over two decades, cleaning up the Tijuana River Valley has been one of my top priorities for Southern Cali-

fornia. The wastewater, trash and sediment that continues to flow into San Diego and Imperial Counties is an alarming danger to public health and our economy. Although we have made recent strides in cleaning up this pollution, there is much work remaining.

That's why I am proud to introduce this important legislation, once again, to help address this decades-long issue. I am very pleased Senator PADILLA has joined me as an original cosponsor and I look forward to working with him on this important issue.

Polluted water from the Tijuana and New Rivers flows north across the border into the United States causing unsanitary water conditions, pollution and beach closures across Southern California. It also jeopardizes military training exercises for Navy Seals in Camp Pendleton.

Three-quarters of the 1,700-square-mile Tijuana River watershed lies in Mexico. However, the watershed, along with all its pollutants, drains into San Diego County and the Tijuana River Valley.

In addition to jeopardizing human health and safety, two of the most drastic effects from this cross-border water pollution are harm to wildlife and damage to the tourism industry, integral to Southern Californian communities. As the coronavirus pandemic continues to threaten our nation's health and economy, it is critical we work to address the pollution in the region so California can welcome visitors back to their beaches when it is safe to do so.

The beaches in the region are central to San Diego's tourism economy. In recent years, beaches in the communities of Coronado and Imperial Beach were closed for more than 200 days in a single year due to pollution.

Health and safety of residents and workers are also at risk. In recent years, local Border Patrol union officials reported that 80 officers suffered from contamination, rashes, infections, chemical burns and lung irritation due to toxic cross-border flows.

In addition, pollution from Mexico harms sensitive areas that provide critical habitat for more than 300 species of birds as well as marine animals like leopard sharks and bottlenose dolphins. The region is home to multiple parks and public lands, including the Tijuana River's National Estuarine Research Reserve, the River Mouth State Marine Conservation Area and River Valley Regional Park Preserve.

The harmful effects of pollution in the Tijuana River Valley on our residents, businesses, economy and environment are simply unacceptable.

In February 2020, the Government Accountability Office issued a comprehensive report, "International Boundary Water Commission: Opportunities Exist to Address Water Quality Problems." My office worked closely with the GAO to utilize their findings to craft meaningful change through this legislation.

Simultaneously, we were able to secure \$300 million in the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement to address pollution in the Tijuana River Valley Watershed.

With significant funding and detailed findings by the GAO investigation, we developed this legislation in concert with federal, state and local agency input. As beaches in both the United States and Mexico continue to close due to high levels of pollution, it is as imperative as ever to advance a solution that engages all stakeholders.

The Border Water Quality Restoration and Protection Act includes key reforms to advance concrete solutions.

One of the problems is that no one agency is in charge of this problem. A whole range of agencies—EPA, International Boundary and Water Commission, State Department, Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, Defense Department—all have jurisdiction or interest in this international issue.

What we need is one agency in charge, taking input from the others so decisions can be made. This approach is similar to other large, regional environmental challenges like the Great Lakes, Gulf of Mexico, Everglades and Chesapeake Bay. Here in California, we have also seen great success with this model of interagency coordination at Lake Tahoe.

Here's how the bill would work:

The EPA would be officially named the agency with overall control of this effort.

The EPA, along with its federal, state and local partners, would be directed to identify a list of priority projects. It also would be authorized to accept and distribute funds to build, operate and maintain those projects.

The bill would permanently authorize the Border Water Infrastructure Program to manage storm water runoff and water reuse projects.

State and local authorities would also be authorized to contribute funding to federal projects, which is currently not allowed.

The International Boundary and Water Commission would be authorized to mitigate storm water from Mexico and the pollution that comes with it and is required to construct, operate and maintain projects on the priority list developed by the agencies within the U.S. that improve water quality.

We need a new and comprehensive approach to this issue that has plagued border communities for too long. This bill creates a formal process to consider effective, long-term solutions and additional wastewater infrastructure to mitigate cross-border pollution and I hope the Senate can move on this bill quickly.

I want to thank California Environmental Protection Agency, California Natural Resources Agency, San Diego and Imperial counties, cities of Imperial Beach and Coronado, Mayor of Chula Vista, Mary Casillas Salas, the City of San Diego and the Port of San

Diego for supporting this legislation. These communities, and others, have been negatively impacted by this issue for far too long.

It's past time that we finally solve this problem to safeguard local health and economic growth.

Once again, I thank Senator PADILLA for his cosponsorship. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 578. A bill to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 578

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 "Food Allergy Safety, Treatment, Education, and Research Act of 2021" or the "FASTER Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. FOOD ALLERGY SAFETY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(qq)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(qq)(1)) is amended by striking "and soybeans" and inserting "soybeans, and sesame".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any food that is introduced or delivered for introduction into interstate commerce on or after January 1, 2023.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) descriptions of ongoing Federal activities related to—

(A) the surveillance and collection of data on the prevalence of food allergies and severity of allergic reactions for specific food or food ingredients, including the identification of any gaps in such activities;

(B) the development of effective food allergy diagnostics;

(C) the prevention of the onset of food allergies;

(D) the reduction of risks related to living with food allergies; and

(E) the development of new therapeutics to prevent, treat, cure, and manage food allergies; and

(2) specific recommendations and strategies to expand, enhance, or improve activities described in paragraph (1), including—

(A) strategies to improve the accuracy of food allergy prevalence data by expanding and intensifying current collection methods, including support for research that includes the identification of biomarkers and tests to validate survey data and the investigation of the use of identified biomarkers and tests in national surveys;

(B) strategies to overcome gaps in surveillance and data collection activities related to food allergies and specific food allergens; and

(C) recommendations for the development and implementation of a regulatory process and framework that would allow for the timely, transparent, and evidence-based modification of the definition of "major food allergen" included in section 201(qq) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(qq)), including with respect to—

(i) the scientific criteria for defining a food or food ingredient as a "major food allergen" pursuant to such process, including recommendations pertaining to evidence of the prevalence and severity of allergic reactions to a food or food ingredient that would be required in order to establish that such food or food ingredient is an allergen of public health concern appropriate for such process; and

(ii) opportunities for stakeholder engagement and comment, as appropriate, in considering any such modification to such definition.

(b) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall make the report under subsection (a) available on the internet website of the Department of Health and Human Services.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 579. A bill to make a technical correction to the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019; considered and passed.

S. 579

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

SECTION 1. RETROACTIVE ACCESS TO SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY BENEFITS INDIVIDUALS WITH AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS (ALS).

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b) of the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-250) is amended by striking "applications for disability insurance benefits filed after the date of enactment of this Act" and inserting "applications for disability insurance benefits approved after the date that is 5 months before the date of enactment of this Act".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-250).

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 580. A bill to reauthorize the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the "Affordable Housing Redevelopment Act," which I introduced today.

I want to thank Senator PADILLA for joining me on this important bill, and Representatives JARED HUFFMAN and MIKE THOMPSON for leading a companion measure in the House of Representatives.

Established in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis, the Neighborhood Stabilization Program was created by Congress to help provide assistance to communities hit hard by the recession by funding the acquisition and rehabilitation of troubled residential properties.

The program helped States, local governments, and nonprofit organizations acquire properties and rehabilitate or repurpose them as long-term affordable housing.

Between 2008 and 2019, Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds have facilitated the construction or rehabilitation of more than 50,000 homes, and the program has generated \$1.8 billion in return income, allowing communities to stretch Federal investments even further.

Today, more than 7.4 million units of affordable housing are needed across the U.S. to meet the needs of low-income renters. In my home State of California, more than 1.4 million units are needed to address the State's affordable housing shortage.

Due to financial burdens and loss of income resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, millions of people in the United States are at risk of eviction or foreclosure, and the need for more affordable housing is expected to increase dramatically.

In addition to making long-term investments in building new affordable housing in the United States, it is also critically important to focus resources on more immediate solutions, such as acquiring and rehabilitating existing buildings.

Acquisition and rehabilitation provides two distinct advantages: it lowers per-unit construction costs and makes affordable housing units available to low-income households much faster.

The "Affordable Housing Redevelopment Act" would reauthorize and expand the Neighborhood Stabilization Program to help State and local governments purchase blighted, vacant, abandoned, foreclosed, or surplus properties, and convert them into affordable housing. Eligible projects would include mixed-use development and conversions of non-residential office and retail properties.

All new units would have to serve households whose income does not exceed area median income, and at least 25 percent of units would serve households whose income does not exceed 50 percent of area median income. Long-term affordability requirements would apply in all cases.

The bill would authorize \$1.5 billion in discretionary appropriations to be allocated as a competitive grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This bill provides a targeted and cost effective way for the Federal government to help communities build more affordable housing, while also stimulating local economies and creating jobs.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SMITH, Mr.

MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. OSSOFF, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 582. A bill to prohibit the imposition of the death penalty for any violation of Federal law, 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. 582

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Death Penalty Prohibition Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON IMPOSITION OF DEATH SENTENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person may be sentenced to death or put to death on or after the date of enactment of this Act for any violation of Federal law.

(b) PERSONS SENTENCED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person sentenced to death before the date of enactment of this Act for any violation of Federal law shall be resentenced.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LEE, Mr. COONS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. DURBIN):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce in the Senate, with my colleagues Senators YOUNG, DUCKWORTH, LEE, COONS, GRASSLEY, DURBIN and PAUL a bipartisan resolution to repeal the 1991 and 2002 Authorizations for Use of Military Force (AUMF) against Iraq. This legislation will formally end the authorizations for the Gulf and Iraq wars—30 and 19 years, respectively, after these AUMFs were first passed, reasserting Congress' vital role in not only declaring wars, but in ending them. The repeal of these authorizations also recognizes the strong partnership the United States now has with a sovereign, democratic Iraq.

The United States is no longer at war with Iraq and our legal frameworks should reflect this reality as much as our policy frameworks, to include the Strategic Framework Agreement that Iraq and the United States signed in November 2008, which affirms the establishment of a long-term relationship of cooperation and friendship, based on the principle of equality in sovereignty and the rights and principles that are enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

Since 2014, U.S. troops have been in Iraq, alongside Iraqi forces, at the Government of Iraq's request for assistance in combating the Islamic State of Iraq

and Syria (ISIS). Current Administration officials, including President Biden, Secretary of State Blinken, Secretary of Defense Austin and Commander of the United States Central Command, General McKenzie, have routinely emphasized that United States military forces remain in Iraq at the invitation of the Government of Iraq and in respect to its sovereignty. Recent presidential administrations have maintained that the 2002 AUMF only serves to "reinforce" any legal authority to combat ISIS provided by the 2001 AUMF and is not independently required to authorize any such activities. As such, repealing the 1991 AUMF and the 2002 AUMF would not affect ongoing United States military operations. It would however, prevent the future misuse of the Gulf and Iraq War authorizations and strengthen Congressional oversight over war powers.

It is past time to repeal both AUMFs and formally mark the end of the Iraq War that resulted in a devastating loss of life and wounded tens of thousands of our troops. It makes no sense that two AUMFs remain in place against a country that is now a close partner. They serve no operational purpose, run the risk of future abuse by the President, and help keep our nation at permanent war.

I am proud to join this group of Senators in introducing a bill to repeal these outdated and unnecessary authorizations. I hope we can continue to find bipartisan compromise on these tough war power issues to include revising and replacing the 2001 AUMF.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 87—RECOGNIZING THAT THE UNITED STATES NEEDS A MARSHALL PLAN FOR MOMS IN ORDER TO REVITALIZE AND RESTORE MOTHERS IN THE WORKFORCE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 87

Whereas any relief and long-term recovery from the economic fallout of the COVID-19 pandemic must recognize, rebuild, and return mothers to the workforce;

Whereas women, and especially working mothers, are bearing the brunt of the economic fallout from the COVID-19 pandemic as a result of existing social barriers and policy failures such as—

(1) the lack of a care infrastructure, including child care deserts and lack of care infrastructure caused by high child care costs;

(2) the lack of family-supportive workplaces;

(3) the lack of a national paid leave policy; and

(4) gender and racial pay inequity;

Whereas, at the beginning of 2020, women made up the majority of the workforce for

the first time in almost a decade, even as women continued to face unjust gender and racial wage gaps;

Whereas 2,300,000 women have left the labor force since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, including 275,000 who exited in January 2021;

Whereas participation by women in the labor force was less than 55 percent in April 2020 for the first time since 1986, in part because of the child care crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas participation by women age 20 and older in the labor force fell to a 33-year low in January 2021, hitting 57 percent;

Whereas women—

(1) have suffered the majority of pandemic-related job losses; and

(2) have lost over 5,400,000 net jobs since February 2020, and account for 55 percent of overall net job loss since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas 86 percent of net jobs lost in December 2020 were jobs held by women, with women losing 196,000 jobs during that month;

Whereas mothers in the prime of their working lives have paid an especially high price, with mothers ages 25 to 54 experiencing a 5.7-percentage point decline in employment since the COVID-19 pandemic began, compared to a 3.1 percentage-point decline for fathers in the same age group;

Whereas women are overrepresented in low-wage jobs and underrepresented in high-wage jobs;

Whereas employment in the bottom quartile of the wage distribution has declined by 17 percent since February 2020, far exceeding the overall employment decline of 6.5 percent;

Whereas wages for women are key to the economic security of the families of such women;

Whereas women of color play a particularly vital role in the financial stability of their families, and any disruption to their earnings can be detrimental to the welfare of their families;

Whereas the absence of affordable child care exacerbates inequality by severely inhibiting low-income parents from attaining promotions and higher salaries;

Whereas child nutrition is strongly linked to the employment status of mothers, such that almost 1 in 4 children experienced food insecurity in 2020 at the same time that mothers experienced work disruptions or unemployment that led to income loss;

Whereas work interruptions caused by school closures and child care closures have disproportionately impacted women, forcing women to reduce work hours, take a leave of absence, or permanently leave the workforce;

Whereas, without reliable and affordable child care, mothers who have left the workforce will not be able to return to work, since such mothers often cannot pay for child care without the income made from going back to work;

Whereas essential workers who are single parents face additional challenges and greater financial burden due to needing affordable child care;

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated existing stigmas against working mothers that falsely assume that their role as caregivers will negatively impact their work performance;

Whereas mothers forced to permanently leave the workforce or reduce work hours because of the COVID-19 pandemic are experiencing career trajectory disruptions that lower their lifetime earnings potential and endanger their future Social Security earnings and other potential retirement income;

