



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 22, 2021

No. 129

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Gracious and loving God, hear our prayers. We come to You in faith hoping that You would receive our concerns, spoken and unspoken, personal and professional. From the depth of Your infinite mercy, listen to us, and bless all that troubles us.

Then enable us to listen for Your response. In a time when so much noise and messaging is coming from every direction, words of counsel and criticism, voices of guile and guidance, give us reason to pause and listen for Your word as You speak into our lives.

Give us ears to hear and spirits willing not just to hear but to put Your counsel into practice, that this House would be built on the foundation You have established.

And in our dealings with one another, in our interactions with the people who depend on our integrity and faithfulness, may we be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to become angry.

With humility, patience, and forbearance, may we reveal Your righteousness this day.

For it is in Your saving name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) come

forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GROTHMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

200 DAYS OF DELIVERING FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the child tax credit's checks arriving to families in my district and across the country.

It has been 200 days of this Congress and 200 days of House Democrats delivering for the people.

Last week, thanks to the American Rescue Plan, child tax credit monthly payments began arriving to roughly 39 million households and covering almost 90 percent of children nationwide.

In my district the child tax credit will benefit almost 95 percent of our children.

In Texas, the families of nearly six million children got their checks totaling \$1.5 billion in aid.

Unfortunately, about 46,600 children in the Houston area still have not received a check.

The good news is this: Nonfilers can still apply on the IRS portal. Caregivers just need their Social Security number or their ITIN number. And it is very important to remember that these benefits will not affect SNAP, Medicaid, SSI, or any other public assistance program.

Madam Speaker, I am hopeful and sincerely believe that we can build back better, and our children's future can be assured.

ACTIONS AND RESULTS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, actions and results speak louder than words.

In the months since President Biden first called for unity and bipartisan cooperation, the President's and Speaker's reckless tax-and-spend policies have hurt middle-class families and small businesses. These are the very people they profess to want to help the most.

For the third straight month, the cost of living in America has continued to increase, the highest rate of inflation we have witnessed since 2008.

Compared to last year, gas prices are up 45 percent. Food prices have increased 2½ percent. The price of an automobile is up 45 percent for a used car. Americans know they are paying more for what they need to live every day while their paychecks have decreased by almost 2 percent.

Americans are spending more and getting less. This inflation is a hidden tax and a pay cut on every American family. And the effects of these are felt hardest by our senior citizens and people living on fixed incomes.

The cost-of-living adjustment for Social Security this year was barely 1 percent, but rising consumer prices have outpaced that increase by more than four times.

HONORING LOIS CARSON

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

□ 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.

H3805

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember an Inland Empire resident and an excellent public servant, Lois Carson.

Lois was a beloved member of my community and a passionate advocate for childcare, education, and welfare reform.

Lois served as the president of the San Bernardino Community College District Board of Trustees while I served on the Riverside Community College District Board of Trustees. I have fond memories of working with her at trustee conferences where we would collaborate on improving the lives of Inland Empire students.

During her 30 years as the executive director of Community Action Partnership of Riverside County, Lois provided services for low-income residents. Under her leadership the agency ran successfully and received the first public sector Community Action Agency award for excellence in 2005.

The Inland Empire was fortunate to benefit from Lois Carson's many talents, and I am honored to have known her and believe that her legacy will live on in the many lives she touched.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WALTER STRAKA

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the life of Private Walter Straka.

At 17, Walter lied about his age to serve in the Army National Guard. In 1941, his unit, the 194th Tank Battalion, arrived in the Philippines just months before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

After the fall of Bataan in 1942, Walter and his comrades were forced on a brutal 65-mile trek now known as the Bataan Death March.

During the march, Walter was forced to walk in intense heat and subjected to appalling abuse at the hands of the Japanese army.

By Walter's own account, he should have been dead a thousand times, but Walter not only survived this 6-day march, he also survived 3 years as a prisoner of war before returning home to Brainerd, Minnesota.

Once home, Walter ran a successful business, raised a family, and was an active member in his community.

Walter Straka died this year at the age of 101. With his passing, the State of Minnesota said good-bye to its last survivor of the Bataan Death March.

Private Walter Straka is an American hero whose unforgettable story has inspired me and so many others.

Our Nation is stronger because of his exceptional service and courage.

CONGRESS MUST ACT

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, last week marked a year since our country lost a giant and a friend to all, John Lewis.

Republicans and Democrats of both Chambers rightfully used our platforms to memorialize a man who gave so much, and as many say, he was the conscience of our caucus.

Mr. Lewis nearly lost his life at the age of 25 to those on the other side of the Edmund Pettus Bridge in March of 1965 as he nonviolently protested voter suppression laws.

And he dedicated the rest of his life to justice, equality, and protecting the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, 66 years later we are again on that bridge. Seventeen States have passed 28 laws to make it more difficult to exercise our constitutional right to vote.

We must act.

So I say to my colleagues that stand in the way of the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, would you also have stood on the other side of that bridge?

Mr. Lewis understood we could not wait for those on the other side of the bridge to join us. We must secure, protect, and expand the right to vote for all Americans to truly honor Mr. Lewis' life, legacy, and our democracy.

ADDRESSING THE CUBA CRISIS

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will now address the Cuban crisis just south of our border.

Cuba is, of course, a very progressive Marxist state. The government runs the economy with all the restrictions of freedom; that means there is no freedom of press.

The State Department International Religious Freedom Report shows numerous violations of freedom of religion as believers in God are harassed. There is no freedom of movement. And now with protests, people are disappearing.

How does the United States respond? There was a Free Cuba mural put up in Washington, D.C., and the mayor of our Nation's capital responded by saying that it was said in the past that Cuba has an education system we should learn from, and the mural disappeared.

I beg President Biden to do what he can to restore internet service so the people in Cuba can communicate with each other. Please don't lift the embargo. And above all, provide a little bit of moral leadership and show that you are opposed to the Marxist cabal to the rest of the world.

RECOGNIZING OLYMPIANS FROM NORTH CAROLINA AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL STATE UNIVERSITY

(Ms. MANNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, ahead of the 2021 Tokyo Olympics, to recognize the Olympians from North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, the largest HBCU in the Nation, located in my district in Greensboro, North Carolina.

It gives me great pride to recognize Trevor Stewart and Randolph Ross, Jr., who will represent the United States on the track and field team.

Randolph Ross, Jr., a sophomore, is competing in the men's 400-meter and the 4x400-meter relay, and Trevor Stewart, a senior, will compete in the men's 4x400-meter relay.

Two other Aggie runners will compete in the Olympic track and field events. Akeem Sirleaf will compete for Liberia, and Daniel Stokes will compete for Mexico.

With all four of these young men qualifying, the entire Aggie 4x400-meter relay team will run in the Olympics.

I also recognize NC A&T director of track and field programs, Duane Ross. Coach Ross' leadership has propelled his team forward to success.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the athletes and coach on this tremendous achievement. On behalf of North Carolina's Sixth District, I am sending them the best of luck in Tokyo. Go, Aggies.

CELEBRATING PURPLE HEART HOMES

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Today, the Purple Heart Homes nonprofit is celebrating their 750th completed project.

Headquartered in Statesville, North Carolina, Purple Heart Homes is a nonprofit founded by combat-wounded veterans to help aging and service-connected disabled veterans in their housing needs.

Founded in 2008 by John Gallina and the late Dale Beatty, they established Purple Heart Homes with a mission to help those that have given so much to our Nation.

Whether it is building ramps or constructing new homes, they step in to fill the void in programs designed to serve our deserving veterans.

I congratulate John and his diverse team on their incredible accomplishments to serve our heroes.

I recently met with John and his team, and while they have unique backgrounds that they bring to this mission, they are all united by one thing: They are called to serve.

I congratulate John and his team, and I also congratulate Purple Heart Homes.

□ 0915

THE ALLIES ACT OF 2021

(Mr. CONNOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, after 20 years, the United States is winding down its involvement in a long, protracted war in Afghanistan, but we have an obligation to the men and women who have served with Allied forces who put themselves at risk, especially the interpreters.

I am proud of the fact that the first 2,500 of those people will be, in fact, located in Virginia for processing as we try to protect them and their families for their service in a noble cause.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to voting for the bill that will be coming up later this morning, and I thank Mr. CROW, particularly, for his leadership in this matter.

INCREASING INFLATION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see President Biden has acknowledged that we are having a lot of inflation right now in this country affecting prices for everybody. He even went so far as to tell some restaurant owners that you are going to be in a bind for a while because it is going to still be hard to get workers.

When people are paid not to show up because of overgenerous benefits, all our small businesses will continue to be in a bind. When you pay people not to work, you get inflation. So for a few maybe getting a wage increase because the restaurants are in a bind, everybody receives higher prices. Prices are up, we know, on food, on fuel, lumber, many things. This is what happens when the government spends too much, puts too much money into the economy all based on debt.

So what are we going to do about that? Are we going to set a course here to put people back in business, or do we want to have, like we saw just this last month, another 5.4 percent of inflation, which is really a tax on every American.

AVERTING LOSS OF LIFE AND INJURY BY EXPEDITING SIVS ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 535, I call up the bill (H.R. 3985) to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 to expedite the special immigrant visa process for certain Afghan allies, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN). Pursuant to House Resolution 535, the amendment printed in part C of House Report 117-95, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3985

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 "Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act of 2021" or as the "ALLIES Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. IMPROVING AFGHAN SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM.

(a) *EVIDENCE OF SERIOUS THREAT.*—Section 602(b)(2) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(iv), by striking "has experienced or is experiencing" and inserting "has asserted a credible basis for concern about the possibility of";

(2) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (E).

(b) *ACTIVITIES FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED WITH INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE OF SUCCESSOR FORCE.*—Section 602(b)(2)(A)(ii)(I)(bb) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by striking "sensitive and trusted".

(c) *AFGHANS EMPLOYED SUBJECT TO A GRANT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.*—Section 602(b)(2)(A)(ii)(I) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by inserting after "United States Government" the following "including employment or other work in Afghanistan through a cooperative agreement or grant funded by the United States Government if the Secretary of State determines, based on a recommendation from the Federal agency or organization authorizing such funding, that such alien contributed to the United States mission in Afghanistan".

(d) *ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE PROCESSING REQUIREMENTS.*—Section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security" and inserting "the Secretary of State"; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking "a petition for classification under section 203(b)(4) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4))" and inserting "a request for such status in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of Homeland Security and Secretary of State"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking "petition" and inserting "request"; and

(B) in subparagraph (D)(i) by striking "petition" and inserting "request".

(e) *STRENGTHENING PROTECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.*—Subparagraph (C) of section 602(b)(2) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) *SURVIVING SPOUSE OR CHILD.*—An alien is described in this subparagraph if—

"(i) the alien was the spouse or child of a principal alien described in subparagraph (A) who had submitted a request for classification pursuant to this section or a petition pursuant to section 1059 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163; 8 U.S.C. 1101 note) which included the alien as an accompanying spouse or child; and

"(ii) such request or petition—

"(I) if approved, was revoked (or otherwise rendered null) due to the death of the principal alien; or

"(II) if pending, is otherwise approvable but for the death of the principal alien."

(f) *APPLICABILITY.*—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any requests for special immigration status, applications for special immigrant visas, or applications for adjustment of status under the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) that are pending on

the date of the enactment of this Act or filed on or after such date.

(g) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.*—The amendments made by this section shall not diminish, replace or override any vetting, verification of employment, approval by chief of mission, or any other screening process required for a special immigrant visa under the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note).

SEC. 3. AFGHAN ALLIES PROTECTION ACT.

Section 602(b)(3) of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (8 U.S.C. 1101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(G) *SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.*—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, in addition to any unused balance under this paragraph, 8,000 principal aliens may be granted special immigrant status under this subsection. For purposes of status provided under this subparagraph the authority to issue visas or adjust status shall commence on the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and shall terminate on the date such visa numbers are exhausted."

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

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) 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 may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3985.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3985, the Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act of 2021, or the ALLIES Act, makes essential changes to the Afghan special immigrant visa program to ensure that the lives of those who served faithfully alongside American troops in Afghanistan are protected.

The special immigrant visa program allows those individuals who worked for or on behalf of the U.S. Government in Afghanistan, or for the NATO International Security Assistance Force in support of the American mission, to seek lawful permanent residence in the United States.

To be eligible, applicants must establish qualifying employment in Afghanistan for 2 years, receive approval from the Chief of Mission, and undergo rigorous background checks and national security vetting, a process that, on average, takes 3 years.

Our 20-year mission in Afghanistan will formally come to an end in just a few short weeks. Each day that we continue to draw down our military presence in Afghanistan, threats to the lives of Afghans who supported our cause are increasing exponentially.

The Biden administration has committed to relocating certain applicants

to a third country. Some who have passed the national security vetting process will be transferred to the United States to complete visa processing.

These evacuations, which are scheduled to begin at the end of this month, are a critical component of our withdrawal strategy. But evacuations alone are not enough. Congress must do our part to protect those whose lives are at risk because of their support and service to our Nation.

First and foremost, we must ensure that enough visas are available for eligible applicants. H.R. 3985 increases the number of visas that may be issued to qualifying Afghans by 8,000, which would ensure that all qualified applicants who are currently undergoing processing can immediately receive a visa if they are approved.

Second, we must streamline visa processing to the greatest extent possible, without compromising national security or program integrity.

H.R. 3985 does this by reducing duplicative paperwork requirements and modifying the requirement that applicants prove the existence of an ongoing serious threat to their lives; to reflect the fact that Afghans who worked in support of the U.S. mission now face an obvious threat as a direct result of their work.

Third, the bill strengthens protections for certain groups of Afghan nationals, including surviving spouses, and children of deceased principal applicants, individuals employed by NATO in support of the U.S. mission, and individuals whose work was funded by a U.S. Government cooperative agreement or grant.

Collectively, these changes will ensure that no one whose lives are at risk because of their support to the American mission are abandoned or forced to wait for Congress to act to authorize more visas.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of this important bill. I thank Representative CROW for championing the cause of our Afghan allies and working across the aisle to build consensus and support for this legislation. We must keep our promises to these brave men and women. Their lives depend on it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 3985, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the culmination of 20 years of policy failures in Afghanistan, and it comes at the same time that our southern border has been recklessly opened to the world. This measure's only redeeming feature is that the alternative is even worse.

Let's begin with the debacle occurring on what, until January 20, was our southern border; finally secured by President Trump's policies.

On his first day in office, President Biden reversed those policies. He stopped the "remain in Mexico" proto-

cols that required asylum claimants to remain there while their claims could be adjudicated. He stopped all construction on the nearly completed border wall, leaving construction gaps that make it all but useless. And he ordered our enforcement agencies not to faithfully execute the law.

The result is that over a million foreign nationals have illegally entered our country this year, with a projection of 2 million by the end of the year. Now, that is the entire population of Wyoming, Alaska, and Vermont combined. And the Gallup organization warns that based on its polling, there are 42 million people just in Latin America and the Caribbean who intend to follow. And this occurs at the same time that 20 years of failed policy in Afghanistan is culminating.

The attack on September 11, 2001, was our generation's Pearl Harbor. It was conducted by al-Qaida, which was acting as an agency of the Taliban government of Afghanistan, which gave it support and protection.

Now, the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Congress pledged the entire resources of the country to the war and the President pledged to win through to "absolute victory." Days after the attack on New York and Washington on September 11, Congress voted a tepid Authorization for the Use of Military Force—whatever that is—and the President told us to go shopping.

For 20 years, we dithered, twiddled, postured, hesitated. We attacked Iraq, that had nothing to do with 9/11, and put a lot of brave troops in harm's way without giving them the support that they needed and without our leaders ever having a clear objective, much less any will to win.

You know, it was from that very podium in this Chamber that General Douglas MacArthur warned that in war there is no substitute for victory. That is a lesson our leaders have failed to learn time and again. So this debacle is now coming to its sad, shameful, and sorry conclusion.

The Taliban again threatened to seize this ill-fated country, imperiling the thousands of Afghans who assisted our troops in various ways. To encourage their help, we passed the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009, which created a special immigrant visa, or green card program, for Afghan nationals who worked with the United States Government for at least a year, and who face retribution from the Taliban. This program also provides green cards to their spouses and their children.

Now, during the 20 years that our troops have been in Afghanistan, tens of thousands of Afghans have worked for or on behalf of the U.S. Government in one capacity or another, and to date, over 15,500 green cards have already been issued to the principal applicants. And then additionally, for each principal applicant, an average of 3.5 green cards have been issued to spouses and children. That is about 70,000 that we

have already taken in. That is a city the size of Bowling Green, Kentucky. But many more are still there.

So we have before us H.R. 3985, the ALLIES Act. It makes changes to the Afghan special immigrant visa program to accommodate the accelerated withdrawal that the President has ordered.

The emergency created by this order means that we will not be adequately vetting arrivals under this program. Those already admitted have had to meet eligibility requirements. They have had to undergo security and background checks. If we had been able to develop this legislation the old-fashioned way, through real face-to-face meetings and good-faith discussions, I think we could have produced a process that protected both the American people and the Afghan families who sided with our government. But alas, that was not to be under this majority.

Instead, H.R. 3985 authorizes 8,000 more green cards on top of the 10,000 authorized but still unclaimed. Now, given that 15,500 principal green cards have been processed over the 20-year life of this program, the odds of processing a like number in a matter of months is pretty slim; unless, of course, the administration cuts processing and vetting corners, which I think is a given.

H.R. 3985 also increases the eligibility pool for the Afghan special immigration visa program in two ways.

First, it removes the requirement that Afghan nationals who worked with the U.S. coalition forces must have performed "sensitive and trusted" activities for U.S. personnel. This provision was added several years ago with the understanding that there must be limits on the number of people who come to the U.S., and in an attempt to ensure that the limited number of green cards available actually go to those Afghan nationals who are most in danger.

Now, we have asked the administration how many individuals may be eligible once this language is removed from the statute. Their answer? They don't know. And they don't care.

Second, this bill extends program eligibility to Afghans whose employers received grant funding from the U.S. Government or were in cooperative agreements with the U.S. Government and who "contributed to the United States mission in Afghanistan."

Well, I am concerned that we do not know exactly what can be considered as contributing to the United States mission in Afghanistan or how many people to whom this could apply.

The bill also eliminates the requirement that an applicant has experienced an ongoing, serious threat as a consequence of his or her qualifying employment. This requirement is one of the main reasons for the creation of the program; to help ensure the safety of those in danger because of working with the U.S.

This means that among the worthy asylum seekers, we are likely to see

those without merit, or worse, those who seek to do our country harm, because the vetting process is effectively abandoned by this bill. And this comes at a time when the asylum process is being made a mockery by thousands of meritless claims a day showing up on our southern border and being admitted into our country.

I wish we could have had an honest and open discussion about the wisdom of eliminating this requirement in committee. Unfortunately, the Democrats chose to bypass the committee process. But with the American withdrawal fast approaching, we are left with this deeply flawed bill on the one hand, or the very real prospect of watching Afghan patriots being hunted down and seeing them and their families hung by construction cranes. So I will support this bill as the least bad option that the Democrats have left us.

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

□ 0930

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, the ALLIES Act is a chance for Congress to ensure that America honors its promise to our Afghan partners and friends.

The phrase "life and death" gets tossed around in this Chamber, but this bill is truly that for thousands of our Afghan friends. The Taliban is intent on hunting down and killing Afghans that served alongside Americans for the past 20 years.

Some Members of this body, including me, may not be here today without the service and sacrifice of Afghans who answered the call to serve shoulder to shoulder with us. Those Afghans knew the risk that their service posed to them and their families, yet they signed up to help because they believed we would have their back.

They have already demonstrated unwavering courage and loyalty by working alongside us. They have demonstrated their commitment to America, and they have earned a path to safety.

The U.S. combat mission in Afghanistan will come to an end in a matter of weeks. At the same time, the threat to our Afghan partners who served alongside men and women is increasing drastically every single day.

Simply put, we are running out of time. They are running out of time. We must streamline the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa process and increase the number of visas to match the pipeline of applicants. The ALLIES Act does just that.

The ALLIES Act removes several administrative barriers to expedite visa processing, and it makes these changes without weakening the important security vetting of applicants. The bill allows family members of deceased SIV applicants to continue through the process if the applicant is killed before visa approval.

The bill clarifies that Afghans who worked to benefit the U.S. mission under federally funded cooperative agreements and grants also qualify for the program. This includes Afghans who performed critical democracy, human rights, and governance work on behalf of the U.S.

Lastly, the ALLIES Act raises the visa cap by 8,000 visas to meet the current number of applicants.

Before I close, let me thank the Honoring Our Promises Working Group, a bipartisan group; the Biden administration; Leader HOYER; and the Judiciary Committee for their partnership in crafting this bill and getting us to the vote today.

This is personal to any of us who served with the men and women who will be saved by this bill. But it is also a moral and national security issue for America.

It is a moral issue because the American handshake must matter. We must be a country that honors our promises if we are to be a beacon of hope and democracy for the world.

It is a national security issue because America is strong, not just because we have aircraft carriers and fighters and bombers, but because we have friends and allies. We don't go it alone. We face many threats, and we will continue to in the future, and we will need friends to help us face those threats. If we turn our back on the Afghans who served with us for the last two decades, it is going to be awfully hard to find future friends.

Mr. Speaker, this is our chance to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the ALLIES Act.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a veteran of the Afghanistan war.

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, for me, as well, this is a very personal endeavor and a very personal bill.

Speaking as a combat veteran of the Afghan war, the Afghans supporting our troops weren't just interpreters; they became our brothers and our sisters on the battlefield. We depended on each other for survival.

They fought with us; they bled with us; and in many cases, they died with us, all for the dream of a better Afghanistan, for a safer world, for prosperity for their families, and for ripping out the dangerous and sick extremist ideology that has tormented their country, taken their society backward, and threatened the United States of America.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration's reckless withdrawal is allowing the Taliban to once again seize control of Afghanistan.

The urgency of the situation on the ground is not hyperbole. Just yesterday, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said the Taliban appears to have strategic momentum in their offensive, and I hope that this Congress can continue supporting the Afghan security forces to help them halt that advance and, in

the wake of it, al-Qaida's and ISIS' inevitable rise.

No one is safe from the Taliban reprisal. We have seen in recent weeks the mass execution of surrendering Afghan security forces and the Afghan interpreters who worked with our troops that are now at the top of the Taliban's target list.

The United States made a commitment to our allies in this conflict, and these individuals have lived up to their end of the bargain. Now, we have an obligation to honor our promises to them.

According to the State Department, the average processing time for an SIV applicant is over 700 days. This is unacceptable, given the urgency.

I want to be clear. The legislation before us, which I strongly support, does not diminish or circumvent the screening process. Trust me, before these men and women were allowed to work with our units, they were heavily vetted, and that is before this 700-day process that they are now going through.

I support increasing the number of Special Immigrant Visas by 8,000. I support streamlining this process. And if it comes to it, I support taking care of the families of those who didn't make it back, like one of my interpreters, who we called Spartacus, who was found with American documentation on him and taken back to his village and beheaded along with members of his family to send a message.

It is notable, Mr. Speaker, that, in 1975, then-Senator Biden did not support the evacuation of our South Vietnamese allies. I hope now-President Biden will erase that sin.

It is not just a moral obligation. It is a national security obligation because when our soldiers have to go back to deal with a rising al-Qaida, which I sadly predict they will have to, we will need local allies once again.

We are sending a message right now by our conduct. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation and ask the Senate to swiftly pass it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 23 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 19½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. As has been mentioned, it makes key changes in the Afghan Allies Protection Act to ensure that the Special Immigrant Visa program, which is part of current law, works as Congress intended to protect the lives of Afghan nationals who served honorably alongside U.S. troops in Afghanistan.

For the past several years, many of us have expressed grave concerns about the challenges our allies face in navigating the Special Immigrant Visa process. It currently takes an average

of 3 years to complete the process, which includes numerous forms, applications, detailed documentary requirements, and lengthy criminal background and national security checks.

This bill makes important changes to streamline the application without compromising the national security interests or the integrity of the program.

Now, I think back to when we voted after 9/11, and I don't think any of us—and I will speak for myself—believed that we were starting a 20-year war, the longest war in America's history. During that war, Afghans stepped forward to serve beside our brave military.

I am proud that veterans in this Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, have stepped forward to work together to make sure that this bill moves forward so that we can honor our commitment.

Mr. Speaker, we are finally leaving Afghanistan after 20 years, our longest war. We have a moral obligation to ensure that our allies can safely and more quickly be removed from harm, so we need to stand by these brave men and women and pass this bill. It is in the national interest.

If we can't keep our promises to our allies, who is going to believe us in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CROW from Colorado, in particular, for leading on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3985, the ALLIES Act.

For almost two decades, American troops have fought the war on terror in Afghanistan. Over the course of the war, thousands of native Afghans put their lives on the line to support our American servicemembers. They served as translators, guides, contractors, and more. Their support was critical to the safety of our servicemembers and the success of our operations.

They showed true bravery and risked their lives in pursuit of an end to the Taliban's regime and a free nation. Now, their decision to help Americans is seen as traitorous by the Taliban, and many of these Afghans and their families have been marked for death.

This danger has only been compounded by the Biden administration's hasty withdrawal from Afghanistan. No plans were originally put in place to help these individuals evacuate, and now, many face dire consequences.

We have a moral imperative to support those who served alongside our men and women in uniform and cannot leave them behind. While the administration has announced plans to evacuate some of our Afghan allies, they should not have been an afterthought.

I call on the administration to expeditiously process SIV applicants and expand their efforts to get these individuals and their families out of harm's way immediately.

In addition to those efforts, I am pleased the House is considering this critical legislation today. It expands and amends the Special Immigrant Visa program to better support our Afghan allies and their families. These combined actions are the least we can do to help them for their service to us.

Anyone who puts their life on the line to stand alongside American servicemembers deserves not only our gratitude, but they deserve our protection. That is why I am proud to vote in favor of the ALLIES Act of 2021, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3985, the ALLIES Act of 2021.

First, I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward, and I thank my friend, Mr. CROW, for sponsoring this bill.

Recently, I met with Combined Arms, a local organization that works with veterans and SIV recipients in Houston. They shared their harrowing stories of the sacrifices they and their families have made and of their fear that they have of being put to death.

They also shared with me the times that they have been waiting to receive their SIVs. In some cases, they have waited for 10 years. This is unacceptable.

I call on my colleagues to support this legislation so we can protect our allies and reform the system, but also to support the immediate evacuation of our allies in Afghanistan to U.S. soil, where we can ensure their safety.

We can't wait any longer. We need to act now. We need to evacuate all 18,000 allies with pending SIV applications and their immediate families who are in danger.

Mr. Speaker, I met with a young man who is now safely in Houston, but sadly, his father has already been murdered by the Taliban. At least 300, I am told, have already been murdered, just like his father, by the Taliban. The more we delay, the more we put families at risk.

Mr. Speaker, we need to support this bill. We need to support an immediate evacuation. And we need to make sure that our friends who stood with us, that we now stand with them.

□ 0945

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

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

I stand here alongside my colleagues in solidarity that we should be standing with the Afghans who stood together with our men and women in uniform. There is zero question that we should do that, and every veteran that I represent in the Texas 21 District shares that, as we have heard here on this floor.

I am supportive of that underlying principle, however, a self-executing

manager's amendment was included that I had concerns with. It expands the program to include nonprofits and grantees, private organizations, that contributed to the United States mission in Afghanistan.

We don't know who would be included. We don't know how many people would now be eligible.

It expands the program to individuals who worked for the International Security Assistance Force without the need to perform sensitive and trusted activities for the United States forces. These people do not have to be Afghans, and we don't know how many people this would be. It weakens the standard for qualification.

Under current law, an alien has to verify that they have experienced or are experiencing an ongoing serious threat as a consequence of the alien's employment by the United States Government.

The new standard is, has asserted a credible basis for concern about the possibility of an ongoing or serious threat. A credible basis for concern about the possibility of is concerning low, lower than even the credible fear standard of significant possibility we currently employ.

The bill allows for another 8,000 principal aliens to be granted this special immigrant status. We agree we want to try to help those principal aliens. There are 10,000 currently unused. That would be about the 18,000 number. Let's also remember that we have 3½ people come in per person on average. We have had about 125 to 130,000 folks come in. This would be about another 75 to 80,000. That does not include dealing with the NGOs.

So we are now massively expanding this program, which means we are going to be back down here at the well talking about new numbers and more expansions based on nebulous standards with respect to NGOs and private entities that aren't individuals who worked for the United States Government directly alongside our men and women in uniform.

That is more than concerning, and it brings me back to my final point: We have got to restore regular order in this body. We are not amending this, we are not debating it in committee, and we did not have a hearing on the specific manager's amendment that was added. It was just added, put on the floor, and put under the title of something that everyone supports, which means, Mr. Speaker, that you are put in the position of figuring out whether you are going to support the underlying matter while all these things are added to it which have serious concerns we should have debated in committee and debated and amended on the floor.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the ALLIES Act.

I believe, as my colleagues have stated so eloquently, that we have a moral

obligation and a duty to take care of those who protected and safeguarded American troops in Afghanistan.

Future allies will look at how we treated those who put themselves in harm's way: the thousands of interpreters and others who aided our mission when they are asked to help us in other times of need.

There is one particular group I would like to call special attention to: the Afghan Female Tactical Platoon. This small group of elite Afghan women sought a better future for their country. They were trained by our country's Special Forces and supported our special operation missions during the war. They gathered essential intelligence and helped protect the lives of innocent civilians and American troops. We owe these brave women more than our gratitude. We owe them what they gave us: loyalty and protection.

Because of their gender, they are marked for especially heinous retaliation and punishment by the Taliban. Without our help they will almost certainly be raped, sold into sex trafficking, tortured, or executed all because they helped the American people.

I want to thank Representative CROW for his steadfast leadership on this critically important issue, and I urge my colleagues to approve this essential bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), who is the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying: No man left behind; no woman left behind. That is the commitment and that is a promise that we made to the interpreters, to our Afghan partners, that we would not leave them behind in the dust to be slaughtered by the Taliban. They have a bull's-eye on their back. I have talked to them. I have talked to our Special Forces whom they protected in this 20-year war. They will be killed if we don't get them out of there.

Our Defense Department is on a fast track. That entire country—the Taliban is on the offensive—is likely going to fall to the Taliban. The decision to withdraw completely has been made, but we have to be prepared for the aftermath. A refugee crisis and humanitarian crisis will occur. The women in Afghanistan will be tortured and will not be educated. We had a school of 200 women—girls—that were blown up. Little girls were blown up. That, Mr. Speaker, is the Taliban. That will be the same fate for our Afghan partners if we don't get them out of there now.

They have 700 now coming to Fort Lee in Virginia. I urge the administration to get the rest of them. There are 9,000 interpreters, probably 20,000 total when it comes to our Afghan partners. I ask the President to please get them out before they are killed by the Taliban.

Our ISR, or intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, capability is wiped out. The Bagram air base fell to the Afghans in a very sloppy transition, and the Taliban is going to take that over, too. Now we can't see what China, Russia, and Iran are doing. We can't see what ISIS and al-Qaida are doing. We are going dark, Mr. Speaker, because we can't see anything on the ground.

But I can tell you this: The moral obligation we have to save those whom we promised we would protect has to be fulfilled, and that is precisely what this bill does, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Judiciary Committee for bringing this forward.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for offering me this minute and a half, and I thank him for his leadership for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the ALLIES Act. This bill will save lives and protect our allies. It will also honor our commitment to the region. Thousands of Afghans have served as interpreters, drivers, and guides to assist U.S. troops. Their service and commitment have been consistent over the 20 years that now marks the longest U.S. war in history.

The Afghan Special Immigrant Visa, or SIVs, allows people who worked for or on behalf of the United States Government to seek lawful permanent residence in the United States. But as we prepare to remove our troops, the Taliban continues to target our friends. The ALLIES Act of 2021 provides for an additional 8,000 SIVs to accommodate everyone who currently could be an eligible candidate in the pipeline. We have an opportunity and a moral obligation to save the lives of those who served us.

As we draw down our military presence in Afghanistan, many who served alongside our troops continue to face increased threats because of their service to us. We must do the right thing by our brave allies.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CROW for his service and his leadership on this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I came to speak on this bill because it means a lot to me. My war was Vietnam, and I remember the end of that war. I remember the friends that we left behind, I remember the families that were torn apart, and it still weighs on me.

Now I have a son who spent years in Afghanistan, and when he talks to me, he does not talk about taxes or healthcare. He talks about the people he left behind in Afghanistan and what we are doing for them. We cannot do

this again. We must not do this again. We have to rise and bring back and repatriate all the people who were so important to us in combat.

Mr. Speaker, I know you understand that. Please do not abandon friends of America again.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my appreciation to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his leadership in moving this bill forward and certainly to our friend and one who has served this Nation in many ways, Congressman CROW, for his continued consideration of our friends in Afghanistan.

As the co-chair and founder of the Afghanistan Caucus, I have gone to Afghanistan many, many times in the early years. I know the people in Afghanistan truly love democracy. I know the women and children want education, and I know that in the midst of our decision on the longest-serving war, we must find that pathway to be able to ensure democracy prevails, both in terms of the democratic leadership of government but also in the lives of the people.

I hesitate to read this language: "Gunfire erupts. At least a dozen men are seen shot to death amid cries of 'Allahu Akbar', God is great.

"The victims were members of an Afghan Special Forces unit: their executioners, the Taliban. The summary killings took place on June 16 in the town of Dawlat Abad in Faryab Province, close to Afghanistan's border with Turkmenistan." It is, of course, a difficult thing to read and to understand.

But as we begin to write the democratic principles of a constitution so many years ago—prior to this Nation going to Iraq—people were interested and excited about their life. Women were elected as parliamentarians. In fact, they prided themselves on a number of parliamentarians who happened to be women.

In the instance of that leaving Afghanistan the first time, we found that those women, many going to their districts, were killed. Schools for children that girls were in, schools that I took books to, were actually burned to the ground.

So those who stood by us, those who guided our troops, those who translated for us, and those who took us into the villages—because many of you know the stories of our soldiers going in with money. That was the policy at that time—this bill specifically acknowledges their leadership.

I include in the RECORD three articles referencing this important issue.

[From Human Rights Watch, Apr. 1, 2021]
AFGHANISTAN: TALIBAN TARGET JOURNALISTS, WOMEN IN MEDIA

NEW YORK.—Taliban forces are deliberately targeting journalists and other media workers, including women, in, Human Rights Watch said today. Threats and attacks

against journalists across the country have increased sharply since talks began between the Afghan government and the Taliban, heightening concerns about preserving freedom of expression and the media in any peace settlement.

Human Rights Watch found that Taliban commanders and fighters have engaged in a pattern of threats, intimidation, and violence against members of the media in areas where the Taliban have significant influence, as well as in Kabul. Those making the threats often have an intimate knowledge of a journalist's work, family, and movements and use this information to either compel them to self-censor, leave their work altogether, or face violent consequences. Provincial and district-level Taliban commanders and fighters also make oral and written threats against journalists beyond the areas they control. Journalists say that the widespread nature of the threats has meant that no media workers feel safe.

"A wave of threats and killings has sent a chilling message to the Afghan media at a precarious moment as Afghans on all sides get set to negotiate free speech protections in a future Afghanistan," said Patricia Gossman, associate Asia director. "By silencing critics through threats and violence, the Taliban have undermined hopes for preserving an open society in Afghanistan."

Human Rights Watch interviewed 46 members of the Afghan media between November 2020 and March 2021, seeking information on the conditions under which they work, including threats of physical harm. Those interviewed included 42 journalists in Badghis, Ghazni, Ghor, Helmand, Kabul, Kandahar, Khost, Wardak, and Zabul provinces and four who had left Afghanistan due to threats.

In a number of cases that Human Rights Watch documented, Taliban forces detained journalists for a few hours or overnight. In several cases they or their colleagues were able to contact senior Taliban officials to intercede with provincial and district-level commanders to secure their release, indicating that local commanders are able to take decisions to target journalists on their own without approval from senior Taliban military or political officials.

Taliban officials at their political office in Doha, Qatar, have denied that their forces threaten the media and say that they require only that journalists respect Islamic values. But Taliban commanders throughout Afghanistan have threatened journalists specifically for their reporting. The commanders have considerable autonomy to carry out punishments, including targeted killings.

Women journalists, especially those appearing on television and radio, face particular threats. The recent wave of violent attacks has driven several prominent women journalists to give up their profession or leave Afghanistan altogether. Female reporters may be targeted not only for issues they cover but also for challenging perceived social norms prohibiting women from being in a public role and working outside the home.

Journalists outside the country's main cities are especially vulnerable to attacks because they are more exposed and lack even the minimal protection that a larger Afghan media, government, and international presence provides. However, as the fighting has increasingly encroached on major cities, these have offered decreasing protection to journalists seeking safety from the violence in their home districts.

A journalist covering the fighting in Helmand province said that one of his sources told him the Taliban were looking for him and he should lie low. "The majority

of Afghan journalists feel intimidated and threatened," he said. "All the journalists are scared because everyone feels like they could be next."

Residents of Taliban-held areas have long expressed fear of retaliation if they complain about the way Taliban forces carry out military operations or enforce restrictions. In a June 2020 report, Human Rights Watch documented severe restrictions in areas under Taliban control, including limits on freedom of expression and the media.

The Taliban leadership should immediately cease intimidation, threats, and attacks against journalists and other media workers, Human Rights Watch said. They should urgently provide clear, public directives to all Taliban members to end all forms of violence against journalists and other media workers, and intimidation, harassment, and punishment of Afghans who have criticized Taliban policies. The Taliban leadership should also explicitly reject violence against women in the media.

The United Nations and governments supporting the Intra-Afghan Negotiations should publicly press the Taliban leadership to adopt these recommendations, and provide increased support, including protection, to independent media organizations and journalists in Afghanistan, especially those facing threats.

"It's not enough for Taliban officials in Doha to issue blanket denials that they're targeting journalists when Taliban forces on the ground continue to intimidate, harass, and attack reporters for doing their jobs," Gossman said. "Countries supporting the peace process should press for firm commitments from all parties to protect journalists, including women, and uphold the right to free expression in Afghanistan."

TALIBAN THREATS TO AFGHAN MEDIA

Although the Taliban routinely deny responsibility for attacks on journalists, the Afghan Journalists Security Committee (AJSC) has said:

Since the beginning of the spike in targeted killings in early November [2020], supporters of the group [Taliban] have welcomed the killings of journalists on social media, calling these killings in many cases a religious duty. Taliban supporters accuse journalists of being agents of Western countries, and corrupted by Western values, thereby legitimizing any violence against journalists and the media as not only being permissible but a key part of their war.

TALIBAN THREATS RELATED TO REPORTING ON THE WAR

Taliban commanders and fighters have long targeted the media, accusing them of being aligned with the Afghan government or international military forces. If journalists report unfavorably about Taliban actions or military operations, the Taliban often accuse them of being spies. District and provincial-level Taliban commanders have also criticized journalists for not reporting incidents such as civilian casualties from government airstrikes. Journalists have said that the role some of them play as influential and prominent figures in many communities has made them targets of the Taliban. By attacking them the Taliban effectively threaten all local media. A journalist in Helmand said:

If the more prominent journalists are targeted first, the other journalists, who might be less influential or prominent, are automatically intimidated and fear for their lives . . . Pro-Taliban accounts on social media . . . explicitly issue warnings to other journalists, along the lines of "learn something from the death of this journalist"—you can be next.

The effect on Afghan media has been profound. The killings and threats have gen-

erated fear among journalists and media workers, many of whom have altered their work patterns in an effort to mitigate the danger or try to be less visible.

Taliban pressure on the media is an apparent part of an effort to shape public debate about the war at a time of heightened political tensions surrounding the peace talks. Local journalists said Taliban commanders and fighters call them to complain about published reports, questioning why a certain issue was covered in a certain way. A journalist in Kandahar said:

The Taliban warned me about reporting on casualties related to a suicide attack. They wanted me to say that a lot of people got killed but I just reported the attacker dying . . . The Taliban threatened a couple of journalists over the last couple years for not reporting on assassinations. They say, 'Why don't you report the actual number?' When we argue with them that it is the correct number, they threaten us.

When one journalist reported a Taliban attack on a civilian facility in Kandahar, he said that within minutes he received death threats and other warnings on his phone. The Taliban called him to say that they had not targeted civilians but a nearby government checkpoint. The journalist said that he lives in fear that the Taliban might still come after him. Other journalists in Kandahar have reported being followed by Taliban fighters. Because of such confrontations, journalists often self-censor their stories.

In Helmand, Taliban commanders targeted journalists who reported on military operations during a Taliban offensive in October. Taliban forces attacked the outskirts of Lashkargah city, overrunning Afghan government checkpoints until US airstrikes drove them back. In the months before he was killed by an improvised explosive device (IED) on November 11, Elyas Dayee, a journalist, had received multiple threats from Taliban commanders in Helmand, warning him to stop his reporting on their military operations. Another reporter covering the fighting said that the morning after his report came out, a Taliban commander called and accused him of publishing reports against the Islamic Emirates and warned that he would face consequences.

THE NATURE OF THE THREATS

In Taliban-controlled provinces, threats often come from local commanders with knowledge of the journalist's family, work habits, and movements. These commanders maintain individual contact with journalists and editors, and usually communicate these threats by phone or through social media.

A radio presenter in Zabul province said that he and his colleagues routinely receive threats from the Taliban accusing them of giving the government publicity. The callers always know details about the journalists they call, including their jobs, family members' names, and often their addresses. One caller told him that he should either leave the area or work for the Taliban. When he refused the caller told him he should "count down to his death." He said his relatives also receive these threats and are told to communicate them to him.

In Ghazni province, reporters say that they have been threatened and intimidated by various groups and do not know who is behind every attack. However, despite official denials from the Taliban leadership, comments by Taliban commanders and fighters on social media have led journalists to suspect that the Taliban are responsible for many attacks. These commanders generally have considerable autonomy to plan and carry out military operations independently.

The Afghanistan Journalists Safety Committee said that in Ghazni province, the

Taliban had instructed the majority of the local media outlets that they would only be permitted to continue media activities if they followed Taliban directives. Another journalist in Ghazni said that the Taliban commanders in the province object to any content that is negative or critical about them. Journalists whose reporting is perceived as favorable to the Afghan government may immediately become a target. Leaving their jobs is often their only recourse.

On December 21, Rahmatullah Nekzad, head of the Ghazni journalists' union, was fatally shot as he walked from his home to a local mosque. Although the Taliban spokesman, Zabihullah Mujahid, denied that the group was responsible for the attack, Nekzad had been receiving threats from local Taliban commanders since at least 2019. He said in early December, that the Afghan National Directorate of Security (NDS), the country's intelligence agency, informed him that he and 15 other journalists in Ghazni were at risk of a Taliban attack. He described the threats he received:

I use a social media account to upload daily news. Some local Taliban called me to accuse me of running social media pages that post anti-Taliban news . . . Their argument was that every time you post something on your wall, these . . . are also your accounts. They also threatened people who commented on the post.

In another case in mid-December, Taliban forces stopped the vehicle in which a local journalist was traveling. He called a contact, who then contacted a Taliban official. As a result of this intervention, the local Taliban released him. While he was in their custody, the Taliban accused him of working for the government's intelligence agency and for "foreigners."

Journalists have also been threatened for reporting on Taliban abuses. A radio correspondent from Badghis province said that after he and his colleagues broadcast a report about the Taliban extorting payments from highway drivers, the journalists began to receive threats:

In addition to the radio, we have a Facebook page where we publish the news of the day. After I posted this story, one of the comments read: "The martyrs of the Islamic Emirate will soon kill the employees of this media station." The same message came in [Facebook] Messenger. Since then, we report less news on Facebook now. Badghis's capital is a very small city. Everyone knows each other and I have no doubt that they also know the address of our office.

Another journalist from Badghis said that in November, as he was traveling from Herat to Badghis province, Taliban fighters stopped him and forced him out of his car. They interrogated him about whether he had cooperated with government security forces and threatened to kill him. He said that his family was aware that he was on the road. He was finally released after local and ethnic Taliban elders who knew them mediated his release. "I am still in fear and . . . shock from this incident," he said. "Now I publish less news of the war. Whenever I go to a press conference, I am fearful and cautious. I only cover news from the capital now."

Local Taliban fighters have assaulted journalists who have traveled into Taliban-controlled districts. A journalist from Wardak province said that a group of Taliban fighters stopped and beat him and another reporter, accusing them of spying and "going around without the Taliban's permission to take pictures, record videos, and talk to people." The journalists showed their press identification but were not released until after they called a contact, who then informed senior Taliban officials, who ordered them released.

Threats also come in writing. A journalist in Ghazni said that a letter was dropped by his house ordering him to meet with the local Taliban because his reports were not "neutral." It warned him that if he did not change, his death was "close." After the warning, he left his home district and stayed in Kabul for a few months. Eventually he returned home but avoided his office out of fear.

The Taliban also send cell phone text messages to comment on media coverage, often chiding reporters that they should have included the Taliban point of view. While criticism of media reporting is not in itself problematic, when it comes from an armed group with a history of killing journalists, the messages are intimidating and create fear. "Being a journalist is something that can put your life in danger without even doing anything specific to antagonize the Taliban," one journalist in Ghazni said.

Journalists also receive threats when they share their political views on social media. Taliban commanders also use Facebook to issue threats. A journalist in Ghazni said that shortly after he posted a government statement on a military offensive that resulted in Taliban casualties, he received a message from a Taliban commander demanding to speak with him:

He told me not to listen to what [government officials] say and ordered me to come see him. I had to comply. He came with his men in a Toyota vehicle. He threatened me and told me not to post anything more on Facebook.

Another journalist in Ghazni had a similar experience after using Facebook to post his report on the police killing a suspected Taliban bomber. He received a call from a man who said he was with the Taliban and asked him why he was publishing inaccurate information. The man warned him that they would watch out for what he published and that he should not publish such reports anymore.

Local Taliban commanders issue warnings about radio and television stations airing music programs, which they consider prohibited, and blame journalists for this practice. One journalist described the threats he received:

Whenever the Taliban hears about music on local radio channels, they immediately start calling you, threatening to kill you. They told me many times that they held court sessions about me, proving that I am guilty of broadcasting music. They threatened to kill me. I left this job because of these threats.

The journalist said that local Taliban officials had also told him not to broadcast election-related news because elections were "US-instigated." He said: "I argued with them for a couple of months that this is not my personal choice but the station's editorial decision. Then the Taliban asked for my boss' number and threatened him until he left." Another Ghazni reporter said he had received at least six threats in which callers warned him of vague consequences if he did not remove music or make other changes to the programs.

Threatening to harm relatives is a common tactic to spread fear. A journalist in Khost said that he received threatening calls from unknown numbers, some accusing him of working for Christians, others accusing him of being a foreign spy. Some specifically warn him that they know his relatives and where he lives:

I am terrified but cannot do anything about it . . . One of my relatives said that I should leave [journalism] because he is scared . . . I cannot carry on with my work. I cannot go outside freely. A caller shared a lot of information about me as proof that

they have been watching me—he told me my name, my father's name, where I work, and the address of my house . . . after a few days, I got a message saying "the path you have chosen is not the right path, so you should move on from it or else we will decide what to do with you."

For the time being, the journalist has changed his phone hoping to prevent further threats.

TALIBAN THREATS TO WOMEN IN THE MEDIA

The Afghan Journalists Safety Committee reported that 14 women working for media outlets in Afghanistan were threatened or violently attacked in 2020. An increasing number of Afghan women in journalism have left the profession because of worsening security and threats, a trend that emerged after 2015 and has accelerated.

The Islamic State of Khorasan Province (ISKP), an armed group affiliated with the Islamic State (also known as ISIS), took responsibility for killing four women journalists and media workers, including Malala Maiwand, the first woman TV presenter for Enikass News, on December 10, and the March 2 killings of Mursal Waheedi, Saadia Sadat, and Shahnaz Raufi, who worked at Enikass News dubbing foreign language news reports.

It is often not clear whether the ISKP, the Taliban, or other groups are responsible for some threats and attacks against women. In Ghazni province, the Taliban have instructed media outlets that the hosts of entertainment programs should not be women, and that no music should be broadcasted.

Farahnaz Forotan, one of Afghanistan's best-known journalists noted for her hard-hitting interviews on Tolo News, left the country in November after hearing that she was on a Taliban blacklist and would soon be killed.

She said that the Taliban:

do not accept free media, and, in many events, they had rejected being interviewed by women. The reason they wanted to kill me, was because as a woman I am not accepted according to their values . . . The situation in Kabul is very scary. I know four journalists in Kandahar who left their jobs. The local media does not reflect it because they cannot. They are being threatened and the government cannot provide protection . . . Every morning I check messages to make sure that everyone is safe. I live with fear—it is very difficult to live with the fear of losing a loved one.

Another Kabul-based journalist had worked as a producer for a television news outlet but left her job in mid-2020 after receiving threats. She said:

The Taliban threatened me a couple of times on the phone, and they told me to leave my job. I also found a letter from the Taliban in a hole in our door. The letter repeated that I must not work anymore for news agencies because this job doesn't suit me morally. If you continue, then you have no right to complain [about the consequences].

[From the New York Times, July 22, 2021]

U.S. SCRAMBLES TO MOVE TRANSLATORS FROM AFGHANISTAN WHILE LEAVING MANY IN LIMBO

An additional 4,000 Afghans who worked with American forces, many of them interpreters, had been approved to relocate to the United States with their families in light of the withdrawal of U.S. troops, State Department officials said on Wednesday.

But officials added that evacuations were only taking place out of Kabul, the capital, and any eligible Afghans in remote areas were on their own in figuring out how to make the difficult, and likely dangerous,

journey if they wanted to take advantage of the offer.

"In order to come on an evacuation flight, they would have to get themselves to Kabul," a senior official, who requested anonymity in order to discuss the plan in detail, said on a call with reporters. "Obviously, we don't have extensive U.S. military presence. We don't have the ability to provide transportation for them."

"If they're staying in the north of the country and they don't feel safe staying in Afghanistan, they could go to a neighboring country" and finish their application process there, the official added.

The United States also will not provide security to applicants outside Kabul, many of whom are under direct threat from the Taliban for cooperating with coalition forces during the war.

With the American military in the final phases of withdrawing from Afghanistan, the White House has come under pressure to protect Afghan allies and speed up the process of providing them with special immigrant visas, and President Biden has vowed to do so. There have been about 20,000 applicants for the special visa program.

This month, 2,500 Afghans will be sent in stages to an Army base in Fort Lee, Va., south of Richmond, where they will wait roughly 10 days for final processing. The next 4,000 applicants, who need further approvals, will go with their families to other countries to complete the visa process before coming to the United States, the senior official said.

The official did not indicate which countries those applicants would be sent to complete the visa process.

The House is expected to pass legislation this week increasing the number of State Department special immigrant visas and streamlining the application process.

[From Time Magazine, June 15, 2021]

WE MUST HELP THE AFGHAN INTERPRETERS
WHO HELPED US

(By Florent Groberg)

Groberg received the Medal of Honor during combat operations in Afghanistan, and is on the Advisory Board of With Honor Action.