Whereas child care is a lifeline for working mothers, and over 75 percent of mothers with

children younger than age 10 say child care is one of their top 3 challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas, in 2019, before the COVID-19 pandemic hit the United States, there were roughly 9,700,000 working mothers with a child younger than age 6;

Whereas 95 percent of the child care workforce is comprised of women, and yet nearly ¾ of child care workers with children report problems with accessing public support programs and often struggle to afford high-quality child care for their own families;

Whereas 60 percent of businesses in the child care industry are minority-owned;

Whereas a significant investment in child care would be simultaneously job creating and job enabling, creating care jobs and supporting parental employment, both of which would benefit women;

Whereas women of color are disproportionately represented in many frontline industries that also lack critical benefits such as paid sick leave and flexibility to telework, including food services, hospitality, retail, and social assistance;

Whereas the unprecedented burdens of child care, work, and remote learning have strained the mental and emotional health of mothers; and

Whereas access to paid leave during the COVID-19 pandemic has been linked to a reduction in the spread of COVID-19 by as many as 15,000 new cases per day where people were able to use the leave, such that paid leave has prevented the compounded stressors of countless evictions, hospitalizations, and hungry children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) mothers, especially mothers of color, have been pushed to the brink of economic, social, and emotional collapse during the COVID-19 pandemic because of the existing economic and social inequalities that women have long faced;

(2) any relief and long-term recovery package to address the COVID-19 crisis should recognize and rebuild moms in the workforce, in order to secure meaningful and sustainable economic recovery, by including, at a minimum—

(A) a robust paid leave plan, which is essential to securing the physical health and financial health of families, including emergency paid leave policies that would create a path toward permanent paid leave solutions;

(B) the means to rebuild and stabilize the child care industry, which is essential to economic recovery and bolstering women in the labor force;

(C) major investments in our education systems, which must be made in order to safely reopen schools and campuses, providing funding to support and protect the safety and health of educators, support staff, students, and families;

(D) recurring child benefits, and expanded and improved child tax credit and earned income tax credit to help reduce child poverty and provide economic security for families;

(E) an expanded unemployment insurance program that benefits struggling workers, including those experiencing long-term unemployment; and

(F) access to mental health support for mothers, which is essential to maintaining the health of the family; and

(3) employers and policymakers in the United States must prioritize addressing the economic cliff facing mothers, and make permanent the aforementioned policies so that mothers are protected against any future economic calamities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 88—REQUESTING THAT THE PRESIDENT TRANSMIT TO THE SENATE NOT LATER THAN 14 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THE ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION DOCUMENTS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE PRESIDENT RELATING TO THE AMOUNT OF FUNDING PREVIOUSLY ENACTED UNDER CERTAIN PUBLIC LAWS AND CURRENTLY UNSPENT

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 88

Whereas the national debt of the United States is \$27,900,000,000,000;

Whereas this represents \$223,441 in debt per taxpayer;

Where Congress appropriated over \$4,000,000,000,000 on a bipartisan basis to address COVID-19 during 2020;

Whereas Congress passed additional COVID-19 relief legislation as part of the bipartisan-bicameral omnibus COVID-19 relief deal on December 21, 2020;

Whereas the latest reports from the Congressional Budget Office indicate that a substantial portion of funds previously allocated remain unspent;

Whereas Congress needs reliable information on unspent funds before it should consider allocating additional dollars;

Whereas, according to Center for a Responsible Federal Budget, the proposed American Rescue Plan allocates less than 10 percent of its total funding to directly combat COVID-19 needs;

Whereas, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the level of spending in the proposed American Rescue Plan is at least 3 times the size of the output shortfall in our economy, which will lead to higher inflation; and

Whereas, almost half of the American Rescue Plan would not be spent until fiscal year 2022 or later, with at least \$140,000,000,000 not being spent until fiscal year 2024 or later: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President is requested to transmit to the Senate not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the President relating to the amount of funding previously enacted and currently unspent provided under the following laws:

(1) The Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-123).

(2) The Families First Coronavirus Response Act (Public Law 116-127).

(3) The CARES Act (Public Law 116-136).

(4) The Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act (Public Law 116-139).

(5) Division N (relating to additional coronavirus response and relief) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260).

SENATE RESOLUTION 89—HONORING THE HUMANITARIAN WORK OF DR. ARISTIDES DE SOUSA MENDES DO AMARAL E ABRANCHES TO SAVE THE LIVES OF FRENCH JEWS AND OTHER PERSONS DURING THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 89

Whereas Nazi Germany invaded France on May 10, 1940, and after brief but intense hostilities, secured the surrender of France on June 22, 1940;

Whereas, as a consequence of the Nazi conquest, the lives of French Jews and Jewish and non-Jewish persons of other nationalities seeking refuge in France were put in grave and imminent danger;

Whereas many thousands of those persons fled to Bordeaux, France, and elsewhere in southwest France, seeking to traverse Spain and escape to Portugal;

Whereas, in 1939, the Government of Portugal under Antonio de Oliveira Salazar issued Circular 14, which sharply restricted the availability of visas to displaced persons;

Whereas the Consul General of Portugal in Bordeaux was Dr. Aristides de Sousa Mendes do Amaral e Abranches;

Whereas, in June 1940, confronting a humanitarian crisis and in defiance of Circular 14, Sousa Mendes, assisted principally by his diplomatic colleagues Jose de Seabra, Manuel de Vieira Braga, and Emile Gissot, issued without charge tens of thousands of visas, including thousands to fleeing Jews;

Whereas Sousa Mendes reportedly stated, "I declare that I shall give, free of charge, a visa to whosoever shall request it. My desire is to be with God against Man rather than with Man and against God.";

Whereas those visas, as well as Sousa Mendes' personal intervention at the border between France and Spain, enabled the refugees to reach safety in Portugal;

Whereas, in July 1940, the Government of Portugal under Oliveira Salazar responded by recalling Sousa Mendes, dismissing Sousa Mendes later from active diplomatic service, and subjecting him to economic retribution and subsequent ostracism;

Whereas, in 1941, Sousa Mendes explained, "In truth, I disobeyed, but my disobedience does not dishonor me. I chose to defy an order that to me represented the persecution of true castaways who sought with all their strength to be saved from Hitler's wrath. Above the order, for me, was God's law, and that's the one I have always sought to adhere to without hesitation. The true lesson of Christianity is to love one's neighbor.";

Whereas, in 1954, Sousa Mendes died penniless in Lisbon, Portugal, under the cloud of the discipline imposed for his defiance;

Whereas, in 1966, Yad Vashem recognized Sousa Mendes as a Righteous Among the Nations for his selfless efforts to save Jewish lives at personal risk to himself, making Sousa Mendes the first of a number of diplomatic rescuers to be so honored;

Whereas, in 1988, the United States Senate passed Senate Resolution 270, 110th Congress, agreed to June 23, 1988, to commemorate Sousa Mendes' humanitarian efforts;

Whereas, in 1986, President of Portugal Mario Soares posthumously rehabilitated Sousa Mendes, decorating Sousa Mendes as an Officer of the Order of Liberty;

Whereas, in 1988, the Parliament of Portugal posthumously granted Sousa Mendes the status of Ambassador;

Whereas, in 1995, President of Portugal Mario Soares posthumously bestowed on Sousa Mendes the Grand Cross of the Order of Christ;

Whereas, in 2017, President of Portugal Marcelo Rebelo de Sousa posthumously bestowed on Sousa Mendes Portugal's highest honor, the Grand Cross of the Order of Liberty;

Whereas, in 2020, the Parliament of Portugal unanimously voted to memorialize Sousa Mendes in the National Pantheon in Lisbon; and

Whereas, in 2020, on the 80th anniversary of his heroism, the United States Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad initiated commemorations in honor of Sousa Mendes in Bordeaux, France, and Portugal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and salutes the humanitarian and principled work of Dr. Aristides de Sousa Mendes do Amaral e Abranches, Consul of Portugal in Bordeaux, France, for acting with great courage and at personal risk to issue transit visas to French Jews and other persons, sparing them from Nazi occupation and the Holocaust, thus saving many thousands of innocent lives;

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of this resolution to the President; and

(3) requests that the President transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of Portugal and the President of the Assembly of the Republic of Portugal.

SENATE RESOLUTION 90—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 1 THROUGH 5, 2021, AS "NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK"

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ROSEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 90

Whereas school counselors are more important now than ever, as the COVID-19 pandemic has magnified the mental health crisis among the youth of our Nation;

Whereas the American School Counselor Association has designated February 1 through 5, 2021, as "National School Counseling Week";

Whereas school counselors have long advocated for equitable opportunities for all students;

Whereas school counselors help develop well-rounded students by guiding students through academic learning, social and emotional development, and career exploration;

Whereas personal and social growth can help lead to increased academic achievement;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in ensuring that students are ready for both college and careers;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in making students aware of opportunities for financial aid and college scholarships;

Whereas school counselors assist with and coordinate efforts to foster a positive school climate, resulting in a safer learning environment for all students;

Whereas school counselors have been instrumental in helping students, teachers,

and parents deal with personal trauma as well as tragedies in their communities and the United States;

Whereas students face myriad challenges every day, including peer pressure, bullying, mental health issues, the deployment of family members to serve in conflicts overseas, and school violence;

Whereas a school counselor is one of the few professionals in a school building who is trained in both education and social and emotional development;

Whereas the roles and responsibilities of school counselors are often misunderstood;

Whereas the school counselor position is often among the first to be eliminated to meet budgetary constraints;

Whereas the national average ratio of students to school counselors is 430 to 1, almost twice the 250 to 1 ratio recommended by the American School Counselor Association, the National Association for College Admission Counseling, and other organizations; and

Whereas the celebration of National School Counseling Week will increase awareness of the important and necessary role school counselors play in the lives of students in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of February 1 through 5, 2021, as "National School Counseling Week"; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National School Counseling Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the role school counselors play in schools and the community at large in preparing students for fulfilling lives as contributing members of society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 91—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF "CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH"

Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 91

Whereas a competitive global economy requires workers who are prepared for skilled professions;

Whereas 3,000,000 workers will be needed for the United States' infrastructure in the next several years, including designing, building, and operating transportation, housing, utilities, and telecommunications;

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic has displaced millions of workers in the United States and fundamentally shifted entire industries within foundational aspects of the

economy, creating significant demands for high-quality and efficient upskilling and reskilling opportunities to ensure a quick and equitable recovery;

Whereas career and technical education (referred to in this preamble as “CTE”) ensures that competitive and skilled workers are ready, willing, and capable of holding jobs in high-wage, high-skill, and in-demand career fields such as science, technology, engineering, art and design, mathematics, nursing, allied health, construction, information technology, energy sustainability, and many other career fields that are vital in keeping the United States competitive in the global economy;

Whereas CTE helps the United States meet the very real and immediate challenges of economic development, student achievement, and global competitiveness;

Whereas the United States has 30,000,000 jobs providing an average income of \$55,000 per year that do not require a bachelor's degree yet increasingly require some level of postsecondary education;

Whereas over 12,800,000 students are enrolled in CTE across the country at the secondary and postsecondary levels, with CTE programs in thousands of CTE centers, comprehensive high schools, career academies, and CTE high schools, and nearly 1,000 2-year colleges;

Whereas CTE matches employability skills with workforce demand and provides relevant academic and technical coursework leading to industry-recognized credentials for secondary, postsecondary, and adult learners;

Whereas CTE affords students the opportunity to gain the knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to secure careers in growing, high-demand fields;

Whereas secondary CTE is associated with a lower probability of dropping out of high school and a higher likelihood of graduating on-time;

Whereas according to an American Federation of Teachers poll, 94 percent of parents approve of expanding access to CTE and other programs that prepare students for jobs;

Whereas students at schools with highly integrated rigorous academic and CTE programs are significantly more likely to meet college and career readiness benchmarks than students at schools with less integrated programs;

Whereas, in 2018, Congress affirmed the importance of CTE by passing the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Public Law 115-224), which supports program improvement in secondary and postsecondary CTE programs in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and outlying areas; and

Whereas, February 23, 2019, marked the 102nd anniversary of the signing of the Act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, commonly known as the “Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917”), which was the first major Federal investment in secondary CTE and laid the foundation for the bipartisan, bicameral support for CTE that continues as of February 2021: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of February 2021 as “Career and Technical Education Month” to celebrate career and technical education across the United States;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month;

(3) recognizes the importance of career and technical education in preparing a well-educated and skilled workforce in the United States; and

(4) encourages educators, school counselors, guidance and career development pro-

fessionals, administrators, and parents to promote career and technical education as a respected option for students.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, by supporting the development of a workforce trained in in-demand skills, we can accelerate the recovery of our economy. The Nation's continued progress and the socioeconomic mobility of our citizens are contingent on the education and skills of the American workforce and its ability to adjust to and fulfill the needs of the 21st century economy—especially in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic. Career and technical education (CTE) programs are vital to every student's education, providing them access to the important knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to obtain careers in rapidly growing, high-demand industries. Today, approximately 12.8 million students across the Nation are enrolled in CTE programs offered by thousands of career academies, comprehensive high schools, CTE high schools, community colleges, and CTE centers. Through applied learning, these students obtain workplace skills and technical training that mirror in-demand positions in the workforce.

In the next decade, millions of skilled workers will be needed to fill infrastructure positions in the United States, including jobs related to designing, building, and operating transportation, housing, telecommunication, and utilities facilities. CTE programs intentionally match skills with workforce demands, lowering the probability of high school drop-out and increasing the likelihood of on time graduation rates. These CTE programs will help fill the estimated 30 million U.S. jobs available with an average annual income of \$55,000 that do not require a bachelor's degree yet necessitate some level of postsecondary education.

Across Virginia, I hear about an increase in workforce needs from frontline health services to manufacturing PPE to contract tracing—the list goes on. As we see a surge in unemployment overall from the pandemic, it is essential that we highlight the important role of CTE in the country's ability to meet the challenges we face in economic recovery and development, student achievement, and global competitiveness. In 2018, Congress affirmed the importance of CTE by passing the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act which supports CTE programs in secondary and postsecondary education. We also need to ensure we continue reskilling and upskilling workers by supporting workforce development programs.

Today, with my Senate CTE Caucus co-chairs Senator PORTMAN, Senator BALDWIN, and Senator YOUNG and more than half of my colleagues in the Senate, I am pleased to again introduce a bipartisan resolution to designate February as Career and Technical Education (CTE) month. CTE Month en-

courages students, parents, counselors, educators, and school leaders to learn more about the diverse educational opportunities offered in their communities, and recognize the valuable role of CTE in developing a well-educated and highly skilled workforce in the United States.