I lived by these words. That includes the day a suicide bomber hit and killed four men in my patrol in Asadabad, Afghanistan: Sergeant Major Kevin J. Griffin, Major Thomas E. Kennedy, Major Walter D. Gray, and USAID Foreign Service Officer Mr. Ragaei Abdelfattah. I think about them every day.

The blast knocked me out. I woke up as my medic strapped a tourniquet to my leg and turned to my Afghan interpreter to assist with bandages. Patrol after patrol, year after year, for twenty years, our Afghan interpreters have stood by our side in harm's way. Now we have a choice to stand by them.

Taliban militants and terrorists have long targeted our interpreters, including their wives and children. By the time the U.S. withdraws from Afghanistan in September 2021, there will be little defense left for these loyal allies.

Another one of my Afghan interpreters reached out to me last week. He made it out of Afghanistan but his wife and kids are trapped and targeted. "The situation is getting worse day by day in Afghanistan. I am worried for my wife and kids," he wrote, "Please help."

More than 17,000 Afghans who worked with U.S. forces, not to mention their family members, are still waiting for a decision from the U.S. Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) program. The process is mired in a maddening bureaucracy. Many have waited for years after going through security checks with practically every U.S. government

agency imaginable, often at their own expense for health screenings and other requirements. The situation has only become more dire of late with the U.S. Embassy in Kabul halting visa applicant interviews because of an escalating COVID-19 outbreak in Afghanistan.

Every soldier I have spoken with who served in Afghanistan supports granting asylum for loyal Afghan interpreters who have taken all the necessary security steps and are seeking this emergency asylum. Not only is granting asylum the right thing to do, it also benefits the U.S. by accepting talented and hardworking people, many of whom have already put it all on the line for our country.

Members of the For Country Caucus in the U.S. House are leading the charge, including Democratic Representatives Jason Crow, Jared Golden, and Seth Moulton, and Republicans Don Bacon, Adam Kinzinger, Peter Meijer, and Michael Waltz. These veterans have formed a task force and called on the White House, State Department, and Defense Department to immediately create a plan that can be executed before the final withdrawal of U.S. forces this September. Senator Jeanne Shaheen and U.S. Army veterans Senator Joni Ernst and Senator Jack Reed are forming a bipartisan coalition in the Senate.

"My concern is very simple," Representative Crow said, "And that is if we pull out and don't protect our Afghan partners, many of them will be killed."

Earlier this year, The Atlantic reported that Taliban militants hunted down and killed "Mohammad," an interpreter who worked with U.S. forces for a decade and then spent nearly another decade trying to get through the SIV process with his wife and kids. Mohammad's family just learned they finally have been approved for humanitarian parole. They are scheduled to be resettled in Texas shortly. My hope is we will hear many more stories of brave Afghan families, including that of my own interpreter, who will be granted asylum and can begin the next chapter of their lives in peace and shared prosperity.

This will only happen if the U.S. steps up and protects the interpreters and families under threat. Our history points us to solutions. The Ford Administration evacuated over 130,000 Vietnamese to Guam at the end of the Vietnam War. The Clinton Administration did the same for Iraqi Kurds during Saddam Hussein's regime.

Whether through an emergency evacuation, an expedited SIV process, an expansion of other refugee and humanitarian programs, or a combination of all of these, the Biden administration should urgently make a plan and execute it.

I am blessed to be a first-generation American and U.S. Army veteran who served with patriots, some of whom made the ultimate sacrifice. Our Afghan interpreters are patriots, too. Now is the time to open our arms and stand by them, their wives, and their children.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I support the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program, and I support its increased numbers. I ask my colleagues: Don't stop here. Let's keep going. These are our friends, and democracy must prevail.

Mr. Speaker, against the backdrop of a war that has demanded sacrifice and summoned patriotism, I rise in unequivocal support of H.R. 3985, "The Allies Act of 2021," which honors the contributions of our allies in Afghanistan by strengthening the Afghan Special Immigration Visa (SIV) Program.

I wish to recognize my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, Con-

gressman CROW, who valiantly served three tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, for leading this bipartisan effort to uphold our commitment to our partners in Afghanistan.

This piece of legislation, which I am proud to co-sponsor, comes as we conclude a multigenerational war that has accomplished its principle objectives: rendering justice to those responsible for 9/11 and making sure that no attack on the homeland ever emerges from Afghanistan.

Over the course of achieving this mission, we found critical allies and made invaluable friends, among them those who leveraged their skills and knowledge to protect our troops from harm.

The Afghan Special Immigrant (SIV) Program, created in 2009 to provide safety for Afghan interpreters, contractors, and security personnel assisting U.S. efforts in the country, is more than a program.

It is a promise—a promise to our allies that when they have our back, we have theirs.

Specifically, the bill improves the SIV application process by:

- amending the credible threat requirement;
- aligning applicant standards;
- clarifying eligibility for certain Afghans;
- streamlining duplicative procedures, and,
- increasing protections for surviving spouses.

Reports on the ground indicate those Afghan nationals who worked on behalf of the U.S. Government face extreme danger.

Time is of the essence, and this bill removes our friends and allies from the bureaucratic barriers of additional lengthy paperwork to establish a credible threat, when we already know that such a threat exists for individuals with verified ties to the U.S. government.

Additionally, to qualify for the Afghan SIV Program under the current law, Afghan nationals who were employed by the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) or Resolute Support (RS) must have performed "sensitive and trusted" work.

This employment requirement was removed for U.S. Government employees in the FY2020 National Defense Authorization Act, but it remains for individuals employed under ISAF and RS.

All current applicants must also submit an I-360 petition to USCIS after completing the State Department's Chief of Mission process.

This redundancy creates duplicative applications and introduces a gap in the process that allows for fraudulent petitions, ultimately slowing down the processing time for all applicants.

The Allies Act of 2021 aligns standards across all types of employment and gives the Department of Homeland Security the flexibility to not require I-360 petitions in cases where applicants have already proven eligibility through the Chief of Mission Process.

By making standards uniform, clear, and nonduplicative for all applicants, this bill streamlines application processing and ensures a more efficient safety plan for all our allies.

The bill also expands the types of individuals eligible for the SIV.

In practice, the original Afghan SIV statute only includes Afghan nationals who worked under U.S. government contracts.

Yet we received support from many Afghan nationals under nongovernmental cooperative agreements and grants, including many key contacts working on critical democracy, human

rights, and governance work to assist the U.S. mission in Afghanistan.

This bill makes clear that Afghan nationals that worked under such non-governmental agreements to advance the U.S. mission are eligible for the Afghan SIV program.

In addition to previously excluded contractors, we must also acknowledge the danger surviving spouses face and place them at the front and center in our migration support efforts as well.

Currently, surviving spouses of deceased SIV applicants are not allowed to continue through the process if the primary SIV applicant died before visa approval.

The immediate families of our allies are also our allies and we must remove this dangerous obstacle for them to reach safety.

The Allies Act of 2021 allows family members of deceased primary applicants to continue through the process if their spouse had applied for Chief of Mission approval.

We cannot leave our Afghan allies and their spouses vulnerable to the imminent threat of revenge from the Taliban.

They simply are not safe at home and they need our help.

The adaptations and amendments that this act offers would facilitate a path to safety and freedom for nearly 20,000 of on-the-ground partners whose work made possible all our advancements in that country.

Madam Speaker, I urge us to act with compassion and honor our core American value of promoting freedom for all, for it was our reverence for this value that characterized our extended presence in Afghanistan in the first place.

It is time for us to ensure the safety and lives of our friends and allies in Afghanistan.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership and for the 2 minutes, which may be the most important 2 minutes I have had on the floor in a very, very long time, because what we debate here today is not an ideological disagreement. It is not a question of whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, Mr. Speaker. It is a fundamental question of who we are as a country and will we abide by the values that not only make us successful in times of war, but which distinguish us as a people and allow us to say that we are an exceptional nation.

When our troops—troops like JASON CROW, the sponsor of this legislation—go to engage in combat in foreign lands, they are armed and equipped with the very best technology money can buy. But from the human standpoint, from the all-important humanitarian and cultural standpoint, they are blind and deaf. That is fixed by locals who risk everything, not necessarily for the money, but because they believe in who we are. This is the moment when we return the favor by saying: If you stood with us, we will stand with you.

It is far from a national security perspective, because God help those who

go into a country if we don't take care of those who helped us in Afghanistan. But, more importantly, it is about our values.

Mr. Speaker, you know very well that our military has at its core the value that we leave no one behind. Now we decide whether we live by that value or whether we take the cheap, the easy, the quick, and ultimately, the dangerous way out. It is dangerous for the next conflict we find ourselves in and dangerous because of what that will tell the world about our commitment to loyalty and the values that make us exceptional.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

□ 1000

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that my colleague from Maryland, the distinguished ANTHONY BROWN, is presiding, having served in Iraq and served in the U.S. Army for a 30-year stint.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Representative CROW, for his leadership on this issue and in offering this legislation.

Representative CROW, like Congressman BROWN, is one of the Members of this House from a new generation of service who wore the uniform of our country in the post-9/11 conflicts.

These veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, like Representative CROW, understand what we must do to support our friends who stood with us, who risked their lives and the lives of their families with their American partners.

The mission of our Armed Forces in Afghanistan over the past 20 years has been clear, although very extended: destroy the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11 and deny al-Qaida a safe haven from which to threaten global security in our country. Today, Osama bin Laden is dead and al-Qaida has been routed. Terrorism, however, has not gone away.

Our troops are now coming home. The fate of the Afghan people will surely be determined by them, with our help, with us standing by. America will continue to support the Afghan Government and its security forces, but it is up to them to show the Taliban that there is no military solution and that their resolve is evident by their defense of their Nation.

As American personnel return from Afghanistan, that country's civil war will continue, and we cannot leave our Afghan partners behind. We talk about leaving no American behind. That is an absolutely essential premise as we send our men and women into harm's way. Nor should we leave behind any of those who facilitated our efforts, who stood with us, who risked their own lives and put themselves in jeopardy.

No one has any illusions about what the Taliban would do if they had their way and what they will do in those places they already control. They will take it out, and they will, in fact, literally take out those who stood with us and facilitated our efforts. There can be no doubt the punishment they would inflict on Afghans who stood alongside the United States and our allies.

We can only imagine the horrors that would befall their families in retribution. This legislation recognizes that these Afghan allies have earned safety in our country for themselves and for their loved ones. It would expand the visa program and expedite processing to help ensure there is a path to America for Afghans who worked side by side with our troops, our diplomats, our development professionals, and our partner forces in carrying out our missions there.

While President Biden is already taking executive action to bring some of these allies here, legislation is needed to ensure that all of them can make it safely out of harm's way. It should be said, of course, that they will all be vetted to ensure that, in fact, they are coming to the United States and will be consistent with the security of our country and our people.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill today in a very bipartisan way. This is not about Democrats. It is not about Republicans. It is about an effort that Republican and Democratic administrations pursued and received help in doing so. Each vote is not only an assent for this sound policy, but a gesture of our deep appreciation for the service of our allies.

Let this vote remind the world that our country's steadfast foundation, our highest ideal remains our bonds of friendship, loyalty, and trust. Let us remind our friends and foes alike that Americans keep faith with our allies, and let us practice that in this body and at the White House.

I ask my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike: Vote for this bill. We can argue about differences of opinion on our effort in Afghanistan, but when we do something, whether we argue one side or the other, when we ask people to help us in that effort, help us, America, our men and women in uniform in harm's way, when we ask those to help us, it is important for us to keep the faith with those who do. Vote "yes."

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER).

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Allies Act. It is our moral obligation to honor the promises we made to our Afghan allies and ensure that those who risked their lives for the U.S. mission are safely relocated, but it is patently clear that the Special Immigrant Visa program, as it currently exists, is not up to the task. Staffing shortages and bureaucratic hurdles have resulted in years-long delays in the process and a backlog of over 18,000 applications.

The Allies Act will help speed up the process by streamlining duplicative procedures and removing unnecessary requirements, while maintaining the necessary security and vetting procedures. It also expands eligibility for those who are unfairly left out of the program, most critically, surviving spouses and children of applicants who died or were killed by the Taliban before visa approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the recent news of the plans to begin evacuating some of these Afghan interpreters, but make no mistake, there is much more to be done. We have a responsibility to ensure that those who risked their lives serving alongside U.S. and coalition forces are both swiftly evacuated and given a path to safety.

This bill is a significant step toward that goal and will help ensure that America lives up to the promises made to those brave individuals and their families. I am proud to support this bill, and I call on all of my colleagues to do so today. I urge passage.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

I never served in theater, but I have worked on this issue for 14 years. We started with Senator John McCain and Senator Kennedy, and it moved forward on a bipartisan basis, both the House and the Senate, with the special immigrant visa. But, sadly, it always was too slow, too bureaucratic, and there really wasn't the sense of urgency that was necessary to make sure that the people who put their lives on the line to help Americans in these difficult circumstances were dealt with.

Something has changed. First of all, President Biden has made an extraordinarily difficult call that we are going to wind down that presence of the United States in terms of military. It is a difficult call. It was one that needed to be made because the circumstances were not going to change. If it was 5 years, 10 years, it would just be more billions of dollars and more lives; putting off the day of reckoning.

I admire the President for doing so, but I hope he brings that same sense of urgency to deal with these people who we can't afford to leave behind.

Another thing that has changed is the energy of new Members of Congress who served in the theater; my colleague, JASON CROW. We just heard from PETER MEIJER. They have added a sense of urgency on a bipartisan basis that has helped us craft this legislation, that will solve the problems if we are willing to implement it in full force.

I call upon the administration to expedite the transition. I call on all of us to continue to make sure that we provide the resources, the attention, and the urgency to make the program successful. But make no mistake, we have

a lot of work to do to protect people who helped us. Being a friend should not be fatal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this legislation as an important next step and urge that we redouble our efforts to make it successful.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, 51, that is how many days until our official withdrawal from Afghanistan; 800, that is how many days it takes to process a single special immigrant visa; 21,000, that is how many of our Afghan allies put their lives on the line, not just for their country, but for ours, who are at risk of being beaten, tortured, beheaded, and slaughtered by the Taliban. And make no mistake, if they can get their hands on our friends, that is what the Taliban will do.

So the math is clear. We are out of time. The stakes are clear. Our reputation as a country, our ability to find allies in future conflicts, the willingness of people all over the globe to work for America because they trust us to uphold our own values, that is what is on the line.

We have to pass the Allies Act. The administration needs to conduct a full evacuation because we do not leave people behind. We are the United States of America. Let's remind the world of that today.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a tragedy in so many ways; the loss of so many of the best and brightest of our youth because of political and military leaders who were willing to put them in harm's way but without a commitment to victory and without the willingness to back them with the full might of the United States.

For Afghanistan, it means the best and brightest of that country, the very people who were willing to risk their futures for freedom are the ones who are now being forced to flee, depriving Afghanistan of the most patriotic citizens who could otherwise have formed the core of a free government if we had finished the job we started.

It is to be greatly hoped that like the Iranian diaspora, they will focus their energy from abroad to support the resistance movement that is sure to emerge under the yoke of Taliban oppression. It is to be greatly hoped that our Nation will finally return to a tradition that served us well for nearly 200 years; that there is no substitute for victory and no excuse for waging war without the absolute commitment to swiftly win it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am heartened to see Members on both sides of the aisle

speak in support of this important bill. It is vital that we pass this legislation and it is vital that we do so quickly. As we speak, nearly 20,000 of our Afghan allies are facing increasing threats from the Taliban and insurgent groups. The administration will begin evacuating some individuals at the end of this month.

As Members of Congress, we must also do our part to honor the sacrifices made by these brave men and women and pass the Allies Act. It is much too bad that we cannot do more, but this is the least that we can do. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, many Members here, including myself, have traveled to Afghanistan for years to express our gratitude to our heroic men and women in uniform serving there. We remain in awe of their patriotism and courage.

And just as awe-inspiring are their partners on the ground: the local Afghan interpreters, drivers, embassy staff, contractors, security personnel and others who have worked shoulder-to-shoulder with the American military and our diplomatic personnel.

These Afghan partners have been vital to the safety of American lives and to the success of our mission. They accepted an extraordinary risk to their lives and families, with the understanding that we would stand by them.

And now, they are under attack—facing the threat of deadly retribution from the Taliban.

Today, with the ALLIES Act, the U.S. Congress is honoring our promises to these brave heroes: to respect their service and to not leave them behind.

Thank you to Congressman JASON CROW—a former Army Ranger who served our Nation in Afghanistan and Iraq.

He, with Congressman SETH MOULTON and the entire bipartisan "Honoring our Promises" Working Group, has been firm, principled and relentless in fighting for this legislation and other action to protect our "Afghan allies."

Earlier this summer, with their leadership, the House proudly passed the HOPE for Afghan SIVS Act, which took the first step in that mission.

This group has also been instrumental in coordinating Congress's response with the Biden-Harris Administration.

As President Biden has said, "Those who helped us are not going to be left behind." And with his action this week, evacuating Afghan partners to Fort Lee as they await final processing, that promise is being honored.

The Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act will fix the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) process, created over a decade ago to provide safety for Afghan interpreters, contractors, security personnel and others who worked with the United States.

Sadly and unconscionably, the SIV process has long been plagued by severe delays and backlogs, leaving many applicants waiting years for their visas—and hundreds have been killed before receiving approval.

Currently, there are many thousands of applicants in the pipeline, not including their spouses and children. This delay is not only demoralizing—it is deadly, because of the imminent danger posed by Taliban.

The ALLIES Act builds on the HOPE for Afghan SIVs Act, as it increases the Afghan SIV cap, streamlines the application process and strengthens protections for surviving spouses and children, among other important steps.

And it does this without compromising the strict background check and national security vetting procedures or other processes to confirm eligibility.

The threat facing our “Afghan allies,” as the national security and defense community calls them, cannot be overstated.

According to the nonprofit organization No One Left Behind, more than 300 translators and their family members have been killed since 2014. Many died while waiting for their visas to be processed.

Over 90 percent of the hundreds of Afghan partners report having received at least one death threat because of their work with Americans.

One Afghan partner, who has been waiting six years for a visa decision, worries, “If the Taliban take over, they’ll easily find me and kill me. Then my wife will have no husband and my daughter will have no father.”

Another says, “I get phone calls from the Taliban saying, ‘We will kill you.’ They know who I am and that I worked for the Americans. If they find me, they’ll torture me and then kill me. It’s better if I just kill myself first.”

These courageous allies cannot wait a day longer.

As the United States prepares for and executes the strategic and important withdrawal from Afghanistan, we must do so in a way that protects those who protected us.

With that, I urge a strong and bipartisan vote for our “Afghan allies.”

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 535, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Mr. NADLER. 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 407, nays 16, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—407

Adams	Bergman	Budd
Aderholt	Beyer	Burchett
Aguilar	Bice (OK)	Burgess
Allen	Bilirakis	Bush
Allred	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Amodei	Bishop (NC)	Butterfield
Armstrong	Blumenauer	Calvert
Arrington	Blunt Rochester	Cammack
Auchincloss	Bonamici	Carbajal
Axne	Bost	Cárdenas
Bacon	Bourdeaux	Carl
Baird	Bowman	Carson
Balderson	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (LA)
Banks	F.	Carter (TX)
Barr	Brady	Cartwright
Barragán	Brown	Case
Bass	Brownley	Casten
Beatty	Buchanan	Castor (FL)
Bentz	Buck	Castro (TX)
Bera	Bucshon	Cawthorn

Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Miller (IL)
Cheney	Higgins (NY)	Miller (WV)
Chu	Hill	Miller-Meeks
Cicilline	Himes	Moolenaar
Clark (MA)	Hinson	Mooney
Clarke (NY)	Hollingsworth	Moore (UT)
Cline	Horsford	Moore (WI)
Cloud	Houlahan	Morelle
Clyburn	Hoyer	Moulton
Clyde	Hudson	Mrvan
Cohen	Huffman	Mullin
Cole	Huizenga	Murphy (FL)
Comer	Issa	Murphy (NC)
Connolly	Jackson	Nadler
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Correa	Jacobs (CA)	Neal
Costa	Jacobs (NY)	Neguse
Courtney	Jayapal	Nehls
Craig	Jeffries	Newhouse
Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Newman
Crenshaw	Johnson (LA)	Norcross
Crist	Johnson (OH)	Norman
Crow	Johnson (SD)	Nunes
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	O'Halleran
Curtis	Jones	Obenolte
Davids (KS)	Jordan	Ocasio-Cortez
Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Omar
Davis, Danny K.	Joyce (PA)	Owens
Davis, Rodney	Kahele	Palazzo
Dean	Kaptur	Pallone
DeFazio	Katko	Palmer
DeLauro	Keating	Panetta
DelBene	Keller	Pappas
Delgado	Kelly (IL)	Pascarell
Demings	Kelly (MS)	Payne
DeSaulnier	Kelly (PA)	Pence
Deutch	Khanna	Perlmutter
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Peters
Dingell	Kilmer	Pfleger
Doggett	Kim (CA)	Phillips
Donalds	Kim (NJ)	Pingree
Dunn	Kind	Pocan
Emmer	Kinzinger	Porter
Escobar	Kirkpatrick	Pressley
Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi	Price (NC)
Españalat	Kuster	Quigley
Estes	Kustoff	Raskin
Evans	LaHood	Reed
Fallon	LaMalfa	Reschenthaler
Feenstra	Lamb	Rice (NY)
Ferguson	Lamborn	Rice (SC)
Fischbach	Langevin	Rodgers (WA)
Fitzgerald	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)
Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	Latta	Rose
Fletcher	LaTurner	Ross
Fortenberry	Lawrence	Rouzer
Foster	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Fox	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Frankel, Lois	Lee (NV)	Ruppersberger
Franklin, C.	Leger Fernandez	Rush
Scott	Lesko	Rutherford
Fulcher	Letlow	Ryan
Gaetz	Levin (CA)	Salazar
Gallagher	Levin (MI)	Sánchez
Galleo	Lieu	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Lofgren	Scalise
Garbarino	Long	Scanlon
Garcia (CA)	Loudermilk	Schakowsky
Garcia (IL)	Lowenthal	Schiff
Garcia (TX)	Lucas	Schneider
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Gimenez	Luria	Schrier
Gohmert	Mace	Schweikert
Golden	Malinowski	Scott (VA)
Gomez	Malliotakis	Scott, Austin
Gonzales, Tony	Maloney,	Scott, David
Gonzalez (OH)	Carolyn B.	Sessions
Gonzalez,	Maloney, Sean	Sewell
Vicente	Mann	Sherman
Gooden (TX)	Manning	Sherrill
Gottheimer	Mast	Simpson
Granger	Matsui	Sires
Graves (LA)	McBath	Slotkin
Graves (MO)	McCarthy	Smith (MO)
Green (TN)	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Green, Al (TX)	McClain	Smith (NJ)
Griffith	McClintock	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McCollum	Smucker
Grothman	McEachin	Soto
Guest	McGovern	Spanberger
Guthrie	McHenry	Spartz
Hagedorn	McKinley	Speier
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Stansbury
Harris	Meeks	Stanton
Harshbarger	Meijer	Staubert
Hartzler	Meng	Steel
Hayes	Meuser	Stefanik
Herrell	Mfume	Steil

Steube	Trahan	Watson Coleman
Stevens	Trone	Weber (TX)
Stewart	Turner	Webster (FL)
Strickland	Underwood	Welch
Suzoi	Upton	Wenstrup
Swalwell	Valadao	Westerman
Takano	Van Drew	Wexton
Taylor	Van Dуйne	Wild
Tenney	Vargas	Williams (GA)
Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Williams (TX)
Thompson (MS)	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (PA)	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)
Tiffany	Wagner	Wittman
Timmons	Walberg	Womack
Titus	Walorski	Yarmuth
Tlaib	Waltz	Young
Tonko	Wasserman	Zeldin
Torres (CA)	Schultz	
Torres (NY)	Waters	

NAYS—16

Biggs	Gosar	Perry
Boebert	Greene (GA)	Posey
Brooks	Hern	Rosendale
DesJarlais	Hice (GA)	Roy
Duncan	Massie	
Good (VA)	Moore (AL)	

NOT VOTING—7

Babin	DeGette	Higgins (LA)
Carter (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Lynch
Cleaver	F.	

□ 1047

Mr. DESJARLAIS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 218.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 2021, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on the Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act of 2021 or the Allies Act (H.R. 3985) I wish the record to reflect that had I been present for rollcall No. 218, I would have voted “AYE.”

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Granger	Meng (Jeffries)
(Balderson)	(Calvert)	Napolitano
Boebert (Gosar)	Grijalva	(Correa)
Buchanan	(Stanton)	Payne (Pallone)
(LaHood)	Johnson (TX)	Porter (Wexton)
Comer	(Jeffries)	Reschenthaler
(Arrington)	Jones (Williams)	(Van Drew)
DeSaulnier	(GA))	Ruiz (Correa)
(Matsui)	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Frankel, Lois	(Stanton)	(Underwood)
(Clark (MA))	Lawrence	Salazar
Fulcher	(Beatty)	(Cammack)
(Simpson)	Lawson (FL)	Stewart (Moore)
Garcia (IL)	(Evans)	(UT))
(Garcia (TX))	McEachin	Titus (Connolly)
	(Wexton)	Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

□ 1100

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the floor schedule for next week, and I welcome the majority leader back to the colloquy. It is good to see him spry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 10:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. I want to make that clear. That is an acceleration from 12 p.m. We have a lot of business to do next week. We have a lot of appropriations bills, so we want to make sure that we are not meeting late, late into the night.

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

On Wednesday, the House is expected to meet at 11 a.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will expect to meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet, as usual, at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider at least 7 of the 12 appropriations bills for fiscal year 2022.

Recognizing the importance of completing our work well in advance of the deadline at the end of September, I would let the Members know that, unfortunately—well, first of all, let me say, we have marked up all 12 bills, and they have been reported out of committee.

The Senate has not reported out, nor considered a single appropriation bill. And we have 60 days before the end of the fiscal year, approximately, give or take.

The House will consider a seven-bill minibus, H.R. 4502. That bill will include seven appropriations bills: the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies bill; and Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies; Financial Services and General Government; Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies; Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies; Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

There will be additional bills on the appropriations. There are, obviously, after the seven, five additional appropriation bills that will be available for consideration. Three of those bills, as I understand it, have been noticed by the Committee on Rules for amendments to be filed. So they will be ready to go next week, and I am hopeful that we will be able to move some of those bills next week.

They will be the Legislative Branch appropriation bill; the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies appropriation bill; and the Department of

State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriation bill. That will leave the Department of Defense bill and the Department of Homeland Security bill.

Lastly, additional legislative items are possible. And that will be our schedule for the week to come. I expect it to be long days, which is why we are going in at 11 a.m. on one day and at 10 a.m. on two of the days, which we usually go in at 12. I would hope that that would preclude us from going very late at night, but I think everybody ought to expect that we will be here into the evening.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information as we look toward this appropriations process coming to the floor next week.

I would hope it doesn't take the same tone that it took in committee, and that is a hyper-partisan approach, which in years past, we have seen Republicans and Democrats come together to ultimately determine how best to fund this United States Government. And any bill that is going to get sent to the President's desk is going to ultimately be a bipartisan bill.

Unfortunately, that is not the bill that is going to be coming to the floor. There are a lot of very extreme radical elements that were put in that bill, but there was also something very alarming, and that was a break, a departure, from over 40 years of bipartisan agreement on what is known as the Hyde amendment.

Henry Hyde, in the 1970s, was able to get agreement between Republicans and Democrats to say on all the things we may disagree with, let's at least agree that taxpayer funding should not be used for abortions. And overwhelming majorities of Republicans and Democrats have supported that going back to 1976.

This appropriations bill guts the Hyde amendment. And why this Democrat majority decided to break from decades of bipartisan agreement on Hyde is perplexing. But I would hope, among many other things, we would be able to have that full debate on the House floor; that amendments like restoring Hyde would be made in order, not a closed process, not a very narrow process where the goal would be to push a hyper-partisan bill out of the House that won't become law, which means it would be a very futile exercise that we would be participating in next week, but, in fact, to work in a bipartisan way on those things that we can come to an agreement on about how to properly fund the government.

I am not sure if that is being anticipated with the seven bills that are coming in this bloated bus, but I would hope that the majority, as the Rules Committee looks to determine which amendments would be made in order, would go to an open process and let things like the Hyde amendment be debated, and frankly, to be supported in the bipartisan way that it has always enjoyed going back over 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the gentleman could shed light on that, and I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He is certainly accurate that the Hyde amendment has been in our bills for a very long period of time. What I think is not completely accurate is that it has been a bipartisan support, has enjoyed bipartisan support, and that there were Democrats who obviously supported the Hyde amendment.

And I realize that this has made it controversial, having been left out of the bill. I don't know what the Committee on Rules is going to do; we will have to see what they do. But in any event, I want to tell you that a large number on our side of the aisle believe that a constitutionally protected healthcare matter for women ought not to be determined by their financial ability.

So there is controversy with respect to Hyde. There is also controversy with respect to Federal employees as well, that I know well, because I chaired that subcommittee. We give to Federal employees the healthcare benefit, but then we say they can't use it for some things. Actually, that money is their money; it is not our money. It is given in compensation for their services.

But in any event, so there are controversies, I would tell the gentleman, and I am not sure exactly what the Committee on Rules is going to do and, therefore, don't want to speak for it.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, hopefully, like I said, we get the opportunity to have that open debate process so that we can bring amendments like restoring Hyde to this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask about something that is going to be coming up next week, and that is this January 6 Commission that the Speaker created is expected to meet next week.

Yesterday, we saw an alarming departure from Congressional tradition, and that is Speaker PELOSI unilaterally made a decision to remove minority members from that committee. You go through the history of Congress, and prior to this year, never has the Speaker denied the minority the ability to choose who they are going to put on committees. And not only did it happen yesterday with multiple members, a ranking member of a standing committee was removed, an officer in the United States Navy was removed from that committee, without explanation.

That, first of all, undermines all credibility that this committee will have. It is clear that now it is an attempt by the Speaker to just completely politicize that committee. Why the majority chose to abuse power in that way and deny minority rights in that way is perplexing, but it doesn't bode well for the institution, and it surely doesn't bode well for the impartiality and the credibility of this committee.

I don't know if the majority is looking at reconsidering that decision, but

obviously, it is unprecedented. And if the gentleman wants to explain that, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman can explain it. I think, frankly, your party is hoist on its own petard. We brought to this floor, with Mr. KATKO and Mr. THOMPSON agreeing on the process, offering to the House an equally divided five-and-five commission; the five Republicans being totally in the ambit of the minority leader. We brought it to the floor; the subpoena power being equally divided between the parties and having to cooperate in accomplishing the issuance of the subpoena. And very frankly, although there was some discussion of it, there was no doubt that the staff would have been resolved. The question of being equal staff on the Republican and Democratic side would have been resolved in the Senate.

I see the gentleman shaking his head. I can tell him, I know it would have been resolved; period. And the Republican Party objected to that commission, equally divided, five and five, with the minority leader strenuously lobbying against it being passed in the United States Senate. It was not passed in the United States Senate.

Press asked me, If it is defeated in the Senate, what are you going to do? I said, We are going to move forward, of course. And that is what we are doing. We are moving forward.

Now, the makeup of that committee, three of the persons who were appointed by the—excuse me—were recommended by the minority leader were accepted by the Speaker. And I am not going to spend a long time going into the quotes of the two or their premise, but all I can say is when asked the question, Ms. CHENEY, who I know you folks have kicked out of leadership because she tells the truth.

Mr. SCALISE. That was not the reason that Ms. CHENEY was removed as chair.

Mr. HOYER. Well, that is certainly one of the statements, however.

Mr. SCALISE. It had nothing to do with the statements that were made.

Mr. HOYER. That is one opinion.

Mr. SCALISE. An opinion we don't share because it is not accurate.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I clearly know we don't share that view, but it was referenced that, well she may have told the truth but she ought to stop telling the truth.

And that was one of the references that were made as you replaced her as your third in line because she—from our perspective—and I think from a large perspective of the American people—told the truth, and she continues to tell the truth.

And she was asked the question: What do you think about this non-partisan investigation? She said, I am absolutely confident that we will have a nonpartisan investigation that will look at the facts; that it will go wherever the facts may lead. There are three members from the minority lead-

er proposed that the Speaker did not object to. She has objected to two members. And the rhetoric around this from minority leader and from those two members has been disgraceful. Thus, this must be an investigation that is focused on facts. And the idea that any of this has become politicized is really unworthy of the office that we all hold and unworthy of our Republic.

So I don't blame you, and I probably would have taken the same reaction as you have taken. But very frankly, from the Speaker's perspective, and from others, this needs to be a commission that does in fact commit itself to going where the facts lead and determining the who, what, where, when, and why.

I have some very strong feelings as to why the insurrection, or as some say, the tourist visit—on your side of the aisle, Mr. Whip—the tourist visit that resulted in the death of a number of people, terrorizing Members of this House who thought their lives were in danger because people were trying to break into the House Chamber.

The rationalization of that activity has been rampant by many on your side of the aisle. We have some strong feelings on this, and we are going to get to the facts. And the American people will make the ultimate judgment, obviously. And we want to see that commission, again, hoist on your own petard, the overwhelming majority of you voted against a commission. Five Republicans appointed by the minority leader—appointed by, not recommended by—and five Democrats; subpoena power shared, and notwithstanding the fact that some of you, apparently, don't agree. I guarantee you, it would have been equal staffing. That would have been resolved. That was not a really big issue.

It was a make-up issue to vote “no” in the United States Senate because, in our view—so you understand—Donald Trump didn't want the commission.

□ 1115

So, Donald Trump was saluted, and we didn't get a commission, which was a commission that almost exactly to the jot and tittle, as Mr. KATKO said, what the minority leader asked for.

So, you don't like the result now. I get it. But I believe, as Ms. CHENEY said, this is going to be a factfinding select committee. Witnesses will say what they are going to say.

By the way, one of the people that was rejected by the Speaker may well be, and maybe both, witnesses before the select committee. I don't know that. Nobody has told me that. But that may be the case.

So, we are going to proceed. I know there is disagreement. That is not surprising. But you looked the opportunity that you asked for in the eye and rejected it, so here we are.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the opportunity that we asked for, and I think the majority leader knows that the minority leader put a number of issues on the table that he

wanted included in that review, and those were rejected. They were rejected by the Speaker, and they were rejected by the majority.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. The majority leader will have an opportunity, but there were a number of things you said that I think need to be cleaned up because they are just not accurate.

If you look at the Members that were kicked off from the minority side yesterday—still no explanation given, by the way—that includes a ranking member of a committee and an officer in the United States Navy who was removed yesterday by Speaker PELOSI with no reason given in an unprecedented way.

Maybe Speaker PELOSI and maybe this majority don't want to see all the facts come out because those two Members who were removed yesterday were raising very serious questions that ought to be answered, whatever those answers are. Whatever those facts are, they were publicly raising questions.

Maybe because they raised those questions that might be uncomfortable for the majority, they were removed from the committee with no explanation given. That had never happened before in the history of this Congress.

Again, if you want the facts, don't sit there and say that you want the facts if you are going to remove people who are trying to get facts, who are raising serious questions that should be answered. They raised them publicly, and they were going to raise them in the committee. Maybe because they were going to raise those tough questions, they were removed by the Speaker, Members of the minority who were removed by the Speaker.

I don't know if that is the new precedent that the majority leader wants to see in the future. But I will tell you, since the gentleman likes quoting LIZ CHENEY, I will read this quote from LIZ CHENEY: “Speaker PELOSI and the Democrat majority have no business determining which Republicans sit on committees.” That is from LIZ CHENEY, if the gentleman wants to quote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is that a quote about Mrs. GREENE?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, that is a quote about Mrs. GREENE, but it is a general quote about whoever it is. You could go down your list.

By the way, there were Members of the majority who are on that committee who voted on January 6 to reject electors. Maybe not this year's January 6, but as the gentleman knows, every Republican President this century has had Democrats on this House floor object to electors being seated, including multiple members of the January 6 committee on the majority side. They weren't removed. In fact, they were appointed by the Speaker.

Yet, two of our Members, who raised very serious questions about facts that should be answered, wherever those answers lead, were removed because

maybe the majority doesn't want all the facts to come out. Maybe they only want a certain narrative to come out. That is not an investigation. That is a kangaroo court, if that is the approach that is going to be taken.

But the action taken yesterday by the Speaker, the unprecedented action, undermines the credibility of that commission, and it is a shame for the institution because the Members we appointed were going there to find the facts, to help participate in finding the facts.

Clearly, that is not the interest now of this committee. That was exposed yesterday in the Speaker's unprecedented action.

It is not something that this institution, whether it is Republicans running it or Democrats—and as the gentleman knows, that pendulum swings both ways. But never before this year had a majority removed Members that minority leaders submitted for committees. It is just not what has happened in this institution. But, now, it seems to be the norm because maybe some people that are asking tough questions are asking too tough of questions that this majority doesn't want to be answered, kind of why this majority won't have a hearing on the origins of COVID.

In fact, it was Mr. JORDAN, along with myself and others, who has raised serious questions that have been backed up by many medical experts around this country that COVID-19 very likely started in the Wuhan lab and was leaked out. Medical experts from every walk of life have looked at the genetic makeup of this COVID-19 virus and said it couldn't have been transferred from bats to animals to humans. In fact, it was likely modified genetically in the lab in Wuhan.

Yet, there is not a single hearing that has been held by this majority on whether it was gain-of-function research, possibly funded with taxpayer money. All of those questions should be raised, but maybe the majority doesn't want those facts to come out.

We should want the facts to come out wherever they lead. So don't pound the desk and say you want the facts when you remove people who are asking questions to get at the facts. It shouldn't be a one-sided question and argument.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we passed said the Speaker would appoint all the members. These Members were not kicked off; they never got on.

LIZ CHENEY was asked whether that was the appropriate thing to do, and her response was—you had her quote: "I agree with what the Speaker has done."

Now, the reason she agreed—yes, they have raised questions, and on your side, you wanted to raise questions. You wanted to look at everything but January 6. Maybe January 6 as well,

but you wanted to look at this incident, that incident, the other incident, the incident over here. Are they relevant incidents? Sure, they are; but not to January 6.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, but why not look at all of them?

Mr. HOYER. Clearly, when you were in charge, you didn't look at some of the incidents that happened while you were in charge that were similar in nature. Very frankly, I think those incidents ought to be looked at, but not by this commission because they were incidents that did not involve insurrection; did not involve stopping the work of the Congress of the United States; did not terrorize Members of this House.

Now, I know that some of you have had pictures taken of you in this House. You looked pretty terrified to me. You thought there was something serious happening. This stuff that this was a tourist visit is absurd.

The issue of dissembling is not new. President Trump put that in an art form. If he didn't like what was going on here, he created something over here with a tweet or a comment or an action that he took. That is the shell game.

The issue is: What happened on January 6? What was the insurrection about? Why were people coming into the Capitol saying: Let's hang the Vice President of the United States—not of our party.

People shake their heads. I am not sure why they are shaking their heads. They saw it on television. They see it on the tapes over and over and over. They see people being convicted. I happen to think the sentences are too short. It was treason. It was treason based upon a lie.

We need to get to the bottom of it. What the Speaker has done is make sure that we are going to get to the bottom of it, notwithstanding the fact, and I will repeat again, all of you had the opportunity to vote five—five—shared subpoena, and the leader was empowered to appoint anybody he would want.

The legislation that passed this House said the Speaker would appoint—the Speaker. Did she consult with the minority leader? She did. Did she disagree with two that he appointed? She did, and she did not appoint them. That was in her power. And I agreed with her, and LIZ CHENEY agreed with her.

Why? Because that would have been dissembling, not looking for facts. Mr. JORDAN has said over and over again that he believes the election was stolen. Court after court after court after court said no proof. No proof.

So, we are where we are, and we are going to proceed. We are going to proceed, and if the Speaker decides to retain the three and name two others, so be it.

We are going to proceed. We are going to proceed, and we are going to get the facts, and we are going to get

those facts known to the American people. It is going to be widely covered. There are going to be a lot of witnesses. We are going to find out the who, the what, the where, and the why.

For the first time in history, Americans, Trump signs waving, stopped the business of the Congress of the United States—an insurrection and, from my view, a treasonous act. So, we are going to proceed.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if the facts were what the majority wants, then the majority wouldn't be afraid of certain Members asking tough questions that maybe the majority doesn't want.

Since the gentleman brought up Mr. JORDAN, I will tell you a question that Mr. JORDAN has been raising publicly. One of the questions Mr. JORDAN has been raising is: Why weren't the Capitol Police better equipped when there was intelligence prior, weeks prior to January 6, that there may be large crowds, that there may be threats? Why weren't the Capitol Police more equipped? Were National Guard offered to the Capitol that were rejected? And at what level, if that is the case, were they rejected?

Maybe he was starting to ask those questions. Maybe he should have just sat back and not raised those questions until after the committee started, but he started raising those questions.

By the way, they are important questions to be answered, but he won't be able to ask those questions about why the Capitol Police weren't better equipped because Speaker PELOSI yanked him off the committee when he was selected by the minority leader.

You can talk about the power of the Speaker and brag that that is her power, but just because you have the might doesn't make it right. What she did was an abuse. To say, "I am just going to choose who on the Republican side I am going to allow, but, boy, if some other Members are going to ask tough questions, I have the power to take them off," that is not what power is used for.

This House, this democracy, we should want the facts. If some Members are going to ask tough questions, you should want everybody to be asking tough questions. If the facts lead there, you go there. If the facts don't lead there, you go somewhere else and ask more tough questions.

If some Members are going to ask tough questions that the majority doesn't want to be asked, that undermines the credibility of that commission to remove them from asking those questions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman believe that the three Members that the Speaker accepted and was willing to appoint would not have asked those questions?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, they haven't said publicly whether they

would or not. Mr. JORDAN sure did. Again, maybe he was punished for raising tough questions in advance of the hearing instead of waiting.

But in the end, those were questions. Sheriff Nehls, who was also one of our selections, was right there with these brave Capitol Police officers, holding down the House of Representatives so that the Chamber wasn't breached. Sheriff Nehls was right there.

But, again, if the integrity of that commission is now undermined because Speaker PELOSI chose to remove people who were going to ask tougher questions, then, ultimately, it proves that this is not a commission set on finding the facts. It is a commission set on establishing a narrative regardless of the facts. That is a disgrace, for this institution to go down that road.

There is still time to reconsider. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the majority to reconsider how they use or abuse the power that is vested upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Your side had an opportunity to support the Capitol Police. Your side had an opportunity to support law enforcement. Your side had the opportunity to increase the capability of the Capitol Police to respond to insurrectionist, violent, and criminal agents.

Your side had that opportunity, and what did it do, to a person?

It voted "no," and we passed it. We passed support of the Capitol Police. We passed support to strengthen our defenses. We passed legislation to try to make the Capitol more secure and our Capitol Police safer. We passed that legislation with not a single one of your votes. It went to the Senate, and it sits. You read what that is doing to the morale of the Capitol Police along with some of your comments about the Capitol Police.

So you had that opportunity.

I will say to the Speaker, Republicans had that opportunity. Just as they rejected the five and five, they rejected support of the Capitol Police.

Seventeen of them voted against giving them a Gold Medal.

Why?

Because the insurrection was mentioned in the resolution, and, of course, there was no insurrection. It was a tourist visit, as they ambled politely through the Halls of the Congress saying how appreciative they were of the efforts being made by their Democratic Representatives.

If you saw it that way, if you believe that, it is impossible for me to understand why.

So I tell the whip, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican Party has had two opportunities to have an even, fair commission. They rejected them, apparently, according to what the whip says, because we didn't want to look at Seattle, we didn't want to look at this

city or that city or the other city or this, that, and the other.

By the way, President Biden made it very clear that those who committed criminal activities were not demonstrators, they were criminals. Biden said that, and I agree with him.

What they didn't want to look at is who recruited the crowd that came in here, who riled that crowd up, and who deployed them to the Capitol of the United States for the specific objective of stopping the steal, and what he meant, of course, is our acting.

His Vice President, whom he talked to on numerous occasions about stopping the election, concluded that that was not legal, that was not within his authority, and so he acted consistent with the law. That really annoyed Mr. Trump.

So here we are. We should have had a bipartisan commission. We should have moved that forward, and, yes, we should support the Capitol Police by adopting the supplemental.

By the way, the Senate supplemental is more in terms of dollars than the House supplemental. So it is not a question of we spent too much money to do this to make the Capitol safe, to make the Capitol Police armed, to give them the opportunity to get the intelligence that they need to proceed.

But what a distraction that the Capitol Police weren't prepared.

The question is not: Were they prepared?

The question is: Why did American citizens try to commit insurrection and treason in the Capitol of the United States and stopped our work?

Not for very long. We came back, we did our work, and we got it done to the benefit of our country, our democracy, and our image around the world. Our democracy was resilient.

Nobody was angrier, I will tell you—and I think Mr. SCALISE, you were there—Mr. Speaker, nobody was angrier about what was happening that night than MITCH MCCONNELL, the leader of the Senate, who said he believed subsequent to his voting against impeachment, but notwithstanding that, he believed the President bore responsibility, as the minority leader said, not all responsibility, but bore responsibility.

So we are going to look at this. You can talk all you want. Your leader has now decided he is going to withdraw the three and not participate. We regret that. But it is not going to stop us. It is not going to stop our getting at the truth. It is not going to stop our having the American people know the who, what, where, when, and why of the first time since 1812 when a foreign power invaded our Capitol that the Capitol of the United States was invaded by people who were seeking to undermine the democratic processes under our Constitution.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that as that commission starts, it will not include other Members, Republican Members, who wanted

to ask some of those tough questions in terms of supporting the police.

I don't think the gentleman has seen any stronger support for police than on this side of the aisle. I have been maybe more vocal than anyone about support for the United States Capitol Police because I wouldn't be here alive today without the bravery and heroism of the Capitol Police, and I think we all stand with them.

Ultimately, when you look at the supplemental that came through the House in May, there were a number of Members on the Democrat majority side who voted against that supplemental who have been vocal about defunding the police.

And, in fact, we have been trying to bring up H. Res. 352, which expresses support for police in opposition to this crazy, radical idea of defunding the police, where in many of these cities that have actually defunded the police, they have seen rapid increases in crime.

Even more—and I know I have held roundtables with sheriffs from the New Orleans area, as many of my colleagues have met with law enforcement—they will tell you the biggest challenge today, in addition to the growing crime wave, they are seeing is a demoralization around the country for police because they see these efforts to defund the police and they see elected officials speaking out publicly against police. It is not coming from the Republican side. I think the gentleman knows where it is coming from.

Why won't this bill be brought to the floor to just express support for police?

The fact is that the majority on the Democrat side will not bring a resolution to express support for police, H. Res. 352, by Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and others, at a time when we are seeing around the country not only a demoralization but an increase in resignations. People are leaving the great work of law enforcement because they see in those communities that have defunded the police a lack of support. Most sheriffs will tell you they are having trouble recruiting new people right now because of the attacks on police all around the country that we saw from the summer where cops were murdered, shot, beaten. Yet a resolution to express support to let them know that we have their back still won't be brought to the floor by this majority.

I hope the gentleman would look at bringing H. Res. 352 to the floor so that we can actually express to all police that we support them and that we do have their back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You had an opportunity to support the police and you voted with those who wanted to defund the police. All of you had an opportunity, just a few weeks ago while we had a bill on the floor, to support, to fund the Capitol Police to make them safer, more effective, and better able to enforce the law,

and you all, to a person, voted “no.” You had the opportunity, and you voted with those who you say on our aisle didn’t want to do that. But it passed.

Why did it pass?

Because the overwhelming, overwhelming, overwhelming majority of Democrats—it is the only reason it passed—voted to support the police, our Capitol Police. I will tell you that is also true of our Members in terms of supporting law enforcement at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Are there some who say some things?

Yes. There are some people who say some things on your side—I have quoted a couple of them—that I am sure you don’t support. But having said that, the proof is in the eating of the pudding. We had a bill on the floor that supported the police. You voted against it, every one of you.

Mr. Speaker, you can talk all you want about supporting them, but, very frankly, the bills you are going to be voting on next week support the police. They are not defunding.

Unlike the Trump budgets. If you look at the Trump budgets, who cut law enforcement funding?

Trump budgets.

Check me on that, and then come to the floor and say: HOYER is not telling the truth. Check me.

You had an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the minority had an opportunity to support the police. They all voted “no.” The Senate is doing the same. It is a shame because it is undermining the morale of the Capitol Police. You have seen that reported in the newspapers. This is not me saying it. They don’t understand why.

Mr. SCALISE is absolutely right. The Capitol Police have kept him, in particular, and others who were attacked by a crazed, apparently left-wing, but crazed bad person, he may be mentally defective, but he did a very bad act, and he was targeting Republicans. We all stood up when Mr. SCALISE was in the hospital and thanked the Capitol Police for protecting him and others on that site. That was a terrible, terrible, venal criminal act. The guy was probably a Democrat. I don’t know. We have called him out for being that. That is what we ought to all do.

On January 6, some very bad criminal people acted in this Congress and in this Capitol against our democracy and against our Constitution, and we want to study it. We want to get the facts so it doesn’t happen again and so we know who is fomenting this insurrectionist psychology and who rationalizes it on this floor now.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will just point out that President Biden himself a year ago said he supports efforts to divert money away from police, which, by the way, is the same thing as defunding police. If you are diverting money away from police, then you are defunding police. But, again, there is a resolution that has been sitting out there for a while now express-

ing support. I hoped we would bring that to the floor and express that support.

There are also a number of other issues dealing with inflation. We are seeing a dramatic increase in inflation across this country. Everything someone buys when going to a grocery store, we are paying more for things like eggs and milk. If you try to go on a summer vacation right now, you are paying over 40 percent more for gasoline. You are seeing it across the board, and that dramatic increase in inflation is a tax. It is a tax on hardworking families.

This chart shows for the gentleman so many of those things. Used cars are up 45 percent, if you can even find a car to buy because there is such a shortage when the government is paying people not to work.

The borrowing, by the way, and spending of trillions of dollars—which are some of the items that are going to be coming to the floor next week and beyond, trillions more, much of it deficit spending—is part of the reason we are seeing inflation: gas 45 percent up, home prices 15 percent up, milk 5 percent, laundry machines 29 percent, if you can get one. You might have to wait 6 months to get a washer and dryer.

All of this is a tax on hardworking, middle-class families.

What we should be doing is bringing legislation to the floor to confront these problems, not to keep spending trillions and trillions more in deficit spending and higher taxes that ultimately would lead to more evaporation of middle-class jobs which is what the majority is bringing, but I would hope that the gentleman would look at working with Republicans on legislation to start addressing some of these problems that are affecting household families all across the country.

□ 1145

Republican, Democrat, Independent, doesn’t matter, they are seeing this problem, and they would like to see this Congress confront it, not make it worse with more deficit spending, with more multitrillion-dollar spending bills and higher taxes that will ship more jobs overseas, shutting down energy production in America.

While the President is signing or authorizing agreements with Russia to use pipelines to ship their energy to other countries, he is shutting down pipelines in America so that we can use more of our natural resources, again, leading to higher prices across the board, things that are adversely affecting families.

I hope we can bring legislation to confront these challenges to the floor, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have brought them to the floor. We are going to continue to bring them to the floor, and we hope Republicans support them.

We created 3 million new jobs; more jobs in our first 5 months than any administration in history—the gentleman forgot to mention that figure—double the monthly rates of the 5 months prior to that under the Trump administration.

The average number of new unemployment insurance claims has been cut in half. Last week, that number was about 400,000. The same week last year, it was 1.5 million under the Trump administration. Small business optimism has returned to its 2019 average. The economy grew at 6.4 percent in the first quarter. Independent projections from CBO, the IMF, the Federal Reserve, the World Bank, OECD, and many others all forecast America this year reaching the highest level of growth in nearly four decades.

Furthermore, as the gentleman knows, the Director of the Federal Reserve has opined that he thinks, yes, there is a surge in inflation. Yes, we are concerned about it. The Federal Reserve is watching it. We are watching it. We want to keep inflation in check.

The gentleman referenced that we are paying people not to work. Let me remind the gentleman, we had four bills which did similar things which were passed in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion last year, overwhelming bipartisan fashion, and none of them would have become law without the signature of President Donald Trump.

Now what happened? Donald Trump left, and bipartisanship left with him; not because he was so bipartisan, but he thought that what we were doing was good for the people, and therefore, I think he thought, good politics. I think that is accurate.

The fact is that this economy is now doing exactly what we want it to do. It is growing. Now it surged. There is no doubt about that, and that surge has resulted in inflation hiking at a higher rate than we would like, including the products that the whip mentioned, Mr. Speaker.

We need to contain inflation because it does rob those particularly on fixed incomes. But the multitrillions that were spent last year, one of which, the CARES Act spent—was almost a unanimous vote in this House—\$2 trillion. So we did that because we believed that the magnitude of the challenge confronting us by COVID-19, both to the health of our people and the health of our economy, demanded such a robust response.

One of our Members who had been vaccinated—some Members hadn’t been vaccinated—has come down with it. Now, hopefully, the vaccinations that he has will moderate any adverse impact of this delta virus. But I would say to the gentleman, it is a little bit like the commission, that we want to focus on the bad news, not focus on the good news. The gentleman wants to focus on other news, not the central news of the insurrection, and I understand that strategy.

But there is a lot of good news happening in America. There is some bad news, too. Part of it is because people haven't gotten vaccinated. The gentleman's State has that problem; Mississippi has that problem; South Carolina and some other States have that problem; my State has that problem. Not to the extent of some other States, but all 50 States are seeing a surge. So giving up and getting off the field at this point in time is not appropriate.

I think that we are going to find that the President's program that he suggests, as he says, and I agree, will have a generational impact for decades to come in making sure that our economy continues to grow; that our people are educated; that we expand the middle class; lift people out of poverty, as we did with children who are now 50 percent of them are going to be lifted out of poverty. That is good news for America. It is good news for all of us. Those kids are going to be better educated and make more productive contributions to our society.

So I hope a number of Members will support pieces of legislation that will carry that vision of the President into fruition, and we will work toward that end.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we look at those bills coming to the floor next week, frankly, they would make those problems worse. I know when we talk about the inflation side—we talk about inflation, because it is the thing we hear the most when we talk to our constituents back home, because regardless of the statistics, the data is little solace if you see your dollar going for less further, less far. In fact, you see your dollar not going as far because whatever you are making, you are spending even more money than you were spending before and waiting longer to get things because of these policies.

In fact, the spending itself is part of the problem that is leading to inflation. People get that. And so they look at these multitrillion-dollar spending bills and they are starting to ask the questions: What is really in those bills? If it is not things to help my family, because I am paying more with all of this new spending, what is in it?

We just found out today there are millions of dollars in the bill that is coming to the floor next week specifically just for one entity, Planned Parenthood of Mar Monte, San Jose, California; Planned Parenthood, the largest provider of abortions in the country. So not only is Hyde being discarded, the mutually agreed upon, bipartisan, and not just Henry Hyde with a few other people. Henry Hyde passed this in the 1970s under a Democrat majority. Democrats and Republicans said taxpayer funding shouldn't be used to provide abortions, and it had always been sacrosanct in spending bills that this Congress passed, Republican and Democrat, since that time until now.

So not only are they gutting Hyde in the bill, but they are putting millions

of dollars into Planned Parenthood by name. This is what drives people nuts when they see that kind of spending and a disconnect because they are paying more money for regular household goods. And instead of us confronting that on the floor, they see this kind of spending that is generational, because it is the next generation that will have to pay for it. Because as much as it seems this majority wants to raise taxes to spend more money, even all the taxes that would run more jobs out of this country don't cover all of this kind of radical spending.

I would hope we go a different direction. We surely will be opposing that kind of radical spending and it surely won't be helping those families who just want answers, who just want to see relief from the problems that they are facing.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It was not radical spending in 2020, because Trump signed the bills. Trump left, and it became radical spending. That is situational ethics, Mr. Speaker. I will leave it at that.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, the final point I would like to bring up to the leader, we are seeing something that is actually very encouraging in Cuba; that is, the people of Cuba taking to the streets to demand freedom; something that has been decades in the making. I would hope that we see all government leaders, Republican, Democrat, executive branch, legislative branch, all expressing our support for the Cuban people who seek freedom, because I think one of the most heartfelt signs that I know I saw, and so many of my colleagues saw just a week ago, were not only people taking to the streets to call for freedom, they were carrying the American flag in Cuba.

We see this all around the world. It is one of the things that for all of our differences brings us together, and that is that here in the United States Congress, we are not only working to promote freedom in this country and to preserve it for future generations, but this freedom that we work to preserve inspires people all around the world. Whether it is Cuba, or in Iran which we saw years ago, or any other country, when people seek freedom, there is really only one flag that they wave, and that is the United States flag.

Our colleague, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, whose family fled Cuba, like so many of our colleagues, some first generation. CARLOS GIMENEZ, former mayor of Miami-Dade, personally fled Cuba seeking freedom—and talking about the American Dream—he is a first generation who fled a socialist nation who is now a sitting, voting Member of the United States Congress, who now wants to express support for the Cuban people.

So there is a resolution, H. Res. 527, that expresses our solidarity standing with the people in Cuba who are seeking freedom. I would just ask the gen-

tleman if he would look at bringing that bill to the floor. The people in Cuba are trying to get that freedom, and they are being heavily oppressed. Many may even be being murdered right now as they have shut down the internet. They shut out the media, because there is no freedom of the press.

We are hearing stories that are very alarming. If we can express our support that we are standing with those people in Cuba who do seek freedom as well, I think it would be a strong signal. I ask the gentleman if we could bring that to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. As he knows, the President of the United States has strongly expressed support of those who are seeking freedom and liberty in Cuba. He said that shortly after the demonstrations occurred. He has maintained that position. I share that opinion with him, and we are discussing what action we might be taking here in this House.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. Hopefully, we can work together to get that brought to the floor and express that support in unison and that would send a strong message.

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

HONORING GOLD STAR FAMILIES

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to bring American troops home from Afghanistan, it is important to recognize those who weren't able to make it home.

With that in mind, I rise to honor our Nation's Gold Star families, mothers, fathers, husband, wives, siblings, and children with a loved one who died in service to our country.

I have deep gratitude for the families who have suffered such a painful loss, families like that of Captain Joseph Schultz, who was killed in action in Afghanistan in 2011. Captain Schultz's mother, Betsy, channeled her grief over losing her only child into action, forming a nonprofit respite home for other Gold Star families, the Captain Joseph House in Port Angeles, Washington.

The Captain Joseph House, and organizations like it, provide a network of support and comfort for the surviving family members. Their work matters, and we should be grateful for it.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my gratitude to all who have lost a loved one in service to our country.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the pro-life Hyde amendment. Typically,

during appropriation season, of course, Democrats and Republicans debate our differences, but we have always historically rallied together in opposition to taxpayer-funded abortions, and we have adopted the bipartisan Hyde amendment.

However, for some inexplicable reason, this year is different. In 1994, then-Senator Joe Biden famously stated: "Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them." Of course, he was right. But the President's position has changed now, giving fuel to the fire of Democrat leadership here in this House to follow suit in their own funding bills.

It is time to make these Hyde amendment protections permanent. It is true: Hyde saves lives. And today I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize the inherent dignity of every single human life, rejecting this blatant attack on pro-life amendments like the Hyde amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in this House.

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

□ 1200

STANDING WITH THE CUBAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. CORREA. Today, Mr. Speaker, I stand with the Cuban people in their struggle for freedom.

Today, I ask that the Cuban Government respect basic human rights, basic religious freedoms, freedom of speech, freedom of association, and the freedom to be heard.

Today, I ask that the Cuban Government listen to the plight of the Cuban people.

Deteriorating living conditions, rising healthcare concerns, COVID-19, all of these factors have left the Cuban people hungry, vulnerable, and very angry.

That is why, after decades of repression, thousands of brave men and women, especially young people, have taken to the streets of Cuba, marching to be heard, demanding that the Cuban Government respond to their pleas for help.

Instead, the Cuban Government has responded by halting internet access and beating and arresting Cuban citizens that are calling for freedom.

In Havana alone, the Cuban Government has attacked protesters and arrested more than 100 young people.

If the Government of Cuba wants to normalize relations with the United States, the first thing the Cuban Government has to do is to respect human rights and religious freedoms.

STANDING AGAINST THE CASTRO REGIME

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

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Cuban people and against the illegitimate, violent dictatorship that continues to assault the basic freedoms and rights of the Cuban people.

This photo here behind me is of two of my heroes, my abuelo and abuela. In 1960, they and their children were forced from their homeland by the communist regime for having the audacity to say no to Castro and his thugs.

Sixty years later, that same regime and that same poisonous ideology wreak terror on the Cuban people as the people march courageously in the streets, knowing full well what brutality awaits them as they ask for the most basic of human rights.

Yet, there are some in this body who foolishly wish to blame America for the plight of the island and the suffering of the Cubans. Let me say emphatically that the Cuban people are suffering and crying out for freedom because the communists have spent 60 years cynically destroying their country and trying to break the spirit of their own people. They will not succeed.

I stand firmly against the Castro regime and any of their apologists, and I stand with the Cuban people who are crying out for freedom.

PROTECTING VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

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

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout my career, I have worked to protect vulnerable populations.

Yesterday, I was proud to support the Consumer Protection and Recovery Act, which will aim to protect exploited consumers, including the elderly, who are oftentimes the most at risk.

The Federal Trade Commission has an essential role to safeguard consumers from businesses that utilize misleading and deceptive practices. These bad actors must be held accountable, and the victims of any scam deserve justice.

I appreciate the leadership of the House Energy and Commerce Committee to ensure that the FTC has the capabilities it needs to protect all individuals from fraud.

I encourage our Senate colleagues to consider this important legislation as soon as possible.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, nearly 20 years ago, I introduced legislation in this House, which passed the House and the Senate. President George W. Bush signed it into law, and it went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court and now is the law of the land. It banned partial-birth abortion in this country.

While that was landmark legislation, today, it is more important than ever that we protect innocent unborn life.

That is why, a little over a month ago, the city of Lebanon in my congressional district back home became one of more than 30 cities across the country, and the first in Ohio, to become a sanctuary city for the unborn.

It is why I have consistently and enthusiastically supported legislation which would get rid of the funding for Planned Parenthood and its affiliates and supported legislation like H.R. 18, which codifies the Hyde amendment to ensure that Federal taxpayer money does not fund abortions.

And it is why, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

We should not allow tax dollars to go for funding other people's abortions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

GUN VIOLENCE PLAGUES OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the gun violence plaguing this country and the elected officials who stand by and watch, content on not passing new laws to address its scourge on the American people.

I rise for the 9-year anniversary of the mass shooting that took place in a movie theater in Aurora, Colorado, 9 years ago this week—12 lives gone, 70 injured.

I rise for all of those who were at the baseball game just this last weekend around the corner, running for their lives because they heard there was a shooting.

Your gun rights are not under attack when 23 million firearms were sold in the United States of America in 2020 alone. But what is under attack is your ability to live freely in this country without the threat of gun violence in a movie theater, in your place of worship, in your school, in your backyard, or driving around at night.

I rise for the students who marched for their lives, and I rise because the need to pass a law for gun safety is of the fierce urgency of the now.

REMEMBERING HERB HEILBRUN

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, this past December, America lost another hero from our Greatest Generation, Herb Heilbrun.

Born and raised in Cincinnati, Herb enlisted in the Army Air Corps after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He flew 35 missions during World War II, where he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross for saving the lives of his crew after his plane was hit.

Following the war, Herb returned to Cincinnati, where he worked in sales and real estate before being named president of the Cincinnati Board of Realtors in 1970.

Herb's service did not stop after the war. Herb Heilbrun devoted the later years of his life to traveling our great United States of America with his best friend, a fellow Cincinnati and Tuskegee airman named Johnny Leahr. They reached out to teach students the importance of respect, racial tolerance, and friendship.

Herb was truly a beloved member of our community. Always appearing at veterans' events, proudly in his uniform, he passed away at the age of 100.

It was a privilege for me to call Herb Heilbrun my friend. May we all honor him for his life of service and dedication to our country, to his community, and to his family. May he rest in peace.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill to rename a post office in Avondale after Herb and John, and I urge the House to pass it without delay.

HONORING HAZEL ERBY, BETTY THOMPSON, AND HENRY GIVENS, JR.

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

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise today with heavy hearts. Since the beginning of July, we have lost three civil rights giants in our community: Ms. Hazel Erby, Ms. Betty Thompson, and Dr. Henry Givens, Jr.

Mama Hazel and Mama Betty were trailblazers, breaking down barriers for Black women and all Black people to be leaders in St. Louis and beyond. I would not be Missouri's first Black Congresswoman without the doors that they opened up for me.

Dr. Henry Givens, Jr., led Harris-Stowe State University for 32 years. His leadership transformed Harris-Stowe, the university I attended, from a small college with just one building into the nationally acclaimed HBCU that it is today.

We will miss them all dearly, but together, we are St. Louis strong. We will

carry their work forward to build a more just future for all of us.

REOPEN U.S.-CANADA BORDER

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

Mr. JACOBS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration announced that it would once again extend the U.S.-Canada border closure for nonessential travel until August 21.

This is yet another example of the President's failure on this issue. His second day in office, he signed an executive order calling for a plan. That never happened.

We have sent multiple letters from my office calling for answers. They have gone unanswered.

Reporters have asked for clarity. The White House has dodged.

Families and small businesses have pleaded for action so they can reunite and recoup lost revenue. They have been ignored.

Canada has announced that they will allow fully vaccinated Americans in the country starting in August. This is long overdue but still light years ahead of our President.

This extension is unacceptable, ignores the science, and extends the suffering of families and small businesses in my region.

Reopening the border for non-essential travel can be done safely. The time for stalling and silence has long passed. The Biden administration needs to act immediately and reopen our shared border.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(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, as elected Representatives, we are obligated to handle taxpayer dollars in a manner that is both responsible and above reproach. For decades, legislators, through provisions such as the Hyde amendment, have rightfully shielded hardworking citizens' tax dollars from the unethical practice of abortion.

However, countless legislative proposals this Congress prove that my colleagues across the aisle are not interested in preserving vital pro-life, good government provisions upon which our constituents depend, as they have intentionally eliminated the Hyde amendment at every opportunity. By removing pro-life provisions like Hyde, we are subjecting the American people to funding practices that violate the sanctity of life.

I could speak at length about the horrors of abortion, but the simple fact of the matter is this: Taxpayer dollars should never financially support abortion, and we should always protect the conscience rights of our constituents.

As such, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

I am proud to stand up for the lives of the unborn, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

EXTREME DROUGHT IN MINNESOTA

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, most of Minnesota is in extreme drought, and many of our farmers are facing a tremendous hardship.

There are reports that herd culling is already being done around the region due to the lack of quality feed, and farmers will soon be forced to make impossible decisions regarding their crops and livestock.

The situation is serious and demands our attention. I have asked the administration to allow emergency haying and grazing on CRP lands now, but that request was met with silence.

If the drought continues to worsen, and if the administration does not act, the impacts on our economy will be far-reaching.

In the meantime, I stand ready to assist my constituents in navigating these challenges and working toward quick recovery.

□ 1215

WE NEED TO REIN IN SPENDING

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

Mrs. STEEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about rising inflation and the burden this is having on American taxpayers.

President Biden promised not to raise taxes on middle-class Americans, but the rising price of essentials like groceries, gas, and appliances are making our paychecks worth less.

Gas prices are up 45.1 percent.

In my home State of California, gas is more than \$1 higher than the national average. We already pay some of the highest taxes in the country.

And make no mistake, this inflation is a hidden tax on every single American.

Despite these rising costs that American families are paying the price for, President Biden has insisted that the solution is to spend trillions more.

American families are going to continue feeling the consequences as long as President Biden's reckless tax-and-spending spree continues. We need to rein in spending and lower taxes for

those we serve, not spend trillions and leave future generations in debt.

HONORING ANTONIO "TONY" RANGEL

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

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Antonio "Tony" Rangel, a longtime veteran from the city of Placentia, who is now the namesake of American Legion Post 277.

Mr. Rangel served in the United States Army during the Korean war and has spent more than half of his life as a member of the American Legion.

Mr. Rangel has not only served our Nation, but also has long been a pillar of our Placentia community. He was named Placentia Citizen of the Year in 1989 and continues to live up to that title each and every day.

It is only fitting that the Post 277 building is officially the Antonio "Tony" Rangel Hall.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Rangel for his service to our country and to California's 39th Congressional District.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my good friend from the State of Texas (Mr. GOHMERT.) It is always a pleasure to be with him.

Today I want to talk about something that is near and dear to all of us. Maybe I am exaggerating when I say dear to all of us. But I am referring to a Federal agency that at one time former Senator Orrin Hatch described as the most feared Federal agency in our country. I am talking about the IRS; I am talking about right now the operations of the IRS.

In recent months we have learned that the agency has yet to process millions and millions of tax returns filed over the past 3 years. People across this country have been waiting to receive money that is theirs far longer than is reasonable. The agency should be working night and day to catch up.

I want to take this opportunity also to thank my friends on both sides of the aisle, because for most people in our districts, we are the IRS. We are the people answering those tough questions and helping them navigate in an almost impossible Federal agency in order to get things done.

Now, at the same time as this backlog persists, the agency is doing things that take us back to the last time that Mr. Biden was in the White House, and we have returned to those bad, old,

dark days of the Obama administration when Lois Lerner and her cronies were targeting conservative, nonprofit organizations because of their political views.

Just weeks ago, the IRS was caught red-handed, once again. In a letter declining a nonprofit status to a Christian organization, the agency decried biblical teachings as a nonneutral, politically oriented form of speech. These bureaucrats had the audacity to say that the organization's Bible teachings about the Christian faith, which are shared by millions upon millions of Americans of all different political views, were too aligned with the Republican Party to warrant nonprofit status.

Now, upon learning of this shameful decision, my friend from Texas, KEVIN BRADY, and I joined Americans across this country to demand answers as to how the IRS could come to such an egregious conclusion. Thankfully, and only because of this oversight and the exposure to what happened, our legislative oversight and the public's righteous indignation caused this agency to reverse its course; but, again, only because of our oversight and the exposure to what was actually taking place within this agency.

This IRS needs more oversight and accountability if we are to expect it to do the right thing. But the one thing I want to explain to all of our citizens across the country, if you get a call from the IRS, understand that that call is not from the IRS. The IRS will only contact you by mail. When I go home, and I think all of my colleagues are the same, I hear people tell me, "The IRS called me." I say, "That is not the IRS. That is a scam."

But you know what? There are things we have to do. We have not only an obligation, we have a responsibility to improve all Federal agencies.

Now, it is sad to say that the only scandal entangling the IRS this year isn't the one I just talked about. In an outrageous criminal act, someone, either inside or outside the IRS, breached IRS systems and leaked the confidential tax records of thousands and thousands of Americans to a left-wing propaganda outlet, Pro Publica, which proceeded to publish these private financial details in pursuit of a political narrative on tax policy.

This is an astonishing breach of trust that should cause every American to wonder if his or her own tax information could be weaponized against them. It is not farfetched. When President Donald Trump's tax returns were leaked to The New York Times last year, I noted that if this could happen to the President of the United States, it could happen to any American.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here we are. In 2019, the late Representative John Lewis and I worked together to figure out how we could reform the IRS so that it would better serve our taxpayers. We worked as friends, set aside any political differences we may have

had, and authored the Taxpayer First Act, which was passed with overwhelming support from this entire Congress and signed into law by President Trump 2 years ago in July of 2019.

The primary intent of this legislation was to make the IRS a customer-service-oriented agency. Our tax system is a voluntary system. After all, this is one of the few Federal entities that Americans will interact with consistently for their entire lives. From their birth until their death they will have actions within the IRS.

There are few things more intimidating than having to resolve a dispute with the IRS, so making it a resource rather than an adversary was our chief aim. That is what we were trying to get to.

But how can an agency that takes years to process tax returns, leaks private financial records to damage certain taxpayers, and wields its vast power to punish people or organizations with certain political or religious views be seen as anything other than an adversary?

The IRS is one of the most powerful forces in our lives. I have heard this so many times when I go back home, and I am sure you have heard it, and I am sure most Americans feel the same way: People tell me, "I don't mind paying my taxes as long as those moneys that I put in get used the right way, but I do fear the agency with which I have to interact."

Let's work together to hold this agency accountable. It is not all members of the IRS who we are criticizing or who we are looking at right now. We are talking about certain things that happen within that agency that absolutely are terrifying to the average American.

We, as a body, representing everyone in this country, need to take a look at where it is that we are failing and where it is that this agency has failed and why it has become such an intimidating agency.

If you want to restore the faith in any of our agencies or any of the things that we do in our life, you do it by actually working within the framework of that agency and looking at what we can do as the personal representatives of the American people to cure the situation as it is now and make the IRS a service-based agency and not one of intimidation.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much those observations. It is so important for everybody to understand, the IRS is feared, and we learn through people like Lois Lerner that it is not always honest, and yet nobody has been held to account. I am hoping that at some point that will occur. I am so grateful to my friend from Pennsylvania.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ).

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the Nation's attention to a tragic event unfolding in my State of Oregon, the horrifically destructive Bootleg fire.

This fire, now the third largest in my State's history, has consumed some 400,000 acres. That is about 660 square miles of previously beautiful landscape, pine, fir, sagebrush, grass, and meadows. The fire has taken millions of board feet of timber, the lives of thousands of forest creatures, cattle by the dozens, if not hundreds, horses, fences, buildings, and homes. The fire has released hundreds of thousands of tons of carbon, which could have remained sequestered far into the future. The smoke plume created by this conflagration has reached across this Nation, more than 2,000 miles, to pollute the air across the U.S., reaching finally the East Coast, including the air right here in Washington, D.C.

I have spoken with people whose homes and ranches were in the path of this fire. It moved so fast they could not gather and remove their cattle in time to save them. They have been sending me pictures of animals that have perished and pictures of many others who had to be put down because of injuries they suffered from the flames from which they could not escape. These are truly some of the saddest photos I have ever seen.

How did we get here? Fires happen naturally in our Western forests. They have always been a part of the Western landscape. These fires used to burn low to the ground at relatively low temperatures. Underbrush, vegetation, and smaller trees would burn, and in what were normal times, larger trees would survive.

Then about 100 years ago, our Nation decided to put out and suppress these fires. For years the trees and brush that grew unabated by fire were reduced to some extent by logging activities then allowed in our forests.

In the 1970s, forests saw the beginning of a steep reduction in forest management, and our forests began to grow unnaturally dense. Federal regulations decimated the timber industry, leaving more and more trees and brush on our Federal lands. The fires, fueled by this huge amount of ever-increasing woody mass, grew in their ferocity and danger. And now, after years of fire suppression and woefully inadequate forest management, we are paying the price.

The horrific infernos we are seeing out West are not the fires of centuries past. These terrifying, out-of-control wildfires become so immense, they often start burning from the top of the trees, not from the underbrush, leaping from treetop to treetop, causing the fire to travel faster and burn hotter.

The blame for our forests' deplorable and dangerous condition does not belong to any one person or group. However, I must call out the massive special-interest lawsuit industry that profits from the operation of the Equal Access to Justice Act by legally kneecapping almost every attempt to manage our Western forests.

□ 1230

So what is the long-term solution? We are seeing some early evidence that

managed forests fared far better than did forests that were not thinned or otherwise treated in anticipation of the fires that are sure to come. Firefighters on the ground indicated that thinned areas slowed down the fires so that firefighters had a fighting chance to bring the fire in those areas under control.

This is good news because it means there is some hope. There is a way out of this if Congress can find the political will to work toward a solution.

I am pleased to report I am working with ranking member BRUCE WESTERMAN, whose Resilient Federal Forests Act will be a huge step toward giving the Forest Service the tools it needs to better manage our vast public lands.

In fact, today, I introduced legislation included in that package, the Commonsense Coordination Act. This bill will cut through some of the red tape that agencies must overcome to complete critical forest management activities.

I express my sympathy to the people suffering from the Bootleg fire and all the fires across the West. My staff and I have been on nonstop calls with local officials, county commissioners, and ranchers. The experiences they are sharing are incredibly sad and made more so by the fact that we could have done so much better when it came to protecting our Nation's forests and those that live in and around them. I will continue to do all I can here in Congress to help.

Lastly, I thank all the brave men and women who are out fighting the fires, including firefighters, farmers, ranchers, helicopter pilots and others. This is hot, dirty, difficult, and dangerous work, but their tireless efforts are saving lives, homes, forests, wildlife, livestock, and property.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BENTZ, and I have to give a shout-out to BRUCE WESTERMAN as the ranking member on the Natural Resources Committee. This very morning, we had a Republican group, but we couldn't get the whole committee to do it on that very issue of forest fires and maintaining healthy forests.

Hopefully, we will get the majority to understand it is not enough to just let nature take its course. You trim the undergrowth. You have fire lanes so you can stop a fire when it gets started. There are so many things that Republicans understand is just good forest management.

So whether it is lightning or something else that starts a fire, we don't have to see 400,000 acres go up in flames. This administration is determined not to do proper management of the forests, and so many people get hurt.

I am proud to have a colleague like Mr. BENTZ that will stand up for what is best for forests, for nature, and has a lot of common sense in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Encounters at the southern border have reached a 20-year high of now over one million illegals trying to smuggle themselves into our country. This proves that the Biden administration's immigration policies are not working and that they have reignited a crisis at our southern border previously contained by the Trump administration.

In fact, the border crisis is getting so bad that States not even geographically connected to the border are feeling the effects.

Just last week I was traveling down I-24 East from Nashville, Tennessee, to Chattanooga, Tennessee, and larger than day was this huge yellow billboard that said: "CRISIS, Biden Fix the Border." The problems are drugs, cartels, and illegals. This was not some political party that put up that billboard, it was organic. It was home-grown right from the heart of the American people. The message is crystal clear, and America should stand up and take notice.

So why am I seeing this sign in Tennessee, a State that has no connection to the southern border? It is because the Biden administration is flying illegals to every State in the Union making every State a border State. This must stop.

Further complicating the crisis, the Biden administration is considering the elimination of title 42, a Centers for Disease Control public health authority that allows border officials to turn back illegal migrants due to the danger posed by communicable diseases.

By doing this, the Biden administration is not only preventing U.S. border officials from doing their jobs, but unnecessarily exposing American citizens to the dangers of COVID-19.

Since the beginning of the crisis, the Biden administration's reckless policies implemented by executive order have been exposing communities to COVID-19 by refusing to test every illegal migrant that is apprehended.

Even Secretary Mayorkas himself admitted to me in a committee hearing that his agency has released illegals into the interior of the United States who are known to be infected with COVID-19. Local communities are then forced to deal with it.

This is simply unacceptable.

For these reasons I introduced H.R. 2076, the COVID-19 Border Protection Act. My bipartisan legislation requires the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with Health and Human Services, to develop a comprehensive strategy to test illegals that are encountered at the border and quarantine those who test positive. With the rise of the new COVID-19 delta variant, it is critical that every illegal alien who crosses the border be tested.

H.R. 2076 has bipartisan support and 41 cosponsors, including the support of all the GOP Members of the House Homeland Security Committee.

I will continue to push this effort to safeguard the American people and will soon introduce an amendment to the fiscal year 2022 DHS appropriations that will help accomplish the goals of H.R. 2076.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation. I thank my good friend and colleague from Texas for holding this very important Special Order.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Georgia so much for making the effort to stand up for the constitutional rights of Members of Congress not to be detained from getting onto the House floor. We have metal detectors still at each entrance. We didn't used to have them at the Speaker's lobby. Those have been added.

We are co-plaintiffs in a lawsuit that will, hopefully, result in those being removed so that we won't continue to have Republicans miss votes because they get detained, even for the short time, when the Speaker has full discretion as to when to bring down the gavel. We have had a number of Republicans who have missed votes that they would not have missed were there no metal detectors, and especially since there is no intelligence from any source of any Member being a threat to another Member then this totally unprecedented subjugating of House Members below what their roles are and being sent by the same number of people that sent the Speaker.

It is time to get rid of the metal detectors, get rid of the subjugation and get back to the Nation's business.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say I am so excited about the freshman class that came in this Congress. We just heard from three freshmen, and these are folks, especially including my friend from Florida, KAT CAMMACK, that has been added, and I am thrilled. I have been so reassured by the freshman class that has come in and the common sense that came with them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. It is an honor and a privilege to serve alongside Representative GOHMERT, and I look forward to many more conversations on so many different topics, and I thank him for allowing me to be part of this Special Order today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for and in support of our Border Patrol agents, our National Guard, the officers of the Texas Department of Public Safety, our local law enforcement officers protecting our hometowns, and all those that have made securing our border their mission.

In fact, my own Florida National Guard and several of our Florida officers and deputies have become part of the mission to secure our southwest border. For our Border Patrol agents, they have been trained to do a job that this administration will not let them

do. They have dedicated their lives and careers to upholding the rule of law, something that this administration will not do.

They have continually put themselves in harm's way, keeping their heads down and continuing to follow orders. And their reward to date? Well, just look at the facts. Look at the numbers.

Approximately 40 percent of our Border Patrol agents are babysitting and processing, not patrolling, not securing, and certainly not defending the homeland because that is not their mission today.

Eleven agents are currently in the hospital fighting COVID from contact with untested migrants, three of whom are in the ICU today; two are intubated.

Just last month, the month of June, Border Patrol agents apprehended 188,829 migrants. Let me repeat that: 188,829 migrants. That is the highest number in over 21 years. It is staggering. It is shocking. And it should frighten every single American today.

And that doesn't even include the got-aways. The got-aways are the people actively seeking to avoid detection by Border Patrol or National Guard or Texas DPS or any number of resources and assets that we have on the border.

The got-aways right now are about 200,000. And these are just the folks that have been seen by an agent or caught on camera running away. These are the people who are criminals, registered sex offenders, gang members, cartel members. These are people who are now in our country and we don't know where, doing God knows what.

And, of course, let's not forget the drugs, the narcotics that have been seized at the border but also the ones that have made it across. You know, just in the month of June the fentanyl seized—keep in mind, only 20 percent is what they estimate is caught coming across the border—the amount of fentanyl in pounds, over a thousand, is enough to kill every man, woman, and child in the State of Florida 10 times over. And that was just in the month of June. And that was just fentanyl. That doesn't include the cocaine, the heroin, the meth, the weed, and any other narcotics that come.

When you talk about the money that is being made by the cartels every single month, last month, based on the number of apprehensions, that 188,829 that were apprehended, on average, each one of those paid the cartels \$6,000. You do the math. That is over \$1 billion in human smuggling. Human smuggling. That doesn't include the narcotics. And believe me, as those narcotics get across the border and into our communities, they get more expensive and more valuable, and the crime and violence that comes along with them gets bigger and tougher and scarier.

The numbers are pretty staggering, and as we stand here, I mentioned the agents that are currently in the hos-

pital fighting for their lives because they came into contact with people who come from countries that don't test, don't vaccinate, and now today we have a 900 percent increase in COVID cases along the southwest border. 900 percent.

And you know what happens?

These people are not tested. They are checked for lice and scabies, and then on our taxpayer dime they are released into our country.

For all of our Border Patrol agents, I want to say, I am sorry. I am sorry that this administration does not have your back. I am sorry that those on the left don't have your back. But please know that my colleagues and I, we always will.

Let me be clear: This is not about legal immigration. This is about fighting against illegal immigration and the criminals who are profiting off of it.

Now, as we stand here laying down the facts of this crisis—and it is, in fact, a crisis, despite the fact that this administration cannot call it that—Americans around the country are probably wondering how this affects them. They are outraged, sure, but how are they impacted in their daily lives in their communities?

I have to tell you, every town in America is a border town. The nearly one million individuals apprehended to date for this year are coming to our hometowns.

In Florida, they estimate that 70 percent of the migrants that are coming across are coming to Florida. Seventy percent are bound for my home State of Florida. Yes, every town in America is a border town.

And you ask, how are they getting to our hometowns? On our dime.

The NGOs have government contracts. They buy plane tickets and bus tickets, and then they submit reimbursement from FEMA on our dime in our hometowns unchecked, unvetted, and coming to a town near you. Every town in America is a border town.

And as they are on these planes, do they have to show ID? No. No, they do not, because TSA has special guidance that these people are not subject to the same requirements that every other American is when they board an airplane.

□ 1245

They do not have to show photo ID. They do not have to prove who they say they are. Yes, every town in America is a border town now.

And you wonder what happens when these folks get to our hometowns? They use taxpayer-funded schools, taxpayer-funded medical facilities, public safety resources. The list goes on and on. It is about enough to make you sick.

Now when the left decides that taking care of unvetted, untested, and totally dependent illegals is totally more important than taking care of our veterans and some of our homeless veterans, I think that is when we, as

Americans, and particularly, “us,” my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, need to stand up and say enough. Enough is enough. The left’s agenda is dangerous.

Clearly, they have turned every town in America into a border town and defunded our police along the way. The very people who are fighting to protect our hometowns. Drugs, crime—bring it on, they say. Never mind the 93,000 Americans that lost their lives to drugs just last year.

Mr. Speaker, I recently took about six sheriffs from my home State to the border. I wanted my sheriffs in my area, to see exactly what they were up against, because when there is a leak, you can mop all day long, but until you fix the leak, the water will just keep coming. And they saw firsthand really what is at stake. Our country is at stake. And they said, right out the gate, every town now I see is a border town. And let me be exceptionally clear, that you cannot protect your hometown if you cannot defend the homeland, and that starts with securing the damn border.

Yes, stopping this influx of crime and drugs and illegal activity starts with securing our border. But if the crime and the drugs, the negative impacts to our hometowns, our country, our society, our culture, our kids, if the lack of support for our agents isn’t enough to convince every single one of my colleagues to take action, then perhaps the horrific humanitarian crisis unfolding is; the trafficking of children, maybe that is what it takes to inspire action from those on the left.

Next here to me today you see this photo. This is a photo of a 3-year-old little girl. I took this photo on April 11 at 1:46 p.m., standing just outside McAllen at the border. The man holding her told us—standing right there as he was being processed in the field—that that was his little girl. He couldn’t tell me her name, and she was so scared, she couldn’t even tell me her name, or anyone else with us. The man told me and my colleagues that he and his daughter had been traveling for 2 months.

Mr. Speaker, 12 hours later while standing in the Donna processing facilities, Border Patrol agents who had processed and conducted an interview with this man, told us that when they had threatened a rapid DNA test on him because red flags kept popping up in his story, that he admitted that that little girl—this little girl—was not his daughter.

She was someone else’s daughter; someone who was willing to let their child be used, trafficked—and in this case, it is called recycling. Because this administration has policies that encourage children under the age of six to be recycled, where they get matched up with criminals so that they can be escorted across the border. That man—this man—was turned back.

This little girl today is somewhere in the United States in the custody of

HHS away from her family, future unknown. Her story is not unique. This is a regular occurring event; the recycling of children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues: Are you okay with the recycling of children? Is this administration okay with the recycling and trafficking of children?

It is disgusting.

As I said, there are stories like this that go on for days. I, myself, met a 9-year-old little girl who couldn’t barely get the words out to tell me her name and where she was from, because her vocal cords had given out from screaming so loud, because she was being gang-raped by the cartels. If that doesn’t make your stomach turn, I don’t know what will.

President Biden, your administration has proven that while your words are dangerous, your actions are deadly. Your administration has turned every single town in America into a border town, and every American should be outraged at their carelessness, the lack of regard for public health, public safety, national security, and basic human decency.

Mr. Speaker, securing the border is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is an American issue, and it should be our top priority. We need to extend title 42. We need to reinstate the MPP policies. Put the politics and the egos aside and do what is best for our country for the first time in this administration.

Until then, for myself and my colleagues, who actually give a damn, we will continue to craft legislation and put the words into action, and do the thing that the majority and President Biden won’t do, secure the border.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend, Member of Congress, KAT CAMMACK. She has expressed so articulately what I have seen, what I have experienced so many times spending the night on the border, going down those dirt roads along the Rio Grande. It is incredible.

And some would think, Oh, well, isn’t it compassionate to encourage people to come to the United States. It is the most unneighborly, uncompassionate thing that we could do. These are people who—other than the gang members, those who are part of the cartels, those coming from groups in the Middle East and other places that don’t have U.S. interests at heart, but so many of them, they are looking for a better way of life.

Why do they not have a better way of life where they are, including, especially, Mexico? Well, it is because of the unsecured border we have that allows the Mexican drug cartels to make tens of billions of dollars every year coming from America for the drugs, for the fentanyl that kills, for the sex trafficking, for the human trafficking. We are funding the corruption in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, when my wife and I had our honeymoon, we didn’t have much money at all; \$300 got us 5 nights, 6

days in a fabulous place in Mexico. But we don’t go back because the drug cartels no longer say hands off of the tourism.

Mexico is being devastated by the drug cartels. And it is America and administrations like this that are allowing them—actually making it possible—not just allowing, making it possible. Some might say they are truly accessories to the corruption, to the criminality that is going on.

And in fact, evidence of that comes from the fact that as border patrol had told me before, before this administration when they used to talk to me and never ever tried to prevent me from getting to the border and seeing exactly what is going on—that has all changed now. This administration did not allow me, two nights in a row, trying to get to the border, as I have done countless times before—wouldn’t let me get there. In fact, used the place where normally you get down from the embankment, go through the wall that is being constructed by the Trump administration, go down through the flat area, and then you come up to the levee road, and then that allows you to get miles and miles down the dirt roads along the Rio Grande where thousands of people are coming across.

And they didn’t allow it this time. They used the wall, not to keep out illegal aliens, but to keep me from seeing the outrageous travesties and tragedies that are going along our border, because people are being lured to their detriment. In tort law, it would be called an attractive nuisance; like having a swimming pool and having no fence so that a child is drawn in and then drowns.

Well, this administration is luring people to their detriment. And I have been there many nights, it is not on the list of questions that is required to be asked, but so often the border patrol asks, How much did you pay, basically, to drug cartels to bring you into the United States? And it was usually between \$5,000 and \$8,000.

And then often they would say, You don’t have that kind of money. Where did you get that money? And they would indicate, Here and there; get this much here, this much there. Friends in the U.S. sent this much.

So what about the rest of the money? The drug cartels, they are going to let them work it off when they get where they are going.

How do they get where they are going? Well, at that point, it is either Health and Human Services or ICE. Border Patrol, their job is along the border. They don’t, once they transport to a facility, that is usually the end of their transporting. But ICE, Health and Human Services, and now we have the military that is also providing transportation. But as the Border Patrol officer said, cartels call us here in the U.S.—Federal Government. There are logistics. They get them across the border, and then—they don’t use UPS or FedEx or even the U.S. Post Office—

they use the Federal Government and taxpayer money to ship these indentured servants of the drug cartels all over the country to cities all over the country wherever the drug cartel want them to be selling drugs, sex trafficking, human trafficking. The U.S. Government actually makes that happen. They facilitate that.

We have had so many Border Patrol—again, before this last visit to the border when this administration wants to hide what they are doing at the border—they say, Oh, well, if you give us enough notice, then we will put somebody—and this is effectively what—they want to put somebody—I am suppose to supervise—over me to watch what I am doing, prevent me from doing proper oversight down where they are supposed to be doing their job, prevent that from happening so that America does not see how absolutely tragic this invasion is.

□ 1300

Yes, they are gang members, but so many people are coming in, and the cartels know taxpayers in the U.S., who are funding the drug cartels, are also going to pay for the education, all the needs of those coming in.

This administration doesn't care. What they are looking at are future Democratic voters. But they have to act quickly because the longer the people are here, the more they realize, "You know what? I am for hard work, and I am for making my own way. I don't want to see babies killed in the womb. I believe in working a full day. I do believe in marriage and strong family, devotion to family. I believe in God," and they start thinking, wait a minute, that sounds more like a Republican than a Democrat. They don't believe in abortion, most of the folks, and they do have faith in God and devotion to families.

If you read what BLM said they believed in, destruction of what they call Western-style marriage is one of their biggest tenets. Why? Because they are Marxist.

To get to Marxism, you have to create chaos. As Paul Harvey used to talk about, one of the best ways, and a critically important way, to create enough chaos so that you can move toward Marxism is to destroy the family, the nuclear family.

Of course, BLM has it wrong. It is not Western-style marriage. It is not something that North America or South America or Central America came up with, what is typically called the West. It didn't come from this side of the planet or this hemisphere, except in the Middle East.

A man named Moses had a revelation from God and let people know here is what God says: A man shall leave his father and mother, a woman shall leave her home, and the two will become one. That would be marriage, not Western-style. I guess Middle Eastern-style.

It didn't originate here. It has been found throughout history to be the best building block of a very strong society.

That is why surveys continue to find that although, of course, there are people that excel coming from broken homes and other avenues, the best chance a child has of succeeding in life is coming from a two-parent home and a strong nuclear family.

I have seen firsthand what Marxism does. I have heard the director of what we would now call daycare in the old Soviet Union bragging that these children don't belong to their parents: They are just temporary caretakers. We monitor what parents tell their children. If they ever say anything negative about the government, we immediately take the child away and give them to a more deserving caretaker.

I thought, at the time, thank God I didn't grow up in the Soviet Union. Thank God I grew up in east Texas, and I had a mother and father, and they cared deeply about me. I was so grateful for the blessings that I had had.

Wow, the Soviet Union. It failed because it was destined to fail. Marxism is always going to fail. People think: Oh, but it sounds so wonderful, share and share alike.

Now, you have a very small ruling class, and then you have everybody else.

I have been in those stores. Toilet paper so often, no, it was not available. But I learned, and I saw. Real luxuries, like real toilet paper, the store would get those in and put those in the back. If you were a government official, then when you came in, they would get you some toilet paper.

If it is a shoe store, when they got good shoes in, they kept those in the back for government officials. Why? Because they were sucking up to the government officials.

In Russia, it was called blat, political pull. You wanted to have some, so you kept the best of whatever you got in to sell for people that had power. You would do favors for them so that you might have a little power.

As one Soviet told me, a college student: In your country, you can get ahead. No matter who you are, you can get ahead by hard work, making more money, and then money will help you make your way up in society. Here, there are only two ways to move up in society. One is to suck up to people who have political power, and I guess maybe it is a subheading of that, but it is also by ratting out other people.

As he told me: You can get ahead by working hard and making more money here. The best way to move up is to step on other people. If you see them do something inappropriate, then you rat them out and that will allow you to move up.

Except for the very top people that have everything they want, the other people mostly get the same amount of income. That was also tried in Venezuela; it failed. It will always fail.

Anybody that was so stupid that they could not foresee what was emerging, and that is a very strong, powerful middle class in the United States and

part of Europe, Marx couldn't see that coming. He was too blind. He couldn't foresee the formation of labor unions that could stand up to greedy Democrats, billionaires, such as we have here, the billionaires that, by the way, paid hundreds of millions of dollars to affect the election, who was able to vote, and how ballots were gathered.

Well, over in the Soviet Union, you don't have to worry about that. As Stalin pointed out, he didn't care who voted. He just cared about who counted the votes.

We will be seeing evidence continue to emerge from Arizona and Georgia, and, I think, eventually Pennsylvania. But to hear anybody say that there was absolutely no evidence of fraud, it is like John Fund said when he wrote the book about fraud in elections some years back: The biggest fraud about elections is the statement there is no fraud in elections. There has always been.

Lyndon Johnson certainly knew about that, as did people who tried to research allegations of voting impropriety, and the courthouse burned down, destroying evidence. These things have gone on.

Cook County, Chicago, you think there has not been fraud in Chicago? You would have to be either crazy or dishonest to say there has never been fraud in elections in Chicago.

It goes on. The trick is to try to minimize the fraud so you don't disenfranchise so many people.

But there is evidence of fraud. There are hundreds, maybe thousands of affidavits, sworn testimony, about fraud in the last election.

I know there is plenty in the media to say it didn't happen. Because they are saying that, out of either ignorance or dishonesty, others feel comfortable, including people right here on the floor, saying that it is totally debunked, that there was no fraud in the last election. That is a statement out of ignorance or out of being deceptive.

But we have to clean up the elections. We have to quit being a joke in the eyes of foreigners who have paper ballots.

Even as bad as things have gotten in Iraq, there for a while, they had free and fair elections. In 2005, having been over there right after the first election, talking to one of the chiefs of police there, he was telling about how—of course, the voters, when they voted, to avoid fraud, you dipped your finger into purple ink that would last for a couple of weeks so you couldn't vote a second time. If you didn't dip your finger in there and have proof of who you were, you didn't vote the first time.

He was telling me that a policeman who was monitoring the election saw someone suspicious. Upon checking, he saw that he had a bomb, a suicide vest. He threw the man down, jumped on top of him. Both of them were killed. I said, wow, I guess that sent all the voters scurrying, fleeing. He looked surprised and said, no, that they knew if

they got out of line, the policeman would have died for nothing.

The policeman died trying to secure the fair opportunity to vote. Yet, nowadays, that is being belittled: We shouldn't even utilize voter IDs. You shouldn't have to have an ID.

Well, that is the best way to ensure that there is not fraud in the election, just like it is the best way to ensure that someone is not illegally getting a gun or getting a cigarette or getting alcohol. People produce those all the time. Let's quit disenfranchising so many people that are voting lawfully by creating the ability to have people vote illegally.

We keep hearing about: Oh, gee, that is not true. We need to censor people and not allow them to speak or submit things online if they are not in conformance with what the liberal Democrat high-tech industry or the liberal Democrat media say is true or not true.

We listened to 4 years of lies about the Russian dossier when it was produced by a former MI6 agent in England, who even admitted: Yes, my sources, they could have been working for Putin.

It was a manipulation paid for by the Hillary Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee. The FBI was in cahoots and, in fact, even lied to the FISA court.

It really got my attention, having been a judge, to see that FISA court judges had so little regard for their own status, their own courts, that they would not take action to hold in contempt people who held the court in contempt by lying, by defrauding the court, in order to spy on a Presidential political campaign. My goodness, there has never been a Presidential campaign treated as the Trump campaign was.

□ 1315

It even had a Democrat official on tape admitting: We are the ones who paid for violence to get started at Trump campaign events so that we could claim that Trump was stirring up violence.

That was in 2016.

For heaven's sake, we needed a Justice Department that would be just, and we don't have it right now. For heaven's sake, I heard from a constituent 2 days ago who that day was shocked to have two FBI agents show up at her place of work in east Texas. She had not come to Washington on January 6. She was at work in east Texas.

The only reason those FBI agents could have showed up at her place of work was because her nephew texted her a picture of someone who was here on January 6 in Washington and asked: Do you see anybody you recognize? Because it looked like his aunt.

She said: Wow, I thought that was me.

Then jokingly she said: Don't turn me in.

Unless the FBI were monitoring these text messages which was either

by the grant of a warrant from a FISA court that, in my opinion, was breaking the PATRIOT Act and was breaking the law to grant such a warrant, or they were committing a crime and spying on people's text messages without authority.

This is getting out of control here. Of course, we don't hear any stories about the people who were looting and creating insurrections in cities around America last summer. We don't hear about them being arrested or having their homes wrongfully broken into by police or Federal officials. No. But we are hearing about it, and the illegality and the brownshirt tactics of the Federal Government needs to stop.

Mr. HOYER says he was shocked 8 months was all somebody got for disrupting an official proceeding. Well, that also happened on June 22, 2016 for 26 hours on this floor, and I am surprised that Mr. HOYER wants to see his fellow Democrats going to prison for more than 8 months for obstructing an official proceeding.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

ABOLISHING THE FILIBUSTER

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I rise today to recognize the more than 50 Texas Democrats, State representatives, who have taken a stand for liberty and justice for all and who have traversed thousands of miles in the name of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I rise to commend and defend those who are making great sacrifices to protect free and fair elections. They have left their homes, they have left Texas, and they have come all the way to Washington, D.C. They have left their families.

Can you imagine having to leave your home and your family on short notice?

This is not something that they planned. This is not something that they had time to think through and to give all of the deliberations and considerations that one might give to leaving home for some extended period of time, and to be quite candid, not to know exactly how long they will be gone from home, some unknown extended period of time. They have left their homes, and they have left their families. They have left their children.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, simply saying to your child that you have a duty to perform, an unexpected duty, not something that you wanted to do, but something that you know that you

must do in the name of government of the people, by the people, and for the people and in the name of liberty and justice for all?

Leaving their children and coming to Washington, D.C., some of them had to leave jobs. The Texas legislature doesn't pay a huge sum of money to go to serve, some \$600 per month.

So they have left their homes, their families, and their jobs to come to Washington, D.C., not to have a vacation and not to have time to simply socialize and enjoy themselves, they have come to Washington, D.C., because they want to have those of us who have the ability to impact free and fair elections with H.R. 1, the For the People Act, to impact the ability to make sure that elections are properly protected and that the persons who are going to vote have equal access to the polls. They want us to pass H.R. 4, once we file it again, the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, one that would advance voting rights, I might add.

So they have come here to appeal to us to protect liberty and justice for all when it comes to voting, to protect government of the people, by the people, and for the people because it is the vote that accords us this opportunity to govern in a fashion that Lincoln called to our attention in the Gettysburg Address.

They have come to Washington, D.C., to the citadel of democracy in the United States of America, and they are prepared to stay as long as it takes so that they may do what many people would admire them for doing but not everyone would do.

They are here to break the quorum so that the Texas Statehouse cannot pass laws that are invidiously discriminating. Invidious discrimination is a term that I like very much because it means harmful discrimination. Not all discrimination is harmful. But they are here to fight against invidious discrimination, and they come here asking us to take a stand with them. They are breaking a quorum.

Now, there are those who contend that what they are doing is what we are contending that the Senate should not do. Not true. That is not true. They are breaking a quorum. They are preventing the Statehouse in Texas from going forward, and they are doing it with a rule that requires at least two-thirds to be present for business to be lawfully conducted. Well, here in Washington, D.C., we have a filibuster rule.

A filibuster means very simply this: one Member can decide that he or she would not have legislation go forward. Once that decision has been made by one Member, Mr. Speaker, you can only break that filibuster with something called cloture, meaning you now have to get 60 votes before you can pass legislation with 51 votes assuming all Senators are present and voting.

This rule, the filibuster rule, is something that is not necessary. It is something that has been employed by segregationists. It is a favorite tool of

those who have discriminated against us when it comes to civil rights and human dignity in this country.