By formally recognizing CTE Month through this resolution, we hope to bring greater awareness to improving access to high-quality career and technical education for millions of America's students and our nation's ongoing economic competitiveness.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92—DESIGNATING MARCH 5, 2021, AS “NATIONAL SPEECH AND DEBATE EDUCATION DAY”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 92

Whereas it is essential for youth to learn and practice the art of communicating with and without technology;

Whereas speech and debate education offers students myriad forms of public speaking through which students may develop talent and exercise unique voice and character;

Whereas speech and debate education gives students the 21st-century skills of communication, critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration;

Whereas critical analysis and effective communication allow important ideas, texts, and philosophies the opportunity to flourish;

Whereas personal, professional, and civic interactions are enhanced by the ability of the participants in those interactions to listen, concur, question, and dissent with reason and compassion;

Whereas students who participate in speech and debate have chosen a challenging activity that requires regular practice, dedication, and hard work;

Whereas teachers and coaches of speech and debate devote in-school, afterschool, and weekend hours to equip students with life-changing skills and opportunities;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day emphasizes the lifelong impact of providing people of the United States with the confidence and preparation to both discern and share views;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day acknowledges that most achievements, celebrations, commemorations, and pivotal moments in modern history begin, end, or are crystallized with public address;

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day recognizes that learning to research, construct, and present an argument is integral to personal advocacy, social movements, and the making of public policy;

Whereas the National Speech & Debate Association, in conjunction with national and local partners, honors and celebrates the importance of speech and debate through National Speech and Debate Education Day; and

Whereas National Speech and Debate Education Day emphasizes the importance of speech and debate education and the integration of speech and debate education across grade levels and disciplines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 5, 2021, as “National Speech and Debate Education Day”;

(2) strongly affirms the purposes of National Speech and Debate Education Day; and

(3) encourages educational institutions, businesses, community and civic associations, and all people of the United States to celebrate and promote National Speech and Debate Education Day.

SENATE RESOLUTION 93—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA CRIMSON TIDE FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYOFF NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. TUBERVILLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 93

Whereas the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team went 13-0 and won the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship, defeating the Ohio State University Buckeyes by a score of 52 to 24 at the Hard Rock Stadium in Miami, Florida, on January 11, 2021;

Whereas this victory marks the sixth College Football National Championship in the last 11 years for the University of Alabama and the 18th National Championship overall;

Whereas the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship was the 73rd post-season football bowl appearance and the 44th football bowl victory for the University of Alabama;

Whereas the 2020–2021 Crimson Tide football team won the Southeastern Conference Championship and went 11-0 in conference play, becoming the first team in college football history to win 11 Southeastern Conference games in a single season;

Whereas the 2020–2021 Crimson Tide football team averaged 48.5 points per game, which is the most in Southeastern Conference history;

Whereas the University of Alabama head football coach, Nick Saban, has now won 7 College Football National Championships, setting the record for the most national championships won by a single head coach;

Whereas this victory extends the record of Coach Saban to 170 wins and 23 losses during his tenure as the head football coach of the University of Alabama;

Whereas members of the 2020–2021 Crimson Tide football team have been honored by various awards throughout the season and during the post-season, including the 2020 Heisman Trophy winner, DeVonta Smith;

Whereas Chancellor Finis St. John IV, President Stuart Bell, and Athletic Director Greg Byrne have emphasized the importance of academic success to the Crimson Tide football team and all student-athletes at the University of Alabama; and

Whereas the 2020–2021 Crimson Tide football team has brought great pride and honor to the University of Alabama, loyal fans of the Crimson Tide, and the entire State of Alabama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of Alabama Crimson Tide for an undefeated season and winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship game;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the championship season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to—

(A) the President of the University of Alabama, Dr. Stuart Bell;

(B) the Athletic Director of the University of Alabama, Greg Byrne; and

(C) the Head Coach of the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team, Nick Saban.

SENATE RESOLUTION 94—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING FEBRUARY 28, 2021, AS “NATIONAL TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK”

Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 94

Whereas there are 37 Tribal Colleges and Universities operating on more than 75 campuses in 16 States;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities are tribally chartered or federally chartered institutions of higher education and therefore have a unique relationship with the Federal Government;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities serve students from more than 230 federally recognized Indian tribes;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities offer students access to knowledge and skills grounded in cultural traditions and values, including indigenous languages, which—

(1) enhances Indian communities; and

(2) enriches the United States as a nation;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities provide access to high-quality postsecondary educational opportunities for—

(1) American Indians;

(2) Alaska Natives; and

(3) other individuals that live in some of the most isolated and economically depressed areas in the United States;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities are accredited institutions of higher education that prepare students to succeed in the global and highly competitive workforce;

Whereas Tribal Colleges and Universities have open enrollment policies, and approximately 15 percent of the students at Tribal Colleges and Universities are non-Indian individuals; and

Whereas the collective mission and the considerable achievements of Tribal Colleges and Universities deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning February 28, 2021, as “National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week with appropriate activities and programs to demonstrate support for Tribal Colleges and Universities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 3, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a briefing.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Thursday, March 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I

ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:51 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 4, 2021, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DILAWAR SYED, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE ALTHEA COETZEE.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. BREAZEALE
BRIG. GEN. MATTHEW J. BURGER
BRIG. GEN. KENNETH R. COUNCIL, JR.
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL J. HEIRES
BRIG. GEN. ERICH C. NOVAK
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY T. PENNINGTON
BRIG. GEN. JOHN N. TREE
BRIG. GEN. CONSTANCE M. VON HOFFMAN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOSEPH R. CLEARFIELD
COL. MARK H. CLINGAN
COL. SIMON M. DORAN
COL. WALKER M. FIELD
COL. ANTHONY M. HENDERSON
COL. MICHAEL E. MCWILLIAMS
COL. MATTHEW T. MOWERY
COL. ANDREW M. NIEBEL
COL. AHMED T. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. SEAN N. DAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK A. HASHIMOTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAY M. BARGERON
BRIG. GEN. BRIAN W. CAVANAUGH
BRIG. GEN. DIMITRI HENRY
BRIG. GEN. RYAN P. HERITAGE
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER A. MCPHILLIPS
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT B. SOFGE, JR.
BRIG. GEN. MATTHEW G. TROLLINGER

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING THE SERVICE OF READING CLERK JOE NOVOTNY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding service of the Reading Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, Joe Novotny, as he prepares for his retirement. As Reading Clerk, Joe Novotny has served as the 'Voice of the House,' and his trusted leadership and valued presence on the House Floor will be missed by Members and staff on both sides of the aisle.

Joe Novotny has dedicated his entire career to the People's House. A Chicago native, Novotny came to Washington to serve as a Congressional page at age 16. After studying Political Communication at George Washington University, he returned to the House, where he worked as a staffer for the House Education and Labor Committee for fifteen years, rising to become Chief Clerk for this essential committee. His service was greatly respected by all, including by Education and Labor Chair George Miller, who lauded Novotny as 'an incredibly valuable asset to my staff [whose] unparalleled integrity and dedication helped our committee advance major policies that are making a difference in the lives of working families.'

In 2010, it was my great and proud honor as Speaker of the House to name Joe Novotny Reading Clerk: the first openly gay man to hold this important position. His historic service has made our Congress more inclusive, diverse and representative of the people whom we serve. As Novotny stated upon his appointment, 'When you think about the diversity in this House now—and the fact that we have the first woman Speaker and we have the first African-American Clerk of the House—this is a Congress of firsts, so to be a part of that is a tremendous honor.' As the child of immigrants, Novotny's ascendance to service in the halls of the United States Capitol is, as he has proudly said, the story of the American Dream.

As Reading Clerk, Novotny has been vital in engaging and connecting our country with their Democracy, as he ensures that legislative measures debated in the House are clearly articulated not only to Members of Congress but to the American people and to communities around the world. He has consistently brought his steady, calming presence and great professionalism and institutional expertise to the House Floor, and in doing so, has helped advance the ability of the People's House to do the people's work.

His commitment to making the Congress more open, accessible and efficient has been particularly important to the functioning of the House and the health of our Democracy during the challenging time of the coronavirus pandemic, as our institution has adjusted to remote and virtual operations.

While Joe Novotny's service will be missed, his great love for the House and his dedication to our Democracy stand as an inspiration for all who will follow in the path that he has blazed. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I thank Joe Novotny for his patriotic service, which has strengthened the Congress and Country.

CONGRATULATING THE EAGLE SCOUTS OF TROOP 2G OF WIN- CHESTER

HON. JENNIFER WEXTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize three young women from Virginia's 10th Congressional District who made history as the first female Eagle Scouts in the Shenandoah Area Council. Eagle Scout is the highest achievement or rank to earn in Scouts BSA, and Lauren Reed, Amelia "Mia" Lunceford, and Elaina Truban of Winchester have all exemplified the remarkable leadership, talent, and perseverance to earn this distinction.

To achieve the Eagle title, scouts are required to earn 21 merit badges, complete and lead a service project that benefits their community and sit before the Eagle Scout Board of Review. For their thoughtful community projects, Lauren planted shrubbery and landscaping around a flag pole at Locust Grove Cemetery in Stephens City, Mia worked on a wildflower rain garden at Izaak Walton Lake in Frederick County, and Elaina made a raised flower bed and planted seven trees on the grounds of her church. Until recently, girls and young women were not allowed to join the program. Now, there are 83 female scouts in five different troops in the Shenandoah Area Council. All three of the first class of female Eagle Scouts in the Shenandoah Area Council are members of Troop 2G of Winchester.

These young women were honored and recognized in Winchester, Virginia on January 26, 2021. All three are following in the footsteps of their male siblings and other family members who attained the same recognition. Lauren, Mia, and Elaina now help pave the way for future female scouts to pursue the ranks of Eagle Scout, and they are just beginning their journeys as impactful community members and strong, female leaders.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 447 NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 2021

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judi-

ciary, on Homeland Security, on the Budget, and as a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 447, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2021, which invests more than \$3.5 billion over 5 years in expanding opportunities and access to Registered Apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeships.

I thank Congressman SCOTT, the Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, for reintroducing this legislation which passed by a substantial margin in the 116th Congress as H.R. 8294.

This important legislation has the potential to yield \$10.6 billion in net benefits to U.S. taxpayers in the form of increased workers productivity and decreased spending on public-assistance programs and unemployment insurance and which bring America's investments in apprenticeship more in line with countries around the world.

Madam Speaker, the Registered Apprenticeship (RAS) system is America's most successful federally authorized workforce development program.

According to the Department of Labor, 94 percent of people who complete RAs are employed upon completion, earning an average starting wage of above \$70,000 annually.

Yet, according to the most recent data, only 0.3 percent of the overall workforce in America have completed an apprenticeship.

Madam Speaker, this legislation could not be more timely because during a time of record unemployment, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2021 invests more than \$3.5 billion over 5 years in expanding opportunities and access to Registered Apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeships.

The legislation also creates an additional 1 million new apprenticeship opportunities on top of the current expected growth of the apprenticeship system, an investment that not only will pay off for workers and employers, but also benefit the taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, this legislation is critical to expanding the nation's workforce development system during our country's deepest economic downturn since the Great Depression.

Specifically, the National Apprenticeship Act of 2021 authorizes \$400 million for fiscal year (FY) 2022, increasing by \$100 million annually to \$800 million for FY 2026, to support the creation or expansion of registered apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeship programs, including in non-traditional apprenticeship occupations and for nontraditional populations.

This funding will also attract and encourage employer participation and recruitment for individuals with barriers to employment, including individuals impacted by the criminal justice system.

Additionally, to ensure that apprenticeship agreements and program registration to ensure consistency in quality standards and worker protections, H.R. 447 codifies and streamlines standards for registered apprenticeships, youth apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

Also codified are the existing regulations and practices to ensure that all individuals have an equal opportunity to participate in programs under the national apprenticeship system, and to increase diversity in the occupations offered and the individuals participating in programs, especially in high-skill, high-wage, and in-demand industry sectors and occupations.

The legislation institutionalizes, and establishes by statute, the Department of Labor's (DOL) Office of Apprenticeship, and vests it with the following roles and responsibilities:

Increasing participation in programs under the national apprenticeship system through technical assistance and program recognition activities;

Bringing together industry sector leaders and experts, including employers, industry associations, joint labor-management organizations, labor organizations, education and training providers, credential providers, and apprentices to establish national frameworks to expand apprenticeships to new occupations and sectors; and

Improving data infrastructure to improve reporting and publicly disseminating information about apprenticeship programs.

Another strong feature of this legislation is that it codifies the roles and responsibilities of the State Apprenticeship Agencies (SAAs) by:

Authorizing annual funding for State Apprenticeship Offices and SAAs at \$75 million for fiscal year (FY) 2022, increasing by \$10 million annually to reach \$115 million for FY 2026, with one-third of funds equally distributed to all States and outlying areas, and two-thirds of funds distributed via formula to SAAs; and

Requiring SAAs to submit plans for registered apprenticeship activities, which generally mirror existing state requirements under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

My concluding reason for supporting this important legislation is that it strengthens the connections between the Department of Education and Department of Labor through an interagency agreement to support the creation and expansion of youth apprenticeships, college consortiums, and data sharing agreements.

I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting for its passage.

APPRENTICESHIP SUCCESS STORIES APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM

The Houston Community College (HCC) Apprenticeship Program is a partnership between HCC and 11 U.S. Department of Labor approved Apprenticeship programs in Houston. The program provides a 3-5 year job training system for skilled trade and craft workers.

Employers, employer associations, and joint-labor management organizations known collectively as apprenticeship sponsors provide apprentices with on-the-job instruction that reflects industry needs, while HCC provides the classroom-related instruction. HCC apprentices can study in eight different disciplines including: carpenters, electricians, millwrights, pipe-fitters, welders, masons, stationary engineers, and glaziers.

In 2013, HCC launched a 35-million renovation project of the San Jacinto building on its Central campus with HCC apprentices contributing to the massive renovation and restoration project.

Ten HCC plumber and pipefitter apprentices helped upgrade the building's pool, basketball gymnasium, laid pipes and redesigned Memorial Green.

HCC apprenticeship program prides itself on the rapid development and professionalism of its students. Thus far, HCC apprentices can boast a zero OSHA injuries and a 24% increase in productivity and 43% decrease in job turnover.