As an example, Southern segregationist Democrats—that is right, I said Democrats—unified in opposition to civil rights regularly employed the filibuster and prevented cloture. They successfully employed the filibuster to thwart all nearly 200 anti-lynching measures. They prevented a vote on several substantial civil rights bills.

Senator Strom Thurmond in 1957 took on a civil rights bill for 24 hours to filibuster. Former Senator Richard Russell was a leading filibuster. Senator Russell was an outspoken opponent of civil rights legislation. In 1935 he and his colleagues in the Senate stopped an anti-lynching bill with 6 days of nonstop talking. In 1964, he filibustered for 60 working days in the Senate opposing civil rights legislation. Later, in 1964, Russell and more than a dozen other Senators boycotted the Democratic National Convention simply because President Lyndon Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act into law.

So this filibuster rule is a rule that I find no favor with. It is a rule that has haunted those of us who seek equality and justice in this country for everyone. The filibuster rule is not something that is necessary, but that is what the Senate can employ. So if there is an equivalent of the filibuster rule in the Senate as it relates to the Texas house, then I might not have a problem with it.

But, Mr. Speaker, here is the problem: in the Senate, to avoid having the necessary number to pass legislation, constitutionally, you have to have 51 votes. You have to “break” the ability to pass votes with 51. So if the Senate in this United States Capitol would do what those who have come here from Texas would do, then we would have to have them bring 51 people away from the floor to prevent the number necessary to have a quorum. They would have to break a quorum. They don’t have to break a quorum now. They but only have to indicate they would like to filibuster, and, in so doing, we would have to in the Senate here in Washington, D.C., get 60 votes before we can vote to pass something with 51 votes.

I believe that we ought to eliminate the filibuster. I think then if the Senate would want to do what these brave Texas Democrats have done, then they would have to break the quorum by having 51 people stay away from the Senate floor. Right now, they don’t have to have anyone stay away from the Senate floor. It is easy to do what they have done. The Texas Democrats have done something courageous because they have come all the way to Washington, D.C. More than 50 people have aligned themselves so that they can provide a means by which we will have the opportunity to pass civil rights legislation here—H.R. 1, the For the People Act; and H.R. 4 once it is filed again, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

My hope is that we can pass both of these pieces of legislation. My hope is that at some point we will eliminate the filibuster. There are those who would say: If you eliminate the filibuster, at some point it will come back to haunt you because the laws that you pass to eliminate it, others can pass laws to reinstate whatever you have eliminated.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if you pass good laws, it would be very difficult to turn them over simply on a whim. I believe that a good example of this is the law that we passed to accord healthcare to people who didn’t have it in this country, ObamaCare as it is called, but more technically speaking, it is the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act has afforded people the opportunity to have good insurance.

Prior to the Affordable Care Act there were people who thought they had good insurance. They paid their premiums timely. They thought they had good insurance until they had to use it, and it was at this point that they found out just how good their insurance was or how poorly they had decided to buy policies that were what were called junk insurance. They didn’t know because they didn’t need it, and they were paying something that they thought was reasonable for what they thought was coverage that did not exist.

When we passed the law that allowed for persons to have good insurance, the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare, when we passed this law, we then put ourselves in a position such that it could be challenged, and for years it has been challenged. For years there have been efforts to overturn it. For years persons have said: We will repeal and replace.

They never ever considered what the replacement would be going forward with the repeal. To this day the Affordable Care Act still stands.

Mr. Speaker, if you pass good legislation, then you don’t have to concern yourself with the ability of others on a whim to simply overturn it because they don’t like it, because it somehow has given people opportunities that perhaps they didn’t foresee or believe were appropriate. The Affordable Care Act is good legislation, and as a result many people have had the opportunity to have healthcare that they ordinarily would not have.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should eliminate the filibuster as we have it here. I believe we should resort to what the State of Texas has, which is a requirement that you have X number of senators present to make a quorum. It is the quorum that the representatives from Texas have challenged. In Washington, D.C., it is a filibuster that one person can call to the attention of the Senate and use to thwart legislation.

If we go to a quorum here in Washington, D.C., then let the Senators

come up with 51 people who will not show up so that they can prevent legislation from going forward. That would be the equivalent of what is happening in the State of Texas. A quorum is being challenged. There is no filibuster that is being challenged. It is a quorum.

I congratulate them and salute them and commend them for challenging this quorum, to prevent laws from being passed that will thwart the efforts of people to vote who sometimes don’t have the opportunity to vote that I might have, that many of us would have here.

I see nothing wrong with having the ability to vote 24 hours a day. Apparently, some in the State of Texas do. I remember when we had that opportunity in Texas. In this legislation, as being proposed, it would be eliminated. I went out to the polls at midnight, and I greeted people who were coming to vote. I saw people who were leaving work; people who found it beneficial to have the opportunity to come to the polling place at midnight and cast their votes because they are hard-working people, and they sleep during hours that others of us are awake.

I thought it was a wonderful thing to see this voting for 24 hours a day. It is a wonderful thing to know that people can have the opportunity to do this and go right home after work. Not everybody gets off from work at 5 o’clock. Many people don’t get off from work until 11 or 12 o’clock. So this opportunity to vote for 24 hours a day was something very beneficial to a good many of my constituents in the State of Texas.

Unfortunately, it was not something that others approved of and said that they disapprove of it because it wasn’t something that was being done prior to COVID. There are people who said it was never done at any place in the country before. Since when do we decide that we will not do things because they have never been done before? If we decide that we will only do things that have been done before, where will we have the opportunity to make progress? How can you move forward if you decide that you are going to stagnate yourself?

We haven’t always had electronic ballots. We can still vote with paper ballots if we choose, but we have chosen to move forward. We haven’t always had Sunday voting, but we now vote on Sundays. We haven’t always had 24-hour voting, and I contend we ought to have the opportunity to do this now.

Mr. Speaker, I contend to my dear friends that it is our duty and responsibility to make it easier for people to vote. This is what the State of Texas says that it is doing, it is making it easier for people to vote. How are you making it easier if you are going to limit the times that people can vote? How are you making it easier if you make it harder for people to vote by mail? How are you making it easier if

you don't have the boxes so that people can simply drop—safe and secure, by the way—safely and securely drop their ballots off in various places around the county? You are not making it easier. You are making it more difficult under the guise of making it easier.

So I contend that these Democrats who have traversed this great distance, who have come to Washington, D.C. as a means of showing the world that there are still people who will take a stand for liberty and justice for all, for government of the people, by the people, for the people, and protect the right to vote. They are defenders of the democracy when they do this, because the very seat of democracy, the very thing that democracy resides upon is the notion of having a free and fair election. You can't have a free and fair election if you don't have equal access to the polls.

You can't have a free and fair election if you don't have the opportunity to register and vote without certain impediments to your registering to vote. That would create a poll tax. Let me explain.

I went to the polls in Texas to test the system that was in place. I tried to vote with my congressional ID card, the card that I can use to vote on issues related to the budget of the United States of America; the card that I can use to vote on issues related to war and peace. I could not vote with it. I tested the system. I did have the proper credentials, but I wanted to test the system.

The system required me, if I am going to acquire the ID in Texas to vote, it required me to get my birth certificate. If you live in Texas, you can get this ID at no cost. But I was born in Louisiana. I live there, but I was born in Louisiana. Persons who were born in Texas, you can get the ID at no cost. I applied for my ID in Louisiana.

There were some complications with my birth certificate. To this day, I have not received the ID that I applied for; and that was years ago. The point is this: If we are going to have an ID card and contend that it is free to persons who cannot afford the cost of an ID card, we have to make sure that it is free for persons who are not born in Texas who don't have access to birth certificates, who will have to send out of State.

In this country, we don't conclude that you should pay a fee to vote, even if that fee is to get a birth certificate. I contend that this is a way of having a new form of a poll tax. Knowing that college students in the State of Texas who want to vote in the State of Texas to get a proper ID to vote, if it is going to be a State ID or an ID that they don't have for Texas purposes, they will have to get some form of birth certificate or proof of birth in the State of Texas or in this country. They have to present this.

They know that college students can't present it if they were from Cali-

fornia and they are in Texas and they have a California identification that does not necessarily require the birth certificate, then they don't accept this. There is a list of the things that can be accepted, and college student IDs have been excluded from the list.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today saluting them for what they have done, understanding that they are doing all that they can to make a difference, and understanding that they are appealing to us, the Members of this House, to help them, to be a part of their effort to get H.R. 1 and H.R. 4 passed here so as to prevent those in Texas who would thwart the rights of persons to vote from being able to do so if we can pass some of our legislation.

One piece of legislation, H.R. 4, is exceedingly important, because H.R. 4 will bring back the opportunity for people in the State of Texas to challenge changes in laws without a preclearance by the Justice Department or a Federal court that might be here in Washington, D.C.

H.R. 4 would restore the Voting Rights Act that was eviscerated when section 4 of the Voting Rights Act was found unconstitutional. When it was eliminated, eviscerated, if you will, it emasculated section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Section 4 was the coverage area, so that section 5 could then require these other things that would help persons who are trying to prevent States like Texas from doing things that were egregious as it relates to the right to vote.

Section 4 would be restored, and as a result, we would again have coverage for States like Texas, States like Texas in Harris County where I live, that had White primaries. The State of Texas had these White primaries and a man named Lonnie Smith took the State of Texas all the way to the Supreme Court to challenge White primaries. The White primaries were set aside. The Supreme Court said: You can't do that.

Well, in an adjoining county, there were White pre-primarys. The State of Texas has been a bad actor for a long time. These persons who have come here, these noble freedom fighters have come here to solicit our support and our help. And I hope that the United States Senate will at some point eliminate the filibuster. But if not, I trust that there will be 60 persons who will help us get to cloture so that we can take up H.R. 1 and H.R. 4, laws that will help us restore the right to vote for all of Americans without these impediments that are being imposed in States across the country.

To honor them, we have a resolution that we are filing. This resolution is going to honor them for what they have done in coming to Washington, D.C. It will honor them for the stand that they have taken. This resolution will be signed by the members of the Texas Democratic delegation and filed with the House of Representatives.

We also are sending a letter to the President of the United States, a sec-

ond letter, asking the President to please meet with them, not in person, but meet with them virtually. Meet with them and hear their hue and their cry, their appeal for help. I am sure the President understands the issue, so it is not about convincing the President. It is about letting them have the opportunity to speak and letting the President know that they stand firm on the grounds of providing liberty and justice for all, government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Finally, I am here this afternoon, because I believe that we all have to be accountable for what we do. I believe that we all have to, at some point, answer for the positions that we have or have not taken. I am here representing not only myself but other Democrats who could not be here. They are persons who support what we are doing. They are persons who are members of the Texas Democratic delegation.

They have demonstrated that they are standing in solidarity with the members from Texas who are here representing those in Texas who believe that there should not be these laws passed to thwart the efforts to vote. But the members of the Texas Democratic delegation are standing absolutely, totally, and completely in solidarity with the Texas State representatives who are here. And my hope is, that as we stand in solidarity with them, we will at some point achieve our goal. Our goal is simply this: to make sure that in Texas we have free and fair elections.

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

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JERRY LEWIS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to our esteemed former colleague, Jerry Lewis, the longest-serving California Republican in the history of the House, who on a personal level, was my good friend and mentor.

On July 15, Jerry passed from this life into the next. For the last 86 years, Jerry lived a full life. He made an extraordinary impact throughout the Inland Empire community he loved so dearly, leaving it in a far better position than when his decades of public service began.

When I was first elected to this body in November of 1992, Jerry was one of

the first people I turned to for guidance. As I embarked on this new path, it just so happened that this exciting time in my life coincided with a rare low point for Jerry, who just lost his leadership position as Conference chair following the election.

Well, Jerry's loss turned out to be my gain as I was able to hire a number of Republican Conference staff members. From that moment forward, our offices shared a very tight bond, both personally and professionally, that would endure for decades.

Personally, I couldn't have asked for a better person to learn from. Jerry possessed a deep understanding of the needs of his district, and he methodically found opportunities to align Federal resources that could help address them.

In order to achieve his goals, Jerry recognized the importance of working across the aisle and being bipartisan, the realization that was, no doubt, aided by Jerry's first 16 years in the House as a member of the minority party. Jerry worked with whoever he needed in order to deliver results for the people who sent him here.

He demonstrated that if you don't care how it gets done, or who gets credit for it, you can actually get a lot accomplished around here. Jerry's community benefited in countless ways because of his leadership. Thanks to his efforts, veterans and other residents have received better care at the VA Loma Linda Healthcare System and the Loma Linda University Medical Center.

□ 1345

Students have greater opportunities, thanks to his support for STEM education at the Apple Valley Science and Technology Center, which was later renamed the Lewis Center for Educational Research. The entire region is safer, protected from flooding, thanks to the construction of Seven Oaks Dam. I could go on and on.

Jerry may no longer be with us, but the tremendous size and scope of his life will endure and continue to make impacts for many years and many generations.

In 2005, Jerry became the first Californian to serve as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He was incredibly proud to fill this honored position.

Jerry understood his time in that role was finite. He was determined to use that precious time to make a difference for his country, State, and district.

In May 2007, I was fortunate enough to join Jerry as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

In addition to his affection for the district, the body, and the Appropriations Committee, Jerry had a deep appreciation for his staff. His office was like a family. Jerry had many longtime staff members, a clear sign of mutual admiration.

Jerry's greatest love, of course, was reserved for who he always affection-

ately referred to as "his bride," Arlene. Along with their dog, Bruin, the couple was inseparable.

I will always treasure the time I spent together with Jerry and Arlene, especially Wednesday nights at the Capitol Hill Club for prime rib night and our regular get-together for Mexican food at La Lomita here on Capitol Hill.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to Arlene, the Lewis family, and all the former Lewis office staff members. Like all of you, I simply cannot imagine our lives without Jerry and the incredible influence he had upon me.

I know he is looking down at all of us with that smile and chuckle, saying: "Enough now, get back to work, Kenny."

Godspeed, Jerry. We will take it from here.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CALVERT for calling this Special Order in honor of our former colleague, Jerry Lewis.

As fellow Californians, we were his friends and know what a loss it is to us that he is now looking down on us. Maybe that is what is needed. That is the plus.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from California—again, thanking Mr. CALVERT—to honor a fierce and fearless champion of the Golden State, our late cherished colleague, Congressman Jerry Lewis.

Jerry Lewis lived a life dedicated to California, from serving on the San Bernardino City School Board to his decade in the California Assembly to his 34 years representing Inland Empire communities in the U.S. Congress.

It was when he was in the assembly that I got to know him over 40 years ago. I was the chair of the Northern California Democratic Party, and he was on the committee of jurisdiction that was viewing legislation of concern to voter participation in our State.

He always had that smile. He was always very inviting of ideas, very welcoming. I was brand new in the political arena, had hardly been involved in California politics, and so his warm welcome then is something I always remember. When we served together in Congress, we both remembered it well. Jerry and I were friends, again, for a long time.

Then, in Congress, we served on the Appropriations Committee, where he took great pride in being chair of the full committee. How could it be that he was the first chair of the committee from California? He described it as a milestone beyond his wildest dreams.

Mr. AGUILAR, who is here for bipartisan remembrances of Jerry, is part of the Appropriations Committee, and we had our own culture and bipartisanship there over the years.

Jerry took great pride in running the committee because he knew of its power to make a difference in the lives of the people he represented. It was al-

ways important to him to reach across the aisle because, in his words: "The more we can talk to each other as individuals and human beings, the better off the institution is going to be and the more responsive it is going to be."

When we look around California, we see Jerry's legacy. We see it in the cancer research center he established at Loma Linda University Medical Center; in San Bernardino National Forest, which he helped to protect; and the Lewis Center for Educational Research, exploring the night sky. We see his monument in so many tributes that bear his name throughout his community, from Redlands to Riverside, Highland to Hesperia.

It is fitting that Californians were able to say good-bye to Jerry at the University of Redlands Chapel, in the community he so loved.

Jerry's unique voice, core values, and belief in the promise of America have made a difference for California and, indeed, for our country.

May it be a comfort to Jerry's wife, Arlene; their children, Jenifer, Jerry Jr., Jeff, and Dan; their grandchildren and great-grandchildren; Jerry's brothers, Ray and John; and all of their loved ones, that so many people mourn with and pray for them at this sad time.

We will always remember Jerry as a great American and a great Californian.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to pay tribute to the memory of that longtime friend of ours and colleague on the Appropriations Committee, which he chaired, former Congressman Jerry Lewis from California, who passed away July 15, 2021.

After working in the insurance industry and serving in the California State Assembly, Jerry was first elected to Congress 2 years before me, in 1978, and served his southern California district honorably until his retirement in 2013.

Serving together on the Appropriations Committee for 30 years, Jerry and I became friends due to our respect and admiration for this body, the committee itself, and our singular focus on doing all we could to serve our constituents back home in our respective districts.

Jerry was a true believer in our committee, its wielding the power of the purse, and ensuring that we were spending taxpayers' hard-earned tax dollars wisely.

He also prided himself in his ability to steer Federal funding to his district, including funding for critical, life-saving flood control projects, important cancer research, protecting his southern California district from wildfires, and much, much more.

Jerry believed that one of the jobs of being a Federal Congressman was to be sure that his constituents' voices would be heard here on whatever problem they may be having and that we

should spend Federal tax dollars fairly on those projects and matters.

Jerry and I actually found ourselves in direct competition twice, each vying for the gavel as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Though he won in 2004, I won in 2010. I succeeded him as chairman. But we never let those races affect our friendship. It was never personal. Regardless of the outcome, we continued to work together for the betterment of the country and our constituents.

I thank the gentleman from California for hosting this Special Order, a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CALVERT, especially because of the fact that he is the ranking Republican on the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, a key slot, fulfilling, I think, the thoughts from Jerry Lewis himself, that this gentleman from California has a great future in this body. He is living up to it.

I also want to send my thoughts and prayers as well to Jerry's bride, Arlene, and the rest of Chairman Lewis' family as they go through this very difficult time.

There have not been many Members of this body that were as motivated with good thoughts than Jerry Lewis. He was a gentleman. He was a forthright spokesman for his district in California. He was a patriot who believed in a strong U.S. defense and helped to achieve it.

We will not see the likes of this man, I think, again in this body. He was super and superior. I consider his friendship as one of the golden jewels that I will carry with me for the rest of my life.

Godspeed, Jerry Lewis. Our thoughts are with you.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. CALVERT can attest, Jerry Lewis was a larger-than-life figure.

Over the course of his four decades of public service, Jerry was able to rise through the ranks here at the House to become the chair of the House Appropriations Committee. I notice a lot of appropriators here with us today, sharing their memories and paying their respects, as well.

Mr. Lewis earned the respect of Members from both sides of the aisle and worked tirelessly to promote our national defense, care for our veterans, and ensure folks back home in my community and his community of San Bernardino County received our fair share of resources.

Jerry was quick to remind people that he was a kid from San Bernardino. Maybe that is why he liked me a little more than he should have, because I was a kid from San Bernardino as well. But that kid went on to serve his community by advocating for it in Sacramento and eventually here in these halls.

Too often, our region in California is an afterthought. Smaller than our

neighbors to the west in Los Angeles and Orange County, the Inland Empire, my home, was always Jerry's home, and we have always had to fight for our fair share of resources.

But Jerry dedicated his career to delivering resources for our community, and his impact can still be felt on the ground today and through the years ahead.

He served as my family's representative in Congress for many years. Later, I had the opportunity to represent him, first as his mayor and then as his representative in Congress.

He often called me "my mayor." He would say: "How is my mayor doing today?" when he would see me around town, usually when he would see me at his favorite spot downtown where he was grabbing lunch with his bride.

I have never shared this story with Mr. CALVERT. Jerry and Arlene were the first individuals to call me after I was appointed to a city council vacancy a bunch of years ago. The council appointment happened in the evening, and they called early in the morning Pacific time. They didn't quite wake me up, but it was a morning hour on the West Coast. They congratulated me on the appointment, and Jerry talked about the importance of local government making an impact in our daily lives. He reminded me that serving was a huge honor but also an immense obligation and responsibility.

While our politics, at times, were different, and he was quick to remind me of that, I will always be grateful for the advice, for the friendship, for the time he and Arlene spent with me over the years, meeting in his Rayburn office, back in town, or at community events. He was always measured; he was always professional; and he always put his community first.

It is a testament to his legacy that his colleagues from both sides of the aisle are here today to remember him.

My thoughts continue to be with Arlene and the family. I appreciate his contributions and his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for this Special Order.

□ 1400

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Democratic leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if you mention Jerry Lewis from California, our Jerry Lewis probably wouldn't be the first one you would think of. You would think of Dean Martin's sidekick.

When I first met Jerry Lewis some 40 years ago, I guess, now—how long has Jerry been gone? Thirty-two years plus however long he has been gone—I thought of Jerry Lewis. "Oh, Jerry Lewis, yes, he is on the committee." I thought of the comedian Jerry Lewis.

To some degree, Jerry Lewis was a comedian. He was a wonderful guy, wonderful spirit, a wonderful person. I served with him, as I said, for 32 years, both in the House of Representatives and on the Appropriations Committee.

Actually, that is not really right. I served with him 32 years, but I was only on the committee for 23 years before I became the majority leader in 2006 and then went off the committee.

Jerry Lewis is coupled in my thoughts with a guy named Vic Fazio, who was also from California, who was also on the Appropriations Committee, who was one of my closest friends and still is. I think about the two of them because Jerry Lewis and Vic Fazio, for a number of years, headed up the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee together. They were a team, a positive team, a team that agreed that this institution was worth protecting and worth serving.

As I think of Jerry Lewis, I lament the fact—and in doing so, I want to thank KEN CALVERT, also a member, for seeing me in the hall and saying, "Are you doing this Special Order?" Mr. Speaker, if he hadn't talked to me, I wouldn't have known, and I wouldn't have gotten this opportunity to speak.

Much has been said of what he did, but what Jerry Lewis and Vic Fazio represented were Members who thought about the institution, not about party. They were representative of a large number of people in this body who served when I came here in the 1980s and the 1990s who shared that view. TOM COLE is sitting here. He is one of those Members that shares that view.

As I think of Jerry Lewis, I lament the fact that we have lost the Jerry Lewises—not all of them, but too many—who made this body a collegial body, not a confrontational body.

That doesn't mean we didn't have severe disagreements. I remember Jerry Lewis, at one point in time, said, as chairman of the committee, he was going to move Goddard Space Flight Center, which is in my district, some 3,000 or 4,000 people, to California. We had a little tussle about that. The good news was that Barbara Mikulski chaired the committee in the Senate, and the chances of that happening were zero. But we had a tussle about that. It was a friendly tussle, and I really don't believe he was real. He was just sort of getting a little leverage.

Jerry Lewis was a man of this institution, the Congress, and of the Constitution. He cared about this country; he cared about this institution; and he worked positively and constructively for both.

The fact that he was a Republican and I was a Democrat was somewhat irrelevant. That doesn't mean it was not relevant in terms of our having differences. The parties had differences, and there were contentious times. At that point in time, he was on one side, and I was on the other.

I am, I like to think, a man of the House, but I am also a man of the Appropriations Committee. I love the Appropriations Committee. I love the Appropriations Committee because it was a committee where compromise, frankly, was easier.

Philosophical differences are tougher to compromise on. Money is not so tough. We have \$100. I am in the majority, so I get \$60, and you get \$40. That is relatively easy. It is much, much more complicated than that, but it is a committee in which you can decide priorities based upon where you want to put your money. I think it is a little easier than on issues that are deep, philosophically held beliefs.

I wanted to speak, and I thank KEN CALVERT for giving me a heads-up that this Special Order was happening, because we need to get back to the Jerry Lewises and Vic Fazios. I lament the fact that we are so contentious in this body. I lament the fact that there is so much tension in this body.

Everybody in this body has been elected by their neighbors and friends and people who don't know them because that is the only way you can get here. I, therefore, believe that everyone in this body is due respect, even those I vigorously disagree with, because they have been sent here by the people.

But we have lost that sense of camaraderie, and we have lost the sense that, for the most part, we are going to work together.

I came here when Ronald Reagan was elected President. I came here in a special election. Even though we had contention, and we had the Boll Weevils, et cetera, the overwhelming majority of the House, Democrats and Republicans, felt like working together.

I will close with this. I loved Jerry. He was my dear, dear friend. What he represented, I think, was so important. But we have lost the sense that we are all working together for the country, for the people.

I don't mean we have lost it individually, but it seems to me that the camaraderie and cooperation that existed for a long time that I have served in this body is very tenuous at best now. Very frankly, I think it was made even more tenuous in the last administration.

I don't think we are going to get back there. Part of it was because the Democrats, when I came here, had been in charge for about 20 years, and there wasn't a real sense that everything one did would change the complexion or the control of the House of Representatives. Now that is the case, so it is a lot more contentious. People are thinking, "If we do this or do that, maybe we will win the majority." That was not the case then.

I want to thank Jerry Lewis. I want to thank Arlene. I want to thank their family for being the kind of people who made those of us on the other side of the aisle feel like that was just an aisle but we were Americans together, Members of the House of Representatives together, working on behalf of our country and our people and to make the House of Representatives the kind of institution of which the American people could be proud.

Thank you, Jerry Lewis. God bless you.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as we remember the life of Jerry Lewis, I remember the first time that I had the opportunity to meet with him. It was back in 2005. I was a State representative from Louisiana, and Hurricane Katrina had ravaged the whole New Orleans region.

Thousands of people were out of their homes. The city was decimated. The whole region was decimated, and we were starting to work on a plan to rebuild New Orleans.

Obviously, there was a big Federal role to be played. President Bush had committed to help us, but it took action from Congress to ultimately make that happen, to rebuild the levees so that the communities could be protected, to help people get back in their homes. And that brought me to Jerry Lewis.

He met with me and a few other people, and he committed to do the things that needed to be done to help us get back on our feet at our lowest point. That is who Jerry Lewis was.

The city of New Orleans, the people of the New Orleans region, owe a great debt to Jerry Lewis for the things he did, the real action he took to help build New Orleans back after Katrina.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I think it says everything about Jerry Lewis if you look at who has come to speak on his behalf. We have had the Speaker and the majority leader of the House from the other party. You have a man he squared off against twice for the chairmanship of the full committee. You have colleagues on both sides. It tells you he was a very unusual man with very broad appeal.

I first met Jerry Lewis as a staffer. I was the new executive director of the NRCC, and I got a call out of the blue from one of the most important Republicans in Congress who said, "Hey, have you got time to come over and meet?" I thought, "Boy, I am either in trouble or something is serious and big." It turns out that his deputy chief of staff, Letitia White, was married to the brother of a good friend of mine. They happened to meet at the wedding, and he said, "Hey, there is this kid from Oklahoma coming up. You need to get to know him."

Jerry Lewis was the kind of guy who reached out to you no matter what. We became firm friends from there, long before I was in this institution. I used to bring people by, particularly clients who were running for Congress, to meet him because he always helped them and always gave them good advice.

Then, by happenstance, I had the opportunity to come to the Congress of the United States. The first person who helped me was Jerry Lewis, and the first person who gave me good advice

said, "Tom, become an appropriator if you possibly can." It was Jerry Lewis. Then, he helped me get to that spot.

He was the ranking member, our Republican leader on the committee, and guided the decisions I made in terms of what positions I would choose, where I would go, and what subcommittees I would serve on. I always got great advice, always got tremendous help. There was always wisdom in any observation that he had.

Like my friends, I am going to miss him very, very much. I extend my sympathies to Arlene and the family, but this institution lost a great champion. We lost a great American.

God bless him wherever he is now. Actually, I know where he is now. God bless him.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bid farewell to Congressman Jerry Lewis, who passed away last week at his home in Redlands, California. He was 86.

His impact on his district, his state, and his nation are enormous and will not be forgotten.

Jerry approached the responsibilities of public service seriously.

He was one of the longest-serving and most influential Californians in this chamber's history—serving a total of 34 years.

He was the chair of the Republican Conference, a cardinal, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Through it all, he was tireless and effective, delivering for the people he represented.

You can see it in his work:

Improving health care;
Building dams and the environment;
Funding education and scientific research;
and

Strengthening our national defense and industrial base.

Yes, Jerry was a serious legislator. But as everyone who knew him will also tell you, he never took himself too seriously.

He was always smiling.

He loved his wife, Arlene.

He was an optimist—in politics, in his personal life, and about the future of our great nation.

That is his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, the great Italian writer Petrarch said that, "love is the crowning grace of humanity, the golden link which binds us to duty and truth, the redeeming principles that reconciles the heart to life."

I don't know if Jerry ever read those words, but he certainly lived them.

He was a statesman and a public servant who worked hard for his district, his state, and his country because he loved them.

We should always remember that.

God Bless Arlene and his entire family.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of our former colleague Jerry Lewis.

My colleagues here have spoken to the mark he left on the House of Representatives. I'd like to take a moment speak to his legacy in the California delegation, where he was the longest serving Republican in our state's history.

Whether it was as my counterpart as Chair of the California Republican Congressional Delegation, during his tenure as Republican

Conference Chair, or his time as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Jerry was always willing to work with his California colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address the needs of our state.

If Jerry had anything to say about it, California was getting its fair share.

During his time in Sacramento he helped establish the South Coast Air Quality Management District. He understood the need to deal with the horrific smog that was plaguing much of Southern California, and particularly the Inland Empire.

George Miller once pointed out that Jerry and he were on opposing sides of legislation to create the Mojave Desert National Park, but that once the park was created, Jerry immediately turned around and worked with the delegation to ensure that the public had access and that there would be improvements to the park.

That's the kind of legislator he was—instead of being consumed by what divides us, Jerry like to move to the next problem to solve.

We've missed his presence in the House over the last decade. Our thoughts are with his wife Arlene and his children and grandchildren.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of our former colleague, Congressman Jerry Lewis. Throughout his career, Mr. Lewis was respected for his hard work, his in-depth policy knowledge, his commitment to his constituents and to his home state, as well as to his colleagues and the institution of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Lewis was best known for his commitment to the active work of the Appropriations Committee, where he served as Chairman—and he was equally well known for his friendship on both sides of the aisle in his role as the Dean of the California Delegation.

He played a leading role as Chairman of the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee—supporting research, development and scientific endeavors including the space and aerospace sectors that for so long were major hubs of economic activity and cutting-edge technology in our home state.

Mr. Lewis was a believer in investment in education and in research institutions like the University of California system and in resources like the San Bernardino National Forest, which is located in one of the beautiful and distinctive snow-capped mountain ranges that backdrop the unique and well-known Los Angeles basin landscape.

A longtime resident of the San Bernardino area, including San Bernardino and Redlands, cities at the center of his congressional district in the diverse and vast Inland Empire, he was the product of public schools, graduating from San Bernardino High School and later UCLA. After college he served briefly on the staff of former Congressman Jerry Pettis, as a member of his local school board, and later operated a small business.

From 1969 to 1978 like many in this body, he served in Sacramento as a member of the state legislature where he helped establish a committee dedicated to addressing air quality, a major concern in Inland Southern California in the 1970's.

In 1978 he was elected to this body, serving as Chairman of the House Republican Conference in the late 1980's, before ascending to leadership positions on the Appropriations Committee.

I am honored to have known him as a mentor, as a fellow legislator and as a friend. I am grateful for his contributions and leadership in our delegation, for his unending belief in cooperation between parties and branches of government, and his faith in the leadership role of America in the world.

Mr. Lewis gave much of his life to serving our state, working to improve our nation, and to serving with distinction his hometown and home district—his legacy is an inspiration to all of us who have followed in his footsteps and proudly serve the state he loved, in the institution he revered.

Mrs. KIM of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Congressman Jerry Lewis, the longest-serving House Republican in California history.

Throughout his 17 terms in Congress, Congressman Lewis stood as an steadfast example of civic service.

Congressman Lewis knew how to work across the aisle and get things done for his community, our state and the nation.

He was known to all as down to earth and remarkably kind. When someone addressed him as 'Congressman Lewis,' he would always reply with a smile—"My friends call me Jerry. You're my friend, so please call me Jerry."

Jerry loved his hometown of San Bernardino and was loved back by the community.

His legacy of hard work, dedication to conservative values, humor and kindness will not be forgotten.

I hope you will all join me in keeping his family in your prayers during this time.

PAYING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, so we can finish up some things, and for many of us who were very fond of Mr. Lewis, I am going to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my friend.

□ 1415

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Congressman CALVERT for organizing the tribute to Jerry Lewis today.

I knew of Jerry Lewis many years before I had the honor to know him personally. He was elected to Congress the year that I graduated from college in southern California, and he was a well-known name then because of his activism for air quality, which at the time was a very serious concern in that region.

I then had the opportunity and honor to actually be able to work with Jerry in Congress. And I have to say I was a bit leery about him at first. Jerry was a bit of the Republican old guard and I had spent an entire career fighting that affectation, but what I found was a man who was willing to listen as well as to be heard, a man who was so interested in the process and the give and take and the sharing of ideas, that he

really demonstrated what this institution is all about, how it did work, and how it could work in the future if we could learn from his example and his life.

I am very honored to join in the tribute to him today on the floor.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for giving some extended time to recognize Jerry Lewis, who was a statesman, a Congressman from the Inland Empire, a good friend to all of us.

Jerry really was a one-man institution on Capitol Hill, having served in the House for more than 30 years. Jerry was extremely effective at serving his constituents. He always kept his constituents in the Inland Empire in mind, and he was always popular with them. Jerry never lost and never received less than 61 percent of his vote in any of his congressional races.

Jerry was a veteran Congressman, and when I first came to the House in 2003, I actually already knew him, because, as was typical of Jerry, he liked to work with young people. At the time in the eighties and nineties, him and Congressman Bill Thomas from Bakersfield, they would organize conferences for young people to teach them about policy and politics. And I went to many of those events, which I have fond memories of, and when I look back at that, those were really important events in my life that probably inspired me in some way to ultimately serve with Jerry. I will always be thankful for that.

When I did come to Washington as a Representative, Jerry became a close friend, a mentor. Jerry taught me the ropes and how to assimilate and deal with sometimes the strange ways of doing things around here.

Also, back home in California, there are many times that I had the opportunity to visit both Jerry, his wife Arlene, Mr. CALVERT, memorable times at dinner doing constituent events, getting to know his area and always focusing as a whole on how we could do things better in California and work together.

Jerry ultimately became one of the most influential and well-respected Members of the House, earning admiration and affection on both sides of the political aisle and serving his long tenure with distinction.

Jerry was a good friend and a true statesman who will be missed not only in these Halls of Congress but also, as well, in California.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding, and I also thank Mr. CALVERT for organizing this tribute to Mr. Lewis.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) to give a closing good-bye to Mr. Lewis.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I want to say we are all going to miss Jerry. It was a privilege to serve with him, and Godspeed, Jerry.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your patience. You look good up there. Maybe this is a har-binger of the future.

Before I start—because there are some serious things here I want us to get our head around on what is happening financially, and some of the things I see that are—and I am going to be brutal—a bit dishonest in the math on some of the tax proposals—I need to share something that has just been eating at me for 2 days.

This place has about a century-long tradition during the summer of us bringing our children here. John Boehner actually put it into policy that children 12 and under we could bring on the floor with us. We tried very hard in previous years to make this an institution that loved and embraced our families and our children because to be honest, this is a tough job on the family.

And so, 2 days ago a handful of us showed up here—I brought my 5-year old daughter—and we wanted to bring our children on the floor. And instantly representatives of the Speaker—and I know they are doing their jobs, I mean, they were brutal about it, but they were doing their jobs. They said: You can't bring your children on the floor.

Why?

Well, it is against the rules. Okay. I will respect the rules. Show it to me in writing. And they ran off and came back 15 minutes later. Well, we can't find it in writing, but we don't want you to have children on the floor.

Well, why?

COVID.

Okay. If I remember the whole science thing, a 5-year-old little girl is not a Texas State Democrat, they are not super spreaders. Why would you engage in such sort of dystopian cruelty to children? The math is the math.

Do you remember all the speeches that my brothers and sisters on the left gave us that we need to follow the science, particularly in response to COVID? Okay. I have been incredibly respectful of it. I am someone who has never complained on this floor about wearing the mask when we wore the mask, going through the metal detectors because I figured the public is forced to do those sorts of things. But come on, if you are going to preach to us, we are going to follow the science, you know the science on children isn't our problem.

Why would you engage in such sort of cruelty to kids for that one time during the summer when we could bring our kids here to sit here, and my little girl who, as you know, loves you because you have been incredibly kind to her over the years, Mr. GREEN; they get marched off with a group of the floor staff from the Speaker scaring my little girl half to death. You have got to get out of here.

This is sort of the weirdness that this place has become under this leadership,

and the cruelty, this dystopian—and I love using that word—the ultimate explanation we got is, well, it is not in writing, but we can do anything we want.

When that type of cruelty is off the impulse of this leadership, you understand why this place is falling apart with hate. And the inability to show kindness to children, which aren't a problem, gives you almost a poster of what has become wrong with this leadership.

And I don't know if it is vanity, I don't know if they have become control freaks, I don't know if it is that these were Republican children, so therefore, they must be punished, but it was a really crappy thing to do to my 5-year-old and the other little girls that were with that group that just wanted to sit with their daddies and their mom on the floor. That is what this place has become.

Dear Heaven, I hope when we hit this August recess there is some sort of soul-searching evaluation of what we have turned this place into, because a year and a half from now Republicans are going to take back the majority here, and I hope this hasn't become so embedded in our psyches that it is going to become the tit-for-tat seesaw where the types of cruelty that have been foisted on our families, our kids, our Members isn't handed back, but that is where it is going. I needed to share that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get our heads around a couple things that are bothering me, also, in regard to the spending and tax plans and the belief that we are not—excuse me, the Democrat leadership—and I understand a lot of this is generated from the Senate side, so I am not going to blame House Democrats because some of the Democrats I work with on the Ways and Means Committee here in the House, we have different views of the world, but they treat me very kindly, they are very respectful for the ideas, but some of the proposals being put together by the leadership are frauds. They are just mathematical frauds.

And the very things that we would have been and should have been—and Republican hands aren't completely clean on this, but this now has been industrialized.

So here is the scam: The left wants to spend this much money on the infrastructure bills they have. The President, Speaker PELOSI, Democrats promised we are going to pay for all of it. Okay. And then they have industrialized gimmicks that are frauds.

So, first off, we need to deal with the reality of what we are about to do, not only to my 5-year-old, but to everyone that is in retirement or heading towards retirement. Do you understand over the next 30 years—and this was before the spending binge—this government is going to be \$101 trillion in debt in today's dollars? And most of it is actually Medicare.

Now, I have given presentation after presentation on how we can change

that using technology, changing the price of delivering healthcare, because the ACA, ObamaCare; the Republican alternative, Medicare for All, they are financing bills; they do not change the cost of healthcare.

And instead, this is the greatest fragility to our retirement security, the future of our society because if you plan to borrow \$101 trillion over the next 30 years, you have just sopped up actually more borrowable money in the world. This mathematically can't happen.

And guess what our debate around here is? It is how we are going to spend more money. So the left makes—and I am going to show a couple examples of this—a promise, saying, well, DAVID, the American people, we are going to pay for everything.

So let me show you one of the gimmicks, just to get our heads around something that my friends should be embarrassed about.

President Trump offered a rebate rule in regard to pharmaceuticals for people on Medicare. And the idea was, and it is complicated, but the punch line is pretty simple: We have a process right now where there is a rebate paid for through the pharmaceutical companies to the purchasing managers, and it is done to lower the price of the drug at the purchasing level.

The Trump rule was changing the path so the rebate would go right to the consumer. So instead of lowering the price of the drug you would see it almost at the register. Okay. Fine. I had mixed feelings about it, but Democrats absolutely hated it. It was never going to become policy. It was never going to become law. This was a proposal from a couple years ago.

So what does this place do? Well, first off, my Democratic brothers and sisters spent lots of time attacking the idea, making it clear we will never allow this to become law. This will never become part of the Medicare financing system. We are never going to do the Trump rebate mechanism where the consumer gets it.

Okay. Then why would they turn around and pretend it is a pay-for for the infrastructure spending?

Part of the Democrats' financing is, well, we are going to take 170, \$180 billion over the next 10 years—and by not doing the rule that doesn't actually exist that we already oppose that actually isn't in practice, but we are going to pretend we get \$180 billion from that—we are going spend it. You wonder why the American people just realized our numbers are a fraud here? And this is proposed with a straight face. Our inability to tell the truth.

I understand if there is an insatiable appetite for my friends on the other side to do different types of spending, and if you are going to make a promise to the people in the country that you are going pay for it, fine. Okay. Keep your promise.

And this isn't even an attempt to be cute, but this is just blatant. These

dollars don't exist. They were never going to exist, but because the CBO will give us a score on it because we are going to pretend that this might have become policy, even though it was never going to become policy, and the very people that are promoting it made it clear they were never going to allow it, hey, we just created another \$180 billion of magic money.

□ 1430

This is us. This is what this place has become. And we need to lead with a couple of the other things that are also in the tax proposals.

Okay. I understand my brothers and sisters on the left really want to raise corporate tax rates, but be honest about the math. The best study right now says in the first 24 months you unemploy 1 million Americans. That corporate tax hike unemploys 1 million Americans.

And we still haven't found a good study, and we are trying to actually do it ourselves. What you end up saying, when you unemploy 1 million Americans in the first 24 months, what does that actually ultimately cost society?

What did you just do to Medicare? What did you just do to Medicaid, because they are not paying their FICA taxes? What did you just do to unemployment benefits? What did we just do to people's future income power, because you pulled them out of the workforce?

We talk about societal costs to policy around here. Oh, no, we don't talk about societal cost to policy around here, because we don't tell the truth about the math. So a couple of us—and I actually did a fairly detailed presentation about a month ago, saying if my friends on the left really need money, they want to keep their promise in saying, Hey, we are going to spend all of this, we found a trillion bucks—actually, in one of our calculations of \$1.4 trillion over 10 years. Cut spending. Stop subsidizing the rich. It was fascinating. My phone was just dead. My email, no one even responded to that.

See, you have to understand, here is how the Democrat financing washing machine is working: is on this hand, we are going to raise taxes on the rich. We want them to pay more. Okay. That is the Democrat policy. But on the other hand, we are going to turn around and subsidize them to about \$1.4 trillion over 10 years, because we are going to subsidize their solar panels; we are going to subsidize their new Tesla; we are going to subsidize their flood insurance on their house on the beach; we are going to subsidize their retirement accounts; we are going to subsidize their future healthcare. Does that make sense?

It is a washing machine. So I am going to raise your taxes over here, but then I am going—through the backdoor—because when I subsidize you over here, I get power. Because these rich people need to get benefits from me. I mean, is it that cynical anymore?

Wouldn't it be much more economically efficient, much more rational, much fairer to say, I am not going to do things that are going to distort the economy and economic growth and jobs and functioning—my personal fixation of how do you lift the working poor—but we are going to stop subsidizing the ultra-wealthy in the country with all these programs. We are just going to cut the spending over here. Wouldn't that have been a more rational way to find revenues?

But once again, the dirty little secret is much of the rich live in Democrat districts on the coasts. Much of the dirty little secret is these are the people that write the checks. So it becomes sort of this washing machine fraud of wink-wink, nod-nod. For the ultra wealthy we are going to raise your tax rates, but you don't actually pay yourself through income, you live off your assets. So don't worry, it is not going to affect you. Oh, by the way, we are still going to subsidize your multimillion-dollar house on the beach with subsidized flood insurance.

That is the type of fraud we are committing on the American people. We are better than this. And I don't know why this place doesn't own a calculator, or our brothers and sisters here, maybe we are all so busy we don't actually read the details of the very proposals.

So one of the other proposals is something that is referred to as the tax gap. And the Green Book from Treasury was saying, Well, we are going to find \$700 billion of under-collected taxes. Except when you start to dig through it, that number isn't real. It doesn't hold up to any type of scrutiny. So is this another occasion where we are going to do a placeholder? We are going to put a pretend number in here, so we are going to somehow meet certain CBO scores that we all know is a fraud, because if you actually sit and read what CBO wrote, they even make it clear that, Hey, you can do all these things, but within 3 years, those very people that you are chasing their taxes have changed their process.

We are also using really outdated math. We are using math from before tax reform. So a lot of the very mechanics of how taxes are collected, what they are, are very, very different, but we haven't updated our numbers, and we are going to spend \$8 billion dollars at the IRS. But one of the really creepy things we are also going to do, is we are functionally going to turn the banking system into the IRS offices.

So almost everything you will do will now be part of the IRS system to track you. And if you really read through the reports, it makes it clear what we are going to do is take a lot of the very tax revenues, receipts that we are after, and we are going to force them into ether conduits. I don't know if you are about to create a whole new crypto banking system that is going to run under the radar, but be careful.

If it is really about finding the tax sheets, a number of us, and actually some Democrats on the Ways and Means helping, we have been playing with a model that would use data, but publicly-available data. These data services you can buy, you bounce off. You see if, Hey, here is what is reported. Does it actually match what we are able to find on these public records? Instantly, you know if have something that needs to be pursued. And, yes, it will require a capital infusion to update the data systems.

But there is this weird fixation in government that they want to own and control everything, even though the very best data that would help us find the folks that are cheating actually isn't ever going to sit on the government server. It is actually on all these lists that are out there.

There are some great articles talking about how the \$700 billion number is fraudulent. It is just not real. But once again, we are going to build our spending and tax policy on it.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I also apologize. I have had a stunning amount of coffee already today.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to mix a couple metaphors. I am going to both talk about the cost, but I am also going to talk about the environmental impact.

A lot of my brothers and sisters on the left are fixated on high-speed rail. Now, understand, rail is what, a 300-plus-year-old technology. So the infrastructure of the past is functionally what we are about to fund. We are not funding the infrastructure of the future. But you do realize, for one of those high-speed rails to work, you have got to be running about 10 million people on it a year for the environmental impact.

I am not talking about the huge amount of debt, the fact that they never will collect anything close in the fare boxes. But just to do the environmental impact. Are you going to carry 10 million people a year? No.

It turns out it is virtue-signaling once again where the math of the environmental impact doesn't actually match. But we have a bunch of our constituents, Oh, those choo-choos; I like it; fast ones. Oh, look at the Japanese ones. But as you also know, the Japanese high-speed rail system is also collapsing financially, too.

If you really want to have an impact in the infrastructure bill, one of the most powerful things we can do is we can change the cost structures. How long it takes to get through NEPA. How long it takes to finance. How long it takes to get through all the litigation.

This is almost unreadable—and we will try to put some of this up on our website. But we are right now over \$500 million per kilometer just to lay new

rail. We are up here in the very top tier. And you look at the countries that are ahead of us, they have great geographical distances or they are going through highly urbanized areas. We are not.

Something is terribly, terribly wrong in our cost structure. And so how many times have we seen those who are promoting the infrastructure saying, But we are going to put a clock; we are going to make things more efficient so we can actually get this.

And I will give you one of the great living examples:

In New Mexico, they have this amazing wind asset. This place that produces tremendous amounts of wind energy. And California really needs that green energy to meet their rules. They are now going on 15 years just to get the permit to lay the power lines. And they are still not done. They are actually about to go through their NEPA again.

One of the article says they are not going to get it by 2025. I talked to one of the consultants for it yesterday; he is optimistic they might get it by 2023. But they started in 2006 to move the power from this incredible wind area. If someone really says, I want green energy, but I am terrified of getting crosswise with my trial lawyers, who are making a fortune suing on this. I am terrified to get crosswise with my environmentalist, who sue and make money stopping the line sighting. I am terrified to have to deal with the military, my Tribal lands, my State lands, my Federal lands—all these others—where the power lines have to go.

Stop pretending you really want green energy if you are not willing to change the clock on getting a permit to move it. It is just irrational what we are allowing.

We actually have a piece of legislation that will actually just put the clock on these things so it would help pull substantially more money. Because you actually knew what the investment of that power line, for those things to move that green energy. But until my friends on the left start to adopt these NEPA reforms, it is a fraud.

We are going to put all this money into new wind or geothermal, or this and that, but we are never going to allow the line sighting to move the power to the urban areas that actually need it.

I have more of these types of samples where if the public policy here is my brothers and sisters on the left really want more revenues from the wealthy, my pitch to them is stop subsidizing the rich. Because what you are talking about doing in raising capital gains, raising this—you do realize that tax foundation number the other day said the capital gains tax hike actually loses \$33 billion. It loses \$33 billion over 10 years.

The only thing that actually makes money is raising what they call the bases. It is how much you are able to

put into the different tax rates. And with inflation right now, have my brothers and sisters on the left realize what they are about to do to people with homes?

How many of our homes have gone up dramatically in value? How much of that is actually appreciation? How much of it is just inflation?

How many of our kids or friends will ever be able to buy their first home anymore because what we have done in skyrocketing the prices? But how about the person that is going to retire or trying to sell the house because that is their nest egg, and we are now going to tax them on inflation. We are not going to tax them on appreciation, because the other house they have to buy is also inflated.

This is one of the math realities. We don't tell the truth that much of the capital gains that my brothers and sisters on the left are so excited about getting isn't actually capital gains on—So I made all this money. It is just the fact that we have had a bunch of inflation and the values went up.

Mr. Speaker, if you were to sell your house today, and run down the street and go buy something similar or even better, that other one you are buying is also just as expensive. You didn't really gain anything. But if the gain was over, what, \$250,000 per person, you are going to pay taxes. You are going to pay capital gains on it.

This is absurd the way we are approaching the financing of this. And I will argue, I think we have some proposals that would make the environmental impact of infrastructure greener, more sustainable, financeable, workable. But so much of the bill right now reads as financing cash flow for those people that write checks to the left. We are better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your patience with me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2021.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to sections 1 and 2 of House Resolution 467 (117th Congress) and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the allocations set forth in the statement of allocations and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2022, published in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2021.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for wildfire suppression, disaster relief, and program integrity, to include In-

ternal Revenue Service tax enforcement, pursuant to House Resolution 467 (117th Congress) and the CBA, as provided in bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The amounts for wildfire suppression are contained in the text of H.R. 4372, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2022. The amounts for program integrity are contained in the text of H.R. 4502, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2022 and H.R. 4345, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2022. Lastly, the amounts for disaster relief are contained in the texts of the H.R. 4345, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2022 and H.R. 4431, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2022.

Accordingly, I am revising the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2022. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised allocation is to be considered the allocation included in House Resolution 467 (117th Congress), pursuant to the statement published in the Congressional Record on June 24, 2021.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Kellie Larkin of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(Unified amounts in millions of dollars)

	2022
Current Discretionary Allocation:	
BA	1,506,027
OT	1,672,503
Revision for Wildfire Suppression (H.R. 4372):	
BA	2,450
OT	841
Revision for Disaster Relief (H.R. 4345 & H.R. 4431):	
BA	18,942
OT	705
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 4345 & H.R. 4502):	
BA	2,541
OT	2,073
Revised Discretionary Allocation:	
BA	1,529,960
OT	1,676,122
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	1,356,059
OT	1,355,730

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 26, 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-1663. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Management Division, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Streamlining Electric Program Procedures [RUS-21-ELECTRIC-0003] (RIN: 0572-AC53) received July 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 Agriculture.