"The quality of the work on this project will provide lower maintenance and operating cost for Houston Community College and is referred to as Life Cycle Engineering Cost. This project provides a win-win opportunity for Houston Community College and their students," said Apprenticeship Director, Doug Posey.

When the San Jacinto project is complete, it will become an academic center for Central College. The project is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2013.

JOHN SOILEAU'S STORY

John Soileau knows his way around a plumbing system. He's spent the last 5-years learning to install and repair commercial and residential plumbing systems, as well as designing new systems, laying or fitting pipes and repairing and maintaining appliances in Houston Community College's (HCC) apprenticeship program.

"I've learned so much over the five year period. From math basic, AutoCAD, shop classes to welding and learning how to pipe a dollhouse," said Soileau.

Unlike many college students, Soileau got paid to go to school. The 3-5 year apprenticeship program mixes paid on-the-job training with classroom instruction allowing the student to earn as they learn.

"This program gave me the opportunity to make a living and eliminate any doubts I had about how I was going to pay my tuition. It was a win/win situation for me."

As Soileau nears the end of the apprenticeship program, he is looking forward to starting his career as a Master Plumber and with a five-year work history; he says he is confident about his training and his future.

HCC APPRENTICE STUDENTS HELP BUILD NEW HOSPITAL

Eleven Houston Community College (HCC) and Independent Electrical Contractors (IEC) apprentice students broke ground on the Jeanie Sealy Hospital construction project in Galveston, Texas in September 2012. In collaboration with numerous contracted workers, HCC students are proving on a daily basis that their apprentice training is valuable to the project.

"The project is an example of the quality of electricians being trained at their apprentice school. The old time skills of electrical workers simply are no longer sufficient to meet the demands of modern day technology in accomplishing the work," said Eddie Rodriguez, Director of IEC Apprentice School.

The total project was design by computer aided drafting or AutoCAD with prefabrication of all conduits including the smaller 3/4" size conduit at their fabrication shop and shipped to the job site for installation. The complexity of this project has construction veterans in awe of the students' knowledge and success.

"I was totally impressed with the complexity and quality of the conduit installation in such a complex and compact facility as a modern hospital requires," said Doug Posey, HCC Director of Apprenticeship Programs.

Apprentice workers training has been recognized in providing increased productivity by 24%, worker turnover down by 43%, job site absenteeism down by 59%, Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) re-

cordable injuries down by 67%, and first aid cases down by 90%.

"IEC continues to modernize their training methods and the technology needed to satisfy the contractor's needs to stay productive and competitive in today's market place," said Rodriguez.

The Jeanie Sealy Hospital project contract is valued at \$27.4 million. The project is scheduled to conclude August 2015.

HONORING EDGAR KING FOR HIS LIFETIME OF SERVICE TO SARA- TOGA COUNTY, NEW YORK DAIRY FARMERS, AND THE EN- TIRE NORTH COUNTRY REGION

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Edgar "Ed" King for his lifetime dedication to public service for the betterment of Saratoga County and New York State's Dairy industry.

Born a Saratogian with deep family roots in dairy farming, Ed made improving New York's agricultural industry his life's work at the local, state, and national level. A lifelong farmer and graduate of the prestigious Cornell University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Ed went on to serve as the Deputy Commissioner of New York State's Department of Agriculture and Markets from 1976 to 1987. When Ed returned from Albany, he immersed himself in local politics, and was elected Supervisor for Northumberland on the Saratoga County Board of Supervisors in 1992. He held that position until 2004, following in his father's footsteps who held the same seat after being elected in 1944. Ed also spent time serving on the boards of Dairy Management, Inc., the National Dairy Board, and the New England Dairy Promotion Board.

After retiring from his exemplary career in public service, Ed continued to be heavily involved in the day to day operation of Kings Ransom Farm in Schuylerville. This fifth-generation, family-run farm is one of the largest dairy farms in the region, established in 1901 by King's grandfather. Ed continued doing what he loved, interacting with and serving his community, as he and his wife, Carolyn, operated a bed and breakfast on the farm where they eagerly welcomed visitors, tourists, strangers, and friends. Ed was especially proud to watch as his sons very successfully expanded the business to add King Brothers Dairy, a dairy store that offers home delivery service. My heartfelt condolences go out to his wife, their four sons, and his extended family.

Ed was an extraordinary leader for Saratoga County, the dairy industry and beyond. He was tireless in his efforts to promote agricultural development throughout New York State. His welcoming demeanor, selfless service, and deep respect for everyone he encountered is a shining example for us all. Ed was an integral part of the community and will be greatly missed. On behalf of New York's 21st Congressional District, I am honored to recognize his remarkable leadership and life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I was not in attendance to cast my vote on consideration of the En Bloc 1 amendment to the For the People Act (H.R. 1). Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 52.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF VERNON E. JORDAN, JR.**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of the distinguished civil rights leader and my dear friend, Mr. Vernon E. Jordan, Jr. For decades, Mr. Jordan pursued public service as a lawyer, presidential advisor, and civil rights advocate. We have lost a prominent figure of the American civil rights movement, a tremendous leader, and a dear friend.

Mr. Jordan dedicated his life to social justice and civil rights activism. Born on August 15, 1935, he grew up in the segregated South and graduated from DePauw University in Indiana in 1957, where he was the only African American in his class. Jordan then attended Howard University School of Law, where he began his legal career working in the civil rights movement. In 1961, he joined the firm of Donald Hollowell and won a lawsuit against the University of Georgia on behalf of the first two Black students to attend the University.

Throughout his lifetime of social justice activism, he assumed leadership positions to improve the lives of those around him. Mr. Jordan served as field secretary for the Georgia chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), director of the Voter Education Project for the Southern Regional Council (SRC), and head of the United Negro College Fund. Later in 1971, he was appointed president of the National Urban League.

Upon his recovery from an assassination attempt on his life in 1980, Jordan stepped down from the Urban League and took a position as legal counsel for the Washington, D.C. firm of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, and Feld. While there, he represented many prominent clients, including Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton. In 1992, Mr. Jordan was chosen by President-elect Clinton to lead his transition team and then served as his advisor. He was the first Black person to be assigned such a role.

Jordan knew what it meant to serve his community and our nation. His dedication for civil rights and ability to move society toward justice will always leave a mark in history. Mr. Jordan dedicated his life to transforming society and his hard work will always be remembered.

Madam Speaker, I extend my deepest condolences to Vernon's wife, Ann; his daughter, Vickie; and his entire family during this extremely difficult time. His life and legacy will always live on and he will be dearly missed.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2021

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1 and my great disappointment that the Majority refused to allow my commonsense amendments to be offered to this bill. This bill was written behind closed doors and though Members of Congress offered over 180 amendments to improve this bill only 56 were allowed to be offered on the House floor. That is a travesty for Congress and the American people who want and deserve honest and transparent elections. This bill bans voter identification laws and mandates States implement mail-in voting both of which will lead to massive election fraud. Even European countries have rejected these failed policies due to fraud.

While serving in the Florida Senate I was tasked with reforming Florida's election laws following the 2000 election and chaos that ensued. Having tackled election reform in the aftermath of an uncertain election, I know firsthand how important it is to restore confidence and eliminate existing grey areas that may lead to fraud or raise questions about fairness.

Events surrounding the 2020 election raised questions from my constituents about the operation and certification of voting machines used throughout our state and the nation. Chief among those concerns was whether our voting machines are connected to the internet and vulnerable to manipulation through hacking. To answer these and other questions I contacted the U.S. Election Assistance Commission which certifies voting hardware and software for use in our elections.

In her letter to me, the Inspector General of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission addressed this topic stating that the "EAC believes Michigan may use modern transmission features in at least some of its Dominion voting systems." This is in direct conflict with assertions by the maker of the Dominion Voting System who stated, "... Voting systems are by design meant to be used as closed systems that are not networked meaning they are not connected to the Internet."

To end the confusion on this issue and restore confidence in our system, I filed an amendment that would prohibit voting systems from being connected to the Internet; specifically, stating that no system or device upon which ballots are programmed or votes are cast or tabulated shall be connected to the Internet at any time. That would ensure the integrity of voting machines. Unfortunately, that amendment was not allowed to be debated and voted on.

My second amendment would ensure that election machines are fully auditable—no longer would election officials and election equipment providers deny full audits of elections due to proprietary software or hardware. The American people have a right to a full audit of any election to ensure the full integrity of elections. There is no good reason to oppose this amendment but, again, it was not allowed to be debated and voted on.

And, my third amendment would have prohibited the use of voting systems produced by a foreign entity. It would also require all com-

ponents of the voting systems be manufactured and maintained in the United States. Why should the votes of the American people be subject to counting using foreign equipment that cannot be audited and that may be connected to the Internet? My amendments would ban all three of these things.

By denying elected Members of Congress a vote on these amendments, Speaker PELOSI decided against providing full transparency and accountability in our federal elections. This partisan bill should be rejected.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES AND
CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR.
IRBY B. HUNTER, SR.**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Irby Hunter, Sr., who transitioned on February 24, 2021. It is with sorrow that I mourn his passing, but with great joy that I remember his rich legacy.

Dr. Hunter was born in Lindale, Texas on July 12, 1940 to Oliver and Malissa Hunter, the fourth of six children. He excelled in school and went on to earn a Bachelor of Science in Chemistry from Texas College and a Master of Science in Chemistry from Tuskegee Institute in 1963. Thereafter, he continued his education at The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston School of Dentistry, where he earned his doctorate degree in dental surgery as only the second African American to earn a degree from this institution.

Dr. Hunter launched his dental practice in Dallas, dedicating his career to consistently focusing on the health and healing of his patients. Throughout his robust career, he served as the President and Chairman of the Board of the Gulf State Dental Association for three terms. Other noteworthy leadership roles included President and Chairman of the M.C. Cooper Dental Society, and affiliation with the Dallas County Dental Society, the Texas Dental Association, and the American Dental Association. Along with his impressive career, Dr. Hunter was consistently engaged with his community, serving on the founding Board of Directors of the Sunbelt National Bank. Furthermore, he was President, Ball Chair, and Chaplain of the Cotillion Idlewild Club; a loyal donor to the YMCA Mooreland Branch; and a regular volunteer at several Dallas area schools. He remained closely affiliated with his alma mater, Texas College, serving on the Trustee Board of Directors and regularly attending a host of Texas College events.

Known for his approachable and kind demeanor, Dr. Hunter was a loving husband of 58 years, dedicated father of two, and respected community member. Beyond his passion for his career and community, he will be remembered for encouraging the young people in his life to dedicate themselves to their studies as they pay it forward.

Dr. Hunter is preceded in death by his parents, brother, Dr. Oliver Hunter, Jr., and sisters, Ruth Byrdson, Faye Stull, and Rosalind McClellan. He leaves behind his devoted wife, Staphalene; daughter, Constance Hunter Wilson; son, Dr. Irby Hunter, Jr.; sister, Nancy

Curtis; grandchildren Cecily, Clarke, Camille, Chad, Peyton, Irby III, and Thomas; a host nieces and nephews; and the dedicated medical team at the East Illinois Clinic in Dallas.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in expressing my condolences to the loved ones of Dr. Irby Hunter, Sr. His loss will be felt by many, including myself. But I find hope in knowing that his legacy will live on for years to come.

RECOGNIZING BRIGADIER
GENERAL JONATHAN C. MOYER

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor U.S. Army Brigadier General Jonathan C. Moyer. A beloved son of Burlington County, Jonathan C. Moyer was recently promoted to Brigadier General and took command of the 335th Theater Signal Command. I, and the town of Pemberton, cannot be prouder of him.

Brigadier General Jonathan C. Moyer's promotion is much deserved. He has served his country in the armed forces for over two decades and has been awarded a Bronze Star Medal, and numerous citations of the Meritorious Service Medal and Army Commendation Medal for his service. In addition, Brigadier General Moyer is dedicated to community service and uplifting veterans and students.

Brigadier General Moyer is a co-founder of Tip of the Arrow Foundation, a not-for-profit organization that assists mobilized National Guard and Reserve Veterans returning from military service overseas to translate their military skillset to find gainful civilian employment. Brigadier General Moyer also served as Director of Coaching for Tip of the Arrow Foundation, where he managed 30 volunteer coaches to assist our Veterans with resume writing, job interviews, and salary negotiation. Additionally, Moyer has been involved with several organizations from AFCEA, AOC, to AUSA, serving as a senior mentor for local high schools and colleges STEM programs.

I commend Brigadier General Jonathan C. Moyer for his work, and I know I speak on behalf of my constituents when I say congratulations.

CELEBRATING WWII VETERAN
KENNETH COOPER'S 100TH
BIRTHDAY

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th birthday of WWII Veteran Kenneth Conrad Cooper, who served in the United States Navy from 1942 to 1981. After a full military career, Navy Captain Cooper retired as an Air Wing Commander.

Born March 12, 1921, to Clarence and Ruby Cooper, Ken was raised in Pomona, the western anchor of California's citrus-growing region known as the "Queen of the Citrus Belt."

Ken was part of the Orange Empire legacy, having been born and raised on a citrus

ranch. He grew up working in the groves and well remembers the sweet scent of citrus blossoms and the sooty smoke of the smudge pots that were lit to save the orange trees from frost.

With a mother who was a public school teacher, and later a principal, Ken was a good student who followed in his mother's footsteps to become a lifelong educator.

Ken remained in the Pomona area to attend Chaffee and La Verne colleges. While in college his love of flying took wing and he earned his pilot's license and became an instructor. Then WWII happened.

With his civilian flight instructor background and the urgency of the war at hand, he joined the United States Navy and immediately began training young pilots. A short time after his entrance into the service, he began flying the large DC-6 and DC-7 transport planes.

It was during these tumultuous times that he met a Navy nurse, Shirley, who became his wife. At the end of the war, he and Shirley settled back in the Orange Empire.

Ken became an elementary school teacher. During his many years in education, he advanced from classroom teacher to principal of both elementary and junior high schools. At the end of his career, he was assistant superintendent of the same school district he attended as a child.

These were busy years for Ken. Along with raising a family of three children with Shirley, while moving up the ladder in education, he also was chairman of the Pomona Planning Commission, president of the local Kiwanis Club, and president of the Pomona Teachers Association.

He maintained his passion for flying by participating as a Navy Reserves "weekend warrior." While doing all of this, he earned a Master's degree at Pomona College and attended the Naval War College, thereby continuing his military advancement.

In retirement, his drive did not diminish. He and Shirley maintained additional homes in both Mexico and Palm Springs, where he pursued his passion for golf. It was also during this time that he and his wife did a great deal of traveling, mostly on cruises. This wanderlust took them all over the world, from Asia, Alaska, Europe, South and North America, and the Caribbean, to name a few.

Later they moved to Walnut Village in Anaheim, where Ken participates in veterans celebrations in full uniform.

Please rise with me to salute this good man who has devoted his life to family, community and country. Happy 100th with many more birthdays to come.

REMEMBERING EMILIA MARIA
PLACANICA

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Emilia Maria Placanica, of Warren, Ohio, who passed away peacefully on Sunday, February 21, 2021 at the age of 83.

Emilia was born on May 8, 1937 in Caulonia, Regio Calabria, Italy, daughter of Ilario and Rosa.

Emilia married the love of her life, Francesco Carmelo "Frank" Placanica on Oc-

tober 13, 1957. They shared 52 years of marriage together until Frank's passing in 2010.

Prior to coming to the United States in 1960, Emilia graduated and held a degree as a tailor for men and women's garments. She retired after a 30-plus year career working in various department stores.

Mrs. Placanica enjoyed sewing, cooking, knitting, crocheting, making ceramics, reading, being with friends and family, however, she most enjoyed and loved babysitting her grandchildren. Emilia was a God-fearing woman and greatly enjoyed reading prayers in Italian.

Emilia will be dearly missed by her children, Anna Maria Placanica of Washington, D.C., Sandra "Sandy" Placanica—Frazeskos of Warren, Renee Placanica of Warren, and Antonio F "Tony" Placanica of Liberty, and grandchildren, Francesca, Isabella and Giorgio Frazeskos, Francesco McElrath, Adrianna, Olivia and triplets, Antonio, Francesco and Dominico Placanica. In New York, Emilia leaves her niece, Rosa Placanica, along with her children (great-niece/nephew) Angelica Blazina-Mantovani and family and Fabio Blazina. Additionally, Emilia leaves many family members abroad to include sister-in-law Rosa (Australia), as well many nieces, nephews, great-niece and nephews, cousins in Italy and Australia.

Emilia was preceded in death by her parents; her husband, Frank; daughter, Angelina Placanica; two brothers and three sisters.

My family and I are proud to be friends with Emilia's daughter, Sandy, and her grandson, Giorgio. My deepest condolences go out to the Placanica Family and to all whose lives Emilia touched.

HONORING UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE COLONEL LARRY H. SHAW

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Air Force Colonel Larry H. Shaw on his highly decorated, 33-year career serving our nation, and to congratulate him on his retirement as commander of the 434th Air Refueling Wing, Grissom Air Reserve Base in Miami County, Indiana.

Colonel Shaw began his military career in 1988 after earning his commission from Reserve Officer Training School at the University of Nebraska, where he graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice. He went on to accumulate more than 5,700 flight hours and deployed overseas for multiple operations. Colonel Shaw's years of leadership, pilot training, and mission development have ensured the nearly 1,900 military, civilian, and contractor personnel at Grissom have what they need to support the United States Air Force mission and defend our country.

Grissom Air Reserve Base is a source of pride for Hoosiers in our community. It is the largest employer in Miami County, and it is home to the largest KC-135R Stratotanker unit in the Air Force Reserve Command. Since Colonel Shaw became commander in 2016, I have seen firsthand the positive impact of his dedication and commitment to excellence. I want to thank him for his outstanding initiative throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. He has

gone above and beyond to ensure the brave men and women under his command remain safe and healthy. In addition, his innovative thinking has brought numerous economic development opportunities to northern Indiana, strengthening the communities surrounding Grissom Air Reserve Base.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Colonel Shaw's accomplishments through more than three decades of service in the United States Air Force and Air Force Reserve. On behalf of 2nd District Hoosiers, I am grateful for the incredible legacy he will leave behind, and I wish him all the best in the years to come.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2021

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act I am proud to have co-introduced, which includes my amendment to further facilitate voting by all eligible Americans through the best-practices expansion of vote-by-mail elections.

Our For the People Act is a truly revolutionary bill that will implement many of the most critical government reform efforts we need to get government working for the people again, such as fighting voter suppression, simplifying voting, promoting election security, curbing special interest and dark money in politics, incentivizing smaller and broader donations, increasing transparency and fortifying ethics laws.

While I applaud the efforts and amendments of my colleagues that incorporate lessons learned in this past election, like ensuring Americans with disabilities have access to voting and verification infrastructure, I believe more can and must be done to analyze the greatest possible utilization of mail-in voting throughout our nation. My amendment, which has been accepted by the House and added to the bill, is needed because we should know what went well and what needs improvement as we look to responsibly expand voter access by mail.

Heading into the 2020 election, five states—Oregon, Washington, Colorado, Utah and my Hawaii—held universal vote-by-mail elections, with no-excuse absentee voting being an option in 34 states and the District of Columbia. The growing concerns over the safety of in-person voting during the COVID-19 pandemic prompted an additional 11 states to make it easier to vote by mail using absentee ballots.

The prevalence and easy access to vote-by-mail led, in part, to record voter turnout in the last election. Roughly two-thirds of eligible voters cast a record 158.4 million ballots, with nearly 65 million ballots cast using the mail. This is a dramatic increase from the 2016 elections, where roughly 34 million Americans cast a ballot by mail.

In my Hawaii, which performed its first universal vote-by-mail election in the 2020 primary elections, vote-by-mail increased election accessibility across-the-board, especially for our kupuna (elders) and those in underserved communities for whom in-person voting is problematic, especially during the COVID-19

pandemic. Hawaii's most recent primary election resulted in the highest voter turnout percentage for a primary election in our state's history, and more people voted in Hawaii's general election than ever before. We demonstrated to ourselves and the rest of the country that we can hold an all-mail election with virtually no fraud claims or disputed election results.

Despite Hawaii's success, I am sure we can do even better, and there are best practices that can be shared amongst the states across our nation to encourage the even more widespread adoption of vote-by-mail. Thus, my amendment simply directs the Election Assistance Commission to conduct a study on vote-by-mail efforts in 2020 elections and develop recommendations to help states better administer their elections in the future. My study and the recommendations that will come from it can help improve vote-by-mail procedures and systems to ensure the right to vote to all eligible Americans while protecting the integrity and security of our elections.

I thank this House for supporting my amendment, and urge this body to support final passage of the underlying bill. The For the People Act will truly deliver on our obligation to help renew Americans' faith in government by making sure it is of and for the people. Mahala (thank you).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDA L. LAWRENCE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, on March 2, 2021, my vote was not recorded on the second vote of the second vote series (Roll Call No. 55 on H.R. 1). Had my vote been recorded, I would have voted: "Yes" on the Democratic En Bloc 3 Offered by Ms. LOFGREN (Gallego Amendment, Grijalva Amendment No. 23, Grijalva Amendment No. 24, Langevin Amendment, Lawrence Amendment No. 26, Lawrence Amendment No. 27, Levin (MI) Amendment, Luria Amendment, Manning Amendment, Phillips Amendment, Plaskett Amendment No. 33, Plaskett Amendment No. 34, Plaskett Amendment No. 35, Plaskett Amendment No. 36, Schneider Amendment).

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MONROE COUNTY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Monroe County Historical Association located in Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania. They are approaching the significant benchmark of 100 years of service, which they celebrated at their annual meeting on February 28.

Formed on April 8, 1921, a group of enthusiasts known as the Historical Society were given one room in the Stroud Mansion to keep records and relics of earlier days. Officially in-

corporated on September 5, 1928, the Historical Society continued to collect artifacts and required more space over the years.

On March 8, 1990, the Monroe County Historical Society merged with the Monroe County Museum Association forming the present-day Monroe County Historical Association. A few years later, on May 16, 1994, the Woman's Club of the Stroudsburgs transferred total ownership of the Stroud Mansion to the Monroe County Historical Association.

They are well known for their stately home, the Stroud Mansion, which was built in Georgian-style architecture in 1795 by a prominent businessman and has its own unique history. It is a prime example of their stewardship and is one of three buildings they maintain. The stately Mansion houses pieces dating back to pre-contact experiences as well as historic photographs and articles. I am sure the Monroe County Historical Association will continue to document the events of our recent times with a sharp awareness of how soon they will be our past.

It is my honor to commend the Monroe County Historical Association for their service as the official county historical organization for Monroe County. The staff and volunteers have strived well and hard to preserve Monroe County's rich history. It is my hope they will continue this valuable work for many years to come.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2021

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement from Oregon Secretary of State Shemia Fagan urging support for H.R. 1, For the People Act.

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1, FOR THE PEOPLE ACT—STRENGTHENING AMERICA DEMOCRACY HEARING

(Oregon Secretary of State Shemia Fagan)

Dear Chairwoman Lofgren, Ranking Member Davis and Distinguished Members of the Committee: My name is Shemia Fagan, and I'm honored to serve as Oregon's 28th Secretary of State. As Oregon's chief elections officer, I lead the agency responsible for upholding our democracy. I am writing in support of H.R. 1, For the People Act.

My dad raised my two older brothers and me as a single parent in a beautiful part of rural Oregon: The Dalles and Dufur. Our mother suffered from addiction and was in and out of our lives. I remember my brother driving us to the Portland area when I was in high school to see my mom after she had been homeless for several years. We pulled up to this large Victorian-style house, with a big wrap around porch and we were blown away by this large house. Instead of walking up the steps to the front door when she greeted us though, my mother dropped to all fours and crawled under the porch. She invited us into her home, where a sleeping bag covered the dirt. Underneath that porch she shared with us one of her few possessions, a box of pictures of me and my brothers. A few years later she went into recovery and fought her addiction. In doing so, she fought for herself and our family. In 2014, she passed away and I'll never forget the words of the minister at her eulogy, "Trish reached the

place of an ordinary life, but it didn't just happen to her, she had to fight for it with everything she had in her."

Many of us understand the meaning of the minister's words because we have had to fight, and are often still fighting, against poverty or injustice to reach the place of an ordinary life. The ballot is a place to have your voice heard on the issues that impact you directly. Those fighting against barriers to the ballot box need to see progress within reach, and I've learned that no matter the fight: progress must be within reach for everyone. H.R. 1, the People's Act is a step toward progress for all eligible Americans.

I'm fighting every day as Oregon's Secretary of State to ensure every Oregonian has a voice.

The consideration of H.R. 1 comes at a critical moment in America's history. For far too long, too many Americans across the country have faced barriers to having their voice heard. We should not settle for the status quo. We know that free and fair elections are a cornerstone of our society, democracy, and country—and that they are under threat. Hostile foreign governments are trying to undermine our democracy and attack our democratic institutions. Meanwhile, people within our own democratic institutions are putting up barriers that impede the fundamental right to vote. We must take seriously these attempts to undermine the basic principles of democracy.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, will help restore and bolster voters' rights. Democracy only works when the people can participate and have their voice heard. This legislation will help to lift the voices of every American, no matter their political party or where they live.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, will help restore and bolster voters' rights. Democracy only works when the people can participate and have their voice heard. This legislation will help to lift the voices of every American, no matter their political party or where they live.

H.R. 1 builds upon best practices across the country, including many originated in Oregon. We are proud to lead by example with tried and true policies that have improved voter access and participation in the democratic process for decades. The late Republican Secretary of State Dennis Richardson said, "Everyone who is eligible to vote should be able to vote." Secretary Richardson's words exemplify what we proudly refer to as 'The Oregon Way.' Together, Oregonians across the political spectrum continue to work together to reduce barriers to participating in our democracy. As Oregon's Secretary of State, I am proud to lend my voice to the chorus calling for replicating Oregon's example to other states.

Vote at Home Act is important legislation that was introduced by Representative Earl Blumenauer and Senator Ron Wyden and I'm proud to support this act and see the critical legislation included in H.R. 1.

Best Practices in Oregon include:
 Vote by Mail
 Automatic Voter Registration
 Online voter registration
 Voting Rights for formerly incarcerated individuals
 Secure and convenient drop box locations throughout the state
 Early Voting
 Pre-registration of 16 and 17-year-olds
 Voting for individuals with disabilities
 Voting for uniformed services and overseas voters

VOTE BY MAIL/VERIFIED PAPER BALLOTS

In Oregon, we have a proud tradition of open, fair, and accessible elections. This is why we were proud to be the first state to

switch entirely to a vote-by-mail system. Voters first approved our vote-by-mail system in 1998 and it has long enjoyed bipartisan support. My recent predecessor, Republican Secretary of State Bev Clarno said in a 60 Minutes interview that vote-by-mail is not controversial in Oregon and suggested that if other states try it, "they might like it."

Thanks to our safe, secure, and modern system, Oregon consistently ranks as a national leader in voter turnout. Voters' pamphlets are sent to every Oregon household two to three weeks before an election, giving voters time to research issues or candidates. Registered voters receive an official ballot to complete and insert into an official ballot return envelope, which is then signed by the voter. This ballot return envelope can be mailed (postage paid) or dropped off at any official drop box across the state.

Election security is built into Oregon's vote-by-mail system. Each ballot has a unique bar code. Election officials in every county double check the signature on the ballot envelope to ensure it matches the one on file. In the 2020 elections, Oregon had a 3-step authentication process that allowed for computer verification and then two individuals verify the signature on the ballot. Simply put, paper ballots are the safest method for conducting secure and accurate elections.

Military and overseas ballots are mailed to voters at least 45 days before Election day. Ballots may be accessed through an on line portal called "My Vote" and filled in with Oregon's online ballot-marking tool. Once printed, ballots are mailed to the appropriate county elections office. A signed ballot may be faxed or emailed if the voter completes and returns an official Secret Ballot Waiver Form.

AUTOMATIC VOTER REGISTRATION

In 2016, Oregon became the first state to implement an automatic voter registration (AVR) system. Under the old system, most Oregonians needed to take a separate step to register to vote at the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) after obtaining or renewing their driver license or ID Card. This law makes voter registration automatic, shifting from an opt-in process to an opt-out process. It eliminates the need to fill out the voter registration card for those with qualifying interactions at the DMV. Instead, eligible Oregonians receive a mailing from the Oregon Elections Division explaining their options for registering to vote.

The AVR process is limited to applicants who have been coded as citizens by DMV. The Elections Division sends Oregon Motor Voter Cards to those who have provided documentation that they are U.S. citizens. Oregon voters are also required to attest to their qualifications—including citizenship—at the time they submit their ballot.