EC-1664. 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-2021-0196; Project Identifier 2018-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-21571; AD 2021-11-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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-1665. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0452; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00388-R; Amendment 39-21597; AD 2021-12-10] AD 2021-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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-1666. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0857; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00707-A; Amendment 39-21570; AD 2021-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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-1667. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31375; Amdt. No.: 3961] received July 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-1668. 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-2021-0333; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00252-R; Amendment 39-21609; AD 2021-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 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-1669. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0509; Project Identifier AD-2021-00608-E; Amendment 39-21626; AD 2021-11-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 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-1670. 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-2020-0790; Project Identifier 2020-NM-077-AD; Amendment 39-21604; AD 2021-12-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 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-1671. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (AHD) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0265; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01541-R; Amendment 39-21603; AD 2021-12-16] (RIN:

2120-AA64) received July 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-1672. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. (Type Certificates Previously Held by Agusta S.p.A. and AgustaWestland S.p.A.) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0304; Project Identifier 2017-SW-108-AD; Amendment 39-21606; AD 2021-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 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-1673. 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-2020-0850 Project Identifier AD-2020-00288-E; Amendment 39-21569; AD 2021-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 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-1674. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0512; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01621-R; Amendment 39-21627; AD 2021-13-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 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-1675. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of The Burn of Columbia Valley Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2020-0005; T.D. TTB-168; Ref: Notice No.: 190] (RIN: 1513-AC60) received July 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 Ways and Means.

EC-1676. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Palos Verdes Peninsula Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2020-0003; T.D. TTB-166; Ref: Notice No.: 188] (RIN: 1513-AC70) received July 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 Ways and Means.

EC-1677. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the White Bluffs Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2020-0004; T.D. TTB-167; Ref: Notice No.: 189] (RIN: 1513-AC57) received July 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 Ways and Means.

EC-1678. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Obsolete Regulation Regarding Rewards for Information Relating to Violations of Tax Laws Administered by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau [Docket No.: TTB-2021-0004; T.D. TTB-169] (RIN: 1513-AC56) received July 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 Ways and Means.

EC-1679. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Goose Gap Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2020-0011; T.D. TTB-170; Ref: Notice No.: 196] (RIN: 1513-AC63) received July 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 Ways and Means.

EC-1680. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Ulupalakua Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2020-0014; T.D. TTB-171; Ref: Notice No.: 199] (RIN: 1513-AC65) received July 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 Ways and Means.

EC-1681. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Treatment of amounts paid to section 170(c) organizations under employer leave-based donation programs to aid victims of the ongoing Coronavirus Disease 2019 [Notice 2021-42] received July 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 Ways and Means.

EC-1682. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final rule — Requirements Related to Surprise Billing; Part I [TD9951; CMS-9909-IFC] (RIN: 1545-BQ04) received July 20, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2497. A bill to establish the Amache National Historic Site in the State of Colorado as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 117-100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2278. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the September 11th National Memorial Trail, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 117-101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 3110. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. BERGMAN, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. BOST, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. CARL, Mr.

CARTER of Georgia, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. GOHMERT, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. HERRELL, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MELJER, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. PALMER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. REED, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSENDALE, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STAUBER, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. TIMMONS):

H.R. 4614. A bill to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and improve forest management activities on National Forest System lands, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on Tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SIREs):

H.R. 4615. A bill to require the Secretary of State to establish an expedited procedure to renew or extend the period of validity of certain passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4616. A bill to deem certain references to LIBOR as referring to a replacement benchmark rate upon the occurrence of certain events affecting LIBOR, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4617. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study on payment for order flow, to require the Investor Advocate of the Commission to provide recommendations on payment for order flow, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 4618. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to modernize the reporting requirements under section 13(f) of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4619. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit trading ahead by market makers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 4620. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to limit the exemption provided for family offices from the definition of an investment adviser, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BALDERSON (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. TURNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOONEY, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 4621. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 102 West Main Street in New Albany, Ohio, as the "Congressman Samuel L. Devine Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BALDERSON (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. TURNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 4622. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 226 North Main Street in Roseville, Ohio, as the "Ronald E. Rosser Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BENTZ (for himself, Mr. STAUBER, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GARCIA of California):

H.R. 4623. A bill to establish a categorical exclusion for forest management activities carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture jointly with another Federal agency if such forest management activities received a categorical exclusion with respect to such other Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. BERGMAN (for himself, Mr. BOST, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 4624. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve access to health care for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 4625. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 4626. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require an independent assessment of health care delivery systems and management processes of the Department of Veterans Affairs be conducted once every 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 4627. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish standards and requirements for non-Department mental health care providers participating in Department of Veterans Affairs Community Care program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. DUNN, Mr. ALLRED, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 4628. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Veterans Health Care Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4629. A bill to apply user fees with respect to tobacco products deemed subject to the requirements of chapter IX of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAWTHORN (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STEUBBE, Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 4630. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the airfare of aliens unlawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 4631. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reinstate the authority of the Secretary of Education to make Federal Direct Stafford Loans to graduate and professional students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 4632. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit a plan to eliminate the backlog of passport applications due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4633. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the repayment by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of benefits misused by a fiduciary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 4634. A bill to provide that certain orders of the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect until certain conditions are satisfied, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BACON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. FULCHER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMB, Mr. MANN, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MENG, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMUCKER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4635. A bill to reverse declining milk consumption in schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 4636. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow parental choice in the selection of primary

health insurance coverage or primary coverage under a group health plan for certain dependent children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4637. A bill to sever United States Government relations with the Creek Nation of Oklahoma until such time as the Creek Nation of Oklahoma restores full Tribal citizenship to the Creek Freedmen disenfranchised in the October 6, 1979, Creek Nation vote and fulfills all its treaty obligations with the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 4638. A bill to establish a panel of constitutional experts to recommend to Congress an appropriate process for providing for the case of the death of a candidate in a contingent presidential or vice-presidential election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to better coordinate the base erosion and anti-abuse tax with certain credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. DELAULO, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 4640. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for certain reforms with respect to medicare supplemental health insurance policies; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. CHU, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. BROWNLEY):

H.R. 4641. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct research on wildfire smoke, 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 Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 4642. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the cover over of distilled spirits taxes to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4643. A bill to prohibit the admission of aliens to the United States for 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 4644. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the Optional Practical Training Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 4645. A bill to clarify that individuals engaged in aircraft flight instruction or testing, including phased testing of experimental aircraft, are not operating an aircraft carrying persons or property for compensation or hire; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 4646. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for comprehensive student achievement information; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BERA, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 4647. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for certain conservation subsidies to include subsidies for water conservation or efficiency measures and storm water management measures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 4648. A bill to modify the boundary of the Cane River Creole National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 4649. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to allow for the use of the Coronavirus State fiscal recovery fund to support mental and behavioral health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4650. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for dental and oral health care benefits 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. KILMER (for himself, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COOPER, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. CROW, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr.

KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PHILLIPS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VELA, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 4651. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, to establish a RECOMPETE grant program to provide flexible, 10-year block grants for purposes of creating quality jobs, providing resources to help local residents access opportunities and attain and retain employment, increasing local per capita income and employment rates, and supporting long-term, sustained economic growth and opportunity in persistently distressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. KIND (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4652. A bill to provide competitive grants for training court reporters and closed captioners to meet requirements for realtime writers under the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4653. A bill to prohibit the creation and use of fake social media accounts or profiles and the sending of fraudulent emails or other electronic messages, and to require certain social media companies to remove fake or harmful accounts and profiles from their platforms; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4654. A bill to prohibit the creation and use of fake social media accounts or profiles and the sending of fraudulent emails or other electronic messages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4655. A bill to establish a pilot program to promote public-private partnerships among apprenticeships or other job training programs, local educational agencies or area career and technical education schools, and community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Mr. COLE, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. GALLEGU, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H.R. 4656. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a new Tribal priority window for the 2.5 gigahertz band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 4657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accuracy of mortgage underwriting for home loans guaranteed by the Department of Veterans Affairs by ensuring that energy costs are included in the underwriting process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIEU (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 4658. A bill to designate the Encinal Trailhead on the Backbone Trail in the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area as the "Anthony 'Tony' Beilenson Trailhead"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. McCLAIN (for herself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 4659. A bill to require providers of broadband internet access service and edge services to clearly and conspicuously notify users of the privacy policies of those providers, to give users opt-in or opt-out approval rights with respect to the use of, disclosure of, and access to user information collected by those providers based on the level of sensitivity of the information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 4660. A bill to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 1125 Chapline Street in Wheeling, West Virginia, as the "Frederick P. Stamp, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MEIJER:

H.R. 4661. A bill to establish a National Supply Chain Database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MEIJER:

H.R. 4662. A bill to establish a National Supply Chain Database, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CHU, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 4663. A bill to amend the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to provide additional funding for E-rate support for emergency educational connections and devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. TIFFANY, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 4664. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to establish emergency fire-freshed management areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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 Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Ms. OMAR, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BASS, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mrs. MCBATH):

H.R. 4666. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modernize and improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 4667. A bill to provide for temporary emergency impact aid for local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. MAST, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 4668. A bill to eliminate the position of the Chief Diversity Officer of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself, Ms. SEWELL, and Ms. MANNING):

H.R. 4669. A bill to expand cost sharing reductions with respect to qualified health plans offered through an Exchange, 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. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4670. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage and payment for certain tests and assistive telehealth consultations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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 Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4671. A bill to provide for greater county and State consultation with regard to petitions under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow employers to contribute to ABLE accounts in lieu of retirement plan contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4673. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the automatic enrollment of eligible veterans in patient enrollment system of Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. REED, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 4674. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the 7-year recovery period for motorsports entertainment complexes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. CHU, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. BERA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 4675. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received from State-based catastrophe loss mitigation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4676. A bill to provide financial assistance to States and Indian Tribes for the development, implementation, improvement, or expansion of a flex-tech energy program to enhance manufacturing competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4677. A bill to direct restoration and protection of the New York-New Jersey watersheds and estuaries hydrologically connected to New York-New Jersey Harbor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 4678. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for greater spousal protection under defined contribution plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 550. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States policy recognizing the Assyrian Genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H. Res. 551. A resolution expressing support for the designation of August 1, 2021, as "Gold Star Children's Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 4614.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, clause 2
Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4615.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4616.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4617.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 4618.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4619.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Taxing and Spending Clause: Article 1, Section 8, clause 1—provides Congress authority to, inter alia, enact spending legislation.

Commerce Clause: Article 1, Section 8, clause 3—provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the states, including the use of the channels of interstate commerce, the instrumentalities of interstate commerce, or persons or things in interstate commerce.

Necessary and Proper Clause: Article 1, Section 8, clause 18—allows Congress the power to make all laws that are necessary and proper for executing its enumerated powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the U.S. Government.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ:

H.R. 4620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BALDERSON:

H.R. 4621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BALDERSON:

H.R. 4622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 4623.

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, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 4624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 4625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 4626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the United States Constitution

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H.R. 4627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached bill is constitutional under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes" as well as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4629.

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, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAWTHORN:

H.R. 4630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 4631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1, Sec. 8 "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 4634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 expresses that Congress shall have the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 4635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 4636.

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, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 4638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

20th Amendment of the US Constitution

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 4640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 4641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 4642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Moreover, the Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 4645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress has the power 'to regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . .'

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 4646.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4647.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution, which reads:

"The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 4648.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 4649.

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 Constitution.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 4650.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4653.

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. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4654.

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. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 4655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1—All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ:

H.R. 4656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 4657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LIEU:

H.R. 4658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const., Art. 1, Sec. 8

By Mrs. MCCLAIN:

H.R. 4659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section—Powers of Congress. 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. MEIJER:

H.R. 4661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MEIJER:

H.R. 4662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 4664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 4666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 4667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 4668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 4669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have 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. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 United States Constitution

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 4672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4673.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 4678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 58: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 82: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 153: Mr. CASE and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 267: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 287: Mr. BUCK, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 564: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 571: Mr. LIEU, Ms. MANNING, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 606: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 712: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 797: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 841: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 928: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 962: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 1012: Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 1025: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1057: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1066: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1080: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1297: Ms. SEWELL.

H.R. 1346: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1368: Ms. WEXTON and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1456: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 1474: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1550: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1596: Ms. MENG and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1611: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 1667: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 1693: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1696: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1730: Ms. NORTON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 1749: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 1813: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1842: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Mr. TORRES of New York.

H.R. 1910: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1916: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1997: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 2007: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2021: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 2022: Ms. FOX.

H.R. 2048: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 2050: Mr. RUSH, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2063: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2082: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2104: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2108: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2126: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2144: Mrs. AXNE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2172: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2193: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2198: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2249: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.

H.R. 2265: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2294: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 2316: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 2328: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2347: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2361: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2373: Mr. WELCH and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2377: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2400: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2435: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 2456: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 2499: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2525: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2558: Mr. LONG, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 2565: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 2590: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2654: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2670: Ms. BUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2705: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2724: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 2748: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. WALTZ, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2773: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2811: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2815: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2934: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 2954: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3001: Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 3072: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 3106: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 3107: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 3116: Mr. PANETTA and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3134: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3148: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 3179: Mrs. SPARTZ and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3183: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 3187: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3215: Mr. MELJER and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 3235: Mrs. SPARTZ.

H.R. 3299: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3335: Mrs. AXNE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

H.R. 3359: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LIEU, and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 3400: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 3440: Mr. KIND and Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 3441: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. WILD, and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 3443: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. FALLON, and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 3444: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 3449: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3452: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3460: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 3461: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3474: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 3482: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 3486: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. CARL.

H.R. 3491: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3496: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 3519: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3522: Mr. MORELLE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 3554: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. JACOBS of New York.

H.R. 3641: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 3650: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 3665: Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3692: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 3708: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3710: Ms. LETLOW, Ms. VAN DUYN, and Mr. FITZGERALD.

H.R. 3728: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 3753: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3755: Mr. RUSH and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 3780: Mr. AGUILAR and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 3807: Mr. BOWMAN, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 3811: Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 3876: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3884: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 3922: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 3940: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3946: Ms. PORTER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3953: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3982: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 3985: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 3992: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 4005: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 4027: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4029: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 4049: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 4085: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4104: Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DEFazio, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4131: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4132: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 4148: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4166: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 4181: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 4187: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4190: Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 4191: Mr. CROW.

H.R. 4215: Mrs. MCCLAIN.

H.R. 4252: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 4266: Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4271: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 4297: Mrs. STEEL.

H.R. 4298: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4323: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4328: Mr. GOODEN of Texas and Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 4339: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4375: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4380: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CORREA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 4390: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 4416: Mr. BABIN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr.

DESJARLAIS, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KUSTOFF, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. CAWTHORN.

H.R. 4421: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4429: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 4433: Mr. MOONEY, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 4435: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 4438: Mrs. CAMMACK.

H.R. 4441: Mr. PERRY, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mrs. GREENE of Georgia.

H.R. 4441: Mr. PERRY, Mr. TONKO and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4461: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 4498: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 4510: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4526: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4558: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 4559: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4563: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 4568: Mr. DONALDS, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. VAN DUYN, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4576: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.J. Res. 12: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 53: Mr. POCAN and Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. REED, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.

H. Res. 136: Ms. STRICKLAND and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H. Res. 225: Ms. HOULAHAN and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H. Res. 332: Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 336: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KAHELE, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H. Res. 366: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mr. HOLINGSWORTH.

H. Res. 376: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 404: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H. Res. 509: Ms. SALAZAR.

H. Res. 510: Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 516: Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 529: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GARBARINO, and Ms. MANNING.

H. Res. 536: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. VEASEY.

H. Res. 547: Mrs. LURIA.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 2 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 216: Mr. Mann, Mr. Walberg, and Ms. Letlow.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 22, 2021

No. 129

Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TAMMY BALDWIN, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who inhabits eternity, You have given us the gift of this day. We will rejoice and be glad in it.

May our lawmakers never forget that they borrow their heartbeats from You. Lord, continue to sustain our Senators and give them all they need to glorify Your Holy Name. May Your Spirit so move them that they will live exemplary lives. Lord, compel them to be just and honest in all their dealings. May they remember that our country is no better than our citizens and no stronger than its commitment to righteousness.

We pray in Your righteous 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 bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the

Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TAMMY BALDWIN, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. BALDWIN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, the Senate took a vote on whether to proceed to a debate on infrastructure. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues blocked the Senate from taking this first entirely procedural step.

I understand that the effort to finish the text of the bipartisan bill has progressed since I announced this vote last week. The negotiators have made significant progress, but there are still some outstanding issues. Therefore, at the end of the vote yesterday, I changed my response to a no so that I may move to reconsider the vote at a future time.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle should be assured, as majority leader, I have every intention of passing both major infrastructure packages, the bipartisan infrastructure framework and a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions, before we leave for the August recess. I laid out that precise schedule at the end of June, and I intend to stick with it.

A new report by the chief economist at Moody's, Mark Zandi, hardly a liberal economist, someone who actually served as an economic adviser to Senator McCain, concluded that both major infrastructure proposals are essential to maximize our economic potential—not just one, both. And, together, they would give a massive boost to the economy, ease inflation pressures, create jobs, increase productivity, and reduce income inequality.

These are incredibly worthy goals, and the Senate is going to keep working on both tracks of infrastructure in order to achieve them.

NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now on another matter, today in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, President Biden's nominee to lead the Bureau of Land Management, Tracy Stone-Manning, will receive a vote to advance her nomination to the Senate floor.

While it sometimes flies under the radar, the Bureau of Land Management is responsible for overseeing nearly 250 million acres of public lands and 700 million acres of mineral rights, a vast track of the United States of America. No Agency is more important to the maintenance of public lands for public use. BLM, the Bureau of Land Management, that is, will play a huge role in the fight against climate change as well.

Over the past 4 years under Donald Trump, the Agency abandoned its mission, shrunk public lands, targeted our national monuments, and opened up those beautiful landscapes for corporate industrial development. In short, the next leader of the Bureau of Land Management has a tall order in restoring and protecting America's public lands.

Ms. Stone-Manning is exceedingly qualified to take on this important job.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5027

After serving on Senator TESTER's and Governor Bullock's staff, she went on to lead the environmental agency in Montana, where she was respected not only by conservationists but by ranchers and fossil fuel interests as well. She developed a reputation as an honest broker, someone who is firm in their principles but always willing to try and build consensus.

Yet the members of the Republican minority on the committee are trying to turn this consensus-driven, well-respected nominee into another partisan flashpoint, dredging up a letter she forwarded while in graduate school and claiming it was evidence that she is "an echo-terrorist." The claim is just as hysterical as it sounds.

Ms. Stone-Manning has the full support of the chair of the committee, the Senator from West Virginia; Mr. TESTER, the Senator from Montana; and from me.

We need someone like Ms. Stone-Manning to manage our public lands, a staunch advocate for conservation but also an honest broker, someone who will repair the damage of the last 4 years and be a faithful steward of America's national treasures, someone who understands that conservation policy has a critical role to play in the fight against climate change. Ms. Stone-Manning has all of those qualities, and I look forward to moving her nomination to the Senate floor.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, with COVID-19 cases ticking up all across the country, with some bureaucrats and elected officials actually talking about reimposing various measures on the American people, the Biden administration continues to let illegal immigrants pour across our southern border, and reportedly, they are considering loosening our border security even more.

Remember when the Biden campaign's rhetoric and then the Biden administration's early actions led to a rush on the border. They tried to wave it off as a seasonal, springtime surge, but, of course, that wasn't true. The numbers just keep climbing.

Customs and Border Protection had more encounters on the southern bor-

der in June than they had in May, nearly 190,000 encounters last month alone—the highest number in 21 years. Law enforcement is coming across huge groups of hundreds of individuals. With almost 3 months still remaining in fiscal year 2021, CPB has already encountered more illegal immigrants than it did in the entirety—the entirety—of fiscal 2019, which was, of course, before COVID. We have exceeded that total with almost 3 months to go.

The Biden administration claims they are addressing the crisis by simply speeding up the rate at which they get migrants out of custody, out of border facilities, as if simply reducing the head count was the goal. Of course, that is no solution at all if the individuals are simply being released into the interior of our country.

Ordinarily, legal immigration is part of the heart of the United States of America, and it always has been, but it simply is not a universal human right for everybody in the Western Hemisphere who would like a better job or to break our rules and turn up at the border. No country, none—no country in the world—could govern itself that way.

In fact, this ongoing crisis is supremely unfair and uncompassionate to the men, women, and children whom it continues to entice into the scorching desert Sun. Border Patrol agents are having to double as humanitarian workers and EMTs. They rescue people who get lost, who are at risk of drowning, who have been simply abandoned by smugglers or traffickers.

Amidst all this, in the thick of this crisis, the Biden administration has spent weeks flirting with ending its title 42 authority, declaring the COVID emergency to be finished and over at our southern border and letting even more people stream across. COVID is already on the rise again, the border is already in crisis, and the President and his team want to end the emergency safeguards at our border? Reimpose COVID precautions on the American people but end the COVID emergency for illegal immigrants? How does that make any sense?

Meanwhile, our Democratic friends here on Capitol Hill say they want to push a massive amnesty plan into the reckless taxing-and-spending spree they want to pass later this year on a party-line vote. As if damaging inflation, soaring costs, lower real wages, and more debt were not punishment enough for the American people, Democrats also want to stuff a massive amnesty plan into their tax-and-spend spree. It is like they have systematically identified the worst idea for American families on every single issue and set about rolling them into one huge, reckless proposal.

RUSSIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on a completely different matter,

last year, on a broad and a bipartisan basis, Congress passed sanctions that were designed to block Russia from completing its Nord Stream 2 pipeline project. The Biden administration recently waived those sanctions to allow the pipeline to move forward. Now it appears the administration has cut a deal with Germany that will allow the pipeline to become operational.

The initial press reporting about this deal does not inspire confidence that this administration is taking the Russian threat as seriously as it should, nor does it indicate that we are standing with our Ukrainian partners, who are struggling to defend themselves against Moscow's aggression. The administration appears to have ignored the broader implications of the Nord Stream 2 project and Russia's approach to Europe writ large.

Green energy initiatives or promises of diplomatic meetings will not address the real risks Moscow poses—not even close. Just a couple of years ago, Washington Democrats were absolutely melting down over their belief that the prior administration was being too soft on Russia and leaving Ukraine in the lurch. Where is the outrage today?

For several years there, my colleagues across the aisle sounded like big-time Russia hawks, so I hope they will now join Republicans in pressing the administration to explain this curious decision, to explain how President Biden intends to impose meaningful costs on Moscow for all its misdeeds at the same time they have America greasing the skids—greasing the skids—for this Putin pipeline.

IRAQ

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on one final matter, next week, President Biden is set to meet with Prime Minister of Iraq Mustafa al-Kadhimi. The meeting comes at an important moment for our shared efforts toward peace and security in Iraq and the entire region.

ISIS has been significantly weakened in Iraq and Syria after years of shared efforts, but the terrorist organization remains a grave threat. And ISIS is far from the only threat Iraqis and the Iraqi Government are facing. For years, Iran has systematically sought to undermine Iraq's sovereignty. Iran's well-armed proxy of militias report to Tehran, not Baghdad, but they operate inside Iraq.

These groups have conducted campaigns of intimidation and assassination against peaceful protesters and independent journalists in Iraq, the same brutal methods they employ in Syria, Lebanon, and in Iran itself. These Iranian-backed militias are also threatening our own American interests in Iraq. Iran wants to pick fights with a superpower while making the nation of Iraq bear the risk.

The fact is, the United States is in Iraq at the invitation of their government. We are there to support the

Iraqis and to help the Iraqis kill terrorists and defend their sovereignty. Our presence in Iraq also helps our operations in Syria against ISIS and al-Qaida.

Again, it is pretty obvious the terrorist threat is not over. Remember, the disastrous withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan may not simply be felt in that country; a Taliban victory and resurgence of al-Qaida could embolden jihadists all over the world, just as the rise of ISIS did in the wake of President Obama's withdrawal from Iraq.

As we watch Afghanistan descend into chaos and ISIS continue to lash out in Iraq and Syria, now is not the time for either the United States or Iraq to pretend that our shared mission is over. As I have warned again and again, terrorists don't observe our political timetables. They don't pack up just because we lose faith or lose focus.

So let's hope this administration is already learning from their mistakes in Afghanistan. When the Iraqi Prime Minister visits next week, the White House should provide strong assurances that the United States will stand strong with our friends and continue to support our partners who are standing up to terror and to extremism.

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.

The majority whip.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, America is a nation of immigrants. But for the Native Americans, the first people over here, all of us have come to this country in various stages in our family life: personally, through our parents, grandparents, and beyond. We have built, within the confines of our Nation, an amazing story to tell the world of how such a diverse group of people can come together in one place and make a nation that has an impact on the world itself. That makes it very difficult to understand sometimes why we struggle so much with the issue of immigration. It is so central to who we are, what we have done, what we will become. Yet, when the conversation comes around about immigration policy, immigration law, we dissemble into warring factions and too often get little or nothing done.

The Presiding Officer may be surprised to know that it has been almost 36 years—36 years—since this Congress has passed any meaningful or substantive immigration law. The last real effort was under President Ronald Reagan. That is not an indication that our immigration system is perfect. It is far from perfect. There are many problems with it, as we look at it in a critical and important way.

I look at it from a perspective that maybe is different than some. I am the son of an immigrant. My mother was brought to this country at the age of 2 from Lithuania, became a naturalized citizen, and was very proud of that fact and raised her three boys to be proud of it as well.

Just a few steps from this Chamber is my office that I have decorated with the naturalization certificate of my mother right next to my desk, a reminder of who I am, where I came from, and also a warning to anyone coming into the office that this Senator feels very strongly about the issues of immigration.

Now I have the responsibility, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to actually deal with the laws surrounding immigration. It is not an easy assignment. If we have failed for 36 years to come up with a law, it is because there are strongly held views on both sides. Yesterday was a good illustration of that.

I called for a hearing with my friend and colleague Senator ALEX PADILLA, a California Senator, on farm labor, farm workers. The reason we wanted to call this was because it was not untimely that we had received a bill from the House of Representatives, which they passed on a bipartisan basis, to rewrite the laws on farm workers. They did a great job. I want to commend them for the effort of sending this legislation our way, this bipartisan legislation with 30 Republicans joining most of the House Democrats to enact it in the House of Representatives. And now it is over on our side of the Rotunda. It is a timely and important question.

We estimate that there are 2.4 million farmworkers in the United States who plant and pick our crops, milk the cows, process the food, and work in poultry and meat processing. And without them, these industries would struggle to survive.

That is not my analysis; it is the analysis of the American Farm Bureau and many other organizations that represent agriculture in America.

Of the 2.4 million farmworkers in the United States who pick these crops, half of them are undocumented. That means that, literally, they work in the fields picking the crops that reach our tables and they could be deported at any minute.

The bill that came over from the House of Representatives addresses that. Here is what it says. It says: If you can prove that you have worked picking crops for at least 10 years—10 years—and you can pass a criminal background check, we will give you the opportunity to apply for citizenship. But it is not instantaneous. Ten years is just the starting point. You then have to give us 4 years more of working in the fields, and then we will give you a green card. And in 5 years more, you could be eligible for citizenship. You are going to go through all kinds of reviews and background checks on your path to that moment.

So literally, we are saying to farm workers: If you will give us 19 years of your life picking our crops, we will give you a chance to be a citizen.

I have just heard that process characterized as amnesty—amnesty. For people who are breaking their backs, in the sweltering heat of America, with the toughest jobs imaginable, spending 19 years of their life putting food on our table and then passing a criminal background check, some call amnesty. I won't.

And if you had listened yesterday to the hearing, you would understand why even that process, as bipartisan as it was in the House, is in a tangle of politics here on the Senate side. Two speeches given by members of the Republican membership of the committee really told the story. They started talking not about farm workers picking crops or milking cows or processing our food, they started talking about terrorists, drug dealers, human traffickers, violent criminals coming across our border.

And they rejected the notion that we should give any of them the opportunity for citizenship at any point. They didn't even read the bill. About 19 years of hard work in the field before you could possibly qualify, they just said "reject it."

And when I listened to that, I wondered what they had for dinner last night because it is quite likely that whatever they had—whether it was a vegan diet or one that included meat or other food products—it was on their plate because one of these people that they have just characterized as a potential terrorist is breaking his back, day in and day out, to make sure that there is food for every American.

We heard stories. Linnea Kooistra was a dairy farmer in Woodstock, IL. She and her husband own a dairy farm. That may be one of the hardest assignments in the world. Those cows are going to get milked twice a day if you are going to make a living, and you better be prepared to give time to do it every single day, twice a day. She and her husband did it for years, won awards for their work.

Now, they have just kind of semiretired into row crops, which are challenging, too, but not like a dairy farm. And she said: You know, the thought of our continuing our farm was impossible unless we had immigrant labor.

The jobs on their dairy farm are tough, demanding jobs. People aren't lining up to apply for those jobs. They needed immigrants to make it work, and they couldn't get them.

There was a fellow that was there yesterday—an extraordinary guy, person; I had just met him for the first time—and I ran across him by watching television. I said, yesterday in a hearing, that my appetite for television starts with the Chicago Bears and goes through baseball, a lot of politics and news, but I never miss, if I can help it, the CBS "Sunday Morning" show.

Two weeks ago, this man named Shay Myers, whose home is in Idaho and who farms in Oregon growing asparagus, came on the show and did such a remarkable job, and I said to my wife: I would like to get him before our committee.

Well, he was there yesterday, and he told his story again, and he told about that asparagus field. There aren't many left in the United States because it is tough work and it is unpredictable, and some people just can't make it and how tough it was for him when finally the entire asparagus crop is ready, but there are no pickers for the crop. And it is backbreaking, intensive work.

He took his entire production of asparagus and basically said: Because I can't clear immigrant workers across the border, 90 of them, to pick my acreage on asparagus, I am just notifying the public in the area, it is free, come and take it; it is going to rot in the fields if you don't.

He just gave up and made nothing as a result of it. He grew up, he said, in a community in Oregon or Idaho—I am not sure which—which was half and half, half Anglo, half Hispanic. And he said: I am a very conservative person politically, but how can you say that these people haven't earned their opportunity for citizenship? They work so damn hard, and nobody else wants to do this work, and we count on them.

And, he said: I just happen to believe that growing these crops in the United States is a good thing. American consumers, more and more, are saying: We want some standards. We want to know about the chemicals you are going to use on these crops. We want to know about your farming practices.

He said: I pay close attention to those in America. Other countries that send us those crops from other countries don't pay any attention to it.

And he made a very, very valid point. When I think about those workers and how critical they were to him and his livelihood, it is hard for me to sit here—or stand here and ignore some of the criticism of this farm workers bill.

I want to salute MICHAEL BENNET, of Colorado, in particular. He is our colleague here. And he has, time and again, been able to mobilize the growers and the farm workers into an agreement on a bill. He did it again. He did it once before. I saw him do it, almost miraculously, with our Gang of 8 effort, a comprehensive immigration reform 7, 8 years ago. And now he has done it with this bill. It is amazing.

Arturo Rodriguez was there, one of the founding members of the United Farm Workers—an organization, you will remember, from the days when Cesar Chavez was drawing our attention for the first time in America to who picks the crops. Rodriguez was there, and he was speaking for the workers again—bringing workers from Michigan and Georgia, who were young Hispanic women, who were working in the field just a few weeks ago and now

are sitting in the Halls of Congress, begging for this legislation.

When I think about all that and then hear that work effort, that bill, being dismissed by the Republican leader this morning as mass amnesty—"mass amnesty," that was the phrase he used—it saddens me, and it angers me. It saddens me that many of the Senators who are saying these things aren't listening to these farm workers who are giving their lives so that we can have food for our families.

Tom Vilsack was there yesterday, the Secretary of Agriculture. I like him. I voted for him twice to be that Secretary. I am glad he has the job. He told the story of going to the State of New York, meeting a man who had been a migrant worker, picking crops for 20 years. This man had heard about Vilsack's arrival and about this legislation that was pending, and he said to the Secretary of Agriculture: I hope this happens so I can see my family.

And Vilsack said to him: Your family, where is your family?

He said: In Mexico. He said: I have been here for 20 years picking crops in the United States of America, going from field to field and State to State—20 years—and I haven't been able to see my family in that time.

And Vilsack said: Why?

He said: Because I am undocumented. And if I cross that border to see my family, I may never get back here again to pick the crops and earn the money and send it back to my family so they can get by.

We don't think about that very often, do we? We think, Well, these workers come in, and everything is just normal. Nothing is normal about being undocumented and picking someone's crops and not being able to see your family for 20 years.

I am not going to give up on this issue of immigration. America shouldn't give up on immigration. There are a million reasons why the theory that helping to find good immigration laws is mistaken in some way when you consider the fact that each year we naturalize a million people in America. Those are people who went through the process I described many times, waiting for years for that opportunity. And we say a million new Americans, through this legal process, is normal and good for us. I think it is.

There are some who say that if we said to farm workers, You have a path to citizenship, a 19-year path to citizenship, of backbreaking work in the fields, that we are sending a message to countries to turn them loose, come on into the United States, no questions asked. I couldn't disagree more.

We should have a process in America in immigration which we are proud of, that reflects our heritage and our belief in immigration as part of our future as well. I think there are just some basic things that every Member of the Senate should consider and, I believe, should be the basis of our immigration policy.

First, we need a secure border. In the age of COVID-19 and drug dealing, I want to know who is coming into this country and what they are bringing. That is not an unreasonable question to ask at our borders. A secure border is important for those reasons.

Second, we should never knowingly allow any person to come into this country who will do us harm, nor allow anyone into this country who threatens us.

And third, we need an orderly process, one that respects the law because the United States cannot absorb all of the people who want to come here right now. We have to have an orderly process, knowing who is coming into the border and what impact they are going to have on our Nation.

And then we ought to sit down and, instead of throwing around all the labels of mass amnesty and terrorism and human trafficking, acknowledge who these people are.

One of the things that the Senator from Kentucky referred to, I am sure, is a decision last week in Texas by a Federal court. That judge, Hanen, again, ruled in a way that troubles me—I think troubles many people—that the DACA Program, created by President Obama that has given up to 850,000 young people a chance to become at least legal in America temporarily, was unconstitutional and wrong. I think his decision is terrible, and I hope that the Biden administration appeals it and we win the appeal.

But the people who are affected by that decision, by the DACA decision, are young people, as I mentioned—infants and toddlers—brought to this country, who grew up here and know no other country. They pledge allegiance to that flag in a classroom every morning. They believe that is their flag, this is their country. And most of them, when they were teenagers, finally realized for the first time they have a problem: They are undocumented.

Should they be given a chance to become citizens of the United States? Overwhelmingly, the American people—Democrat, Republican, and Independents—say: Yes, that is only fair; give them a chance. They were brought here as kids. Give them a chance, those Dreamers, those DACA recipients. And to have them characterized as the beneficiaries of mass amnesty is unfair, and frankly, it doesn't reflect very well on us as a nation.

If we cannot find in our values, in our hearts, an opportunity to give these young people a chance to prove themselves, it really disappoints me that my colleagues would take that position.

These young people are remarkable. For 20 years of my public life, I have come to know them, and I am always amazed by the fact that I don't have to put a footnote at the end of that sentence and say "except for a few here and there." By and large, I have never run into one who has run into problems. I know it happens occasionally,

but it is so rare. These are remarkable young people, Dreamers, who just want a chance to be part of America's future.

I have come to the floor over 120 times with color photographs telling their individual stories. Each one is an amazing testimony to who we are as Americans and why these young people want to be part of us and what they can bring to this country. Remarkable stories—doctors, nurses, teachers, engineers, members of our military, front-line workers—on COVID-19. They do remarkable things.

One of them, yesterday, appeared in a video before our committee, Vicente Reyes. Vicente Reyes is a DACA recipient. His mom and dad are undocumented. He is studying robotic engineering at a university in California.

Do we need him? I mean, can we do without Vicente Reyes? I assume we can do without him, but wouldn't we be better if he were part of us, part of the American family, and part of the American future?

That is what DACA is about. That is what Dreamers are about. If we help him, is that mass amnesty to give that young man a chance?

Incidentally, he told a story. He used to be out there picking those crops, and his mom and dad still are. Every morning, he said, before they go to the fields for a 10-hour day of back-breaking work picking crops, he said: Mom and dad hug me. They hug me and I hug them back because we know something. There is a secret in our family. My mom and dad are undocumented, he said. They may not come home tonight.

That is what that family faces to go out and do this back-breaking work, and that is the reality. And to dismiss this as mass amnesty—to even talk about a path to citizenship for Vicente, to talk about some way to help his mom and dad from being frightened every single day of being deported, that is what I dedicated my work for in this Senate and the Senate Judiciary Committee for many years.

I hope we can find some Republicans who will step up and join us in that effort. We need at least 10 of them. That is hard to find. Maybe we can find them. I am hoping we can do it soon.

We have a lot of work to do in this country for the Dreamers, for the farm workers, for the frontline workers who were there when we needed them so desperately during the COVID-19 pandemic and are still there today doing that work.

We are a big, wonderful nation that has a great story to tell, and it is a story of success written by immigrants with their blood and their toil and their dedication to this great Nation. We need to renew that effort.

CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this has been one of the most difficult years ever for the Capitol Police here in

Washington. These are men and women who have worked in this building and nearby in our office buildings and protect us to make sure we can come safely to work every single day and our staff and our visitors and tourists who come to the Capitol Building. These men and women are amazing.

We know that January 6, 2021, is a date that they will never forget. They were on the front lines of the violent January 6 insurrection that shocked this building, our Nation, and the world. Hundreds of Capitol Police literally fought for hours that day to protect this building and to protect me and other Members of the U.S. Senate.

The attack left one Capitol officer, Brian Sicknick, dead and more than 140 total officers from the Capitol Police and DC Police injured. Some members said it was the most savage fighting they have ever witnessed or been part of. Many of them thought they would die that day, yet they were back at their post the very next day and the day after that, and the day after that, and this morning too.

On April 2, the Capitol Police were still struggling to heal from the insurrection when their department suffered another devastating loss. A driver rammed his car into a barricade just outside the Capitol, a barricade I go through every morning. And one officer was injured and another officer, Billy Evans, was killed—killed. The memorial to him is still out at that barricade.

Only once before in the 193-year history of the Capitol Police had the department lost two members in the line of duty in the same year. That was on July 24, 1998. This coming Saturday is the anniversary of that event, the 23rd anniversary of the murders of Capitol Police Officers Jacob "J.J." Chestnut and Detective John Gibson.

It happened on a Friday afternoon. I remember the day. Most Members of Congress had already gone home for the weekend, but the Capitol was still filled with staff and tourists. Officer Chestnut was at his post guarding an entrance on the east front of the building when a man with a .38-caliber Smith & Wesson revolver and a history of serious mental illness walked in and shot him point-blank in the back of the head. The shooter then ran to the nearest opened door, seeking to escape.

On the other side of that door, Detective Gibson just warned congressional staffers to hide under their desks, and he was face-to-face with that shooter. For the first time in his career, Detective Gibson fired his weapon in the line of duty, hitting the man four times. The man shot back, hitting Detective Gibson twice. Both officers died.

John Gibson had 18 years with the Capitol Police. J.J. Chestnut, a Vietnam veteran, had 20 years in the Air Force before joining the Capitol Police. He was ready for retirement. He thought he was going to be able to take time off with his family, but he lost his life that day.

They became the first civilians ever to lie in honor in the Capitol Rotunda. Today, the Capitol Police headquarters is named after them.

Their murders remained the darkest days in the history of the Capitol Police until January 6, 2021, until a defeated and bitter President Donald Trump incited an angry mob and sent them to this Capitol to try to overturn a Presidential election.

The images from that day are sickening and we have seen them over and over. On February 3, Brian Sicknick became the third Capitol Police officer to lie in honor in the Rotunda.

I had a chance after that to speak to his parents. They were so proud of him and they thought he had a safe job as a policeman. Working at the U.S. Capitol, that has to be a safe place to work. Among the mourners paying their respect in the Rotunda that day were President Biden and the widow of Officer Chestnut.

Mr. President, the men and women who safeguard this Capitol deserve more than words from us, more than speeches. They protect us with their courage and they stand up and fight for us whenever they are called on.

Men and women in law enforcement are on the front lines when it comes to the Nation's gun violence epidemic. So far this year, at least 36 police officers in the city of Chicago have been shot or shot at. It is too easy for convicted felons and people with serious mental illness to get their hands on guns and use them.

More than 90 percent of the American people—all political faiths—believe we should have serious background checks to keep guns out of the hands of people who will misuse them: Convicted felons, mentally unstable people.

The House passed a bill, H.R. 8, in March that would fortify this effort to keep guns out of those hands. Senators MURPHY and MANCHIN have been leading the negotiations. They are not coming along very well. I wish they were. I hope our Republican colleagues will join us in supporting that.

In the meantime, I hope that we don't allow the events of January 6 to just become a matter of history. There are still important questions we need to answer.

And the Capitol Police have done something unusual, maybe the first time in memory. They have written us a letter and begged us to have a commission to really look into and investigate what happened on January 6. They had so much at stake that day. They risked their lives for us. And, sadly, Senator MCCONNELL is not agreeing to move forward on a bipartisan commission. Speaker PELOSI is trying to put one together now and it is not easy. I commend her for her effort.

It would be a shame for us to walk away from the events of January 6 because of worries about political consequences. We owe it to the American people. We owe it to the Capitol Police.

We owe it to the families of those who were injured and those who died to do our part to get to the bottom of what led up to January 6.

If we want this Capitol to be available for future generations to visit peacefully in a positive way, let's do our part to make sure we get to the bottom and answer that fundamental question.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from South Dakota.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, inflation is on the rise. Inflation in June was at its highest level in 13 years. Consumers are facing the effects: higher prices.

Americans are facing increases in rent, in their restaurant bills, in their grocery bills, gas prices, and the list goes on.

Want to buy a used car?

Expect to pay a lot more money than you would a year ago.

Inflation happens when the amount of money out there exceeds the supply of products. When that happens, when demand outstrips supply, prices increase. And that is what we are seeing now. It is being aggravated by Democrats' decision this spring to flood the country with unnecessary money.

During times of crisis, there is a place for increased government spending. The money the government invested in COVID vaccines, for example; the forgivable loans provided to small businesses to help them weather the pandemic; and the increased assistance to hospitals and healthcare providers as the crisis escalated.

But crisis spending is for just that, a crisis, or at least it should be. Unfortunately, Democrats have never met a temporary government dollar that they didn't want to keep spending. "Temporary" government programs aren't really a thing for my friends across the aisle.

And so as the crisis was waning and our economy was rebounding, Democrats doubled down on the crisis spending and passed a massive COVID relief bill filled with unnecessary handouts; hundreds of billions of dollars for State governments, the majority of whom were doing just fine without it. In fact, many running surpluses. Tens of billions more for schools who had barely made a dent in the billions of dollars they had already been given.

Republicans and at least one liberal economist warned that Democrats' massive spending plan could overstimulate the economy, but Democrats didn't listen. So it is no surprise that the flood of unnecessary government dollars is currently helping to boost inflation.

Here is the kicker, Mr. President. After flooding the economy with unnecessary money, Democrats are now preparing to double down on that strategy. That is right. Despite passing a

largely unnecessary \$1.9 trillion bill just 4 months ago, Democrats now want to spend an additional \$3.5 trillion—\$3.5 trillion.

The truth is that number is likely to be even higher, a lot higher. One estimate suggests that the \$3.5 trillion is likely to be more like \$5 trillion or \$5.5 trillion. That is from an independent analysis by the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, where President Biden's own Treasury Secretary used to serve on the board. That is an inconceivably large amount of money.

To put that number in perspective, the entire Federal budget for 2019 was less than \$4.5 trillion—the entire Federal budget. So Democrats are just casually tossing out a new spending bill that might very well exceed the entire Federal budget in 2019.

I can assure Americans that that much money would fuel increased inflation. Consumers would continue to be squeezed by rising prices and watch the value of their salaries decrease.

But the damage would not be just limited to the effects of inflation. Americans would also suffer as a result of the massive tax hikes Democrats are envisioning. Democrats plan to pay for all or some of their spending by raising taxes left and right on small businesses, large businesses, investment, well-off Americans. All of them and more will see tax increases under Democrats' plans.

The President, of course, likes to repeat his mantra that he won't raise taxes on those making under \$400,000. In fact, that isn't really true, as the President's plans for a second death tax will undoubtedly hit middle-class Americans.

While it is true that the President won't be raising income taxes on Americans making less than \$400,000 a year, middle-class Americans will unquestionably bear a substantial part of the burden of his tax hikes because raising taxes, any taxes, has consequences for everyone.

Democrats like to pretend that raising taxes is a consequence-free enterprise, but that isn't even close to being the truth. It doesn't take an economics degree to recognize that. It is common sense. Raise taxes enough on anyone or any business and that individual's behavior or that business's behavior is going to change. A business facing a substantial tax hike may raise prices; it may freeze salaries; or it may not hire as many new workers, and all of those decisions will be felt by ordinary Americans.

Think about it. If a business raises prices to deal with the impact of a tax hike, who is going to feel it the most? Ordinary Americans on a budget.

What is more, most Americans, if they are not self-employed or working for government, are employed by businesses, and if the business they work for isn't doing well, their prospects are going to be significantly affected. If businesses hold down wages to deal with the impact of tax hikes, for exam-

ple, ordinary Americans' long-term earning potential will be diminished. These effects may not sound as concrete as being handed a tax bill, but they have just as real of an impact on Americans' incomes and Americans' lives.

Studies suggest that 50 to 70 percent or more of the burden of corporate tax hikes is borne by workers in the form of things like lower wages. Combine Democrats' proposed business tax hikes with their massive proposed increase in the capital gains tax, which would chill the investment that helps drive job creation, and you have a recipe for permanently diminished economic growth and a permanent reduction in opportunity for American workers.

If Democrats received any mandate in the last election, it was a mandate for moderation, for compromise, for bipartisan cooperation. Yet Democrats are behaving as if they had received a mandate for a partisan revolution. They are busy driving the country down the road to socialism with a massive and permanent expansion in the size of government, and their reckless tax-and-spending spree will hurt the very Americans they claim to want to help.

I hope some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will put the brakes on their party before the Democrats' massive spending spree ends in economic disaster for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

CYBER INCIDENT NOTIFICATION ACT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Cyber Incident Notification Act of 2021.

I am very grateful to be joined by my colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Maine, because on this topic I am about to describe, she was way ahead of the curve, as she is on so many issues. She was so far ahead of the curve as to what we are talking about now, that if the Congress of the United States had adopted her proposals back in 2012—back in 2012—we might not be dealing with, literally, the catastrophic effects of cyber security incidents. We didn't, and that is why we are putting forward the Cyber Incident Notification Act of 2021.

It seems like, every day, Americans wake up to the news of another ransomware attack or cyber intrusion. The SolarWinds breach, which we learned about last December, resulted in the compromise of hundreds of Federal Agencies and private companies. The truth was, as we discovered, the bad guys actually got into 18,000 companies in the SolarWinds hack. Similarly, the ransomware attack on the Colonial Pipeline this past May resulted in gasoline and fuel shortages and price spikes across the entire eastern seaboard, demonstrating how broad

the ripple effects of these attacks can be.

The truth is these attacks can affect hundreds or even thousands of entities connected to the initial target. Earlier this week, the United States and allied governments publicly accused China's government of conducting an extensive hacking campaign on Microsoft's email systems, which again compromised tens of thousands of computers worldwide, including those used by some of the world's largest companies, contractors, and governments.

These events are finally the wake-up call that Senator COLLINS predicted a decade ago, a wake-up call for many of us in Washington, and even for those individuals who sit on these companies' boards that have to understand now the threats and capabilities possessed by our adversaries. These events also reveal major gaps in our Nation's effort to combat and contain cyber threats with insufficient communication between the private and public sectors.

These attacks and hacks demonstrate that our IT and critical infrastructure—much of it operated, appropriately, by the private sector—are under constant daily attack. They also demonstrate that we need to get better insight into cyber incidents as they happen—mid-incident—so that the U.S. Government can bring to bear its most effective capabilities and respond rapidly to protect our critical infrastructure systems.

We saw that recently when the FBI and the Department of Justice were able to claw back some of the ransomware from the Colonial Pipeline attack. With the Colonial Pipeline, what happened was we had a responsible private sector company that notified the government, FireEye, but we cannot rely upon the good will of private entities to individually, case by case, decide whether they tell the government. We need quicker and more comprehensive notification. In a sense, when an entity is being attacked, if that sector is being attacked, we can then notify other companies in that sector in realtime.

The truth is we should have done this much earlier. In fact, SolarWinds showed us that, when it comes to wide-scale breaches of U.S. networks, nobody is responsible for collecting information on the scope and scale of these attacks. This is alarming because this information allows us to develop a full picture of what was targeted and taken, what was at risk, and the type of techniques and tactics used by our adversaries.

These are all issues of critical national security, but as Senator COLLINS knows, under current law, there is no Federal mandate that companies disclose when they have been breached, even if they operate critical infrastructure. Rather, there is the hodgepodge of guidelines, depending on the industry, which, as we have seen, at least some companies then use as an excuse not to report or literally to create a

whole set of legal gymnastics to avoid any level of disclosure. Unfortunately, this leaves our Nation vulnerable to criminal and state-sponsored hacking activity.

The bottom line is we cannot just rely on voluntary reporting to protect our critical infrastructure. We need a routine reporting requirement so that vital sectors of our economy that are affected by a cyber breach can have the full resources of the Federal Government and so that the private sector can be mobilized to respond to and fight off these attacks.

That is why I have been very proud to work not only with Senator COLLINS but also the vice chair of the Intelligence Committee, Senator RUBIO, and, in total, 15 of our colleagues, bipartisan, mostly all from the Intel Committee but also the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee and the chairman—on SASC—of the Cyber Committee, to introduce legislation this week that would require Federal Agencies, government contractors, and the owners and operators of critical infrastructure to report cyber intrusions within 24 hours of their discovery.

The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that the Federal Government is aware of and can take immediate action to mitigate cyber intrusions that have the impact to affect our national security. Part of that notification will be not just to let the government know but to let others in the private sector know as well. Consequently, the bipartisan Cybersecurity Incident Notification Act of 2021 would require covered entities to notify the Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, or CISA, when a breach is detected so that the U.S. Government can mobilize to protect critical industries across our country. These covered entities include healthcare, transportation, financial services, agriculture, energy, and information technology sectors.

Now, the executive branch should have the flexibility to respond to shifting threats. The bill leaves some discretion for this and future administrations to determine whether other entities or classes of entities should be included at a later date.

To incentivize this information sharing to take place, the bill would grant limited immunity and confidentiality to companies that come forward to report a breach. It would also include data protection procedures to anonymize personally identifiable information and to, again, safeguard privacy.

These are not liability protections that would shield network operators, though, from negligence or misconduct. Rather, they would help prevent companies that come forward under this legislation from facing reputational risk just for reporting this vital information to the government.

Ultimately, I see this kind of notification as providing value, as I said, to

the private sector as well so that we may have this common defense. There is no way we can solve this problem with government alone or with the private sector alone. There should not only be a rapid public notification but, in appropriate cases, swift government action.

Ultimately, we need to recognize that the threat landscape has fundamentally changed from even a few years ago. A few years ago, Senator COLLINS had this approach, and I think the private sector was concerned about undue mandates. The world has changed, and even many of the business organizations now agree that, as long as we grant that limited immunity and confidentiality, we need to put this reporting mechanism in place so that the public sector and the private sector can respond.