As a result of automatic voter registration, 92 percent of the eligible voting population is registered to vote. Since implementation in the 2016 election cycle, Oregon saw the second largest increase of people of color registered at 79 percent, according to Blue Lab analysis. A study by political scientist and voting expert Professor Paul Gronke of Reed College, found that Oregon's AVR system helped register more people of color, young people, those who are low income, and rural voters. Across the board, Oregon's AVR system has been one of the most successful programs in the country to expand access to the ballot.

We already know that this program has been instrumental to bringing the vote to traditionally disenfranchised populations. As just one example: in 2016 advocates in Oregon spoke with a man named Charles who was automatically registered to vote. Charles was an African American and disabled vet-

eran of both Korea and Vietnam wars who was told by his commanders not to register to vote because "Black men shouldn't vote." Thanks to Oregon's AVR legislation, Charles cast his ballot for the very first time—ensuring his vote had a place in Oregon's democracy.

ONLINE VOTER REGISTRATION/PRE-REGISTRATION FOR 16 AND 17-YEAR-OLDS

Oregon's online voter registration tool provides Oregonians a convenient and secure way to make sure they can participate in the democratic process. Oregon first implemented on line voter registration in 2009. In the first year of implementation almost 87,000 Oregonians used the system.

Just a few years after, Oregon began allowing 16 and 17-year-olds to pre-register to vote under the online voter registration system and through the AVR system. Oregon's online voter registration system, also allows Oregonians to conveniently update their registration if they move, change their name or mailing address, or want to select or change a political party.

VOTING RIGHTS FOR FORMERLY INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS

Oregon allows previously incarcerated individuals the right to register to vote in Oregon. Persons convicted of a felony, whether the defendant serves their term of incarceration in a state correctional facility or in a county jail, cannot vote while they are serving their term of incarceration for the felony. All others in the criminal justice system retain their right to vote (such as pretrial detainees, persons serving misdemeanor sentences in county jails, persons on parole or probation).

Voting rights are restored when a person convicted of a felony is released from incarceration. However, once released from incarceration they must re-register to vote in order to restore their voting rights.

VOTING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

Oregon allows individuals who are visually impaired to request a large format ballot from their local county clerk's office. The election clerks can send them a video, and/or an audio clip to assist individuals with filling out their ballot privately and securely. Voters with no or limited vision can use a screen reader to have ballots and the voters' pamphlets read to them. Voters using tablets to mark a ballot can increase the size of the font and change the color and contrast of the text. Additionally, Oregonians can utilize a screen reader or other technology to access a ballot at home using "My Vote."

Tablets also help voters with cognitive disabilities or limited reading capabilities. They work well for voters with limited range of motion. Voters who are quadriplegic or have severe arthritis can use their fingers or a number of assistive technologies, such as sip-and-puff systems, to mark their ballots.

Any Oregon voter who needs assistance with can get assistance registering to vote, voting, or returning their ballot and are encouraged to contact their local election officials to ask for assistance and support.

CONCLUSION

We are proud of our trailblazing efforts to ensure all eligible Oregonians have access to the ballot box. In Oregon we believe, regardless of political party or affiliation, that democracy works when everyone is represented and everyone can participate and have their voice heard. H.R. 1 is necessary to ensure Americans who all too often face barriers to the ballot box have an opportunity to have their voice heard.

H.R. 1 builds upon best practices we have built here in Oregon. We are proud to lead by example with safe, secure, transparent, efficient, and modern policies that have been

working in our state and across the country for years.

RECOGNIZING THE 29TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this past week marks the 29th anniversary of the massacre of hundreds of people in the town of Khojaly, Azerbaijan. This was the largest killing of ethnic Azerbaijani civilians during the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict. Khojaly, which is in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan, was once home to 7,000 people. On February 26, 1992, Armenian armed forces massacred over 600 unarmed people—including 106 women and 83 children—and left less than 2,000 survivors. Hundreds more became disabled due to their injuries. More than 100 children lost a parent and 25 children lost both parents. At least 8 families were all killed. This is a devastating tragedy.

A cease-fire was negotiated in 1994, but the conflict remains unresolved. In the wake of the 2020 fighting between Azerbaijan and Armenia in the Nagorno-Karabakh, it is my hope that Armenia and Azerbaijan can finally come to the table and find peace. Long-term peace, security, and regional cooperation are in the best interests of the entire region of the South Caucasus and the world.

Azerbaijan has been a strong partner of the United States and its allies. This cooperation has included: playing a leadership role in non-proliferation issues; providing troops to serve shoulder-to-shoulder with U.S. forces in Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan; allowing transit of non-lethal equipment used by coalition forces through Azerbaijan to Afghanistan; construction of the Southern Gas Corridor from the Caspian Sea to Italy, thereby providing Europe with an alternative to Russian energy sources; and supplying 40 percent of Israel's oil. Azerbaijan also has a thriving Jewish community and has outstanding relations with Israel. As Azerbaijanis throughout the world commemorate the massacre and continue to grieve the loss of loved ones, I hope they can find peace amidst this tragedy.

HONORING THE FAITHFUL SERVICE OF ARMY MAJOR GENERAL BRIAN E. WINSKI

HON. MARK E. GREEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Army Major General Brian Winski for his distinguished and remarkable service to this nation. Major General Winski joined the Army in 1989 and was commissioned as an officer through the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's ROTC program.

His tenacious spirit and tireless work ethic propelled his swift rise through the ranks. Within a few short years, he saw duty as a Rifle Platoon Leader during Desert Storm, and

he served in Iraq as Chief of Operations for the famed 101st Airborne Division, Squadron Commander in the 61st Cavalry Regiment, and Brigade Combat Team Commander for the 1st Cavalry Division. Major General Winski proceeded to serve as Chief Legislative Liaison for the Office of the Secretary of the Army before assuming his duties as the Commanding General of the 101st Airborne Division and Fort Campbell.

Throughout his nearly four decades of service, Major General Winski has been a constant example of the Army's core principles of duty, honor, and courage. In 2006 he was awarded the Bronze Star for Valor for his gallant leadership under enemy fire in a fierce 90-minute firefight. When approaching his mission objective, a contingent of insurgents opened fire on his squad, crippling one of their vehicles. Major General Winski took decisive action and led the men under his command to dispatch 11 enemy combatants, driving the remaining insurgents to retreat.

Major General Winski's leadership extends far beyond the battlefield. Under his leadership, Fort Campbell has been a model Army base, earning the top ranking in the U.S. Army Installation Management Command for the most intergovernmental support agreements. Furthermore, Major General Winski was instrumental in facilitating the construction of a local middle school, which will serve the needs of the families stationed at Fort Campbell. Although Fort Campbell faced unprecedented challenges during the pandemic, Major General Winski's leadership ensured that the base was able to maintain readiness in uncertain circumstances. Under his guidance, Fort Campbell was able to provide critical medical assistance to cities stricken the hardest by the pandemic.

Without question, Major General Winski is a true patriot and has repeatedly gone above and beyond the call of duty. In his command of soldiers both stateside and across the world, he has led with honor and integrity. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest gratitude for his faithful service and commitment to the defense of our nation.

HONORING MAYOR HAZELLE P. ROGERS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished Hazelle P. Rogers. On the eve of 25 years of life in public service, Mrs. Rogers has demonstrated her commitment to her friends and family, her community, and the state of Florida. Along the way, she has made history. Mrs. Rogers' first election in 1996 made her the first person from the Caribbean American community to be elected to office in the southeastern United States. Furthermore, she became the first Jamaican to be elected to the Florida House of Representatives.

Mrs. Rogers has dedicated herself to the public and continues to give back to her community in the humblest of ways. In 2014, former Representative Rogers was a strong advocate for in-state tuition for undocumented students which earned her the Broward Col-

lege 2014 Award for support of the 'Florida Dreamers' Legislation. The communities Mrs. Rogers has led have always admired her leadership and commitment as she is also the recipient of honorable community awards such as the Florida Association of Counties' Champion Award; the Jamaican American Bar Association Legislative Award; and the Florida League of Cities' Legislative Appreciation Award for four consecutive years.

In November, the city of Lauderdale Lakes elevated her to an outstanding victory with a 66 percent vote to the office of Mayor. As Mayor, economic empowerment and economic development for the underprivileged in her community are her passion and fortitude. Mayor Rogers continues to build consensus around issues and support programs that are lifting community members out of poverty and into financial stability.

Madam Speaker, I extend my best wishes and regards to not only Mayor Rogers, but also to Mrs. Rogers' husband, Mr. Clifton Rogers; and the rest of her family and friends for an outstanding and wonderful life in public service.

NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE RESEARCH ACT

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the National Gun Violence Research Act.

As Chairwoman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I am committed to elevating the voice of science in the consequential deliberations taking place in this body. In our efforts to develop fair, effective, and sustainable policy solutions to the challenges facing the American people, we must ensure we are drawing from a strong base of evidence. My fellow Committee Members and I are dedicated to ensuring that the U.S. scientific enterprise is equipped with the resources it needs to derive that evidence. As the COVID-19 crisis has clearly demonstrated, there are enormous benefits to having a thriving research ecosystem in place that is poised to respond when called upon.

Gun violence is a threat to our national welfare. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) released a report reviewing the latest gun mortality data last month entitled A Public Health Crisis Decades in the Making. And the numbers are stark. For the past three years in a row, nearly 40,000 people were killed by guns in the United States. The vast majority of these deaths, 86 percent, were males. Tragically, one in ten were children and teens. Put another way, guns were the leading cause of deaths for Americans age 1 to 24. After years of slow, but steady decline, gun homicides are on the rise, accounting for one third of gun deaths in 2019. Black men are more than 20 times as likely as White men to be victims of firearm homicide. The majority of firearm deaths are suicides. The rate of suicide fatalities has steadily increased over the past decade, with white men more than twice as likely to die by firearm suicide than non-white men.

And the stressors associated with the COVID-19 crisis have not helped. Early research suggests that the rate of gun violence

has risen dramatically during the pandemic, with factors such as increased unemployment, increased alcohol consumption, and increased firearm purchases potentially playing a role.

The fact is that gun violence is rampant in our society and lives will continue to be lost unless we act decisively to stem this tide. I commend my colleagues in the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force for their leadership in advancing the policy discussions surrounding this issue. I was thrilled to see the appropriations committees approve \$25 million for the CDC and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to support gun violence research, finally putting an end to the de facto ban on federal funding for this important area of study.

We are heading in the right direction, but there is much more to be done. We must take a bold, comprehensive approach to grow the field of gun violence research. We need to attract more students to careers in gun violence research and support interdisciplinary collaboration to connect experts in public health with those in criminology and the social and behavioral sciences. We need to support the translation of research into effective policy interventions. We need better coordination among key agencies like the CDC, NIH, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, and the Department of Justice.

The National Gun Violence Research Act takes a whole-of-government approach to addressing the paucity of federal funding for research on gun violence by directing the President to establish a six-year National Gun Violence Research Program. To carry out the program, funding is authorized for the National Science Foundation (\$15 M), the National Institute of Standards and Technology (\$1 M), the Department of Health and Human Services (\$25 M), and the Department of Justice (\$3 M) to conduct or support gun violence research. In addition to awarding individual research grants, the National Science Foundation is directed to establish a much-needed national center for violence research to encourage multidisciplinary collaboration and train the next generation of gun violence researchers. Research enabled by this legislation will improve our understanding of gun violence so we can advance effective solutions and save lives.

REVISITING JANUARY 6TH

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, no one is defending the violent riot at the Capitol on January 6th and as more evidence is reviewed, I am grateful for the insight today by columnist Jack Devine in *The Aiken Standard*:

"My column four weeks ago—"The insurrection that wasn't"—argued that portraying the Jan. 6 assault on the U.S. Capitol as an armed insurrection is simply wrong, unsupported by the facts.

Not surprisingly, many disagree. The armed insurrection label has been repeated so often and by so many that it has become widely accepted as true.

But we've learned a great deal since then about what happened on Jan. 6 and what

didn't—and we've watched as the new Democratic leadership takes extreme and disturbing actions to slay the imaginary dragon that they created.

Let's take another look.

The Capitol insurgents—mainly rowdy protesters caught up in the moment—were not armed in any real sense. Their inventory of "dangerous and deadly weapons," as classified by DOJ investigators, consist of two baseball bats, a hockey stick, one pocket-sized extendable baton, a few cans of commercially available pepper spray and bear repellent, and other makeshift odds and ends. No knives and no guns. The infamous zip-ties, initially considered to be proof positive that the insurgents intended to take hostages, were later determined to have been carried into the building by police officers.

The myth that Capitol Police Officer Brian Sicknick was murdered by the frenzied mob has evaporated completely. The *New York Times* has backed away from its bludgeoned-by-fire-extinguisher report; there was no evidence of blunt force trauma; it appears that Sicknick died of natural causes (probably a stroke) hours after returning to the station house under his own power.

Only one gun was fired during the four-hour assault—that by an unidentified police officer who shot and killed Ashli Babbitt, an unarmed female trespasser. While the FBI is still combing videos to find someone to charge for Sicknick's death, both they and the otherwise pit bull media seem remarkably incurious about Babbitt's killing.

None of the supposed targets of the Capitol assault—Democratic lawmakers and Vice President Pence—were harmed; and the 2020 election result was not derailed by the attack and was never in serious jeopardy.

Make no mistake. The Jan. 6 riot was reckless, angry and ultimately lethal. It cannot be condoned. But for a supposed overthrow of the U.S. government, it looks pretty lame—and more like the continuing wanton rioting that since mid-summer has taken dozens of lives, destroyed untold livelihoods and cost billions in damage to American cities.

A mindless mob bent on venting its anger? Yes. An armed insurrection? Not even close. And how are we dealing with this non-insurrection?

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is pushing for investigation by a "9/11-style commission"—implying that this bumbling fiasco was somehow comparable to the 2001 terrorist attack that murdered nearly 3,000 Americans.

The U.S. Capitol complex in Washington, D.C., has been turned into an armed camp. It was guarded during the inauguration by 25,000 National Guard troops, thousands of whom still remain. The barriers and checkpoints will be kept in place through September. So far, none of the feared domestic terrorists have reappeared.

The Justice Department has been conducting a nationwide manhunt for the Jan. 6 perpetrators and to date has arrested and charged over 300. Reportedly, dozens are being held without bail—a measure usually reserved for hardened criminals arrested for heinous crimes—in stark contrast to the revolving door treatment of thousands of violent rioters apprehended in recent months and quickly released (and provided bail money if needed by progressive organizations, as encouraged by Democratic leaders including Vice President Kamala Harris).

Prospective U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland promises to prosecute the Jan. 6 perpetrators to the full extent of the law. It would be far better to call that riot what it is, acknowledge the broader issue of escalating American violence and deal with it in an even-handed way.

In my column last month, I characterized our government's response to the supposed

insurrection as "performance art"—the art form that utilizes dramatic live performance to evoke an emotional response. It's an apt comparison. The net effect of the actions outlined above has been to cement in the public mind inordinate fear of the risk posed by domestic terrorism, particularly of the white supremacist variety.

Our leadership seems to think that if we're all terrified enough, we'll go along without objection to the politicized show-and-tell—Capitol Hill barricaded and patrolled by armed troops, perpetrators hunted and held without bond, suspension of due process, rampant censorship—America on a wartime footing, but without the war.

Any threat of terrorism, foreign or domestic, from left or right, deserves serious attention—not hyperbole and hysteria."

RETIREMENT OF LIFELONG COMMUNITY ADVOCATE LAURA MARTINEZ

HON. J. LUIS CORREA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Laura Martinez, a public servant who has spent a lifetime helping her community, most recently as the Constituent Services Director for the Office of Congressman LUIS CORREA in Orange County, California.

Over her 30-year career in public service, Ms. Martinez has literally helped thousands of individuals and families resolve issues with local, state and federal agencies. Ms. Martinez devoted 20-years of her public service career with the Office of Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez.

Throughout her years of service, Ms. Martinez developed relationships with liaisons representing Social Security, the IRS, Medicare, Immigration and Customs, and other entities.

By using her expertise in navigating the complicated immigration system and overcoming bureaucratic roadblocks, she was able to reunite families during emergencies, obtaining citizenships, visas, and much more.

Born in the Boyle Heights area of Los Angeles, Ms. Martinez grew up witnessing many acts of racial injustice. Her dream and lifelong mission was to help those who did not have the capability to help themselves due to living in poverty, being a minority, and living in other challenging conditions.

She brought heartfelt passion to her work that included positions with such non-profits as the renowned City of Hope and The East Los Angeles Community Union, which helps empower communities and revitalize neighborhoods.

As a breast cancer survivor, along with her mother, she is a decades long participant in the American Cancer Society Relay for Life. Her team, Laura's Lifeline, has raised thousands of dollars to battle cancer.

Another passion was working with Latino Advocates for Education, an organization that pays tribute to WWII veterans. Her uncles were all veterans who served in WWII and the Korean and Vietnam wars. She was the only girl in a family of six boys, several of whom served in law enforcement.

Ms. Martinez was honored for her work with veterans by being invited to witness the unveiling of the WWII Memorial in our nation's capital.

Ms. Martinez also has a background in real estate and is still licensed with the State of California. She has dedicated her time for her community service as an usher with the La Mirada Performing Arts Center. In her retirement, she will be providing care for her extended family and traveling.

Please join me in wishing this good and faithful public servant a well-deserved retirement after a lifetime of serving others.

**HONORING THE FOUNDING OF
OSCEOLA COUNTY NAACP AND
ITS CONTINUED EFFORTS TO AD-
VANCE CIVIL RIGHTS IN OSCE-
OLA COUNTY**

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, founded in 1909 in response to the ongoing violence against Black people around the country, the NAACP is the largest and most pre-eminent civil rights organization in the nation. One hundred and twelve years later, the organization has over 2,200 branches across the nation with more than 2 million members.

The NAACP's mission is to secure the political, educational, social, and economic equality of rights to eliminate race-based discrimination and ensure the health and well-being of all persons. The NAACP is integral to ensure a society in which all individuals have equal rights without discrimination on race.

The Osceola branch of the NAACP was originally established as the Kissimmee NAACP in 1965 and later changed to its current name in the early 1970's as the Osceola County Branch 5121. Reverend T.C. Callahan served as the branch's first president. The branch is currently led by Deloris McMillon.

The Osceola branch of the NAACP works to promote civic engagement among its community through voter registration drives. It also recognizes outstanding citizens and leaders to inspire younger generations to participate in their community.

The strength of the NAACP is dependent on support from the community. The NAACP seeks enactment and enforcement of federal, state, and local laws securing civil rights. It tirelessly provides for and supports their communities and equality of all citizens.

**IN RECOGNITION OF BRAD
RICHARDSON**

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brad Richardson for his 10 years of service as the President and CEO of the Hardin County Chamber of Commerce.

Since 2011, he has worked in his leadership role to promote economic development, advance businesses, and grow the local economy in Hardin County. Brad played a fundamental role in establishing the Knox Regional Development Alliance (KRDA), and in 2017, he was given the Ft. Knox Gold Neighbor

Award for his work in bringing together Fort Knox and nearby communities. He also invested in the next generation of local talent through the Youth Leadership Hardin County and Leadership Hardin County programs.

I want to thank Brad for his work in the Hardin County community.

**SUPPORTING TEXAS AFTER
WINTER STORM DAMAGE**

HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask for continued support of my district, my city and my state, as we recover from the impact of the winter storm. Many Texans are still suffering.

Even worse, many are still grieving the loss of a loved one. In Harris county alone, 25 human lives were lost as a consequence of this storm.

Senior citizens account for more than one third of the deaths in Harris County.

One woman, 100 years old, was taken to a hospital after being found unresponsive in a home with no power.

The youngest victim was just 8, he was found in a home while using a gas-powered generator, dying of carbon monoxide poisoning.

The damage extends far beyond the city of Houston. Over 200 Texans died. Thousands lost their homes, and 390 thousand still lack access to clean water.

I ask my colleagues, and those watching, that they continue to pray for the people of Texas, and that they help in any way they can.

For those who have already helped I thank you. Thank you very much (Muchisimas gracias).

**REMEMERING APOSTLE
FREDERICK K.C. PRICE**

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Apostle Frederick K.C. Price of Los Angeles, California, who died on February 12, 2021 at the age of 89.

Apostle Frederick K.C. Price is the founder of Crenshaw Christian Center (CCC) in Los Angeles, California. He began CCC in 1973 and shepherded it into a ministry of world renown, with services held in the 10,000-seat FaithDome.

In 1978, Apostle Price received instruction from God to begin a television broadcast and, as a result, Ever Increasing Faith Ministries (EIFM) began broadcasting in five major television markets. Thus, the television broadcast soon after became global.

EIFM can be viewed on many television stations in all 50 states and in many foreign countries. Apostle Price is also heard on numerous radio programs and 19 Internet broadcast stations. Additionally, he can be seen on most social media platforms, including

Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, Pinterest, and others. In 1990, Apostle Price founded the Fellowship of Inner-City Word of Faith Ministries (FICWFM), which later became the Fellowship of International Christian Word of Faith Ministries before disbanding in 2017. And in 2001, he established an East Coast church, Crenshaw Christian Center East.

A visionary and prolific author, Apostle Price is the author of some 50 books on faith, healing, prosperity, and the Holy Spirit. How Faith Works is a classic on the operation of faith and its life-changing principles.

Although he had already operated in the fivefold ministry gift of apostle, in 2008 Apostle Price was publicly affirmed as an apostle of faith. Under the mantle of the teaching gift, Apostle Price established several schools for ministry and formal education at CCC. Among them are Frederick K.C. Price III Christian Schools (preschool to 12th grade); the Ministry Training Institute in 1985; a CCC Correspondence School; the Frederick K.C. Price School of the Bible; and in 2008, the Apostle Price Ministry Training Center. Over the years, Apostle Price has received many prestigious awards, most notably the Horatio Alger Award and the Kelly Miller Smith Interfaith Award.

A year after his affirmation and after more than 35 years of service, Apostle Price stepped aside as pastor to formally install his son, Frederick K. Price Jr., as his successor. For years he served as the presiding prelate of both CCC West and CCC East and as the chairman of CCC's board of directors.

A devout husband and proud father, Apostle Price is survived by his wife of 67 years, Dr. Betty Price, four children, ten grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

I am proud to call myself a friend of the Price family, and I extend my deepest condolences to them and to the countless lives touched by the life and work of Apostle Frederick K.C. Price.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2021

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, the precious right to vote in free and fair elections at all levels in the United States will be seriously jeopardized if H.R. 1 becomes law.

Under an egregiously false facade of reform, the legislation consolidates and conveys new sweeping powers to regulate elections to bureaucrats in the federal government and nullifies existing state laws requiring valid identification before either registering to vote or casting a ballot.

More than two-thirds of states currently rely on voter ID laws to protect the sanctity of the vote. Weakening—even prohibiting—certain safeguards against fraud will make our elections less secure, more vulnerable to fraudulent activity, and will undermine participation in our democracy.

Other safeguards designed to mitigate voter fraud are also abolished, including bans on ballot harvesting.

All states will be required to enable the practice of same day registration and voting

which precludes any serious process at the local level to verify the eligibility of the applicant to vote.

By making it illegal to scrutinize voter rolls with an interstate cross-check and by refusing any cross-check removals from the voter rolls within six months of an election, officials will be stymied in their duty to remove illegal and ineligible voters.

H.R. 1 is embedded with free speech infringements that even the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has harshly criticized saying it “contains significant flaws that are detrimental to the health of our democracy.”

H.R. 1 politicizes the FEC by turning the current bipartisan commission into a partisan entity and expands the powers of the FEC chair, effectively destroying the agency's ability to ensure fair elections by leaving important decisions on what is acceptable speech to a single individual.

And by allowing the IRS to investigate and consider political views of an organization before granting tax-exempt status, this legislation empowers federal bureaucrats—with agendas—to decide which views should be rewarded or penalized.

The bill also mandates states to give the right to vote to all felons who have been released from prison. Yesterday, the Democrats tried—but failed—to go further with an amendment to expand voting rights to criminals currently serving time in jail.

H.R. 1 creates a 6 to 1 funding match for contributions of \$200 or less to a congressional or presidential campaign—meaning for every \$200, the federal government will match \$1,200.

The Congress can—and must—do better.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SUSAN WILD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2021

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I represent a Congressional district with nearly equal numbers of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. But when it comes to the question of whether everyday Americans' interests are reflected in their government, I hear the same message from my constituents, almost unanimously.

Regardless of political affiliation, my constituents seem to agree that dark money is drowning out the voices of working families. And they are outraged that lobbyists for the most powerful interests have a degree of access to our political system that is unheard of for an everyday citizen.

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, would begin the work of returning power to the American people. Among many important provisions, it would implement landmark anti-corruption reforms, including: requiring super PACS and dark money groups to disclose their donors, strengthening “conflict of interest” requirements for federal officials, and preventing members of Congress from serving on corporate boards. I'm also proud to have introduced the Lobbyist Loophole Closure Act as part of H.R. 1, which will enact more robust regulations around what constitutes lobbying and ensure no one can skirt federal lobbying rules.

Together, let's restore the trust of the American people in their government.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 2021

Mr. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support for H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill. It will fight big money in politics, take on the power of special interests, end dark money, and ensure public officials are working in the public interest. It will expand voting rights to ensure we have secure, accurate elections and stop voter suppression efforts designed to keep people from voting based on their perceived political preferences. It ends extreme partisan gerrymandering by creating a non-partisan, open process to draw transparent and fair congressional district maps. This bill will also hold elected officials accountable by implementing tougher ethics laws to ensure elected officials are held accountable.

I am also proud to cosponsor an important amendment to this bill with my colleague Congresswoman SPEIER. Our amendment extends the statute of limitations on campaign finance violations. As a former law enforcement officer, I know that extending the statute of limitations is necessary to improve accountability and ensure that those who break campaign finance laws and then try to hide their actions can be brought to justice. As we have learned in recent events, violations of campaign finance laws may not be uncovered until years after the fact. Extending the statute of limitations provides investigators and prosecutors the ability to go after those who break the law. This is an important addition to H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

However, there is one provision in the bill that I believe could be improved, and I look forward to working with Chairwoman LOFGREN to make improvements. I was just recently made aware of concerns about voting machines that will need to be updated or redesigned after enactment of H.R. 1, including some equipment like Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting machines. I would like to make sure that we don't exclude machines that are currently approved by the Election Assistance Commission without providing reasonable time and assistance to bring these machines into compliance with the new, higher standards of H.R. 1. In my home state of Indiana, many counties rely on DRE machines, and transitioning to the higher standards will require time and resources that I hope we can provide. Also, I have learned that the disability community has concerns about these provisions, so I would like to include in the RECORD a statement describing their concerns. I am committed to working with my colleagues to address these concerns so we can make voting more accessible for everyone.

DISABILITY COMMUNITY FEARS PAPER BALLOT MANDATE WILL HURT VOTERS WITH DISABILITIES

[Jan. 29, 2021]

WASHINGTON, DC.—Today, the undersigned disability organizations issued the following joint statement expressing concerns over a paper ballot mandate.

How ballots are cast in the United States varies depending on what different jurisdictions offer to their voters. Today, most voters in the U.S. cast their ballot by marking a paper ballot by hand or by Ballot-Marking Device (BMD), with some use of Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting machines.

Most American voters are familiar with the former, which requires voters to mark, verify and cast a paper-based ballot. BMDs use an electronic interface to aid voters in marking their ballot. Once the voter has made selections with the BMD, the device directly marks on or prints the ballot. The voter then typically verifies and casts the ballot into the same optical (or digital) voting scanner that hand marked paper ballots are cast. BMDs simply increase the accessibility of paper ballots by allowing voters with disabilities to use these accessible voting machines to magnify, “voice,” and mark their ballots. For example, a blind voter cannot privately and independently mark a paper ballot with a pen, however, they can privately and independently mark their ballot using a BMD.

DRE voting systems, on the other hand, allow voters to use an electronic interface to mark, verify and cast their votes electronically with or without a paper back up. Arguably, DREs provide the best option for voting privately and independently for all voters with all types of access needs based on age, disability, language fluency, literacy, and many other individual circumstances, as guaranteed to all voters by the Help America Vote Act and Americans with Disabilities Act. DREs eliminate the need to handle or directly verify a paper ballot, which prevents BMD voting systems from being fully accessible to all eligible voters.

Despite overall reduced paper consumption in many areas of daily life, as a result of technological advancement, paper-based ballot voting options have become the preferred voting system to many who believe mandating the use of paper ballots is necessary to ensure the security of our elections. However, it must be made abundantly clear, that the ability to privately and independently hand mark, verify, and cast a paper ballot is simply not, and will never be, an option for all voters.