The truth is there are literally terabytes of sensitive data out there, including intellectual property, personal information, contract details, and others that could be exploited. For that matter, what if the SolarWinds attack had not been one of exploiting and taking out information but had actually been a denial-of-service attack, which we saw with Russia taking place against Ukraine a number of years back? That could have taken place with SolarWinds and completely shut down our economy, and we have all seen recently a dramatic upsurge in ransomware.

The truth is every company and virtually every part of government is under daily attack from these cyber criminals and, in some cases, from foreign intelligence services. The Federal Government must have the expertise and the willingness to share this information in realtime to make sure that we can counter this. I think this is a sensible first step in finally putting in place the kind of broad-based cyber strategy our country needs. So I urge my colleagues to join the 15 of us and pass the Cyber Incident Notification Act of 2021.

Again, I note my friend, the Senator from Maine, is here. We have been spending a lot of time together, but I really appreciate her lead sponsorship of this legislation.

I will say it on the floor of the Senate, as I have said in so many private settings over the last number of weeks on some other things, if we had just listened earlier to the Senator from Maine, we would have been in a lot better shape today in this country.

With that, I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, first, let me thank my good friend and the leader of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Chairman WARNER, for paving the way for this legislation. He cares deeply about our country's response to these terrible cyber attacks and intrusions, and I am so grateful for his leadership and for his working with me to

produce the Cyber Incident Notification Act of 2021.

As the chairman has mentioned, this is a bipartisan bill that is broadly supported. It would strengthen our response to cyber attacks and, thus, help to prevent future cyber intrusions. It would require government Agencies, Federal contractors, and critical infrastructure entities, which are overwhelmingly owned and operated by the private sector and other important sectors, to notify the U.S. Government if they become the victims of a significant cyber attack or intrusion.

This effort is a direct outgrowth of our work on the Senate Intelligence Committee and reflects our longstanding concern regarding the lack of timely notification of cyber attacks that can lead to extremely serious consequences for our economy, for our national security, and for our individual privacy.

In September of 2019, for example, Russian hackers gained access to the SolarWinds' software. This resulted in a supply chain compromise that was downloaded by up to 18,000 of its customers. These hackers then conducted follow-on operations that compromised 9 Federal Agencies and 100 private-sector networks.

We did not become aware of this hack until more than a year later and only then because a cybersecurity firm called FireEye voluntarily notified the Federal Government and the public.

Just to reiterate that important point, FireEye was under no legal obligation whatsoever to tell us that the software had been compromised, even though it affected nine Federal Agencies. We are grateful that FireEye told us about this hack, but the fact that companies are not mandated to do so leaves our economy and national security vulnerable to future attacks and lessens our ability to respond effectively when such intrusions do occur.

Where would we be right now if FireEye had not voluntarily disclosed the intrusion? Would the Russians' operation still be ongoing? How much sooner would we have become aware of these Russian cyber operations if key sectors were required to report cyber incidents to the U.S. Government?

As the Senator from Virginia very kindly and generously noted, I have long been concerned about this problem and focused on it.

In 2012, when I was the ranking member of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, I joined with my chairman and dear friend former Senator Joe Lieberman of Connecticut in introducing a bill called the Cybersecurity Act of 2012. That bill would have, among other things, addressed this gap in cyber incident reporting. Unfortunately, our bill did not become law. How much more prepared we would be today if it had been enacted.

My 2012 bill would have led to improved information sharing between the private sector and the Federal Government that likely would have re-

duced the impact of cyber incidents on both the government and the private sector. Having a clear view of the dangers the Nation faces from cyber attacks is necessary to enable both the public and the private sector to mitigate and reduce the threat. We have just recently seen the impact of an attack on a major pipeline. Just think what the consequences would be of an attack that crippled our electric grid.

What we are proposing in the Cyber Incident Notification Act is common sense and long overdue. Our bill recognizes the additional burden that this reporting requirement places on parts of the private sector, and so it, therefore, provides additional liability protection for companies reporting cyber incidents and requires the government to harmonize these new mandates with any existing reporting requirements to help avoid duplication.

The bill also requires the government to produce analytic updates for the government and industry practitioners regularly so that they are aware of cyber incidents taking place and targeting their sectors. This should be a two-way street of the exchange of information.

Let us not delay any longer in passing a robust cyber incident notification requirement. Failure to pass this bill will only give our adversaries more opportunity to gather intelligence on our government, to steal intellectual property from our companies, to compromise our personal privacy, and, most of all, to harm our critical infrastructure.

Again, my thanks to the Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, for his hard work on this bill. Let's get the job done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to oppose the nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning to be the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

This morning, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee voted on her nomination. Every Republican on the committee voted no. Before our business meeting was over, Senator SCHUMER came to this floor, to that desk, and he praised this nominee to the skies. President Biden and the Democrats have wrapped their arms around this nomination, and they won't let go.

So the question is, Who is this nominee whom the Democrats are embracing and every Republican voted against? Well, Tracy Stone-Manning is a graduate student who collaborated with ecoterrorists. Now, these are people who hammered hundreds of metal spikes—500 pounds of metal spikes—into trees in our national forest in Idaho. This is the kind of metal spike that they used—10 inches long, very thick; 500 pounds of these into the national forest.

Tree spiking involves nailing, hammering these rods into a tree. What happened? Why did they do that? Well, they want to stop progress in terms of logging. They want to stop progress in terms of firefighting. Because if a logger or a firefighter were to hit this rod with a chain saw, the chain saw would shatter. Devastating injuries have occurred as a result. If the saws used in timber mills or sawmills were to hit one of these as they are planing through the tree to produce boards, the entire blade shatters. It has been described to me by someone who has worked in one of these mills—it is like a hand grenade going off, damaging people all around in the vicinity. Well, the results can be fatal, and there are examples around the country where this has actually happened. Now, even the Washington Post has labeled tree spiking as ecoterrorism.

Tracy Stone-Manning, as a member of a radical group, edited, typed, and then anonymously sent a profanity-laced letter threatening the U.S. Forest Service. Here are just a few quotes from the letter.

She typed:

You bastards go in there anyway and a lot of people could get hurt.

She typed:

I would be more than willing to pay you a dollar for the sale, but you would have to find me first and that could be your WORST nightmare.

This is the letter she typed to the U.S. Forest Service. She then mailed this threatening letter to the target of the tree spiking, and the target was the U.S. Forest Service.

She and her circle were investigated. They were investigated for their involvement with this ring of ecoterrorists and this ecoterrorist attack that actually occurred to the U.S. forest. She was subpoenaed. She was ordered to give hair sampling, palm sampling, handwriting sampling, and fingerprint samples to the investigators.

She knew full well who the tree spikers were, and she could have easily gone to the authorities to identify them. She didn't. She covered it up for 4 years. She refused to cooperate with investigators.

Recently, within the last couple of months, Tracy Stone-Manning came before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. She came for her confirmation hearing. Since that hearing and the statements that she made to the committee and affidavit she swore under oath and signed,

since that time, in the last couple of months and more recently than that—actually last week in one case—several people involved in her original case have come forward to the press and to the committee to set the record straight from the record and the story that she told the committee at the time.

So the lead investigator on this case wrote a letter to Chairman MANCHIN and to me. I am the ranking member on the committee. That investigator, who I will tell you has worked as a special criminal investigator for the U.S. Government for 28 years, has been a longtime member of the U.S. military, served in Vietnam, and retired as a criminal investigator because of death threats made to him and to his family by the group who worked on this ecoterrorism—he retired from that. But he wrote to the committee. He came forward, and he said that she was the nastiest of suspects. He said that not only did she have knowledge of the plan to spike the trees, he said she was one of the planners.

He wrote to us and said:

It became clear that Ms. Stone-Manning was an active member of the original group that planned the spiking of the Post Office Timber Sale.

So there he is, a criminal investigator. Then just last week, one of the convicted tree spikers, one of the people who actually went to jail because of that—he came forward in an interview in the press. In an interview with E&E News, the convicted tree spiker confirmed that Tracy Stone-Manning knew of the plan to spike the trees, in his words, “well in advance.”

Now, according to the investigator's letter, Ms. Stone-Manning's lack of co-operation actually set back their initial investigation many years. Eventually, when she was identified and received an investigation target letter, she had to make a decision. The lead investigator said she only agreed to testify after she was caught and after her lawyer negotiated an immunity deal.

Tracy Stone-Manning—she helped plan the tree spiking. She covered up for the terrorists and their activity for years. She refused to cooperate with authorities, and she only testified when she was caught and given immunity.

After all this, she created a story and lied to our committee about the incident. On a sworn affidavit to her committee questionnaire, she said it was an alleged tree spiking and that she was not the subject of an investigation.

I specifically asked her: Did you have personal knowledge of, participate in, or in any way directly or indirectly support activities associated with the spiking of trees in any forest during your lifetime? Her response under oath was no.

Both the cop, the criminal investigator, and the criminal, the man who went to jail as the group went to jail for this—they both came forward after

her hearing to say that Tracy Stone-Manning was lying to the Senate.

Over the past 30 years, she has made contradictory statements about the ecoterrorist incident and the network. In 2013, she told a Montana State Senate committee that she was intimidated into sending the letter by a stranger. Yet, in courtroom testimony, she admitted that the tree spikers were her friends. She was one of the ring leaders of the group.

There are many qualified Democrats who could run the Bureau of Land Management. Within the Federal Government, this is the group who oversees one-eighth of all the land in the United States. It is astonishing to me that Democrats are digging in to defend a proven liar and an ecoterrorist collaborator.

So Senator SCHUMER came to the floor today and made it very clear that he is going to support this deeply flawed nominee. Will other Democrats do it as well? Will other Democrats who have millions of acres of BLM land in their States—will they join him?

Things have certainly changed, and it is interesting what has happened to the Bureau of Land Management and the nominees, because President Obama's BLM Director, Bob Abbey, came forward. He said that her actions should disqualify her from leading this important Agency. We are talking about President Obama's Director of the Bureau of Land Management says her history and her past and her activities should disqualify her.

One Biden administration official admitted to NBC News—this was in the last week—her nomination was described as “a massive vetting failure”—“a massive vetting failure.”

Now, there is going to be more to say about this nominee when an attempt is made to discharge her out of the committee, if they get to that point, a cloture vote on the floor, and again, a vote on confirmation. Lots to be said. More information will come out.

It is just hard for me, as the ranking member of that committee, to imagine a nominee more disqualified than Tracy Stone-Manning. She has collaborated with ecoterrorists, she has lied to the Senate, and she continues to harbor truly extremist views that most Americans find reprehensible.

I strongly oppose her nomination. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same. Tracy Stone-Manning is unfit to serve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

REMEMBERING MACNOLIA COX

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, earlier this month, Zaila Avant-garde became the first Black American to win the Scripps National Spelling Bee. It is kind of discouraging in the year 2021 that barrier still needed breaking.

Her achievement is an inspiration for so many students around the country.

She drew strength and courage from another trailblazer who had gotten significant less attention, whose story has not been told and honored the way that Zaila was.

In 1936, 13-year-old MacNolia Cox from Akron, OH, became one of the first two Black students to compete in the National Spelling Bee. She qualified after winning the regional competition that went 60–6–0—rounds, sponsored by the Akron Beacon Journal. Black communities across the country cheered her victory. They looked forward to her joining the national competition. She was celebrated at churches and clubs, talked about by celebrities, and even politicians. At the RKO Palace in Cleveland, band leader Fats Waller, tap dancer Bill Robinson, whom we know, whom history knows as Mr. Bojangles, brought her on stage.

Three thousand Ohioans came to Akron's Union Station to send MacNolia off on her journey to Washington. She had little idea the treatment she would endure at the tip of the Jim Crow South. She was forced to ride—she is, essentially, Ohio's representative at the National Spelling Bee, a 13-year-old Black—I was going to say Black young woman—Black girl from Ohio. She was forced to ride in segregated train cars. She was forced to stay at a private home instead of at the Willard hotel.

Nine years later, my parents—my dad came from overseas, my mom from Mansfield, GA—met at the Willard hotel at the end of his service in World War II.

She could not stay at the Willard hotel because she was African American, while all the other White competitors did. At a dinner for the finalists, she and her mother were forced to enter through the kitchen door of the hotel and sit at a separate table segregated from the other finalists. How shameful that was.

Despite it all, MacNolia Cox made it far in the competition. There were only five students left when the judges gave her a proper noun to spell. She hadn't studied it. Proper nouns were supposed to be off limits. The judges had had enough of a Black girl getting that far. They wouldn't listen to the Beacon Journal reporter, who covered her to report on the competition. She pointed out to the judges that the judges—the judges—weren't following their own rules. She was eliminated. Of course, she was. Her achievements, her story soon faded from memory until now.

Zaila Avant-garde talked to the media about scrolling through pictures of national spelling bee contestants with her father, seeing face after face that didn't look like hers.

It reminds me, yesterday, I had breakfast with the Secretary of the Treasury at the Treasury Department. To get to her office—her office, “her,” I reiterate—you walk down a long, long, long hallway. Every picture in the hallway are people who look like me. They were Secretaries of the

Treasury. Every single Secretary of the Treasury, until Janet Yellen, looked like—well, older, certainly, than the Presiding Officer—but looked like we do.

She saw MacNolia Cox's face, and she learned her story as she was looking through these. She told reporters when she was competing, she thought of MacNolia. She thought about what she had endured 85 years earlier.

Now, more Americans are learning both of their stories. More kids are seeing themselves in the faces of champions. That is why Black history matters. It matters in the classroom. It matters in movies. It matters on the Senate floor. It matters in books. It matters in TV shows. It matters in the national news. It is how we shine a light on the injustices students like MacNolia and Zaila had to overcome and work to fight them.

It is how we show kids that these are dreams—these aren't dreams only for certain kids who look a certain way. These dreams, these aspirations, these achievements in 21st century America should be for everyone.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Akron's MacNolia Cox, and even more importantly, telling her story for future generations.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, over the past week, we have put money directly—directly—in the pockets of the families of 60 million American children.

In Ohio, 2.1 million children, their families got hundreds of dollars each in tax cuts, money to help them keep up with the costs of raising a family, money they will spend in the local economy—I say to the Presiding Officer, you know this, the largest tax cut for working families in American history ever.

Stories have poured into our office from across Ohio—the Presiding Officer is hearing those in Hawaii—all from parents who work hard to make ends meet. They now have a little bit extra of their own money back to spend on groceries and childcare and medical bills and school supplies.

We care about families. There is a lot of talk in this body about we care about families. Well, if you care about families, this is all about empowering families. Families decide how to spend these dollars; MITCH MCCONNELL doesn't decide. Joe Biden doesn't decide. BRIAN SCHATZ doesn't decide. I don't decide how we spend these dollars. Families decide. They are dollars they have earned working hard to provide for their family—it is hard work raising children—and how they have raised their kids.

I think all of us are hearing these stories. Some of them on our websites, some of us in townhalls, we are hearing these stories. Let me just briefly tell just a handful of them.

Rob, from Copley, OH, said he is going to spend it on “bills and neces-

sities, especially necessities for [my] kids.”

Traci said she is going to use it to “pay for my children's sports fees.”

One mother said, “My 8-year-old was able to attend a Coding Camp this week” for the first time. She was just thrilled.

We know how expensive healthcare is. We know how medical bills and copays and premiums eat away at families' budgets. So many parents have talked about how this will help them afford healthcare expenses.

Leanne, from Akron, is going to be able to afford “my daughter's medical bills.”

Hayley said she will use the tax cut “to pay for speech therapy for [her] child.”

Susan said it will allow her to “pay for my child's dyslexia tutoring.”

Jen said, “Ours will be going straight”—you have to love this one—“Ours will be going straight to the orthodontist each month.”

Brittney wrote that this tax cut “came at a great time.” She said:

My son got sick with pneumonia this . . . week. That led to an urgent care visit, breathing treatment, chest X-rays, and a lot of medicine—so our payment will go to [emergency] medical bills to make sure our son [can thrive] and has the medicine he needs.

The Presiding Officer may remember that there were two votes on the child tax credit. First, an amendment to take it out—every Republican voted to take it out—and then an amendment to pass the bill on March 6 at about this time of day and every Republican voted against it. I know it is all about tax cuts for rich people for them, but we can get to that later.

We know another benefit of this is, this is money spent in communities. I am not getting any notes from parents saying: “You know, thank you, Senator BROWN, for this child tax credit you have been working on for a decade. I am going to put more money in my Swiss bank account.” Nobody is saying that. We have gotten so many stories already how this money supports the economy and supports jobs.

Katie from Brecksville: Month 1, she is using it for “a much-needed family vacation.” Month 2, she is using it for “school supplies.” That supports hotel jobs and restaurants jobs and retail jobs.

Lyndsay said she had used it for “back to school clothes,” again, supporting local retailers.

Brittany from Butler said: “We will be able to put new windows in the kids' bedrooms that will keep them cooler in the summer and warmer in the winter.” That sounds like work for a local handyman or a woman or a window business.

Lisa said she is spending it on “diapers and school supplies . . . we put a little into starting a 529 college fund.”

Think about that. These families are struggling. I don't know for sure, but sounds like Lisa may have a couple of

children, so she gets this—they are little, so she is going to get \$300 per child. So she gets \$600 July 15. She will get \$600 August 15. She will get \$600 September 15. She will get \$600 October 15 and November 15. And she has decided she can now afford a few things she couldn't afford. But she is going to maybe put \$100 of that every month into a 529 college fund so her child will be—the whole idea of infrastructure is building a base, a foundation, to launch children into better lifestyles, to launch children into a more productive life, to give kids opportunity. That is what this does. That is what the child tax credit does. And it is almost every-body.

Ninety-two percent of Ohio kids' families are getting a tax cut every single month. So many parents mention the costs of childcare. So often, over and over, we hear how this will allow parents to afford the childcare that allows them to go to work.

Courtney, a mother, wrote that her tax cut is already more than half—“slightly more than half the cost of part-time daycare tuition per month here in Athens,” down in southeast Ohio. She said, it is appreciated so much, the “help getting my child back into childcare and keeping me and my husband in the workforce.”

So it comes back to one question—I think the Presiding Officer knows this—whose side are you on? Whose side are you on in these fights? Are you on the side of the parents who work hard every day for their families?

In a dignity-of-work roundtable in our Senate Banking Committee, a woman from West Virginia said the words “working” and “poor” shouldn't be in the same sentence. The words “working” and “poor” shouldn't be in the same sentence. These are families who are working really hard. Give them a little bit of a break so they can rise above the poverty line so they can afford some things to launch their children into more productive lives.

So are you on the side of these parents who work every day? Or are my colleagues going to raise these families' taxes at the end of the year? Because this expires next year, if we don't continue it. I haven't seen any help yet on their side wanting to come in. I am still hopeful.

We remember what happened on 2017. The Presiding Officer remembers this. In 2017, you could walk out this door pretty much any time of day, and you could look down the hall in 2017, and you could see lobbyists lined up outside of MITCH MCCONNELL's office, all well dressed, all really, really well paid, all hat in hand—some literally, some figuratively—saying: Senator MCCONNELL, we need this additional tax break.

Do you know what? We spend \$1.5 trillion on that tax cut. They don't want to spend \$100 billion a year on these children. One hundred billion is—I should do the math really quick—about 8 percent of \$1.5 trillion, something like that—6 percent. So they will

do \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts. Seventy percent of it went to the richest people in the country. Yet they don't want to do tax cuts for children that elicit these stories.

I don't recall, getting on my website, stories saying: You know, thank you, Senator BROWN—even though I voted against it—thank you for that big tax cut back in 2017. I could buy another yacht, thank you. Or I get to go to Europe again, thank you.

We don't hear those stories. Here are the stories you hear about these children who need that tax cut.

So you will remember when they all lined up outside of our colleague Senator McConnell's office. You will remember that tax cut. They promised it would trickle down to everyone else and then it would create all this prosperity. Well, we know it didn't happen. They kept the money for themselves—no shock there. Corporations turned around and spent that money on—shocking—stock buybacks for their executives. They ended up, always, in the pockets of their executives.

Now, this year, without a single vote from Republicans in Congress, who passed tax cuts for everyone else, a pretty simple contrast: tax cuts for billionaires and corporations—thank you very much—as they line up down the hall, or do you want tax cuts for working families?

Every single month, we show parents and workers, every single month these checks are coming: \$300 per child if your child is from newborn to 5, \$250 a month if your child is from 6 to 17. Every single month, we show we are on your side. We are putting more of your own money back into your pockets.

I know the Presiding Officer joins in this. We will not stop fighting to make sure parents' hard work pays off. We will not stop. We will deliver on this.

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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, many bills get introduced in the Senate and don't seem to go anywhere. The reason is that they are meant to be simply messaging documents, making a statement, telling people what you believe, not necessarily with the motive of passing a piece of legislation.

Now, I usually do not care to comment on these bills. It is simply not worth the time. But when I see the combination of false information spread in messaging bills that could negatively impact my State, I must set the record straight, and that is why I am here.

Several colleagues just introduced a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard. I have been a proud advocate for renewable energy. Iowa is the leader in both wind and renewable fuels. When it comes to the renewable fuel standard, it is hard to argue that there has ever been a more successful clean-fuel policy implemented across the world. Between 2008 and 2020, the use of biofuels under the renewable fuel standard resulted in a savings of 980 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. That is the equivalent of removing over 200 million cars from the road for 1 year. The renewable fuel standard makes gasoline more affordable. It generates good-paying jobs. It reduces oil imports and reduces our country's greenhouse gas emissions.

The messaging coming from the bill rehashes the same talking points about ethanol that Big Oil has trotted out for the past decades. So, once again, Big Oil raises its ugly head.

Of course, Big Oil's talking points have been completely debunked by the latest science and even our nonpartisan research from the Congressional Budget Office. And Congress depends a great deal upon the research done by the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan group of professional people that study things a long time before they release their information.

Now, my pro-oil colleagues say that the renewable fuel standard causes food and feed prices to rise. However, in 2014, the CBO looked at this issue and the impact on food prices if the renewable fuel standard was fully repealed. The Congressional Budget Office concluded that American food prices would be just one-quarter of 1 percent higher if the renewable fuel standard was kept in place versus a total repeal. Out of a \$100 grocery bill, the impact is no more than a quarter. But when you consider that there is a savings of \$5 every time you fill up your gas tank due to the renewable fuel standard, consumers save money overall with the renewable fuel standard in place.

My colleagues who introduced this messaging legislation also claimed, falsely, that corn ethanol achieves little to no reduction in greenhouse gases. Now, this must be the most ridiculous assertion made against ethanol. I would like to invite my colleagues to visit Iowa to see how far ethanol has come in reducing emissions.

The most recent research from Harvard shows that corn ethanol greenhouse gas emissions are 46 percent lower than gasoline. Research by the U.S. Department of Agriculture found the reduction in CO₂ could reach 71 percent by next year if farmers follow best practices.

At a time when the Nation is working to reduce fossil fuel consumption and protect our environment, why would my colleagues introduce a bill that would increase our dependence upon foreign oil and, at the same time, increase greenhouse gas emissions?

And some of these people on this bill have the most pure environmental record in the U.S. Senate.

Renewable fuels like ethanol have a 40-year track record of making fuel more affordable and vehicles more efficient. To limit this consumer choice at the pump is completely irresponsible. Attempts to limit consumer choice, which are driven by big oil interests, must be defeated.

The United States should continue to build on the progress of the renewable fuel standard and bring policy to the table that reduces greenhouse gas emissions and brings jobs to rural America.

Let me end with a history of the RFS because this legislation is a story of irony if you consider how we got to the renewable fuel standard in the first place. You see, Big Oil wanted it. Why did they want it? Well, a lot of States where they had smog had what we call the oxygenate requirement. It was required in the Clean Air Acts that Congress has passed over the decades. In order to meet that standard, Big Oil would add what they call MTBE, a product made out of petroleum that they added to their gasoline to meet the oxygenate standards, to reduce smog.

After a long period of time, people realized that the MTBE was poisoning groundwater in California—maybe other places as well, but I remember mostly the conflict being in California—and they were being sued. So by 2005, Big Oil decided they didn't want to be sued, and what could they do to get out of it? Well, the RFS was the answer.

I was chairman of the Finance Committee at the time. They came to us with the ideas of the RFS, and it fit into a lot of things that we from agricultural interests were trying to accomplish as well. So the renewable fuel standard was written in cooperation with Big Oil—the first time in three decades that Big Oil had any interest in working with ethanol industry. Then, what, after 3 or 4 years of working with us, they have been attacking the RFS since then.

This piece of legislation I am speaking about today is just one more example of Big Oil trying to attack ethanol. And I gave all the facts about ethanol being good for the consumer, good for the environment, and good for less reliance on foreign countries for our energy sources. In fact, everything about ethanol is good, good, good.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOT VOTING—5

Burr
DainesJohnson
Moran

Rubio

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 122.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Todd Sunhwae Kim, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 122, Todd Sunhwae Kim, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Margaret Wood Hassan, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher Murphy, Ben Ray Lujan, Jack Reed, Chris Van Hollen.

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, July 22, be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAUL. 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. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we go ahead with the previously arranged vote.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jill Hruby, of New Mexico, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Department of Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hruby nomination?

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 277 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Baldwin	Heinrich	Risch
Barrasso	Hickenlooper	Romney
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Rounds
Blunt	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Booker	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	Kelly	Schumer
Capito	King	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lee	Smith
Collins	Lujan	Stabenow
Coons	Lummis	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Ernst	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Fischer	Ossoff	Wicker
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Peters	Young
Grassley	Portman	
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—16

Blackburn	Hagerty	Scott (FL)
Boozman	Hawley	Shelby
Braun	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cassidy	Lankford	Tuberville
Cotton	Marshall	
Cruz	Paul	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

COMMEMORATING THE PAST SUCCESS OF THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS AND SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS IN THE 2020 OLYMPIC GAMES AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Mr. ROMNEY. As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 314, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 314) commemorating the past success of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams and supporting the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams in the 2020 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROMNEY. I ask unanimous consent 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 314) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a resolution with Senators BENNET, HAGERTY, KLOBUCHAR, and COONS to honor the 2020 Olympic Games that officially start tomorrow.

More than 600 of our finest athletes have traveled to Tokyo to represent the United States. These athletes trained their entire lives to compete this month on the world's biggest stage. They have shed blood, sweat, and tears and have sacrificed countless hours, many while working separate full-time jobs and raising families of their own.

Of course, no one thought the 2020 Olympics would be starting tomorrow. COVID-19 did not just delay the Games for a year, it also meant hundreds of qualifying events around the world had to be canceled and relocated.

We recognize the dedication of the athletes and coaches of the U.S. Olympic and Paralympic teams, as well as

the family, friends, and loved ones who support them.

We are grateful to our friends in Japan, who have committed tremendous resources to provide safe and secure Games. I have great gratitude for these people of Japan, the people of that great country, for the enormous sacrifice they have made to host the world, to demonstrate to the world that qualities of the human spirit are great indeed, and to make their home a place where the entire world comes to gather and celebrate the human spirit and its accomplishments.

And while these Games may look a little different this year, we stand with Team USA and will be cheering them on as they bring many medals back home.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

MEDICAID SAVES LIVES ACT

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, since my first day here in the Senate—and even before that—one of the issues I have been working to address is how my own home State of Georgia, where State leaders have been digging in their heels, refusing to expand Medicaid—how it is that citizens can somehow provide affordable healthcare to their families—nearly 500,000 Georgians who are uninsured. They are in the Medicaid gap.

That is why last week I introduced the Medicaid Saves Lives Act, legislation that would create a program almost identical to Medicaid that is administered by the Federal Government and would allow people in States like Georgia who have not expanded Medicaid, an alternative path to health coverage because we know that Medicaid literally saves lives.

I was proud to introduce this legislation with my colleagues Senators Baldwin and Ossoff and that it has the support of healthcare stakeholders in Georgia and from across the country. Entities like the Georgia Hospital Association and the Grady Health System understand how expanding Medicaid in Georgia will improve health outcomes across the State, strengthen our rural hospitals and healthcare workforce, and create good-paying jobs.

Medicaid saves lives and also saves jobs. As it turns out, the right thing to do is also the smart thing to do. And so I am glad that this plan is on its way to being included in the forthcoming economic package, and I am going to do everything I can to keep pushing to make sure that it happens.

But today, I come to the Senate floor to talk not so much about policy as

much as to talk about the people behind the policy efforts that we lift up. We should always endeavor to see the human face of the public policy we put forward.

So I want to talk today about Cynthia English. She is a truckdriver in Albany, GA. It is a town in the southern rural part of our State. Cynthia turns 46 in just a few days. Her birthday, actually, is this coming Saturday. Happy birthday, Cynthia.

Cynthia, a hard-working woman, suffers from diabetes and hypertension. She says that she has previously applied for Medicaid and other healthcare programs but has been repeatedly denied because she does not have any children. She does not have any dependents. So she has been denied, in spite of her relatively low income. She is in the coverage gap.

She says that those denials made her feel like she couldn't get any type of help. In fact, Cynthia says that in the past, her diabetes and her blood pressure have had her in "real bad shape," so much so that complications with her diabetes once sent her to the emergency room.

Think about the cost of that for her and for all of us, unable to get the kind of routine care that all of us need but especially if you have a chronic illness like hypertension or diabetes. It doesn't make sense for her or for us that she is in this situation. Without health insurance, Cynthia says she couldn't go to the doctor and that, due to the cost, it was hard to pay for medication. To put it bluntly, as Cynthia said, when you are sick in Georgia, "they still really don't help you if you don't have any health insurance or Medicaid."

Thankfully, Cynthia was able to find the Good Samaritan Clinic in Albany. As a pastor, I have to say that is a good name for a clinic, the Good Samaritan Clinic, in Albany. It offers healthcare to people like her in the coverage gap. She has been able to receive care for her conditions, including a pinched nerve in her neck and back caused by sciatica, another condition that went undiagnosed for far too long because of her lack of health insurance.

If it wasn't for the Good Samaritan Clinic, Cynthia says she wouldn't be here. But it is still not enough—grateful for them, but that is not enough. That clinic does amazing work, but that is not enough.

In other States, Cynthia would be eligible for Medicaid. According to Cynthia, having additional support provided by Medicaid would help her pay for her medications and get all the care that she needs. A hard-working woman, doing all the right things, cannot get the coverage that she needs.

So behind the public policy, we have to remember the stories of real people, people like Cynthia, because there are millions of Cynthias in Georgia and across our Nation who need the Medicaid Saves Lives Act. Until we get this done, I am going to keep lifting up

Cynthia's story and the stories of other Georgians who would benefit from this critical lifesaving legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO CHAD RESARI

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Thursday. It is that time of week that I like to come down to the Senate floor and recognize someone special, someone we call our Alaskan of the Week. And it is—well, it is part of my, like I said, favorite time during the week.

I think some of our press like it because it signifies that most people are leaving. When we had pages, they loved it. But the reason is because you get to learn a little bit about Alaska, some great stories, some great individuals who are usually doing something really great for their community, their State, sometimes the country, sometimes the world. A lot of times, it is people who maybe don't want any recognition but deserve it. So I am going to talk about our Alaskan of the week, who is 85-year-old Chad Resari. And it is a real amazing story.

First, I want to talk a little about what is going on in Alaska right now. In Anchorage, where our Alaskan of the week lives, the sun rose at 5:08 a.m. and will set tonight at 11:01 p.m. Now, that is a lot of sunlight, a lot of energy, even though we lost 4 minutes and 41 seconds since yesterday. So we are losing a lot of daylight, but we still have a lot.

So my message to everybody is: You still have time to come up to Alaska, bask in the midnight sun—or at least midnight twilight, depending on where you are. And if you have to wait until next year, we would love to have you.

I would tell you, if you come to Alaska next year, one of the many things you should try to see, or even participate in if you are brave enough, is the annual Mount Marathon Race on July 4 in Seward, AK. It is a race that Chad Resari has run 25 times. At 85 years old this year, he was officially the oldest person to have ever finished this race.

So competing and finishing any race at the age of 85 is impressive. But let me tell you why finishing this race at that age is truly extraordinary, an inspiration to everybody who is watching—and trust me, he has inspired tens of thousands of Alaskans for his feat.

First, the history: The race dates back to 1915 when legend has it two of what we call "sourdoughs" were in a bar in Seward. By the way, a lot of legends begin in bars in Alaska.

So they were wagering how long it would take to get up and down the 3,022-foot peak in Seward, AK—by the way, a very steep mountain. One insisted that it could be done in less than an hour. The other said, in effect, "No way." The loser was to buy the house a round of drinks. Somewhere in there, some entrepreneur decided to make it a real race, to make it on the Fourth of July. And so every year, the Mount Marathon Race has happened for over 100 years now.

The fastest runner in that first race—the race where there was a challenge in the bar, in 1915—did it in over an hour; the legend is one hour and 2 minutes. So he lost the bet. He had to buy rounds. But the race has lived on.

Now, the record holder is David Norris—he is from Anchorage—who ran the 2016 Mount Marathon in 41 minutes and 26 seconds.

David has since won the race two more times.

Now, here is the important thing about the race itself. It is more than a mile, and half of it is straight up a mountain and then back down a mountain, which is more precarious, 1½ miles.

Outside magazine calls it “the toughest 5K on the planet” Earth. Others use less polite words to describe it. But everyone who knows about the race will agree that anyone who takes to the mountain and completes it is a rock star. This, again, is from Outside magazine.

If you are watching or you are interested, Google Mount Marathon race in Seward, AK. You will get a sense from the pictures.

Here is what Outside magazine said—just a taste of what this race is like. I am quoting here:

That descent from Mount Marathon is sort of a controlled dive . . . a hectic sliding rush along loose, soft rock—

Oftentimes there is still snow up there—

. . . it's part running, part skiing, part falling, and it often leaves finishers dripping with blood or with gravel shrapnel embedded in their butts and legs.

And knees.

This is the most pure mountain race I can think of. It's straight up and straight down—no messing around.

One of this year's runners, who is one of the few professional runners who come from all over the world to run this race, he said:

Alaska doesn't mess around.

So that is the race. That is the race 85-year-old Chad Resari ran 3 weeks ago. Thousands of people come out to watch it. It is a huge event in Seward. Runners from around the world and our 85-year-old Alaskan just completed it.

Who is this tough, now-fabled person in my State?

Chad was born in Hawaii. His parents are Filipino. He spent most of his younger years with his parents on a sugar plantation in Maui. He was an active kid. He ran with his high school running team and, on his off time, sometimes ran up mountains. Good training for Mount Marathon later in his life.

After high school, he spent 7 years in the seminary. He is a deeply religious man. At the end of his time, he and his mentor decided that he should serve God, not as a priest, but as a layperson. And as a longtime member of our Lady of Guadalupe parish in Anchorage, he has stayed faithful to his mission since. In fact, my team was talking to

him yesterday and he was on his way to mass, which he does very, very, very regularly.

After the seminary, Chad was open to a new experience. Someone told him that the wages in Alaska were high, \$2.50 an hour at the time compared to about 90 cents an hour where he was.

Also, he had a brother in the Army stationed in Anchorage, so he said it “might be a good idea. Who knows, I might even be able to find some gold”—in Alaska—“too.”

Also, he read in Reader's Digest he could grow strawberries in Alaska, which is true. So he was intrigued.

He arrived in Anchorage on March 12, 1962. It was 15 degrees below zero. Chad said:

The weather was cool. I'll probably like it here.

He didn't really like the heat and humidity in Hawaii.

He initially worked as a custodian at Catholic Junior High, then began to get interested in coaching students. As a pastor at the school took note of his interest in teaching, he helped send him to then Alaska Methodist University, now Alaska Pacific University, to get his teaching degree.

Until 1966, when Chad retired, he taught PE, first at Central Junior High, then at Mears Junior High. He taught basketball, hockey, soccer, softball, track and field—you name it. Great coach, and he loved working with students and teachers and the other coaches.

Throughout those years, and obviously later, he practiced what he preached. Not only did he continue running, he lifted weights, winning first place in his weight class in a power-lifting competition in 1973.

Although he continued to run and stay in shape, he ran the fabled Mount Marathon race just twice, in 1963 and in 1964, but then he took a long break because the training for the race is very rigorous and time-consuming. He was married then to Edna—49 years now—teaching, coaching, raising three daughters. He just didn't have time to train for this race.

But in 1996, after he retired, he started to train and run Mount Marathon again. He began in earnest from that time. He has only missed this race twice. Once when smoke from forest fires made it too dangerous and again last year, when the race was canceled due to COVID. So he really hasn't missed it at all.

What is his secret?

“I'm not sure I have any secret,” he said. “My wife is a nurse and she makes sure I have my fruits and vegetables,” and like a lot of Alaskans, “I eat a lot of fish,” he said.

They go to mass daily. They always say their evening and morning prayers. When they travel, they pray for their own safety and the safety for everybody on the road or on the airplane with them.

“That's what the Lord would want us to do: keep others in mind.”

You can see Chad is a good man, a spiritual man. He credits God for giving him the strength and stamina to do what he just did, make it up a 3,000-foot mountain, 1½ miles straight up.

This race, when he was officially the oldest person to ever have run it and complete it, was very challenging. But it was also particularly special for him. All across the trail, the people watching—and when you go to Seward, you will see thousands of people—the people running the race, the officials, everybody in Alaska seemed like they were cheering Chad on, 85-year-old Chad running one of the toughest 5Ks on the planet Earth.

One of his former students, now in his 70s, was also there cheering him on. This year, his youngest daughter Trina also ran the race. Tough family. When the finish line was in sight, he could see her and his other daughters, Joanna, Sheila, and their children, who all ran up to urge him to finish strong, get to the finish line. His wife, his niece and her husband, his friends were all there cheering for him when he crossed the finish line of Mount Marathon; 2 hours, 29 minutes, 23 seconds up and down a steep mountain in Alaska at the tender age of 85 years old.

It was challenging, he said. And after, he was definitely tired. But here is the thing. He plans to do it next year and the year after that and the year after that. He says, as long as he can do it, he is going to continue to do it. “For some reason, I just enjoy running that race,” he said.

So Chad, thank you for being such a great inspiration. Thank you for praying for everybody, keeping your fellow Alaskans and Americans in your prayers.

Congratulations on being the oldest person ever to run the fabled Mount Marathon race. And, importantly, congratulations for being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 167, 196, 197, 198, 199, and 200; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The nominations considered and agreed to en bloc are as follows:

IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Heidi Shyu, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering;

Ely Stefansky Ratner, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense; Shawn Graham Skelly, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense; Meredith Berger, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Gina Maria Ortiz Jones, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force; and Caroline Diane Krass, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will get right to the point: the very definition of democracy in the United States is under attack. You see it in State legislatures across the country. Powerful partisans advancing bill after bill to restrict voters' access to the ballot box. It flies in the face of the very evolution of progress.

Gone are the days when voters rode on horseback or walked for miles to cast their ballot. Technological advances, commonsense understandings of the daily lives of hard-working Americans—all these things and more recommend an open, accessible, expanded, and secure election process. Yet instead of seizing these opportunities to ensure every voice, every vote counts, partisan efforts are afoot to take us back—back to a time when senseless barriers were erected to block the votes of very specific communities.

The U.S. Senate—the democratically elected U.S. Senate—should not stand for such an assault on our democracy. And every Senator who swears the oath of office should stand up and stand against this bitter attack on the ballot box.

Protecting the right to vote has long been bipartisan. I stood alongside my dear friend, himself a soldier in the war against voter oppression, John Lewis, when we reauthorized the Voting Rights Act in 2006. And it was with a heavy—but hopeful—heart that I reintroduced the Voting Rights Advancement Act last year to bear his name. I will soon do so again. This bipartisan legislation should advance, and quickly.

Now is the time for every American—regardless of party, regardless of politics—to stand in defense of our democracy. To stand for what is right, and to stand with the clear arc of history—the arc that bends toward justice, toward inclusion, towards equality. With one loud and clear voice, we should reject erosions of voter protections. And we should do so now.

Vermont has always been at the forefront of expanding access to the ballot, and one of our State's leaders in that fight has been Secretary of State Jim Condos. I ask unanimous consent that a column by Secretary Condos, published in the July 14 edition of The Times Argus, be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times Argus, July 14, 2021]

OUR DEMOCRACY IS AT A CROSSROADS

(By Jim Condos)

"The vote is precious. It is the most powerful non-violent tool we have in a democratic society, and we must use it"—John Lewis

This month we celebrated the birth of our nation.

Since its inception, American democracy has undergone continual transformation. During the past 245 years, many activists and advocates have fought tirelessly to expand the franchise that our democratic ideals depend on: the right to vote.

From suffragettes to civil rights leaders, their work has ensured that the march of progress has been oriented forward, focused on increasing access to the ballot box.

This Independence Day was an opportunity to reflect on the resiliency of our country and of our democracy. There has been no shortage of challenges during the past year and a half. Despite these challenges, we achieved record breaking turnout for a general election, which nonpartisan experts have described as the most secure and the most scrutinized election in U.S. history. We were able to do so with common-sense voting reforms, providing voters with more options for receiving and casting their ballot.

After the ballot counting was completed, and the careful town by town certification process took place, we had official results and a list of election winners and losers, just like every other general election in memory.

Unlike other election years, what has followed has brought our democracy to a crossroads. Without producing any evidence, the former president and his allies have used known false voter-fraud claims as justification for their attempts to use state legislatures and phony 'fraudits' to supersede the will of the people and, more significantly, to restrict access to the ballot box.

Our democratic principles should have to endure constant debate. However, willfully disregarding the certified, official election results in an effort to circumvent the will of the people and prevent the peaceful transition of power sets our country on a dangerous path.

Sending us even further into treacherous territory, some state legislatures are using 'the Big Lie' to roll back the voter access expansions made during 2020, and to further suppress voting rights through measures such as the implementation of more restrictive voter ID laws, limits on the ballot-by-mail request period, elimination or reduction in ballot drop boxes, and closure of polling precincts.

After record-breaking turnout in 2020, and with zero evidence of widespread fraud or election rigging, why would they want to make it harder for eligible Americans to vote? The answer is simple: because they were unhappy with the results and want fewer people to vote.

Overall, there have been over 350 bills introduced in 47 states with the sole purpose of reducing access to the ballot. In June alone, 17 state legislatures enacted 28 new voter restriction laws. A small few include reasonable, understandable reforms.

Most make no sense at all. It is clear that some lawmakers would prefer to pick their voters, rather than voters picking their representatives.

Frankly, I am concerned for our nation. We stand at a crossroads, and the decisions we make now will ripple throughout time.

There is hope. In Vermont, we saw the record turnout as a positive, so we made the mailing of ballots to all voters a permanent fixture of Vermont general elections. We also created a new pathway for voters to correct a defective ballot so that their vote will count. We did this by working across the aisles with the support of Democrats, Republicans, Progressives and independents.

In the face of the alarming rise in state-level attacks on voting rights, we cannot afford to wait for solutions one-by-one in all 50 states. With the gutting of the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court, we no longer have the luxury of a "wait and see" approach. Congress can, and must, create minimum voter access and fairness standards that states must abide by, so that eligible voters are not being denied their voting rights.

The true voter fraud in this country is denying any eligible American their right to register and vote.

Congress alone can put an end to restrictive and unnecessary obstacles to voting, prohibit racebased and partisan gerrymandering, make automatic, online and same day voter registration the law of the land, and make voting by mail accessible for every voter, regardless of which side of an invisible line you live on.

Two federal bills pending, the For the People Act, and the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, give Congress this opportunity to act. The time has come for the partisan, political games to stop. Those who are prioritizing the promotion of politically motivated falsehoods about the security of our elections, over the voting rights of the people who put them in office, are committing a severe dereliction of duty.

In 2021, our democracy has come to a crossroads. Fortunately, we have a roadmap, we just need to follow it.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, since the start of the pandemic, the State of Vermont, at every level of its leadership, has taken heroic efforts to mitigate spread of the deadly COVID-19 virus. With strong leadership from Gov. Phil Scott, and bolstered by a firm belief in scientific facts, the State nearly halted altogether the spread of COVID-19, minimized the number of Vermonters lost to the disease, and now leads the Nation in the percentage of residents who have received at least one vaccine shot. As we look to hopefully soon be on the other side of this pandemic, I strongly believe that there are invaluable lessons to be learned from Vermont's response, so that we are better prepared for the days, months, and years ahead.

Aisha K. Jha's "Vermont's and South Dakota's COVID Infection Rates are Remarkably Similar—But their Outcomes are Not" article published in the Washington Post on July 13, 2021, reviews the important steps Vermont took to not only protect the health of its residents but also ensure that minimal economic damage was done given

the circumstances. A strong public health approach, led by Vermont Health Commissioner Mark Levine, always communicated scientific evidence clearly and thoughtfully. This fostered a sense of trust and community that has now resulted in Vermont nearing herd immunity and able to fully reopen local businesses for everyone to enjoy.

I am so proud of every Vermonter who stepped up to do their part to not only protect themselves, but their families, friends, and neighbors. This is truly the Vermont way. I know that if all States followed Vermont's example, and continued to vaccinate all residents, we would be able to put this dark chapter of American history in our rearview mirror.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article mentioned above, about the important work in Vermont to protect our State from the COVID-19 pandemic.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 2021]

VERMONT'S AND SOUTH DAKOTA'S COVID INFECTION RATES ARE REMARKABLY SIMILAR—BUT THEIR OUTCOMES ARE NOT

(By Ashish K. Jha)

Two states. Two different paths in responding to COVID-19. Together, they offer invaluable lessons about the road ahead for the nation—especially as infection rates creep up because of the delta variant.

The two states are Vermont and South Dakota. Both feature among the three states that COVID Act Now classifies as falling in the lowest-risk category, along with Massachusetts. This may be a surprise. While New England states are known to have done extraordinarily well in vaccinating their populations, South Dakota is in the middle of the pack. So, what explains the fact that South Dakota has infection numbers almost as low as Vermont, the most vaccinated state in the nation?

Let's start with some basics. Vermont and South Dakota share several important similarities. Both have relatively White, older and rural populations. They have comparable median incomes. Both states have Republican governors, challenging the simplistic notion that COVID risk is a partisan phenomenon.

Over the past two months, the rates of infection in Vermont and South Dakota have appeared remarkably similar. Both states have seen steep declines in cases, making both states near the best in terms of infections per population.

But this is where the similarity ends. While nearly 75 percent of Vermonters have had at least one vaccine shot, putting the state near the threshold for herd immunity, only half of South Dakotans have had at least one shot. South Dakota's substantial population immunity instead comes in large part from prior infections, particularly during the fall. This massive surge in infections was driven by the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally in August that brought nearly half a million people to South Dakota, sparking outbreaks across that state and, indeed, the nation. With little to no interest on the part of its governor to squelch the outbreak, South Dakota reached the highest levels of infection seen by any state during the pandemic. At its peak, the state was reporting more than 160 new cases per 100,000 residents. Vermont, in comparison, never climbed above 30 cases per 100,000.

Unsurprisingly, these states experienced stunningly different outcomes. Adjusted for population, nearly six times as many people died in South Dakota from covid-19 as in Vermont (230 per 100,000 in South Dakota compared to just 40 per 100,000 in Vermont). In real numbers, while about 250 Vermont residents died from the disease, more than 2,000 South Dakotans died. And as of today, Vermont has a lower unemployment rate, suggesting that there need not be any trade-off between public health and the economy.

By some estimates, nearly half of the people of South Dakota may have been infected. These infections led to huge amounts of suffering beyond the deaths themselves. We are seeing an increasing body of evidence that many who survive serious illness from the virus have long-term complications and symptoms. When infections spike, a run on hospital beds means other people die because they can't access hospital care, which almost surely occurred in South Dakota at the height of the surge. Vermont took a different approach, keeping public health measures in place to keep infections low and then, building up population immunity through excellent vaccination campaigns.

The virus isn't going away. In fact, it is likely to become endemic, meaning it will continue to circulate, occasionally causing outbreaks in low-vaccination communities. Most people will encounter the virus at one point or another. And if they don't have immunity from vaccines, many will get sick. The harms from infection are large, especially in comparison to the generally mild side-effects of the vaccines. And there is some evidence that the vaccine-induced immunity is more effective than natural infection-induced immunity. As the highly contagious delta variant spreads, states that have experienced high levels of infection such as South Dakota may be more vulnerable than highly vaccinated states such as Vermont.

In the spring of 2020, governors had to make decisions with little federal guidance and little historical precedent. But by that summer, it was much clearer how to curtail the disease, protect public health and manage the economy carefully. By following the science, Vermont saved an enormous number of lives and has now reached a degree of population immunity through vaccination that makes large outbreaks unlikely. Embracing a policy of "personal responsibility," South Dakota did little to protect its residents, leading to the deaths of more than 2,000 South Dakotans and the suffering of tens of thousands more. To avoid more unnecessary outbreaks, we need to learn from states that have successfully weathered the pandemic, follow the science and keep vaccinating Americans.

REMEMBERING HARRY CHAPIN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it has been 40 years since the Nation lost a champion for the hungry, and the American people lost a talented and inspirational musical artist. And I lost a dear partner and friend.

I was proud to have been able to work side by side with Harry Chapin on several projects to address hunger, here at home, and in the world. We strategized. We met with other Senators to build support. And I got to know him well. He stayed at our home and even sang for our enthralled children. I was with him on the grounds of the Capitol Building when he pulled out his guitar and gave an impromptu

concert. Passersby were drawn to him, and it was one more magical moment, among so many with Harry.

Harry had incredible energy and drive and commitment to his goals. Bill Ayres, a former Catholic priest who cofounded the organization WhyHunger with Harry, has noted that Harry used to say: "When in doubt, do something." And do something, he certainly did. Since its founding in 1975, WhyHunger has raised more than \$30 million to help more than 10 million families, children, veterans, and others around the world gain access to nutritious food and vital services.

One of Harry's ideas was to convince President Jimmy Carter to form a Commission on world hunger. I readily signed on to help him. When we had that meeting with the President in the Cabinet Room, Harry's persistence was on overdrive. President Carter agreed to establish the Commission. So that goal was in hand. But Harry kept telling the President why we should do this, and President Carter kept trying to tell Harry that he agreed with him. Harry was wound up and excited to have the chance to lay out the case for a Commission. And I finally said: "Harry, don't talk him out of it." Everyone laughed because we all knew that it was a moment that distilled the pure energy for which we all loved and admired him.

I worked with Senator Byron Dorgan and others in gaining authorization for a Congressional Gold Medal, which I was honored to carry to a memorial concert at Carnegie Hall to present to Harry's family. Harry Belafonte and Bruce Springsteen were there and so were so many others who had known and worked with Harry. Harry Belafonte, whom I also admire so deeply, has said this:

I grew to really admire him, not only for his commitment to the cause of hunger, but also the fact that he did it with such passion, such real commitment. As an artist, I certainly loved his work. Not only his music, but the content of his words. He spoke about the human condition with a sense of humor and as a lyricist he had his hand on the pulse of social needs.

A few years ago, I received a letter from a 16-year-old Canadian boy in Newmarket, Ontario, Ryan Kruger. He had heard about my work with Harry and wanted me to know how much he admires him.

"I am a big fan of Harry," he wrote, "and think he exemplifies the ideals of both of our respective nations, as well as the world, or at least what they should be. In this volatile political climate, on both sides of the border, as well as around the world, I think we need a bit more Harry."