Given that paper ballots are already the predominant method of casting a ballot in America today, mandating paper ballots is frankly unnecessary. Additionally, any mandate of a paper-based voting system will inevitably harm voters with disabilities. A paper ballot mandate would: 1.) end all voting system innovation and advancement to produce a fully accessible voting system that provides enhanced security without relying on inaccessible paper; 2.) limit voters with disabilities' federal right to privately and independently verify and cast their ballots and; 3.) ultimately segregate voters with disabilities.

Further, any paper ballot mandate that entitles voters to a hand marked ballot threatens the availability of BMDs for voters who rely on them to mark their ballots and drastically limits use of BMDs to voters with disabilities. This would result in segregating voters with disabilities away from the entire pool of voters by making them the only group of people that use a particular type of voting machine. Federally mandated segregation is problematic alone, but in practice, it also increases the likelihood that poll workers will not be properly trained on the machine, the machines will not be properly maintained or set up for use, and if the only available BMD is not functioning, there is no alternative option for voters who need it. Limits on BMD use will also saddle poll workers with determining who is “disabled enough” to use the BMD, a decision for

which they have no qualifications or legal right. Finally, if the ballot produced by the BMD is not identical to the hand marked ballot or the BMD ballot cannot be scanned and stored with hand marked ballots, the voters right to cast a private ballot is violated.

To be clear, no paper ballot voting system today, ready for widespread use, is fully accessible. Even BMDs require voters with disabilities to verify and cast a paper-based ballot, which does not ensure a private and independent vote. A fully accessible voting system by Federal law must ensure the voter can receive, mark, verify, and cast the ballot without having to handle paper. Most, if not all, market-ready voting systems cannot do this.

Before paper-based voting systems become the law of the land, the harm to voters with disabilities must be addressed.

Signed,
American Association of People with Disabilities, American Council of the Blind, American Foundation for the Blind, American Network of Community Options & Resources, Association of Assistive Technology Act Programs, Association of Programs for Rural Independent Living, Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund, National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities, National Council on Independent Living, National Disability Rights Network, National Federation of the Blind, Paralyzed Veterans of America, RespectAbility, Self Advocates Becoming Empowered, The Arc of the United States, United Cerebral Palsy, United Spinal Association.

JOE NOVOTNY'S RETIREMENT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this week marks the end of an era as Joe Novotny concludes a thirty-year career in the House, the last ten as our Reading Clerk.

In a sense, it seems longer than ten years in that he assumed that role naturally with such quiet competence. He was unflappable in the midst of often frantic activity. He is the face of a critically important and complex set of activities that keeps the House legislative process moving forward. Even when it seems like we're not doing much, it takes a lot of people and a lot of moving pieces to make it look that way.

It's almost as though he was born for this important role, having literally grown up in the House. He was a House page, a program that allowed for so many young people to see firsthand the legislative process.

Joe's rise through the ranks culminated with his decade as House Reading Clerk. He has steadily and thoughtfully performed his duties in exemplary fashion. He has been personally warm and helpful, being a perfect representation for the many men and women behind the scenes that hold his place together.

I, along with thousands of C-SPAN junkies, will miss Joe, and we all wish him the very best in the next chapters of his career and life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to be present for one of the votes, on March 2, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 52.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 2021 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 9

9 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General, and Vanita Gupta, of Virginia, to be Associate Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice.

SH-216

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Indo-Pacific Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2022 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine GameStop, Robinhood, and the state of retail investing.

WEBEX

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the COVID-19 response, focusing on an update from the frontlines.

SD-106

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold closed hearings to examine domestic and foreign threats and other challenges facing the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SVC-217

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Donet Dominic Graves, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine climate change in the electricity sector and fostering economic growth.

SD-G50

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine Native communities and the climate crisis.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Federal Courts, Oversight, Agency Action, and Federal Rights

To hold hearings to examine the Supreme Court and the Judiciary.

SD-226

3 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine military toxic exposures, focusing on the human consequences of war.

SD-G50

MARCH 11

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine farmers and foresters, focusing on opportunities to lead in tackling climate change.

SD-106

MARCH 18

10 a.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To resume joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations.

WEBEX

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S999–S1035

Measures Introduced: Thirty-three bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 553–585, S.J. Res. 10, and S. Res. 87–94. **Pages S1025–26**

Measures Passed:

Advancing Education on Biosimilars Act: Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of S. 164, to educate health care providers and the public on biosimilar biological products, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1021**

Food Allergy Safety, Treatment, Education, and Research Act: Senate passed S. 578, to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases. **Pages S1021–22**

ALS Disability Insurance Access Act Technical Correction: Senate passed S. 579, to make a technical correction to the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019. **Page S1022**

National School Counseling Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 90, designating the week of February 1 through 5, 2021, as “National School Counseling Week”. **Page S1022**

Career and Technical Education Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 91, supporting the goals and ideals of “Career and Technical Education Month”. **Page S1022**

National Speech and Debate Education Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 92, designating March 5, 2021, as “National Speech and Debate Education Day”. **Page S1022**

Congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide Football Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 93, congratulating the University of Alabama Crimson Tide football team for winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association College Football Playoff National Championship. **Page S1022**

National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 94, designating the week beginning February 28, 2021, as “National Tribal Colleges and Universities Week”. **Page S1022**

Measures Considered:

Secretary of Defense Appointment Limitation Exception: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 11, to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces. **Page S999**

Messages from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, with respect to Ukraine; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–4) **Page S1024**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, with respect to the situation in Venezuela; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–5) **Page S1024**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency originally declared in executive order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe’s democratic processes or institutions; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–6) **Pages S1024–25**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Dilawar Syed, of California, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

8 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

18 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general. **Page S1035**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1025**

Notice of a Tie Vote Under S. Res. 27:

Pages S1022–23

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S1026–27

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S1027–34

Additional Statements:

Pages S1023–24

Privileges of the Floor:

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 p.m. and adjourned at 5:51 p.m., until 12 noon on Thursday, March 4, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1034.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation, after the nominee, who was introduced by Ray LaHood, former Secretary of Transportation, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Brenda Mallory, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, who was introduced by Senator Blumenthal, and Janet Garvin McCabe, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, who was introduced by Representative Carson, after the

nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, and Adewale O. Adeyemo, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary, who was introduced by Senator Cardin, and Brian P. McKeon, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

JANUARY 6 ATTACK ON THE CAPITOL

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Committee on Rules and Administration: Committees concluded joint hearings to examine the January 6, 2021 attack on the Capitol, after receiving testimony from Robert G. Salesses, Senior Official Performing the Duties of the Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense and Global Security, and Major General William J. Walker, USA, Commanding General, District of Columbia National Guard, both of the Department of Defense; Jill Sanborn, Assistant Director, Counterterrorism Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; and Melissa Smislova, Acting Under Secretary, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 71 public bills, H.R. 6, 1532–1601; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 22; and H. Res. 185–187, were introduced.

Pages H1075–80

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H1082

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H1019

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Greene (GA) motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 182 yeas to 222 nays, Roll No. 56.

Page H1023

Recess: The House recessed at 11:34 a.m. and reconvened at 12:15 p.m.

Page H1037

Recess: The House recessed at 1:58 p.m. and reconvened at 6:15 p.m.

Page H1039

George Floyd Justice in Policing Act of 2021: The House passed H.R. 1280, to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve

transparency through data collection, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 212 nays, Roll No. 60.

Pages H1039–71

Rejected the Malliotakis motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary by a yea-and-nay vote of 208 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 59.

Pages H1069–70

H. Res. 179, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1) and (H.R. 1280) was agreed to Monday, March 1st.

For the People Act of 2021: The House passed H.R. 1, to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 62. Consideration began yesterday, March 2nd.

Pages H1023–37, H1037–38, H1039, H1071–72

Rejected the Rodney Davis (IL) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on House Administration by a yea-and-nay vote of 210 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 61.

Pages H1071–72

Agreed to:

Lesko amendment (No. 28 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–9) that strikes Sec. 4208, which expands political record requirements for online platforms; and

Pages H1023–25

Lofgren en bloc amendment No. 4 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–9: Spanberger (No. 40) that requires disclaimers within the content of social media posts for foreign-backed political content shared on online platforms; the amendment is the text of the bipartisan Foreign Agents Disclaimer Enhancement Act; Speier (No. 41) that requires large online platforms to maintain a public record of political advertisements which includes information on the total number of views generated by the advertisement, the number of views by unique individuals, and the number of shares; Speier (No. 42) that requires states to establish privacy programs to keep personally identifiable information in voter files, such as addresses, confidential to protect survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, and trafficking. For automatic voter registration, requires that individuals receive an explanation of what information is needed to access voter information online, how that information is shared or sold, and what privacy programs are available to survivors; Speier (No. 43) that extends the statute of limitations for criminal violations of Federal Election Campaign Act from 5 years to 10 years; and for civil violations from 5 years to 15 years; Speier (No. 44) that requires a sufficient number of ballot marking machines equipped for individuals with disabilities, as

defined by the Election Assistance Commission in consultation with the Access Board and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, for all in person voting options; Swalwell (No. 45) that ensures college student voters are not subjected to intimidation or deceptive practices when exercising their right to vote in their college towns; Swalwell (No. 46) that clarifies prohibitions on polling places or ballot dropboxes that falsely purport to be an official location established for an election; Swalwell (No. 47) that adds colleges' and universities' duty to better provide students with voter information on the school's website and transmitted via social media; Tlaib (No. 48) that prioritizes local education agencies that receive Title I funding from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the pilot program to provide voter registration information to secondary school students prior to graduation; Tlaib (No. 49) that requires that every polling location has available free of charge the required forms from the relevant State for an individual to register to vote, or revise the individual's voter registration information; Tlaib (No. 50) that requires all polling stations to be open for a minimum of 4 total hours outside of the regular working hours from 9 am to 5 pm in the time zone of the polling location; Torres (No. 51) that requires the Federal Election Commission to (1) study the efficacy of political voucher programs in expanding and diversifying who gives to candidates and who runs for office and (2) issue a report on how a national political voucher program could be implemented; Torres (No. 52) that requires GAO to conduct a study on turnout rates based on age in States and localities that permit voters to participate in elections before reaching the age of 18; Torres (No. 53) that requires GAO to conduct a study on the implementation and impact of ranked choice voting in States and localities with a focus on how to best implement a model for Federal elections nationwide; the study shall include the impact on voter turnout, negative campaigning, and who decides to run for office; Underwood (No. 54) that requires the Comptroller General's report on small dollar financing to include an assessment of impacts on candidate diversity; Waters (No. 55) that prohibits misinformation which threatens potential voters with civil or other legal penalties if they exercise their right to vote; Williams (No. 56) that requires the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, in coordination with the Election Assistance Commission, to provide a uniform statement that would be included with certain leases and vouchers for federally assisted rental housing as well as with mortgage applications to inform recipients how they can register to vote and

their voting rights under law (by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 58).

Pages H1027–37, H1037–38

Rejected:

Pressley amendment (No. 37 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–9) that sought to lower the Mandatory Minimum Voting Age in Federal Elections to 16 years of age (by a yea-and-nay vote of 125 yeas to 302 nays, Roll No. 57). Pages H1025–27, H1037

H. Res. 179, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1) and (H.R. 1280) was agreed to Monday, March 1st.

Agreed that in the engrossment of the bill, the clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

Page H1072

Recess: The House recessed at 11:20 p.m. and reconvened at 12 a.m.

Page H1074

Presidential Messages: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003 is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 117–20).

Pages H1038–39

Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014 is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2021—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 117–21).

Page H1039

Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015 is to continue in effect beyond March 8, 2021—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 117–22).

Page H1039

Quorum Calls—Votes: Seven yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1023, H1037, H1038, H1070, H1070–71, H1071–72, and H1072.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 12:01 a.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the U.S. Cap-

itol Police. Testimony was heard from Yogananda D. Pittman, Acting Chief of Police, U.S. Capitol Police.

APPROPRIATIONS—LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Library of Congress. Testimony was heard from Carla Hayden, Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress; Mary B. Mazanec, Director, Congressional Research Service; and Shira Perlmutter, Director U.S. Register of Copyrights, U.S. Copyright Office.

A WAY FORWARD FOR VENEZUELA: THE HUMANITARIAN, DIPLOMATIC, AND NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES FACING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, Migration and International Economic Policy held a hearing entitled “A Way Forward for Venezuela: The Humanitarian, Diplomatic, and National Security Challenges Facing the Biden Administration”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

VSO LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATIONS

Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Committees began joint hearings to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, after receiving testimony from Stephen “Butch” Whitehead, Edward R. “Randy” Reese, Jr., Jim Marszalek, and Joy J. Ilem, all of the Disabled American Veterans; Thomas A. Zampieri, Ph.D., Blinded Veterans Association; John Hilgert, Nebraska Department of Veterans’ Affairs, on behalf of the National Association States Directors of Veterans Affairs (NASDVA); Cory Titus, Military Officers Association of America (MOAA); Jared Lyon, Student Veterans of America (SVA); Lindsay Church, Minority Veterans of America (MVA); and Kathryn Monet, National Coalition of Homeless Veterans (NCHV).

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Colin Hackett Kahl, of California, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine how the financial system hurts

workers and widens the racial wealth gap, 10:15 a.m., WEBEX.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider subcommittee assignments for the 117th Congress, and the nomination of Debra Anne Haaland, of New Mexico, to be Secretary of the Interior; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of David Turk, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy, 10 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Deputy Director, and Jason Scott Miller, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Management, both of the Office of Management and Budget, 10:15 a.m., SD-342/WEBEX.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to continue joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to exam-

ine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

House

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing on legislation on Insular Area Climate Change Act, 12 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled "Reauthorizing Trade Adjustment Assistance: Opportunities for Equitable Access and Modernization", 10 a.m., Webex.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to continue joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Thursday, March 4

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Monday, March 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate should be prepared to vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 1319, American Rescue Plan Act.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Arrington, Jodey C., Tex., E205
 Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E199, E205
 Carson, André, Ind., E204
 Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E199
 Case, Ed, Hawaii, E199
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E201
 Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E198, E202
 Garcia, Sylvia R., Tex., E203

Green, Mark E., Tenn., E201
 Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E203
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E197, E201
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E195
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E197, E201
 Kim, Andy, N.J., E198
 Larson, John B., Conn., E197
 Lawrence, Brenda L., Mich., E199
 Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E195
 Posey, Bill, Fla., E197

Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E198
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E203
 Soto, Darren, Fla., E203
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E196
 Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E198
 Waters, Maxine, Calif., E203
 Wexton, Jennifer, Va., E195
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E202
 Wild, Susan, Pa., E204



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.