And we certainly do.

Harry's children wrote an eloquent tribute that was carried in the New York Daily News on July 16. They, and many of us, want to keep alight and aloft the candle that helps Harry Chapin's important legacy live on and on.

I commend their tribute to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, July 16, 2021]

HOW HARRY CHAPIN, OUR DAD, FOUGHT HUNGER

(By Josh Chapin, Jen Chapin, Jason Chapin, Jono Chapin and Jaime Chapin)

For many, attaining fame and fortune is enough to feel successful. For our father, Harry Chapin, it wasn't. His true fulfillment came through service, and 40 years following his untimely death, along with his timeless hit song "Cat's in the Hat," our dad's passionate commitment to ending hunger is what he is best remembered for. During his life (1942–1981), he released 11 albums, performed 220 concerts a year, and received Grammy and Oscar nominations as well as Emmy, Tony and many other awards, including the Congressional Gold Medal. While music was his passion, our father's success became not laurels to rest upon but rather a platform that led to his becoming one of the leading humanitarians of his generation.

Through starting three dynamic and visionary organizations in his short lifetime, WhyHunger, Long Island Cares and the Center for Food Action in New Jersey, he left a lasting impact in the fight against hunger and poverty.

Today marks 40 years since our father's passing in an automobile accident on the Long Island Expressway. It's been four decades without him—four decades of change in culture, politics, music and technology—but after all that change, and even a global pandemic, his legacy organizations WhyHunger and Long Island Cares remain centered on fulfilling our dad's mission of deeply understanding the root causes of hunger and seeking solutions grounded in community power and self-reliance.

Notably, during his lifetime, our father worked with President Jimmy Carter, his dear friend and Democratic Sen. Patrick Leahy, Republican Sen. Bob Dole, and a bipartisan team to form the first and only Presidential Commission on World Hunger. Our father's work to create political urgency and a truly patriotic, bipartisan dialogue surrounding the human right to nutritious food—in our wealthy nation and in a world that can feed itself many times over—should be a call to inspire a new surge of commitment today.

While he embarked on a mission decades ago to combat hunger, the work is far from complete. Today, nearly 2.1 million New Yorkers face hunger every day. On Long Island, nearly half a million face the same reality—a problem that's many times worse than when he started Long Island Cares in 1980. These statistics are staggering, and sadly have increased over recent years. While prior to COVID-19, Long Island neared a 40% reduction of food insecurity, during the height of the pandemic, an additional 223,000 Long Islanders became food insecure, nearly doubling the prior population count.

A generous charitable response and a massive, industrialized emergency food system are not enough. What our father understood years ago is that in order to ameliorate this needless suffering, we need to address the root causes and advance the human right to nutritious food in the U.S. and around the world. Hunger in the U.S. and hunger around the world are deeply connected, and thanks to the work of WhyHunger and our diverse array of partners, exciting alliances are building self-reliance and lasting change. WhyHunger has shown that by offering crit-

ical resources to support grassroots movements, we can build community solutions rooted in social, environmental, racial and economic justice.

Our hope is that the current administration is prepared to substantively address these issues and do what our father knew was, and still is, possible: bring an end to hunger. Currently, Rep. James McGovern of Massachusetts is asking President Biden to convene a new White House Conference on Hunger, just as our father pushed for four decades ago. When asked what his motivation was for this cause, McGovern said that meeting Harry left a lasting impression on his political views on hunger.

What Harry Chapin began with WhyHunger, Long Island Cares and the Center for Food Action continues to make a great impact, but of course there is more to be done. More organizations need to realize that fighting hunger is not only about handing out food in times of need, or even the proverbial teaching people to fish—it is about supporting social movements so that people can organize, advocate and work together to ensure they will always be able to feed their families. Additionally, we need to keep speaking up for social and legislative reform that promotes social and economic justice. If you happened to love our father's music and message, if you care about America reaching its yet unrealized mission of justice for all, or if you want to live in a more peaceful and sustainable world, consider this a call to action.

The authors are the sons and daughters of Harry Chapin.

TRIBUTE TO TANNER HAUCK

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Tanner Hauck, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Tanner is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Arizona State University in Tempe, AZ, where he is pursuing degrees in finance and business entrepreneurship. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tanner for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO STEVEN MEYER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Steven Meyer, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Steven is a recent graduate of Northern State University in Aberdeen, SD, having earned a degree in government and criminal justice. This fall, Steven plans to attend the Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason University in Washington, DC. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Steven for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO RACHEL SCHOON

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Rachel Schoon, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Rachel is from Brandon, SD, where she graduated a semester early from homeschool to participate in a 6-month-long mission trip overseas. Currently, she is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where she is pursuing degrees in communications and political science. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Rachel for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL SILVERNAGEL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Samuel Silvernagel, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Samuel is a recent graduate of the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, MN, having earned degrees in Russian and business law. This fall, Samuel plans to continue serving the American people by working on Capitol Hill. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Samuel for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO KYLEE VAN EGDOM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Kylee Van Egdom, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Kylee is a graduate of Sioux Falls Christian High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending Northern State University in Aberdeen, SD, where she is majoring in government. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kylee for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. 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:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY
AND NATURAL RESOURCES,

July 22, 2021.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE: The nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning, of Montana, to be the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, vice Neil Gregory Komze, PN 443, having been referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee, with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

On the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed, 10 ayes to 10 nays.

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.

JOE MANCHIN III,
Chairman.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, on July 19, 2021, I missed rollcall vote No. 267 on confirmation of Tiffany P. Cunningham, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted yes on her confirmation.

TRISOMY 13

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I rise to thank Belle Lunders, one of my constituents, for sharing the significance of Trisomy 13 awareness.

I ask unanimous consent that her statement regarding Trisomy 13 be submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Trisomy 13 is a chromosomal disorder where the 13th pair of chromosomes have an extra copy creating three chromosomes. Trisomy 13 is the least common and most severe of the feasible autosomal trisomies. Median survival is fewer than three days. It affects one in every 8,000 to 12,000 live births.

Babies born with Trisomy 13 can have many health problems and more than 80 percent don't survive more than a few weeks. Between 86 percent and 91 percent of live births do not live past their first year. Survival beyond the first year is associated with mosaicism. There is no cure for Trisomy 13 but different treatments depend on the symptoms. In most cases surgery and therapy are the best options. Prenatal testing and ultrasound can confirm a Trisomy 13 diagnosis through amniocentesis.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2467. An act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3985. An act to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 to expedite the special immigrant visa process for certain Afghan allies, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2467. An act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-24. A joint memorial adopted by the legislature of the State of Colorado urging the Department of Defense to keep the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM) in Colorado; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 21-001

Whereas, Our nation and the world have significantly benefitted from technological and scientific advances resulting from space exploration and aerospace activities, and Colorado is paving the way for new discoveries in the frontiers of space by having a rich history in aerospace development and being at the forefront of space travel, exploration, and aerospace research; and

Whereas, Colorado is the acting provisional Space Command Base and it will remain the provisional base until 2023. Colorado is also the center for United States military space operations and strategy. According to the Colorado Space Coalition (CSC), the state's military commands are the primary customers for space-based research, development, acquisitions, and operations, representing nearly 90 percent of space-related expenditure by the military. Moving the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM) to Huntsville, Alabama, will be incredibly disruptive to the National Defense Strategy. In addition, it will cause a major upheaval in existing infrastructure and jobs

in the state, which will result in higher costs and less efficient outcomes for the United States military; and

Whereas, Colorado is strategically located at the center of our national and space defense. We are the home to five key strategic military commands: North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM), United States Strategic Command's Joint Functional Component Command for Space (JFCC Space) Missile Warning Center, the United States Air Force Space Command, and the United States Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command; and five military installations, including United States Air Force bases Buckley, Cheyenne Mountain, Peterson, and Schriever, as well as Fort Carson Army Base; and

Whereas, The 460th Space Wing at Buckley Air Force Base provides operational command and control of three constellations to space-based infrared missile warning systems, has been defending America continuously since 1970, and is a critical part of global defense and national security; and

Whereas, Colorado leads the charge in bringing current and future global positioning system (GPS) assets to life, a service provided free to the world by Air Force Space Command in Colorado Springs. From the operation of GPS satellites by Schriever Air Force Base to GPS III, the most powerful GPS satellite to date—being designed and built by Lockheed Martin and launched by United Launch Alliance with Raytheon developing the command and control capabilities, and with companies such as Boeing, Harris Corporation, Braxton Technologies, and Infinity Systems Engineering also supporting GPS development and operations from locations in Colorado, GPS technologies enable an integral part of our global economy to have an incalculable impact that has improved the everyday lives of billions of people around the world; and

Whereas, Colorado's aerospace industry is home to a broad range of companies that create products and systems for commercial, military, and civil space applications, such as spacecraft, launch vehicles, satellites, command and control software, sensors, and navigation operations. These companies include Ball Aerospace, Boeing, DigitalGlobe, Harris Corporation, Lockheed Martin Space Systems, Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, Sierra Nevada Corporation, Teledyne Brown Engineering, and United Launch Alliance, which make up a large portion of the aerospace sector; and

Whereas, Colorado has an existing educated workforce, ranked second in the nation with residents with a bachelor's degree or higher, and a pipeline of higher education institutions to sustain future growth. We are home to the United States Air Force Academy and many colleges and universities, including the University of Colorado Boulder and the University of Colorado Colorado Springs, Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, Metropolitan State University of Denver, University of Denver, Colorado Mesa University, and Fort Lewis College. Altogether, they provide access to world-class aerospace-related degrees and offer aerospace companies one of the country's most educated workforces; and

Whereas, Colorado is home to some amazing research institutions. These institutions include the prestigious Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics (LASP) at the University of Colorado Boulder. It began in 1948, a decade before NASA, and is the world's only research institute to have sent instruments to all eight planets and to Pluto, combining all aspects of space exploration through science, engineering, mission operations, and scientific data analysis; and

Whereas, Colorado is also home to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Space Weather Prediction Center, a world-leading center of predictions for the solar and near-Earth space environment and the nation's official source of watches, warnings, and alerts of incoming solar storms, using satellite observations to protect and save lives and property; and

Whereas, Various organizations are key to Colorado's prominence in aerospace, such as the Colorado Space Coalition, a group of industry stakeholders working to make Colorado a center of excellence for aerospace; the Colorado Space Business Roundtable, working to bring together aerospace stakeholders from the industry, government, and academia for roundtable discussions and business development and to encourage grassroots citizen participation in aerospace issues; the Colorado chapter of Citizens for Space Exploration, whose mission is to promote better understanding of aerospace and its importance in our economy and daily lives, as well as to promote the importance of human space exploration; Manufacturer's Edge, a statewide manufacturing assistance center that encourages the strength and competitiveness of Colorado manufacturers by providing on-site technical assistance through coaching, training, and consulting, by providing collaboration-focused industry programs, and by leveraging government, university, and economic development partnerships; and the Space Foundation, founded in 1983, with its world headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colorado, which holds an annual Space Symposium, bringing together civil, commercial, and national security space leaders from around the world to discuss, address, and plan for the future of space; and

Whereas, For the aforementioned reasons, it is in the best interests of the American taxpayer to keep USSPACECOM in the state because Colorado is already fulfilling the mission of the USSPACECOM; because Colorado Springs has in place the community infrastructure capacity and community support to champion an expanding mission; because the move will cost the United States billions of dollars to relocate the facility; and because the move would severely disrupt the Colorado aerospace industry, which has grown to support the mission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Seventy-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That we, the members of the General Assembly:

(1) Recognizing Colorado's unique blend of military installations and major commands, private aerospace companies, academic and research institutions, and government entities, and the valuable synergies this ecosystem produces, strongly urge the Department of Defense and the incoming Biden-Harris administration to reevaluate the merits of this irresponsible decision and should rightly conclude that it is the correct decision to keep the existing United States Space Command in Colorado;

(2) Furthermore, strongly urge the Department of Defense and the incoming presidential administration to permanently base the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM) in Colorado, recognizing that Colorado provides the existing command structure, base infrastructure, and communications platforms necessary to successfully host additional national security initiatives and ensure coordination of efforts without committing additional funds;

(3) Proudly express that Colorado has deep ties with the Department of Defense and immense patriotic commitment to providing

for the nation's security and bolstering our defense;

(4) Express our most sincere and deepest appreciation to our service members and civilian employees working in and supporting military and civilian aerospace companies, military installations, and civil organizations in Colorado; and

(5) Hereby declare Colorado to be the prime location for the permanent headquarters for USSPACECOM. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Senate Joint Memorial be sent to President-elect Joseph R. Biden, Jr.; Vice President-elect Kamala Harris; Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi; Congressman Kevin McCarthy; Senator Chuck Schumer; Senator Mitch McConnell; Senator Michael Bennet; Senator John Hickenlooper; Congresswoman Diana DeGette; Congresswoman Lauren Boebert; Congressman Jason Crow; Congressman Joe Neguse; Congressman Ken Buck; Congressman Doug Lamborn; Congressman Ed Perlmutter; Jim Bridenstine, NASA Administrator; James W. Morhard, NASA Deputy Administrator; Steve Dickson, Federal Aviation Administration Administrator; Governor Jared Polis; Lieutenant Governor Dianne Primavera; Brig. Gen. Laura Clellan, The Adjutant General, Colorado National Guard; Wayne R. Monteith, Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation at the Federal Aviation Administration; General John W. "Jay" Raymond, Air Force Space Commander; Colonel Jacob Middleton, USAF, Commander Aerospace Data Facility-Colorado; Dr. Christopher Scolese, Director, National Reconnaissance Office; Ross Garelick Bell, Executive Director, Aerospace States Association; Thomas E. Zelibor, Chief Executive Officer, Space Foundation; Dr. Ronald Sega, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; Michael Gass, Co-chair, Colorado Space Coalition; and Stacey DeFore, Chair, Colorado Citizens Space Exploration.

POM-25. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging the United States Congress to pass the North Dakota Trust Lands Completion Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4013

Whereas, upon statehood in 1889, North Dakota was granted 2.6 million acres of scattered lands and minerals with the purpose of funding education and public needs within the state; and

Whereas, establishment of tribal nations and the Little Missouri National Grasslands trapped state-owned lands and minerals within these boundaries which often are very difficult for North Dakota to access and manage; and

Whereas, North Dakota currently holds over 130,000 acres of minerals and over 31,000 surface acres within tribal nations alone, which are largely unable to be developed by the state pursuant to North Dakota's mandate to generate income for schools, universities, and other public purposes; and

Whereas, authorizing North Dakota to relinquish North Dakota land grant parcels located within tribal nations and the grasslands and to select other federal lands or minerals in lieu of not receiving full access to and use of the original land since North Dakota attained statehood will fulfill the promise of land and minerals to North Dakota, provide to Indian tribes greater tribal sovereignty and control of lands and minerals within tribal nations, and provide for greater conservation and preservation of the grasslands; and

Whereas, Congress should authorize North Dakota to relinquish the lands and minerals located within tribal nations and the grass-

lands; and to select in lieu of the relinquished land other federal lands or minerals within North Dakota of equal value: *Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of North Dakota, the House of Representatives Concurring Therein:*

That the Sixty-seventh Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to pass the North Dakota Trust Lands Completion Act; and be it further

Resolved, that the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, the United States Secretary of the Interior, and each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation.

POM-26. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the President of the United States to end the pause on offshore oil and natural gas leasing and allow for the continued exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas resources in the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 71

Whereas, the oil and natural gas industry has historically provided thousands of high-paying jobs for Louisianans working in production or transportation of oil and natural gas, generating millions of dollars in annual revenue for state and local programs, and decreasing America's dependence on imported oil; and

Whereas, recent action by the federal government has paused offshore oil and natural gas leasing and stopped pipeline development; and

Whereas, an extended leasing ban would greatly diminish investment and activity in Gulf of Mexico production and result in substantial, irreplaceable job losses and loss of revenue to the state and its communities; and

Whereas, Gulf of Mexico production provides the only annual recurring revenue from the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, more commonly referred to as GOMESA, a standing revenue sharing arrangement; and

Whereas, under the GOMESA revenue sharing provisions, Gulf oil and gas producing states, including Louisiana, split 37.5 percent of qualified outer continental shelf revenues and 12.5 percent of revenues are directed to the Land and Water Conservation Fund stateside program, through which states can receive up to \$125 million a year in grants; and

Whereas, the GOMESA revenues fund vital coastal protection and restoration programs as set forth by the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority's Master Plan for a Sustainable Coast; and

Whereas, an Obama Administration report from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management analyzing the effects of offshore leasing restrictions found that United States greenhouse gas emissions would be little affected and would increase globally in the absence of new offshore leasing due to increased foreign imports; and

Whereas, the Gulf of Mexico has the lowest carbon intensity in the world in terms of emissions, other than Saudi Arabia, and would be lower than Saudi imports, with 1,274,450 barrels of oil or 62 percent of all 2021 Gulf of Mexico deepwater production being produced by a public corporation with an existing net zero pledge; and

Whereas, the oil and natural gas industry has invested over \$108 billion in greenhouse gas mitigating technologies contributing to a sharp decline in emission of CO2 in the United States; and

Whereas, from 2000 to 2018, emissions declined 67 percent in the United States relative to oil and gas production; and

Whereas, in the same period of time, the carbon dioxide emissions in the rest of the world increased by 29 percent; and

Whereas, the 2020 Louisiana Emissions Analysis, published by the Consumer Energy Alliance, a leading voice for sensible energy policies for families and businesses, found that emissions declined by 71 percent across the state since 1990; and

Whereas, during that same period of emissions reduction, Louisiana's gross domestic product surged 177 percent; and

Whereas, pipeline transportation provides a consumer-friendly and intrinsically safer mode of transportation compared to others that have higher emissions; and

Whereas, restricting pipeline development results in higher costs to consumers and higher transportation emissions; and

Whereas, because projections show energy demand will continue to rise, restricting development on federal lands and waters is nothing more than an "import more oil" policy forcing the United States to rely on imports from sometimes hostile foreign countries with lower environmental standards; and

Whereas, broad and predictable access to offshore oil and natural gas resources will help support and grow more jobs and activity in Louisiana and the Gulf region, reduce America's reliance on overseas imports, and increase revenues to the state and its localities. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby urge and request the administration of President Biden to immediately end its pause on offshore oil and natural gas leasing and allow for the continued exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas resources in the Gulf of Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana also expresses its support for the ongoing development of America's superior pipeline transportation network to the benefit of American consumers and American workers and allow the inherent economic benefits thereof to be fully realized; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the president of the United States, each member of the president's cabinet, and to the members of the capitol press corps.

POM-27. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to pass the "Retired Pay Restoration Act"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 260

Whereas, A 19th Century law requires military retired pay to be offset, dollar for dollar, by the amount of disability compensation received from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA); and

Whereas, Military retired pay earned by service and sacrifice in defending the United States should not be reduced because a military retiree is also eligible for veterans' disability compensation awarded for a service-connected disability; and

Whereas, Retired pay and disability compensation are different types of compensation—retired pay is provided to recognize a career of uniformed service while VA disability compensation is compensation for pain, suffering, and lost future earning power due to service-connected disabilities; and

Whereas, The "Retired Pay Restoration Act" pending before Congress would permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of

their years of military service and disability compensation from the VA; and

Whereas, Service members make countless sacrifices in service to this country and State and should not be forced to forfeit their military retired pay because a 19th Century law reduces their retirement benefit by the amount they receive in disability compensation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House respectfully urges the United States Congress to pass the "Retired Pay Restoration Act."

2. Copies of the resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-28. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress and President of the United States to pass and enact the "Disabled Veterans Tax Termination Act"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 262

Whereas, The State is home to approximately 355,000 U.S. military veterans; and

Whereas, Under current federal law, a military veteran with a service-connected disability can only claim concurrent retirement and disability pay if the veteran has a service-connected disability rating of 50 percent or higher; and

Whereas, Disability rating is a percentage assigned by the federal Department of Veterans Affairs to reflect the severity of a veteran's disability; and

Whereas, Concurrent retirement and disability pay allows military veterans to claim military retirement pay without having the retirement pay offset by the amount of disability compensation that those veterans receive; and

Whereas, Under current federal law, a military veteran not receiving concurrent retirement and disability pay has his or her military retirement pay reduced dollar for dollar by the amount received from veteran disability compensation; and

Whereas, A military veteran who is entitled to both retirement pay and disability compensation should not be subject to a retirement pay reduction for receiving disability compensation; and

Whereas, The federal "Disabled Veterans Tax Termination Act" would allow a veteran with a disability rating lower than 50 percent to receive concurrent retirement and disability pay; and

Whereas, Currently, a military veteran under Chapter 61 can only claim concurrent retirement and disability pay if the veteran has at least 20 years of service; and

Whereas, A Chapter 61 military veteran is one who retires from the military due to a service-connected disability and whose disability rating is 30 percent or higher; and

Whereas, The federal "Disabled Veterans Tax Termination Act" would allow a military veteran under Chapter 61 with less than 20 years of service to receive concurrent retirement and disability pay; and

Whereas, The federal government should not limit the amount of retirement pay a military veteran receives just because the military veteran also receives disability compensation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges the Congress and President of the United States to pass and enact

the "Disabled Veterans Tax Termination Act."

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Clerk of the General Assembly, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and each member of the United States Congress elected from this State.

POM-29. A joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico requesting the United States Congress and the President of the United States to base payments in lieu of taxes on a full property tax equivalency basis; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

Whereas, payments in lieu of taxes are federal payments to local governments that help offset losses in property taxes due to the existence of nontaxable federal lands within their boundaries; and

Whereas, according to the United States Department of the Interior, New Mexico has twenty-two million three hundred sixty-nine thousand five hundred thirty-one acres of land eligible for payments in lieu of taxes; and

Whereas, New Mexico received forty-one million four hundred thousand dollars (\$41,400,000) of payments in lieu of taxes from the Federal Government in Fiscal Year 2020; and

Whereas, technology now exists to more accurately determine the property tax equivalency value of all federal lands in the State; and

Whereas, according to the Congressional Research Service, when the Federal Government changed its public lands policy in 1976 from one of disposal to one of retention, Congress agreed to make payments in lieu of taxes "to make up for the presence of nontaxable land" on a "tax equivalency" basis; and

Whereas, tax equivalency means the amount that would have been received by these jurisdictions if the federal lands were privately owned; and

Whereas, the Federal commitment to pay the property tax equivalency for payments in lieu of taxes is vital for New Mexico's children and communities and is particularly important during periods of fluctuating economic conditions; and

Whereas, New Mexico appreciates every dollar of payments in lieu of taxes received, yet the payments in lieu of taxes that New Mexico receives are not the fair property tax equivalency value, resulting in exponentially compounding depressive impacts on funding for education and essential government services, including first responder services, the construction of roads, schools and other infrastructure and search and rescue services; and

Whereas, the current fluctuating economic conditions have intensified this structural burden borne by New Mexico residents and communities to fund education and all other government services; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that it call upon the United States Congress and the President of the United States to base payments in lieu of taxes on a full property tax equivalency basis, as committed at the inception of the payment in lieu of taxes program; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New Mexico call upon the United States Congress and the President of the United States to coordinate expeditiously and in

good faith with New Mexico and other willing states to adopt such laws, regulations and policies as are necessary to ensure that all future payments in lieu of taxes are permanently made on a full property tax equivalency basis; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New Mexico call upon all people of good will and local, state and national leaders to come together to secure the full and fair property tax equivalency of payments in lieu of taxes for children and communities throughout New Mexico and the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the New Mexico Congressional Delegation and the Governor of New Mexico.

POM-30. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the President of the United States to support the Keystone XL Pipeline, reverse his decision to cancel the permit, and to support American jobs and energy cooperation with our Canadian neighbors; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 53

Whereas, In order to continue fueling our economy, the United States will need more oil and natural gas. Despite efforts to increase the use of renewable energy, the United States is still many years away from ending its dependence on nonrenewable resources; and

Whereas, While working towards cleaner energy standards and pursuing ways to use energy more efficiently is laudable, blindly rejecting the critical role of the oil and gas industry in fueling America's economy will not only result in skyrocketing energy prices, but will also cripple job growth. Those most impacted by increased prices to heat their homes, fill their gas tanks, and keep the lights on are those least able to afford it; and

Whereas, The Premier of Alberta Province in Canada, upon hearing that President Joe Biden will revoke the Keystone XL Pipeline, has urged the Prime Minister of Canada to reach out to the Biden administration to reverse course. Unfortunately, instead of going forward with a project that will benefit countless communities and individuals on both sides of the border, President Joe Biden has decided to hinder American-Canadian energy cooperation as one of his first actions as president; and

Whereas, The United States and Canada are each other's largest energy trading partners. Canada has significant oil reserves and is a responsible partner in regulating the oil and gas industry. Projects such as the Keystone XL Pipeline, when combined with other oil and gas projects in both Canada and the United States, promote North American energy independence and job creation. The United States should be looking for ways to increase and improve our relationship with Canada, not diminish it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge President Joe Biden to support the Keystone XL Pipeline, reverse his decision to cancel the permit, and to support American jobs and energy cooperation with our Canadian neighbors; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Office of the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and

the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-31. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to reauthorize the Atchafalaya Heritage Area program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 27

Whereas, the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area program was designated in 2006 for the purpose of enhancing and protecting the historic, cultural, scenic, recreational, and environmental assets in the fourteen-parish region; and

Whereas, the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area is one of fifty-five national heritage areas designated by Congress since 1984; and

Whereas, National Heritage Areas tell significant stories that celebrate the nation's diverse heritage; and

Whereas, the Atchafalaya basin is the largest and most productive river swamp in the United States; and

Whereas, the Atchafalaya basin provides habitat for twenty-four federal and state-listed threatened or endangered species or species of concern including the Louisiana black bear, the brown pelican, and the bald eagle; and

Whereas, the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area supported events and programs that engaged over fifty thousand residents and visitors and leveraged over sixteen thousand volunteer hours since 2006; and

Whereas, the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area directly leveraged over five million dollars in matching funds over the life of the program; and

Whereas, the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area is among the most culturally-rich and ecologically-varied regions in the United States, home to the widely recognized Cajun culture as well as a diverse population of European, African, Caribbean, and Native-American descent. Therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take action to reauthorize the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area program to continue the work of promotion and preservation of the cultural, natural, and recreational resources of the area for the next fifteen years; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-32. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming requesting the United States Congress and the federal government to reverse federal orders and actions that inhibit the safe development of oil and gas in Wyoming; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 3

Whereas, the state of Wyoming contains abundant and vast natural resources that are and can be used for the production of energy throughout the United States and world; and

Whereas, Wyoming produces energy that benefits consumers and industries throughout the United States; and

Whereas, the energy industry in Wyoming provides millions of dollars in taxes and other revenues annually to the state of Wyoming; and

Whereas, the state of Wyoming and the energy industry have worked together for years to develop Wyoming's energy resources in a safe and environmentally responsible manner, including the development of tech-

nologies to promote the responsible development and use of Wyoming energy; and

Whereas, the federal government owns almost one-half (1/2) of the surface acreage within the state of Wyoming and more than forty-two million (42,000,000) acres of mineral estate in Wyoming; and

Whereas, federal decisions and actions banning, pausing or significantly reducing the production of energy negatively impact the economy of Wyoming and the livelihoods and wellbeing of Wyoming's residents; and

Whereas, President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. signed Executive Order No. 13,990 on January 20, 2021, which requires the federal Secretary of the Interior to unilaterally stop all federal leasing of oil and gas resources in Wyoming; and

Whereas, President Biden signed Executive Order No. 14,008 on January 27, 2021, which indefinitely pauses oil and natural gas leasing and calls for a comprehensive review of federal oil and gas permitting and leasing practices to evaluate potential climate impacts; and

Whereas, the President and various federal agencies have, since January 20, 2021, taken actions and issued orders to limit actions, permits and leases for oil and gas production, including a Department of the Interior order that revoked authority for issuing fossil-fuel authorizations, leases, permits to drill and the affirmative extension of leases and contracts; and

Whereas, these executive actions will lead companies to pursue energy development in other parts of the world where energy resources are not as environmentally responsible and where responsible energy regulations are lacking to where a net negative impact on climate emissions may likely result; and

Whereas, these executive actions severely and negatively affect the value of property held by the state and citizens of Wyoming in areas affected by these orders due to the fact that federal property is intermingled with private and state lands and oil and gas development often involves lateral drilling techniques which cross several classes of property; and

Whereas, these executive actions will adversely impact and jeopardize the employment of at least twenty thousand (20,000) Wyoming citizens who directly or indirectly work in oil, gas and related industries representing over seven percent (7%) of the total employment in Wyoming; and

Whereas, these executive actions may result in negative impacts to Wyoming's diverse wildlife and habitat, including a decreased ability to mitigate wildlife impacts, increased development on currently undisturbed lands and a decrease in quality habitat reclamation work; and

Whereas, these executive actions are causing immediate, disproportionate and extensive harm to the state of Wyoming and will inflict lasting damage on Wyoming residents, industries and the critical services upon which Wyoming residents depend. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1. That the President of the United States rescind, reverse or repeal the executive orders that were issued in January 2021 that suspend or pause leasing, permitting, extensions and authorizations of oil and gas development in Wyoming and that will have an adverse impact on climate change and Wyoming's wildlife and habitat resources while inflicting irreparable and disproportionate harm on the state of Wyoming.

Section 2. That the President of the United States direct all federal agencies to rescind, reverse or repeal any secretarial orders or actions that negatively impact responsible

energy and energy technology development in Wyoming, including Department of the Interior Secretarial Order No. 3395.

Section 3. That the Wyoming Legislature strongly opposes actions by or that direct federal agencies, including the federal Environmental Protection Agency, to unilaterally increase the burden on existing oil and gas companies in Wyoming and to increase the burden on those companies' facilities in Wyoming in an attempt to achieve climate-related goals that are unrealistic and that disproportionately impact the people of Wyoming.

Section 4. That the Wyoming Legislature strongly supports the efforts of the Wyoming congressional delegation to prevent the President and the federal executive branch from unilaterally issuing suspensions and moratoriums on energy development in Wyoming, including the Protecting Our Wealth of Energy Resources (POWER) Act of 2021 and the Safeguarding Oil and Gas Leasing and Permitting Act.

Section 5. That the Wyoming Legislature strongly encourages further congressional action to protect responsible leasing and permitting of oil and gas in Wyoming and to protect Wyoming's residents, energy industry and other industries that are negatively impacted by these executive actions.

Section 6. That the Secretary of State of Wyoming transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Acting Secretary of the Department of the Interior, to the Acting Administrator of the federal Environmental Protection Agency, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and to the Wyoming Congressional Delegation.

POM-33. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to fund a study on floodwater harvesting; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL NO. 2004

Whereas, the seven Colorado Basin states, which consist of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming, are in the twentieth year of severe drought and are therefore experiencing a severe water shortage; and

Whereas, water levels are critical. Lake Powell and Lake Mead store the water supply for both urban and rural usage, and, if drought conditions continue, these reservoirs are likely to reach critically low elevations by 2026; and

Whereas, on January 21, 2020, the Lake Mead water level was at 43%, or approximately 1,093 feet; and

Whereas, the Hoover Dam impounds Lake Mead and provides power to millions of people in Southern California, Nevada and Arizona. If the level of Lake Mead declines below 1,050 feet, hydropower generation will be significantly reduced; and

Whereas, at 895 feet, Lake Mead can no longer provide water; and

Whereas, a new water source could help augment Colorado River supplies; and

Whereas, Denver, Colorado is successfully harvesting floodwater from the Missouri River to help alleviate its water shortage; and

Whereas, in wet years, the Mississippi River reaches flood level with a resulting loss of vast quantities of water into the Gulf of Mexico; and

Whereas, historic flooding in 2011 and 2019 along the Mississippi River caused 11 deaths and damaged infrastructure, homes, businesses and agriculture and other industries. Combined estimates of damages and losses of the flooding exceeded \$9.5 billion, according

to the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

Whereas, liquid can be successfully moved thousands of miles through pipelines; and

Whereas, Arizona has long been at the forefront among western states in supporting the development and implementation of pioneering, well-reasoned water management policies.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring, prays:

1. That the United States Congress fund a technological and feasibility study of developing a diversion dam and pipeline to harvest floodwater from the Mississippi River to replenish the Colorado River and prevent flood damage along the Mississippi River.

2. That, if shown to be feasible, the United States Congress implement the diversion dam and pipeline as a partial solution to the water supply shortage in Lake Powell and Lake Mead and the flood damage that occurs along the Mississippi River.

3. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Governors of the Mississippi River states of Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee and Wisconsin, and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-34. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to appropriate monies to eradicate salt cedars from Arizona waterways; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL NO. 2001

Whereas, the salt cedar tree, also known as the tamarisk, was brought to the United States in the 1800s as an ornamental plant to stabilize soil and control erosion; and

Whereas, salt cedars are now listed as an invasive species by the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas, salt cedars spread prolifically by both seed and sprouting, congesting thousands of acres of river land in Arizona; and

Whereas, the density of salt cedars creates dangerous conditions by congesting flood-prone areas, impeding water flow and exacerbating the impact of flooding; and

Whereas, by increasing the frequency and intensity of wildfires, salt cedars threaten existing and future infrastructure in surrounding communities; and

Whereas, this invasive plant out-competes native cottonwood, mesquite and willow and displaces riparian and other wildlife habitats by altering the ecology and hydrology of native systems; and

Whereas, each salt cedar tree consumes 200 to 300 gallons of water a day, which lowers the water table and creates large deposits of salt in the soil; and

Whereas, salt cedars negatively impact Arizona's economy by jeopardizing agriculture due to high water usage, tending to obstruct irrigation canals and limiting recreational opportunities; and

Whereas, eliminating salt cedars will sustain precious water supplies, reduce the risk of environmental disasters, and minimize structural and ecological damage and loss of life.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring, prays:

1. That the United States Congress appropriate monies to the State of Arizona to eradicate salt cedars from Arizona waterways.

2. That the United States Department of the Interior and the United States Depart-

ment of Agriculture develop innovative solutions to control the proliferation of salt cedars.

3. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-35. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to collaborate and contribute their knowledge and expertise with the Louisiana Waterfowl Working Group in an effort to improve waterfowl habitats on private, state, and federally owned lands; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 73

Whereas, Louisiana has a long and distinguished history of consistent, reliable wintering waterfowl habitat for generations; and

Whereas, waterfowl biologists estimate seed production in moist-soil wetlands located along migration routes and at wintering sites to calculate duck-energy days; and

Whereas, duck-energy days are the number of dabbling ducks that potentially can be sustained energetically in a wetland for a specified duration; and

Whereas, the Louisiana portion of the Chenier Plain Initiative area (CPIA) has a midwinter population objective of over eight hundred and eighty-eight thousand Gadwall and three hundred seventy-eight thousand Blue-winged teal duck-energy days; and

Whereas, the Louisiana portion of the west gulf coastal plain has a population goal of one million seven-hundred thousand duck-energy days of all species; and

Whereas, the Mississippi River Coastal Wetlands Initiative area (MRCWIA) encompasses important wintering waterfowl habitats including Pass A Loutre, Atchafalaya Delta Wildlife Management Area, Marsh Island, and Delta National Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas, the Louisiana portion of the Mississippi Alluvial Valley of the Lower Mississippi Valley Joint Venture has a total duck-energy day objective of one-hundred twenty million nine hundred thousand duck-energy days based on a one hundred ten day wintering period from early November to late February; and

Whereas, Louisiana supports over half of the breeding population of western gulf coast mottled ducks; and

Whereas, over four hundred seventy-five thousand acres of rice were planted by Louisiana farmers in 2020, down from a high of six hundred seventy thousand acres in 1981; and

Whereas, the Gulf Coast Joint Venture has also determined that coastal marshes in the CPIA and MRCWIA are deficient in providing habitat to support their waterfowl population objectives; and

Whereas, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) owns and manages more than one million six hundred thousand acres of Louisiana's land and waterways as wildlife management areas, refuges, and conservation areas; and

Whereas, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior of the United States (FWS) manages twenty three national wildlife refuges within Louisiana, covering more than five hundred fifty thousand acres throughout twenty-nine parishes; and

Whereas, the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture (NRCS) has a long record of working with private landowners to implement conservation practices and programs for the benefit of Louisiana's farms, wetlands, and wildlife habitats; and

Whereas, the Louisiana Waterfowl Working Group (LWWG) is comprised of a diverse group of landowners, managers, business owners, and professionals who share a common interest and concern over the direction Louisiana's waterfowl stock is heading; and

Whereas, the LWWG's mission is to ensure that waterfowl habitat remains a focal point for policy makers and stakeholders at all levels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby urge and request the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the National Resources Conservation Service, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to collaborate and contribute their knowledge and expertise with the Louisiana Waterfowl Working Group in an effort to improve waterfowl habitats on private, state, and federally owned lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the LWWG shall submit an annual written report to the House Committee on Natural Resources and Environment and Senate Committee on Natural Resources detailing the results of its collaborative efforts to improve waterfowl habitats on private, state, and federally owned lands; be it further

Resolved, that the report should consider meaningful updates on habitat trends, policy recommendations, and other relevant topics related to Louisiana waterfowl, and the habitats they depend upon; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, Louisiana State Conservationist, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Region 4 Director, and the officers of both houses of the United States Congress and each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM-36. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey urging the President of the United States and the Environmental Protection Agency to take appropriate action to issue waivers and implement other reforms to allow for the blending of renewable fuels under the federal "Clean Air Act"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 238

Whereas, Over the past year, United States refiners have been devastated by spiking, volatile Renewable Identification Number (RIN) prices under the federal Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) program and a dramatic reduction in the use of fuel that was triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic. These factors have resulted in a shortage of RINs, and eight refinery closures, throughout the nation; and

Whereas, The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has authority from Congress to waive the RFS program's renewable fuel requirements "in whole or in part" if the EPA Administrator determines that "implementation of the requirement would severely harm the economy" of a State, region, or the United States; and

Whereas, Many independent refiners already struggle with slim margins and the RFS program's RIN requirements, as well as the manner in which the unregulated RIN market operates without oversight and subject to speculation and fraud, all of which

are currently inflicting serious economic harm on those businesses; and

Whereas, Current RFS compliance expenses exceed refineries' combined annual costs for labor, utilities, and maintenance, making the costs of such compliance refineries' largest expense, other than the purchase of crude oil; and

Whereas, RIN prices have dramatically increased as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, increasing from as low as 10 cents at the beginning of 2020 to nearly \$2.00 in June 2021, and leading to a consequent increase, of approximately 30 cents per gallon, in the cost of making gasoline;

Whereas, Harmful financial effects associated with the complex RFS program are especially severe under current market conditions, where demand for refined products is significantly depressed by the COVID-19 pandemic and is not expected to fully recover in the near future; and

Whereas, The COVID-19 pandemic caused an unprecedented year-over-year decline in demand for petroleum and other liquid fuels, leading to temporary, partial, and permanent refinery closures, including the mothballing of the fuels section of the Paulsboro Refinery in New Jersey, as well as other capacity reductions throughout the United States; and

Whereas, Production data published by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) in the United States Department of Energy (DOE) has repeatedly shown, for several years, that there is no relationship between RIN prices and the amount of ethanol that's actually blended into the nation's gasoline supply; and

Whereas, The EIA recently noted that, in 2020, 800 million fewer RINs were actually generated than what was required to meet the 2020 RFS standard, thereby resulting in a shortage of available RINs, especially when combined with hoarding by unregulated, non-industry speculators; and

Whereas, Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, State and regional refineries supported over 16,500 New Jersey jobs, compensating those employees with more than a billion dollars in total, while adding \$4.2 billion to the State's gross domestic product and generating over \$12.3 billion in total economic output, including the payment of more than \$382 million in State and local taxes. Unfortunately, some of the jobs supported by these refineries were lost due to a partial shutdown attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic; and

Whereas, Refining and petrochemical industries contribute approximately \$600 billion annually to the nation's economy and employ over three million industrial workers in 33 states, but increasing dependence on imported fuels threatens these industries and potentially affects their fuel supplies; and

Whereas, The recent hacking incident affecting the Colonial Pipeline has exposed the vulnerability of the nation's energy supply, highlighting the need to keep our refineries open to fuel the economy; and

Whereas, On June 1, 2021, Governor Phil Murphy wrote to the EPA to urge the agency to extend flexibilities to merchant refiners through the renewable volume obligation under the RFS program; now, therefore, and be it

Resolved, By the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey respectfully urges the United States Environmental Protection Agency to exercise its waiver authority, pursuant to section 211(o)(7)(A)(i) of the "Clean Air Act," 42 U.S.C. s.7545(o)(7)(A)(i), to reduce nationwide Renewable Fuel Standard volume mandates in order to provide relief to refiners in New Jersey, on the East Coast, and elsewhere.

2. The Legislature also respectfully urges the President of the United States and the United States Environmental Protection Agency to establish reasonable 2021 and 2022 Renewable Fuel Standard volume mandates, which are in line with actual gasoline and diesel demand, and to make the reforming and restructuring of the Renewable Fuel Standard program a national priority, so as to maintain low and stable Renewable Identification Number prices while allowing for the continued blending of renewable fuels consistent with the original intent of the program.

3. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly or the Secretary of the Senate to the President of the United States, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of Congress elected from this State.

4. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MANCHIN for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Robert T. Anderson, of Washington, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

*Shalanda H. Baker, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Department of Energy.

*Samuel T. Walsh, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

*Andrew Eilperin Light, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs).

By Mr. DURBIN for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Gustavo A. Gelpi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

Angel Kelley, of Massachusetts, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts.

Christine P. O'Hearn, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Helaine Ann Greenfeld, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Attorney General.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2428. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to modify False Claims Act procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2429. A bill to amend chapter 38 of title 31, United States Code, relating to civil remedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 2430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for certain conservation subsidies to include subsidies for water conservation or efficiency measures and storm water management measures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2431. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to require the employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to receive training developed by the Inspector General of the Department on reporting wrongdoing to, responding to requests from, and cooperating with the Office of Inspector General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received from State-based catastrophe loss mitigation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2433. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop and maintain a cadastre of Federal real property; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. KELLY, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2434. A bill to provide tax incentives that support local newspapers and other local media, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2435. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2436. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to establish emergency fire management areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 2437. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction projects on certain National Forest System land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 2438. A bill to modify the boundary of the Cane River Creole National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2439. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the responsibility of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to maintain capabilities to identify threats to industrial control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2440. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to convene a blue ribbon panel

to review the forest inventory and analysis program of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2441. A bill to establish in the States of North Carolina and South Carolina the Southern Campaign of the Revolution National Heritage Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2442. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2443. A bill to expand the definition of H-2A nonimmigrant for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act to include aliens engaged in seafood processing, horticultural commodities, or the care of horses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2444. A bill to provide for research and education with respect to uterine fibroids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 2445. A bill to apply user fees with respect to tobacco products deemed subject to the requirements of chapter IX of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2446. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for greater spousal protection under defined contribution plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2447. A bill to amend the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to provide additional funding for E-rate support for emergency educational connections and devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 2448. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that, under certain circumstances, an interactive computer service provider that allows for the proliferation of health misinformation through that service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of that misinformation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr.

CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2449. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to enhance penalties for theft of a firearm from a Federal firearms licensee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 2450. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a rural health center innovation awards program and a rural health department enhancement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 2451. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide matching payments for retirement savings contributions by certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 2453. A bill to promote the launch of aviation's next era; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. OSSOFF):

S. 2454. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the pilot program for alternative water source projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2455. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion of Pell Grants from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2456. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to take certain actions to increase diversity of ownership in the broadcasting industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2457. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by establishing appropriate limits on the federally compelled disclosure of information obtained as part of engaging in journalism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. KING):

S. 2458. A bill to clarify that individuals engaged in aircraft flight instruction or testing, including phased testing of experimental aircraft, are not operating an aircraft carrying persons or property for compensation or hire; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 2459. A bill to provide for improvements to aircraft hangars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 2460. A bill to establish a panel of constitutional experts to recommend to Congress an appropriate process for providing for the case of the death of a candidate in a contingent presidential or vice-presidential election; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make qualified biogas property and qualified manure resource recovery property eligible for the energy credit and to permit renewable energy bonds to finance qualified biogas property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2462. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to extend the jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to include the oversight of markets that set or report reference prices for aluminum premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2463. A bill to require agencies submit zero-based budgets; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 2464. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, to establish a RECOMPETE grant program to provide flexible, 10-year block grants for purposes of creating quality jobs, providing resources to help local residents access opportunities and attain and retain employment, increasing local per capita income and employment rates, and supporting long-term, sustained economic growth and opportunity in persistently distressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 2465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the American Opportunity Tax Credit fully refundable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. COONS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 314. A resolution commemorating the past success of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams and supporting the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams in the 2020 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. Res. 315. A resolution commending the service of Hamilton-class Coast Guard cutters and the officers and crew who served on them; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 316. A resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in

the case of AO Alfa-Bank v. John Doe, et al; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. Res. 317. A resolution congratulating the Milwaukee Bucks, and the fans of the Milwaukee Bucks around the world, on winning the 2021 National Basketball Association championship; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to support library infrastructure.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to establish a National Climate Bank.

S. 617

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 617, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 773

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 773, a bill to enable certain hospitals that were participating in or applied for the drug discount program under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act prior to the COVID-19 public health emergency to temporarily maintain eligibility for such program, and for other purposes.

S. 912

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide information regarding vaccines for seniors as part of the Medicare & You handbook and to ensure that the treatment of cost sharing for vaccines under Medicare part D is consistent with the treatment of vaccines under Medicare part B, and for other purposes.

S. 1273

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to small employers for covering military spouses under retirement plans.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1312, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer and for other purposes.

S. 1486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1486, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1779

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1779, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate copayments by the Department of Veterans Affairs for medicines relating to preventive health services, and for other purposes.

S. 1901

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1901, a bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

S. 1915

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1915, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to allow a veteran to receive a full year supply of contraceptive pills, transdermal patches, vaginal rings, and other hormonal contraceptive products.

S. 2160

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2160, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of General Services from establishing per diem reimbursements rates for travel within the continental United States (commonly known as "CONUS") for certain fiscal years below a certain level, and for other purposes.

S. 2202

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms.

ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2202, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property.

S. 2264

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2264, a bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996.

S. 2301

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2301, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide capacity-building assistance to institutions of higher education to examine and address inequities in college student access and success, and for other purposes.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2324, a bill to amend the FAST Act to improve the Federal permitting process, and for other purposes.

S. 2369

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2369, a bill to provide access to reliable, clean, and drinkable water on Tribal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2382

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2382, a bill to authorize the National Cyber Director to accept details from other elements of the Federal Government on nonreimbursable basis, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 2430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for certain conservation subsidies to include subsidies for water conservation or efficiency measures and storm water management measures; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the "Water Conservation Rebate Tax Parity Act," which I introduced today. Representative JARED HUFFMAN (D-CA) has introduced companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

Access to water has always been a major issue in California and throughout the Western United States. That issue has only become more pressing as climate change increases the risk of drought in the West. Right now, 87 per-

cent of California is facing "Extreme Drought" conditions and 33 percent of the state is experiencing "Exceptional Drought" conditions, the most severe category.

A growing number of States, including California, have begun offering rebates to homeowners to improve the water efficiency of their homes. Unfortunately, many homeowners are unaware that they are required to pay federal income taxes on these rebates and are surprised to be stuck with that bill. Still other homeowners aware of the tax implications are disincentivized from making these efficiencies to their homes.

The "Water Conservation Rebate Tax Parity Act" would exempt such State and local rebates for water conservation improvements, as well as improvements to better handle storm water runoff, from taxable income. This would eliminate the unexpected bill homeowners face, increasing the incentive to make these improvements, which benefit all of us.

I note that such State rebates for energy conservation improvements are already excluded from taxable income. Thus, my bill would simply put water conservation rebates on par with energy conservation rebates for tax treatment.

It is critical that Congress explore many ways to address climate change and mitigate the impacts that we are already seeing. Encouraging homeowners to make their properties more water-efficient is one way to do that.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2432. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received from State-based catastrophe loss mitigation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the "Disaster Mitigation and Tax Parity Act," which Senator BURR and I introduced today. Representative MIKE THOMPSON (D-CA) has introduced companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

Encouraging homeowners to take steps to reduce the risk of natural catastrophe damage to their homes has long been a goal of policy makers. In California, it has been a special challenge to incentivize individuals to purchase earthquake insurance and to harden their homes against potential earthquake damage.

The threat of natural disasters and extreme weather events has become a much greater problem in recent years due to climate change, which is driving an increasing frequency and severity of wildfires, droughts, hurricanes, and other catastrophic events. This, in turn, is reducing the availability and

increasing the costs of insurance for individuals and businesses.

A growing number of states, including California, have begun offering rebates to homeowners to improve their homes to mitigate against damage from such events. Unfortunately, many homeowners are unaware that they are required to pay Federal income taxes on these rebates and are surprised to be stuck with that bill. Other homeowners who are aware of the tax implications are disincentivized from making these improvements to their homes.

The "Disaster Mitigation and Tax Parity Act" would exempt such State rebates for disaster mitigation improvements from taxable income. This would eliminate the unexpected bill homeowners face, increasing the incentive to make these improvements, which benefit all of us.

I also note that such State rebates for energy conservation improvements are already excluded from taxable income. Thus, our bill would simply put disaster mitigation rebates on par with energy conservation measures.

I am pleased that Congress is exploring many ways to address climate change-related matters. Encouraging homeowners to make their properties more resistant to natural catastrophe damage is one way to help.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 2437. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction projects on certain National Forest System land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2437

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 "Expediting Forest Restoration and Recovery Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. APPLICATION BY FOREST SERVICE OF AUTHORITIES TO EXPEDITE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES IN CARRYING OUT HAZARDOUS FUEL AND INSECT AND DISEASE RISK REDUCTION PROJECTS.

Section 104 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6514) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) APPLICATION BY FOREST SERVICE OF AUTHORITIES TO EXPEDITE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES IN CARRYING OUT HAZARDOUS FUEL AND INSECT AND DISEASE RISK REDUCTION PROJECTS.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) INSECT AND DISEASE TREATMENT AREA.—The term 'insect and disease treatment area' means an area that—

"(i) is designated by the Secretary as an insect and disease treatment area under this title; or

“(ii) is designated as at risk or a hazard on the most recent National Insect and Disease Risk Map published by the Forest Service.

“(B) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(14)(A).

“(2) USE OF AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out a hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction project in an insect and disease treatment area authorized under this Act, the Secretary shall—

“(A) apply the categorical exclusion established by section 603 in the case of a hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction project carried out in an area—

“(i) designated as suitable for timber production within the applicable forest plan; or

“(ii) where timber harvest activities are not prohibited;

“(B) conduct applicable environmental assessments and environmental impact statements in accordance with this section in the case of a hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction project—

“(i) carried out in an area—

“(I) outside of an area described in subparagraph (A); or

“(II) where other significant resource concerns exist, as determined exclusively by the Secretary; or

“(ii) that is carried out in an area equivalent to not less than a hydrologic unit code 5 watershed, as defined by the United States Geological Survey; and

“(C) notwithstanding subsection (d), in the case of any other hazardous fuel or insect and disease reduction project, in the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement prepared under subsection (b), study, develop, and describe—

“(i) the proposed agency action; and

“(ii) the alternative of no action.

“(3) PRIORITY FOR REDUCING RISKS OF INSECT INFESTATION AND WILDFIRE.—Except where established as a mandatory standard that constrains project and activity decisionmaking in a resource management plan (as defined in section 101(13)(A)) in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of an insect and disease treatment area, the Secretary shall prioritize reducing the risks of insect and disease infestation and wildfire over other planning objectives.

“(4) INCLUSION OF FIRE REGIME GROUPS IV AND V.—Notwithstanding section 603(c)(2)(B), the Secretary shall apply the categorical exclusion described in paragraph (2)(A) to areas in Fire Regime Groups IV and V.

“(5) EXCLUDED AREAS.—This subsection shall not apply to—

“(A) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

“(B) an inventoried roadless area, except in the case of an activity that is permitted under—

“(i) the final rule of the Secretary entitled ‘Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation’ (66 Fed. Reg. 3244 (January 12, 2001)); or

“(ii) a State-specific roadless area conservation rule.

“(6) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall annually make publicly available data describing the acreage treated under hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction projects in insect and disease treatment areas during the previous year.”.

SEC. 3. GOOD NEIGHBOR AUTHORITY.

Section 8206(b)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) TREATMENT OF REVENUE.—Funds received from the sale of timber by a Governor of a State under a good neighbor agreement shall be retained and used by the Governor—

“(i) to carry out authorized restoration services under that good neighbor agreement; and

“(ii) if funds remain after carrying out authorized restoration services under clause (i), to carry out authorized restoration services within the State under other good neighbor agreements.”.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2442. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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. 2442

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 “Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY.

Section 455(m)(3)(B)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “teaching as” and inserting the following: “teaching—

“(I) as”;

(2) by striking “, foreign language faculty, and part-time faculty at community colleges), as determined by the Secretary,” and inserting “and foreign language faculty), as determined by the Secretary; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) as a part-time faculty member or instructor who—

“(aa) teaches not less than 1 course at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a)), a postsecondary vocational institution (as defined in section 102(c)), or a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b)); and

“(bb) is not employed on a full-time basis by any other employer.”.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide matching payments for retirement savings contributions by certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I have introduced the Encouraging Americans to Save Act (EASA). This legislation makes common sense reforms to the saver’s tax credit by making the credit refundable and restructuring it as a government matching contribution that is directly deposited into a taxpayer’s retirement savings account. This bill would offer matching contributions for the first time to millions of middle and low income individuals not covered by an employer-sponsored retirement plan, including those who save through an IRA under a state or local government savings program—such as workers in my home State of Oregon under the OregonSaves pro-

gram. The government match is also available to middle and lower income savers who participate in an employer-sponsored plan. The government match provided by the bill would both encourage saving and help middle and low income earners build assets by providing an immediate, meaningful return on their personal contributions. The legislation would also establish a coronavirus bonus recovery credit that would provide an additional government match of up to \$5,000 to workers on their retirement saving for a five year period. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. OSSOFF):

S. 2454. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the pilot program for alternative water source projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the “Water Reuse and Resiliency Act.” This legislation would authorize \$1 billion for innovative water infrastructure projects that respond to our Country’s growing water needs and the historic drought facing the Western United States.

In the face of unprecedented heat and drought conditions across the Western United States, and growing water resource challenges across the entire Nation, it is critically important that we invest now to modernize and adapt our water systems for the 21st century.

The Environmental Protection Agency’s Alternative Water Source Projects pilot program provides competitive grants to engineer, design, construct, and test alternative water source systems, including water recycling systems and projects that conserve, manage, reclaim, or reuse water resources.

The Water Reuse and Resiliency Act would reauthorize the EPA’s Alternative Water Source Projects pilot program for five years, increase the authorization to \$1 billion, and make stormwater reuse and groundwater recharge projects eligible for grant funding.

According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), as of July 13, an estimated 89% of the Western U.S. is experiencing drought. Unfortunately, historic droughts are becoming the new normal. The impacts of drought on water availability are compounded by triple-digit temperatures, record low snowpack levels, and a growing population.

By expanding the use of alternative, non-traditional water sources, such as capturing stormwater runoff and recycling wastewater for groundwater recharge, the Water Reuse and Resiliency Act supports innovations in water treatment that can deliver a new, safe, and reliable source of water for potable use or irrigation.

I thank my co-lead, Senator FEINSTEIN, for her tireless leadership fighting for clean water for Californians and

all Americans. I also thank the cosponsors of this bill for championing this vital effort with us in the Senate.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the “Water Reuse and Resiliency Act” as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 314—COMMEMORATING THE PAST SUCCESS OF THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS AND SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS IN THE 2020 OLYMPIC GAMES AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. COONS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 314

Whereas, for 125 years, the Olympic Movement has worked to build a better and more peaceful world by educating young people through amateur athletics, bringing together athletes from many countries in friendly competition, and forging new relationships bound by friendship, solidarity, and fair play;

Whereas the 2020 Olympic Games will take place in Tokyo, Japan, from July 23, 2021, to August 8, 2021, and the 2020 Paralympic Games will take place in Tokyo, Japan, from August 24, 2021, to September 5, 2021;

Whereas, at the 2020 Olympic Games, 206 countries will compete in more than 330 events in nearly 40 disciplines, and at the 2020 Paralympic Games, more than 165 countries will compete in events in 22 disciplines;

Whereas the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams have won 1,974 gold medals, 1,685 silver medals, and 1,536 bronze medals, totaling 5,195 medals, during the past Olympic and Paralympic Games;

Whereas the United States plans to send 613 athletes to participate in the 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games, including a record 329 women;

Whereas the people of the United States stand united in respect for and admiration of the members of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams and the athletic accomplishments, sportsmanship, and dedication to excellence of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams;

Whereas the many accomplishments of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of many others, including individuals on the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee and the National Governing Bodies of Sport and the many administrators, coaches, and family members who provided critical support to the athletes;

Whereas the United States Government is grateful to Japan for hosting the 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games;

Whereas Japan successfully hosted the 1964 Tokyo Olympics, the first ever Olympic Games to be held in Asia, as a symbol of Japanese postwar reconstruction and a catalyst for economic growth and technological development;

Whereas Japan successfully hosted the 1972 Winter Olympics in Sapporo and the 1998 Winter Olympics in Nagano;

Whereas the people of the United States take great pride in the qualities of commitment to excellence, grace under pressure, and goodwill toward competitors exhibited by the athletes of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams; and

Whereas the Olympic Movement celebrates competition, fair play, and the pursuit of glory, elevating the eternal qualities of the human spirit to the world stage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports proceeding with the 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games in a safe and secure environment;

(2) commends the Government of Japan and the Tokyo Metropolitan Government in their efforts to commit tremendous resources to provide a safe and secure environment for the athletes competing in the 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games;

(3) applauds the athletes and coaches of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams and their families who support them;

(4) supports the athletes of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams in their endeavors at the 2020 Olympic and Paralympic Games held in Tokyo, Japan; and

(5) supports the goals and ideals of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games.

SENATE RESOLUTION 315—COMMENDING THE SERVICE OF HAMILTON-CLASS COAST GUARD CUTTERS AND THE OFFICERS AND CREW WHO SERVED ON THEM

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 315

Whereas the first Hamilton-class cutter was the United States Coast Guard Cutter (referred to in this preamble as “USCGC”) Hamilton, which was placed in full commission on March 18, 1967;

Whereas USCGC Mellon, USCGC Chase, USCGC Dallas, USCGC Boutwell, USCGC Sherman, USCGC Gallatin, USCGC Morgenthau, USCGC Rush, USCGC Munro, USCGC Midgett, and USCGC Jarvis completed the class of high endurance cutters and were 1 of the most highly versatile and capable vessels at the time of their construction at Avondale Shipyards in Louisiana;

Whereas Hamilton-class cutters courageously supported multiple peacetime and wartime operations during their time in active service, including Operation Market Time, Operation Urgent Fury, Operation Vigilant Sentinel, Operation Deny Flight, and Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas Hamilton-class cutters conducted illegal narcotics interdictions totaling 3,300,000 pounds and \$23,600,000,000 in market value, including the interdiction conducted by USCGC Hamilton and USCGC Sherman of the M/V Gatun, which discovered 20 metric tons of illegal narcotics with an estimated street value of \$600,000,000 for the largest narcotics interdiction in United States history at the time;

Whereas Hamilton-class cutters have saved thousands of lives during search and rescue operations at sea, including the rescue conducted by USCGC Boutwell and USCGC Mellon of all 520 passengers and crew of the M/S Prinsendam, 1 of the largest at-sea rescues in Coast Guard history;

Whereas Hamilton-class cutters received excellent shoreside support at Coast Guard homeports in Alaska, California, Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, South Carolina, and Washington, allowing the cutters to perform admirably past their service life;

Whereas the Mississippi-built National Security Cutter replaced the Hamilton-class cutter to continue the storied success of high endurance Coast Guard cutters at sea;

Whereas USCGC Douglas Munro, formerly known as USCGC Munro, decommissioned on April 24, 2021, ending over 54 years of service of Hamilton-class cutters to the United States;

Whereas Coast Guard cutters remain a vital component of United States capability across the globe in serving to protect life at sea, deterring illicit activity, and ensuring the continuance of the international rules-based order at all levels of the competition continuum;

Whereas the increasing global complexity and expanding demand for Coast Guard services necessitates the best people, modern technology, resilient infrastructure, and highly capable assets; and

Whereas Congress must recognize the importance of maximizing afloat readiness for the Coast Guard by supporting personnel, investing in mission-enabling technologies, and modernizing assets: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the success of the Hamilton-class cutters in service to the United States;

(2) commends the officers and crew of Hamilton-class cutters for their technical excellence, accomplishments, professionalism, and sacrifices;

(3) supports the role of Coast Guard cutters and their importance to national security, law enforcement at sea, and homeland defense; and

(4) applauds the Coast Guard for continuing to advance the capabilities of the fleet with the National Security Cutter to adapt to the growing need for a global Coast Guard presence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 316—TO AUTHORIZE REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF AO ALFA-BANK V. JOHN DOE, ET AL

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 316

Whereas, in the case of *AO Alfa-Bank v. John Doe, et al.*, Case No. 50-2020-CA-006304, pending in the 15th Judicial Circuit Court, Palm Beach County, Florida, the plaintiff has issued two subpoenas for deposition testimony and document production to Thomas Kirk McConnell, a staff member of the Committee on Armed Services;

Whereas the plaintiff has presented those Florida court subpoenas to the District of Columbia Superior Court, which has issued the subpoenas under local law, Case No. 2021-02459;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent committees and current and former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or documents relating to their official responsibilities; and

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate

may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the Committee on Armed Services and Thomas Kirk McConnell in this matter to seek to quash the subpoenas.

SEC. 2. Elizabeth King, Majority Staff Director of the Committee on Armed Services, is authorized to provide a limited declaration sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the Speech or Debate Clause privilege in this matter, without waiving the Committee's privilege.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Republican leader, Mr. McCONNELL, I send to the desk a resolution authorizing representation by the Senate Legal Counsel and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, this resolution concerns third-party subpoenas to a Senate employee from Alfa Bank, the plaintiff in a lawsuit pending in Florida State court. The plaintiff, a large Russian bank, alleges in its lawsuit that unnamed defendants used cyber tools to create internet log data appearing to show communications between computer servers of the plaintiff and the Trump Organization, causing negative publicity. Alfa Bank is conducting third-party discovery to identify the unnamed persons it alleges conspired against it. As part of that attempted discovery, it has issued two subpoenas to a staff member of the Committee on Armed Services seeking testimony and Committee documents regarding his work for the Committee in examining the publicly-reported allegations about possible clandestine internet communications between plaintiff and the Trump Organization.

Because the subpoenas seek testimony and documents relating to information gathering activities the staff person undertook as part of his duties for the Committee, they request information that is absolutely privileged under the Speech or Debate Clause. In addition, sovereign immunity precludes enforcement of State court subpoenas against officials and employees of the Federal government. This resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Committee on Armed Services and its staff member and move to quash the subpoenas, at the request of the Committee.

In addition, to demonstrate to the court the applicability of the Speech or Debate Clause privilege in this matter, the resolution authorizes the Majority Staff Director of the Committee to provide a limited declaration in support of the motion to quash. By submitting this limited declaration solely to establish its privilege, the Committee is not waiving, and, indeed, continues to assert, its absolute Speech or Debate Clause privilege against being compelled to produce any information in this matter.

SENATE RESOLUTION 317—CONGRATULATING THE MILWAUKEE BUCKS, AND THE FANS OF THE MILWAUKEE BUCKS AROUND THE WORLD, ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 317

Whereas, on Tuesday, July 20, 2021, the Milwaukee Bucks (referred to in this preamble as the "Bucks") won the 2021 National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble as the "NBA") championship by defeating the Phoenix Suns in Game 6 of the NBA Finals by a score of 105 to 98, winning the series 4 games to 2;

Whereas the Bucks won—

- (1) the second NBA championship in the history of the franchise;
- (2) their first round of the NBA playoffs by defeating the Miami Heat 4 games to 0;
- (3) their Eastern Conference semi-finals match-up against the Brooklyn Nets 4 games to 3; and
- (4) the Eastern Conference Finals by defeating the Atlanta Hawks 4 games to 2;

Whereas every member of the 2020–2021 Bucks played a key role in the quest for a championship, including—

- (1) Giannis Antetokounmpo;
- (2) Thanasis Antetokounmpo;
- (3) Elijah Bryant;
- (4) Pat Connaughton;
- (5) Mamadi Diakite;
- (6) Donte DiVincenzo;
- (7) Bryn Forbes;
- (8) Jrue Holiday;
- (9) Justin Jackson;
- (10) Brook Lopez;
- (11) Sam Merrill;
- (12) Khris Middleton;
- (13) Jordan Nwora;
- (14) Bobby Portis;
- (15) Jeff Teague;
- (16) Axel Toupane; and
- (17) P.J. Tucker;

Whereas the entire Bucks organization deserves congratulations for this historic achievement, including—

- (1) the owners of the Bucks, Marc Lasry, Wes Edens, Jamie Dinan, and Michael Fascitelli;
- (2) the General Manager of the Bucks, Jon Horst; and
- (3) the head coach of the Bucks, Mike Budenholzer;

Whereas Giannis Antetokounmpo, for the first time, was named the Most Valuable Player of the NBA Finals, in which he—

- (1) averaged 35.2 points, 13.2 rebounds, 5 assists, and 1.8 blocks per game; and
- (2) shot 61.8 percent from the field per game;

Whereas, in the championship-clinching Game 6 of the NBA Finals, Giannis Antetokounmpo—

- (1) scored 50 points, shooting 64 percent from the field and making 17 of 19 free throws;
- (2) had 14 rebounds; and
- (3) blocked 5 shots;

Whereas Bucks forward Khris Middleton, the first NBA player to begin his career in the Development League and subsequently become an NBA All-Star, which Middleton became in the 2018–2019 season, had an impactful performance throughout the NBA Finals, including a crucial mid-range shot with 1 minute remaining in Game 6;

Whereas the Bucks won their first NBA championship in 50 years, when NBA legends

Kareem Abdul-Jabbar and Oscar Robertson brought a title to Milwaukee in 1971;

Whereas the Bucks, who won the 2021 NBA championship in 6 games, fulfilled the prophecy of Bucks legend Brandon Jennings, who, in 2013, began the "Bucks in 6" rallying cry; and

Whereas the fans in the Deer District showed up, game after game, to cheer on the Bucks in large numbers outside Fiserv Forum: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Milwaukee Bucks (referred to in this resolution as the "Bucks"), and the loyal fans of the Bucks, on winning the 2021 National Basketball Association championship;

(2) recognizes the historic achievement of the entire Bucks organization, including the players, coaches, and staff, for a victorious season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the head coach of the Bucks, Mike Budenholzer;

(B) the owners of the Bucks, Marc Lasry, Wes Edens, Jamie Dinan, and Michael Fascitelli; and

(C) the General Manager of the Bucks, Jon Horst.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. REED. 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHEMICAL SAFETY, WASTE MANAGEMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND REGULATORY OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Chemical Safety, Waste Management, Environmental Justice, and Regulatory Oversight of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 22, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following in-liners in my office be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress: Ty Sharp, Virginia Smith, Graeme Marshall, and Jack Hartman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF AO ALFA-BANK V. JOHN DOE, ET AL.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 316, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 316) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of AO Alfa-Bank v. John Doe, et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REED. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 316) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF TREVOR REED

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 91, S. Res. 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 67) calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to 9 years in a Russian prison.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 22, 2021, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OR TO RELEASE UNITED STATES CITIZEN PAUL WHELAN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 93, S. Res. 165.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 165) calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment, and with an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

(The part of the preamble intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the part of the preamble intended to be inserted is shown in italic.)

S. RES. 165

[Whereas United States citizen Paul Whelan is a resident of Novi, Michigan, and a United States Marine Corps veteran;

[Whereas Paul Whelan traveled to Moscow for the wedding of a personal friend on December 22, 2018;

[Whereas Russia's Federal Security Service arrested Paul Whelan at the Metropol Hotel in Moscow on December 28, 2018, and charged him with espionage;

[Whereas the Federal Security Service has never provided any evidence of supposed wrongdoing;

[Whereas Paul Whelan was imprisoned in Lefortovo Prison and was held there for more than 19 months after his arrest in pre-trial detention;

[Whereas the Federal Security Service has not provided any evidence of supposed wrongdoing;

[Whereas a Moscow court extended Paul Whelan's pre-trial detention multiple times without publicly presenting justification or evidence of wrongdoing;

[Whereas even Paul Whelan's Federal Security Service-appointed lawyer, Vladimir Zherebenkov, said on May 24, 2019, "[The Federal Security Service] always roll[s] out what they have, but in this case, we've seen nothing concrete against Whelan in five months. That means there is nothing.";

[Whereas the then United States Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Jon Huntsman, responded on April 12, 2019, to a question about the detention of Paul Whelan, "If the Russians have evidence, they should

bring it forward. We have seen nothing. If there was a case, I think the evidence would have been brought forward by now.";

[Whereas then Secretary of State Mike Pompeo met with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov on May 14, 2019, and urged him to ensure United States citizens are not unjustly held abroad;

[Whereas the Kremlin has refused Paul Whelan full access to his lawyer and the so-called evidence against him, and any evidence he has seen is in Russian, a language Paul does not read or speak;

[Whereas Lefortovo pre-trial detention facility and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs refused to provide medical treatment for Paul Whelan's medical condition, despite being aware of its worsening state, resulting in emergency surgery on May 29, 2020;

[Whereas Paul Whelan was wrongfully convicted on June 15, 2020, and sentenced to 16 years in a Russian labor camp by a three-judge panel, in a trial witnessed by United States Ambassador John Sullivan, who referred to it as "a mockery of justice" due to the denial of a fair trial and the exclusion of defense witnesses;

[Whereas, in August 2020, on an unknown day because he was moved secretly, Paul Whelan was transferred to camp IK-17, a penal labor camp in Mordovia, where he is forced to work 6 days a week in a garment factory;

[Whereas Ambassador John Sullivan, while visiting Paul Whelan at the labor camp in Mordovia, stated that "Russian authorities . . . have never shown the world evidence of his guilt," and reiterated his call that the Russian authorities correct this injustice and release Mr. Whelan; and

[Whereas Secretary of State Antony Blinken spoke with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov on February 4, 2021, and urged him to release Americans detained in Russia, including Paul Whelan and Trevor Reed, so that they are able to return home to their families in the United States: Now, therefore, be it]

Whereas United States citizen Paul Whelan is a resident of Novi, Michigan, and a United States Marine Corps veteran;

Whereas Paul Whelan traveled to Moscow for the wedding of a personal friend on December 22, 2018;

Whereas Russia's Federal Security Service arrested Paul Whelan at the Metropol Hotel in Moscow on December 28, 2018, and charged him with espionage;

Whereas the Federal Security Service has never provided any evidence of supposed wrongdoing;

Whereas Paul Whelan was imprisoned in Lefortovo Prison and was held there for more than 19 months after his arrest in pre-trial detention;

Whereas the Federal Security Service has not provided any evidence of supposed wrongdoing;

Whereas a Moscow court extended Paul Whelan's pre-trial detention multiple times without publicly presenting justification or evidence of wrongdoing;

Whereas even Paul Whelan's Federal Security Service-appointed lawyer, Vladimir Zherebenkov, said on May 24, 2019, "[The Federal Security Service] always roll[s] out what they have, but in this case, we've seen nothing concrete against Whelan in five months. That means there is nothing.";

Whereas the then United States Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Jon Huntsman, responded on April 12, 2019, to a question about the detention of Paul Whelan, "If the Russians have evidence, they should bring it forward. We have seen nothing. . . . If there was a case, I think the evidence would have been brought forward by now";

Whereas then Secretary of State Mike Pompeo met with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey

Lavrov on May 14, 2019, and urged him to ensure United States citizens are not unjustly held abroad;

Whereas the Kremlin has refused Paul Whelan full access to his lawyer and the so-called evidence against him, and his trial and sentencing were conducted almost entirely in Russian, a language Mr. Whelan does not read or speak;

Whereas Lefortovo pre-trial detention facility and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs refused to provide medical treatment for Paul Whelan's medical condition, despite being aware of its worsening state, resulting in emergency surgery on May 29, 2020;

Whereas Paul Whelan was wrongfully convicted on June 15, 2020, and sentenced to 16 years in a Russian labor camp by a three-judge panel, in a trial witnessed by United States Ambassador John Sullivan, who referred to it as "a mockery of justice" due to the denial of a fair trial and the exclusion of defense witnesses;

Whereas, in August 2020, on an unknown day because he was moved secretly, Paul Whelan was transferred to camp IK-17, a penal labor camp in Mordovia, where he is forced to work 6 days a week in a garment factory;

Whereas Ambassador John Sullivan, while visiting Paul Whelan at the labor camp in Mordovia, stated that "Russian authorities . . . have never shown the world evidence of his guilt," and reiterated his call that the Russian authorities correct this injustice and release Mr. Whelan; and

Whereas Secretary of State Antony Blinken spoke with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov on February 4, 2021, and urged him to release Americans detained in Russia, including Paul Whelan and Trevor Reed, so that they are able to return home to their families in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) implores the Government of the Russian Federation present credible evidence on the allegations against Paul Whelan or immediately release him from imprisonment;

(2) implores the Government of the Russian Federation comply with its international treaty obligations and provide unrestricted consular access to Paul Whelan while he remains imprisoned in Russia;

(3) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide Paul Whelan and all other political prisoners their constitutionally afforded due process rights and universally recognized human rights; and

(4) expresses sympathy to the family of Paul Whelan for this travesty to justice and personal hardship, and expresses hope that their ordeal can soon be brought to a just end.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; 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 resolution (S. Res. 165) was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 165

Whereas United States citizen Paul Whelan is a resident of Novi, Michigan, and a United States Marine Corps veteran;

Whereas Paul Whelan traveled to Moscow for the wedding of a personal friend on December 22, 2018;

Whereas Russia's Federal Security Service arrested Paul Whelan at the Metropol Hotel in Moscow on December 28, 2018, and charged him with espionage;

Whereas the Federal Security Service has never provided any evidence of supposed wrongdoing;

Whereas Paul Whelan was imprisoned in Lefortovo Prison and was held there for more than 19 months after his arrest in pre-trial detention;

Whereas the Federal Security Service has not provided any evidence of supposed wrongdoing;

Whereas a Moscow court extended Paul Whelan's pre-trial detention multiple times without publicly presenting justification or evidence of wrongdoing;

Whereas even Paul Whelan's Federal Security Service-appointed lawyer, Vladimir Zherebenkov, said on May 24, 2019, "[The Federal Security Service] always roll[s] out what they have, but in this case, we've seen nothing concrete against Whelan in five months. That means there is nothing.";

Whereas the then United States Ambassador to the Russian Federation, Jon Huntsman, responded on April 12, 2019, to a question about the detention of Paul Whelan, "If the Russians have evidence, they should bring it forward. We have seen nothing . . . If there was a case, I think the evidence would have been brought forward by now";

Whereas then Secretary of State Mike Pompeo met with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov on May 14, 2019, and urged him to ensure United States citizens are not unjustly held abroad;

Whereas the Kremlin has refused Paul Whelan full access to his lawyer and the so-called evidence against him, and his trial and sentencing were conducted almost entirely in Russian, a language Mr. Whelan does not read or speak;

Whereas Lefortovo pre-trial detention facility and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs refused to provide medical treatment for Paul Whelan's medical condition, despite being aware of its worsening state, resulting in emergency surgery on May 29, 2020;

Whereas Paul Whelan was wrongfully convicted on June 15, 2020, and sentenced to 16 years in a Russian labor camp by a three-judge panel, in a trial witnessed by United States Ambassador John Sullivan, who referred to it as "a mockery of justice" due to the denial of a fair trial and the exclusion of defense witnesses;

Whereas, in August 2020, on an unknown day because he was moved secretly, Paul Whelan was transferred to camp IK-17, a penal labor camp in Mordovia, where he is forced to work 6 days a week in a garment factory;

Whereas Ambassador John Sullivan, while visiting Paul Whelan at the labor camp in Mordovia, stated that "Russian authorities . . . have never shown the world evidence of his guilt," and reiterated his call that the Russian authorities correct this injustice and release Mr. Whelan; and

Whereas Secretary of State Antony Blinken spoke with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov on February 4, 2021, and urged him to release Americans detained in Russia, including Paul Whelan and Trevor Reed, so that they are able to return home to their families in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) implores the Government of the Russian Federation present credible evidence on the allegations against Paul Whelan or immediately release him from imprisonment,

(2) implores the Government of the Russian Federation comply with its international treaty obligations and provide unrestricted consular access to Paul Whelan while he remains imprisoned in Russia;

(3) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide Paul Whelan and all other political prisoners their constitutionally afforded due process rights and universally recognized human rights; and

(4) expresses sympathy to the family of Paul Whelan for this travesty to justice and personal hardship, and expresses hope that their ordeal can soon be brought to a just end.

AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL CYBER DIRECTOR TO ACCEPT DETAILS FROM OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ON NONREIMBURSABLE BASIS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 105, S. 2382.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2382) to authorize the National Cyber Director to accept details from other elements of the Federal Government on non-reimbursable basis, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2382) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 2382

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL CYBER DIRECTOR TO ACCEPT DETAILS ON NONREIMBURSABLE BASIS.

Section 1752(e) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (8) as subparagraphs (A) through (H), respectively, and indenting such subparagraphs two ems to the right;

(2) in the matter before subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking "The Director may" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may";

(3) in paragraph (1)—

(A) as redesignated by paragraph (2), by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (H) as subparagraphs (D) through (I), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph (C):

"(C) accept officers or employees of the United States or member of the Armed Forces on a detail from an element of the intelligence community or from another element of the Federal Government on a nonreimbursable basis, as jointly agreed to by the heads of the receiving and detailing elements, for a period not to exceed three years"; and

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

"(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING DETAILS.—Paragraph (1)(C) shall not be construed to impose any limitation on any other authority for reimbursable or nonreimbursable details. A nonreimbursable detail made

under such paragraph shall not be considered an augmentation of the appropriations of the receiving element of the Office of the National Cyber Director.”.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 26, 2021

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, July 26; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Kim nomination; further, that the cloture motion on the Kim nomination ripen at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 26, 2021, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, 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 4:08 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 26, 2021, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ANDREW PHILIP HUNTER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE WILLIAM ROPER.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

GRAHAM SCOTT STEELE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE BIMAL PATEL, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS R. NIDES, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL.

TOM UDALL, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO NEW ZEALAND, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INDEPENDENT STATE OF SAMOA.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

TAMARA COFMAN WITTES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE MICHAEL T. HARVEY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JONATHAN KANTER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE MAKAN DELRAHIM, RESIGNED.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JILL HRUBY, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

HEIDI SHYU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING.

ELY STEFANSKY RATNER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

SHAWN GRAHAM SKELLY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

MEREDITH BERGER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

GINA MARIA ORTIZ JONES, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

CAROLINE DIANE KRASS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on July 22, 2021 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

ANDREW PHILIP HUNTER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE BRUCE D. JETTE, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 20, 2021.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MELISSA FULTON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Melissa Fulton to recognize her substantial contributions to our community through her remarkable career in the Lakeport Chamber of Commerce and her extensive service to Lake County.

Melissa was born and raised in Harvey, Illinois, but moved to Lakeport California with her husband John in 1989. That same year she joined the Lakeport Chamber of Commerce where she became an active volunteer. After a search committee recognized her impeccable leadership and ability, she was recruited to fulfill the positions of Executive Director and Chief Executive Officer for the Lakeport Chamber of Commerce. She has been serving in these positions for 27 years with only a brief break to serve as Advertising Director of the Lake County Record-Bee and the Clear Lake Observer-American newspapers.

Melissa holds a passion for selfless service as demonstrated through her leadership in her career and in multiple community groups. This includes serving on the Board of Directors of the Lake County Economic Development Corporation, the Lake County Rodeo Association, and the Lakeport Main Street Association. Additionally, Melissa was a past President of the Lakeport Rotary club, where she facilitated fundraising efforts to support the painting and restoration of the Library Park Gazebo.

Her invaluable contributions and achievements to the community include transforming the Lakeport Chamber of Commerce to the Lake County Chamber of Commerce, creating the annual Destination publication, designing and constructing the annual Lake County exhibits for the California State fair, and establishing the certified tourism Ambassador program in Lake County. Melissa has been described by colleagues and community members as a mentor, an instigator, and above all a Lake County treasure who will leave a legacy for herself as a passionate and determined advocate for Lake County.

Madam Speaker, Melissa Fulton's achievements will leave a tremendous impact in Lake County for generations to come. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today.

IN HONOR OF PRETRIAL, PROBATION AND PAROLE WEEK 2021

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the Nation's community supervision professionals and the many vital

roles they play in their work with justice-involved adults and juveniles. They identify opportunities and services to help individuals successfully contribute to society, while, at the same time, holding them accountable for their actions. They remain always mindful of their role in ensuring public safety.

In honor of Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week 2021, we salute all of those who have chosen this important career. In the District of Columbia, we especially thank the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia and the Pretrial Services Agency for the District of Columbia for their service. These agencies are models of excellence in community supervision. Their work reflects the theme of Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week, "Restoring Trust, Creating Hope."

As was the case last year, community supervision officers have demonstrated great courage and resolve in continuing their work during the coronavirus pandemic. They have found innovative ways to remain connected with the individuals they supervise and to continue guiding them in the interest of safety.

Community supervision agencies are valuable partners of government agencies, nonprofits, neighborhood-based groups and all who strive to make our nation safer and stronger. We extend our gratitude to them and ask the House of Representatives to honor them and recognize their many achievements as we proclaim July 18–24, 2021, as Pretrial, Probation and Parole Supervision Week in Washington, D.C.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 215, YEA on Roll Call No. 216, and NAY on Roll Call 217.

HONORING ARMENIAN AMBASSADOR VARUZHAN NERSESYAN FOR HIS WORK STRENGTHENING THE U.S.-ARMENIA RELATIONSHIP

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor His Excellency Varuzhan Nersesyan, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Armenia to the United States. After nearly three years of dedicated service, Ambassador Nersesyan and his family will soon embark across the Atlantic to

serve as Armenia's Ambassador to the United Kingdom.

As Co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I would like to thank the Ambassador for his partnership and willingness to work together to strengthen the U.S.-Armenia relationship and share issues of importance relating to Armenia and the greater South Caucasus region.

Over the past three decades, Armenia has faced three wars initiated by its neighbor, Azerbaijan, dual blockades by Turkey and Azerbaijan, the lingering impact of the devastating 1988 earthquake, energy shortages, an influx of Armenian refugees forcibly displaced from Azerbaijan, and periods of mass migration. Armenia has endured these challenges through the will of its people, who have strongly committed to democracy and the rule of law in contrast to many countries in the region. As a result, Armenia's last two parliamentary elections were free, fair, transparent, and accessible—a true testament to Armenia's democratic principles.

The Ambassador has been a strong proponent of this democratic push, helping to enhance vibrant and strong U.S.-Armenia relations by helping to bring the legislative branches of our countries closer together. My colleagues in Congress and I have warmly welcomed our parliamentary counterparts from Armenia in the U.S. Capitol. U.S. Congressional delegations have also been welcomed in Armenia, including a visit to Armenia involving Members of the House Democracy Partnership in 2019. We must continue this work of advancing our countries' mutual interests. The United States must continue rewarding innovative democracies and inclusive economies like Armenia. This is especially true in a region that is dominated by authoritarian regimes which have a tendency of perpetuating aggressions and attempting to stoke instability.

Ambassador Nersesyan also exemplified the great personal strength and resolve shown of all Armenians as the world witnessed the heartbreaking 44-day war in Artsakh perpetrated by Azerbaijan, Turkey, and Turkish-backed mercenaries in the fall of 2020. Armenians in Artsakh have shown the international community that their right to self-determination in their centuries-old homeland must be taken seriously and their voices have been amplified by exemplary Armenian diplomats like the Ambassador. I witnessed his tireless dedication to advocating on their behalf for their right to self-determination and know his many efforts have not gone unheard in the United States Congress or in the current Administration.

Ambassador Nersesyan's mission in Washington, D.C. is not his first experience in the United States. His deep knowledge of our country and commitment to diplomacy was evident when he served as Armenia's Deputy Chief of Mission at the Embassy of Armenia from 2008 and 2012. During that time, he also matriculated and graduated from my alma mater—the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University—where he earned a Global Master of Arts.

• 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.

During his time here, the Ambassador and his team have also done a wonderful job at showcasing Armenia's vibrant culture and history through many educational and artistic events in our nation's capital such as An Armenian Odyssey in early March 2020.

Once again, I take this opportunity to salute Ambassador Nersesyan on his mission here in the United States. He has truly served in the United States with distinction and humility and has succeeded in strengthening U.S.-Armenia relations. I would like to bid him and his family farewell with the hope that he will continue to shine a bright light on behalf of his country in future diplomatic assignments.

PFAS ACTION ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2467, the "PFAS Action Act of 2021", which is comprehensive legislation to regulate Per- and poly- fluoroalkyl substances ("PFAS") chemicals, clean up contamination, and protect public health.

H.R. 2467 will provide the protections impacted communities need quickly and for the long term.

Specifically, this bill will require Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to use tools under several environmental statutes to:

Stem the flow of PFAS contamination into the environment by requiring cleanup of contamination sites, setting air emission limits, prohibiting unsafe incineration of PFAS, and limiting the introduction of new PFAS chemicals into commerce;

Identify health risks by requiring comprehensive health testing for all PFAS, reporting of PFAS releases, and monitoring for PFAS in drinking water;

Inform communities of PFAS risks by requiring the EPA Administrator to develop a risk-communication strategy and establish a website with information on testing of household well water; and

Limit human exposure to PFAS by requiring a drinking water standard for PFAS that protects public health, including the health of vulnerable subpopulations like pregnant women, infants, and children, and holding polluters accountable.

The legislation also provides grants to impacted water systems, creates a voluntary label for cookware that is PFAS free, provides guidance for first responders to limit their exposures, and requires effluent limitations and pretreatment standards for PFAS introduction or discharge.

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

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

PFAS compounds are also ubiquitous and used in a range of products from food-delivery boxes to nonstick cookware to stain-resistant clothing.

But one of the most troubling routes to PFAS exposure is drinking water that has been contaminated by discharges from factories and other facilities.

PFAS chemicals are an urgent public health threat, because they are persistent, bio-accumulative, and toxic.

PFAS have long been linked with adverse health effects including cancer, immune system effects, infertility, impaired child development, high cholesterol, and thyroid disease.

PFAS have been detected in the drinking water of more than 1,400 communities in 49 states, according to research by the PFAS Project at Northeastern University in Boston and the Environmental Working Group (EWG).

According to monitoring by the EPA, millions of Americans are exposed to unsafe levels of PFAS through their drinking water.

Military families and communities are at especially high risk.

A 2018 UCS analysis of 131 U.S. military facilities showed that nearly all had significant PFAS contamination of groundwater or drinking water, some with levels over 100,000 times the safe limit as determined by the most recent draft scientific assessment from the Department of Health and Human Services.

Included in this analysis was the Ellington Field Joint Reserve Base in Houston, Texas, which tested at levels of 61,000 parts per trillion.

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

This bipartisan legislation will ensure we're treating PFAS as a hazardous chemical and giving our agencies the resources to clean up sites for the betterment of our communities.

I urge all members to join me in voting for H.R. 2467, the "PFAS Action Act of 2021."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I was unexpectedly withheld.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 211, and NAY on Roll Call No. 217.

HONORING DAVIE PINA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Davie Pina as the Napa County Farm Bureau's 2021 Agriculturalist of the Year.

A sixth generation Napa Valley farmer, Davie holds a strong and deep connection to the community. He attended high school locally at St. Helena High School and went on to attend college at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. Davie became an assistant winemaker at Rutherford Hill Winery from 1973 to 1980. After seven years of extensive contributions toward the company, Davie joined John Pina

Jr. & Sons Vineyard Management, where he continued to broaden his knowledge of viticulture. Finally, in 1991, Davie became a managing partner at Pina Vineyard Management, where he has worked ever since.

Along with his demonstrated work ethic and commitment to agriculture, Davie has a rich history of civic engagement and service to the surrounding community. He served on the Board of Directors and as president of the Rutherford Dust Society, a group of community members committed to promoting the highest standards possible for grape-growing and acting as good stewards to the land on which they grow grapes. Davie has also served on the Board of Directors and as president of the Winegrowers of Napa County, and on the Board of Directors for the local Farm Bureau and the Rutherford Grange.

In 1998, he became chair of the Rutherford Dust River Restoration team, which led efforts to restore the Napa River. In recognition of his outstanding contributions to the community, in 2007, Davie was recognized by the Napa Valley Grapegrowers as Grower of the Year. As part of his mission to assist his community, Davie has served with the Rutherford Volunteer Fire Department since 1987 and was its chief from 2012 to 2021. In recognition of his tremendous leadership to the department, he was recognized as the 2013 Fire Fighter of the Year. Davie has continuously pioneered innovative ways to approach sustainable agriculture in Napa Valley and is known throughout Napa as someone committed to sustainability and community service in all realms.

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that Davie Pina's achievements will leave a tremendous impact on Napa Valley for generations to come. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GLENN THOMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I was not present for the vote on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 2668 during the second vote series on Tuesday, July 20, 2021. If I were present, I would have voted YES on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 2668, the Consumer Protection and Recovery Act.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND RECOVERY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2668, the "Consumer Protection and Recovery Act", which will ensure that the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) can protect American consumers and put money back in the pockets of consumers who have been the victims of fraud and other scams by amending the Federal Trade Commission Act (FTC Act) to explicitly provide the FTC the ability to obtain both injunctive and

monetary equitable relief for all violations of the laws it enforces.

Specifically, this bill would:

Add a new subsection (e) to section 13 of the FTC Act that specifies types of equitable relief the FTC may pursue: restitution for losses, contract reformation and rescission, money refunds, and the return of property;

Provide the FTC disgorgement authority to seek court orders requiring bad actors repay unjust gains acquired in violation of the law.

Clarify that the FTC may seek temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions without bond and that any relief sought under section 13(b) may be for past violations in addition to ongoing and imminent violations.

As the Nation's premier consumer protection agency, the FTC is directed to enforce numerous statutes: the core of which is section 5 of the FTC Act mandating the agency to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices and unfair methods of competition.

Section 13(b) of the FTC Act authorizes the FTC to bring suit in federal courts seeking relief for consumers and is a critical enforcement tool the FTC uses to combat fraud and scams under section 5.

In 2020 alone, the FTC returned more than \$482 million to over 1.6 million consumer victims of fraud or illegal business practices.

The FTC's restitution authority under section 13(b) was settled law for over 40 years, but beginning in 2017, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals reversed its own precedent to overturn FTC authority under section 13(b) to obtain monetary relief and the Third Circuit soon followed.

Because of these decisions, close to 48 million Americans in six states became unable to obtain monetary redress under 13(b).

Then, on April 22, 2021, the Supreme Court held in *AMG Capital Management v. FTC* that section 13(b) does not allow the FTC to seek monetary relief or require bad actors to return money earned through illegal activity.

According to Acting Chairwoman Slaughter, the Supreme Court decision "deprived the FTC of the strongest tool [the FTC] had to help consumers."

Mr. Speaker, all five FTC Commissioners have repeatedly urged Congress to take quick action to pass legislation reaffirming FTC authority under section 13(b).

H.R. 2668 does exactly that, by restoring nearly forty years of precedent and giving the FTC the ability to protect Americans from scams and unethical business practices.

Americans need this protection, because every day, and far too often, individuals in Texas and across the country fall victim to financial scammers.

The COVID-19 pandemic has given rise to an increase of scams and fraud that prey on consumers' fears and financial insecurities, and inaction on this issue is not an option as it will only embolden bad actors.

H.R. 2668 will ensure that the FTC maintains its ability to return money to the victims of scams.

Seniors especially need this protection, because they have worked their entire lives with the promise of a safe and secure retirement, but scammers and unscrupulous businesses are taking advantage of uncertainty surrounding the pandemic and working overtime to target them.

Retirement accounts are not the only damage these scams cause—they damage the independence and trust of a vulnerable community.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, we have seen instances of fraud rise in unprecedented numbers, as scammers attempt to take advantage of senior citizens and deprive them of their hard-earned savings.

Bad actors preying on older Americans is, unfortunately, nothing new, but in the midst of a global pandemic impacting Americans' lives and livelihoods, cracking down on those scams must be a priority.

One such scam was thwarted by Houston police and the Harris County District Attorney, who made an arrest in February in an international cyber-scam that bilked unsuspecting, mostly elderly victims out of more than \$1 million.

One victim of the scam, Asuncion Peppers, 74, a retired medical technician knows that first hand; She was bilked out of her life savings.

Hackers contacted Ms. Peppers on Facebook, pretending to be one of her Facebook friends.

She was told she was eligible for a government grant of almost one million dollars and all she had to do was send a check to pay taxes.

Investigators believe the scammers were operating from Nigeria, defrauding senior citizens in the U.S. and around the world.

Before Ms. Peppers realized she was being conned, she sent checks totaling \$87,000 hard-earned money.

She said that she worked three jobs to build her life savings.

Ms. Peppers and her husband are just two of 38 victims bilked out of more than \$1.3 million before the fraud was discovered.

This story is not an isolated incident: although 1 in 20 seniors in the U.S. is a target of fraud schemes, the National Adult Protective Services Association has found that only 1 in 44 seniors report that they are victims of a fraud scheme.

During these unprecedented times, it is imperative that Congress pass legislation that protects U.S. consumers and honest businesses from wrongdoers who steal money through fraud and deception.

Mr. Speaker, we need to strengthen federal prevention efforts and ensure leaders in the public and private sectors are collaborating on effective safeguards.

This begins with ensuring that the FTC has the explicit authority to obtain both injunctive and monetary relief for all violations of the laws it enforces.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 2668, the "Consumer Protection and Recovery Act."

TRIBUTE TO ZAHRA SOMANI
KARAMALI

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and profoundly thank a long

time, super-star member of my staff, Zahra Somani Karamali. After serving in my district offices for thirteen years, Zahra is moving on to pursue a Ph.D. in Psychology and a career as a School Psychologist. It is hard for me to even imagine not having Zahra serving the residents of the 9th Congressional District as one of the most effective Constituent Advocates in the country. Though not in my office, she will always be a beloved member of Team Schakowsky.

Zahra Somani Karamali joined my office in 2008, and she brought perspective, experience, and enthusiasm that have left a permanent impact on our operations and on constituents' lives. She is a dedicated public servant who readily established herself as a strong ally for individuals who would otherwise not have an effective voice. My husband and I had the joy of attending her wedding to Nauman and celebrating the birth and growth of their two wonderful children Ayman and Zayna. She and her family have become cherished friends.

Over the years, Zahra advocated for thousands of constituents who needed help with a wide range of issues. She cut through red tape and solved difficult problems, often in life-changing ways.

Zahra helped immigrant families who were pursuing green cards or struggling to obtain a visa to travel home to visit sick relatives. She helped reunite families, assisted refugees, and helped immigrants obtain naturalization status. She expedited passport applications so that mothers and fathers didn't miss their daughters' wedding abroad. When residents called because they had missing mail or delayed tax returns, Zahra provided an empathetic ear and an enthusiastic hand to help solve those issues. During the pandemic she helped constituents who were stranded abroad and helped constituents obtain desperately needed stimulus checks and important benefits. She fought for constituents to receive all the benefits they needed and deserved and tackled problems big and small with compassion and professionalism.

Zahra is active in the Ismaili community and played an instrumental role in building and strengthening my and my office's relationships with the Muslim community. I am proud to have stood alongside her and so many others in that community in good times and in bad, and I deeply cherish the relationships I've formed along the way.

Zahra is always enthusiastic and willing to do whatever needs to be done. She represented me at office hours in libraries across the northwest suburbs, helped organize and conduct a wide array of events, and spoke on my behalf at events across the district.

Zahra has been an essential member of the team, and a big reason why my office is well known for its effective constituent services. I will miss Zahra very much, as will everyone on the staff. I expect to hear from many constituents who will be very disappointed to hear that Zahra is no longer there to help. We pledge to her that we will all work hard to fill the gap. I know that the fortunate students and families she will serve in the years ahead will benefit from the wonderful gifts that have made Zahra so invaluable to me.

HONORING WENDY BALDO

HON. ANDY BIGGS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of a longtime friend, Wendy Baldo, who will soon begin her well-deserved retirement.

Wendy first came to work in Arizona state government in 1988, during the administration of Governor Rose Mofford. In 1993, she began her long and distinguished career with the Arizona State Senate. In 2009, Wendy was hired as chief of staff for the legislative body, a role in which she has now served for more than 12 years.

I came to know Wendy while serving in the Arizona state legislature from 2002 to 2016. My election to the Arizona Senate in 2010 provided me the opportunity to work under Wendy's guidance, and she continued to serve as my chief of staff for the four years I served as Arizona Senate President. Wendy was always a trusted advisor. She staunchly protected the institution of the Senate and was the fierce, loyal ally every leader needs. It is a rare occurrence in the Arizona Senate for a chief of staff to serve multiple Senate presidents. Wendy's service to five presidents is a true testament to her character and caliber.

The knowledge and expertise Wendy has accumulated in her years in the Arizona Senate are an invaluable resource. Her retirement, while well-deserved, will undoubtedly be a loss for the Senate. I thank Wendy for her many years of service to the people of Arizona and wish her well in this next phase of her life.

REMEMBERING HARRY M.
ROSENFELD**HON. STEVE COHEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer the thanks of a grateful nation for the life and work of former Washington Post Metro editor Harry M. Rosenfeld who guided the newspaper in its Pulitzer Prize-winning Watergate coverage. Mr. Rosenfeld died last week at the age of 91. A survivor of Berlin's Kristallnacht in 1938, he and his family immigrated to New York City in March of 1939, just months before World War II began. After graduating from Syracuse University and a stint in the U.S. Army, Mr. Rosenfeld joined the New York Herald Tribune syndicate and rose to managing editor before joining The Post. Editor Ben Bradlee made him assistant managing editor for metropolitan news where he inherited a staff of hungry reporters covering local beats, among them Carl Bernstein. Mr. Rosenfeld later hired a very persistent Bob Woodward. The double-byline stories of Woodward and Bernstein, covering scandal and corruption in the Nixon administration, eventually led to Nixon's 1974 resignation. He ended his career as the editor of newspapers in Albany, New York. I offer my condolences to his wife Anne and his three daughters and his extended family. Mr. Rosenfeld's enduring sense of justice and demand for accountability helped change American history and inspired

a generation of journalists. His passion for the truth and for journalism was an inspiration and a model to be emulated. His was a life well led.

SUCCESS ACT

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, during the COVID-19 crisis, we have seen how crucial internet access has been for learning and completing assignments. The homework gap, experienced by as many as 17 million students in the U.S. who do not have internet access at home, is an inequity that predates the coronavirus pandemic.

When I first began talking about this issue, I was shocked and saddened to recognize there were so many misconceptions about who was part of the homework gap. So many of my colleagues believed the homework gap is something that predominantly affects students in rural America. But in fact, one in five school-age children in NYC's public school system—the largest public school system in the country—do not have internet access at home.

The nature of homework assignments has fundamentally changed. Before, all you needed was a pencil and paper. But that is no longer the norm. Internet access is essential to completing homework assignments. It broke my heart to hear stories of families parked outside McDonalds or Starbucks trying to catch a free Wi-Fi signal.

Closing the homework gap extends beyond just helping our students finish their homework. Internet connectivity is essential to success in the 21st century; much like electricity was important in the 1930s, internet will be the same, if not more.

That is why Congress passed the Emergency Educational Connections Act as part of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, a bill that I proudly championed with Senator MARKKEY. This provision created the Emergency Connectivity Fund, and provided a one-time \$7.17 billion appropriation to connect students and library patrons learning at home.

As our Nation works to move past the pandemic, we must finally close the full homework gap that predates the ongoing emergency. That is why I am proud to introduce today the Securing Universal Communications Connectivity to Ensure Students Succeed or the SUCCESS Act. This bill would provide \$8 billion a year over five years (for a total of \$40 billion) to extend the FCC's Emergency Connectivity Fund, without an emergency time frame, so that schools and libraries can continue supporting distance learning after the coronavirus pandemic is over. This extended program will then ensure that students connected by the emergency connectivity fund do not lose their internet access and devices once the original funds run dry.

Madam Speaker, as the mother of two young children, I know firsthand how crucial this issue is. Each and every student must have the tools they need to succeed in school, and the SUCCESS Act is an essential component to permanently closing the homework gap. I urge all of my colleagues in both chambers to help close this digital divide for good.

SERIOUS ISSUES FACING OUR
COUNTRY

SPEECH OF

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 2021

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I'm here to point out just how interconnected the climate emergency is to America's housing crisis and how it impacts communities of color.

We are living in a climate emergency. Wildfires are raging, sea levels are rising, and severe weather events are getting stronger. Meanwhile homes are being destroyed, and not nearly enough is being done to address environmental racism and the ways in which communities of color across this country suffer disproportionately from a lack of action. We cannot stand by as corporations, big oil, and industry titans pollute the air we breathe and contaminate the water we drink without consequence.

The truth is that these negative environmental factors compound social and economic conditions, and lead to higher levels of chronic health problems such as asthma, diabetes, and hypertension in communities of color and low-income communities. It should surprise no one that on average, people of color comprise 56 percent of the population living in neighborhoods with facilities that release toxic substances into the air and water supply.

This is a fair housing issue and a direct result of systemic racism and historically racist policies, including redlining and exclusionary zoning, that segregate low-income people and people of color into areas that have suffered from decades of disinvestment. These segregated areas are often located closer to industrial districts and are therefore more likely to be deprived of green spaces, healthy homes, and clean drinking water. None of this is news. But, because of worsening residential segregation, the increasingly harmful effects of climate change and extreme weather events are exacerbating these conditions in low-income communities and communities of color.

Today, formerly redlined communities suffer from hotter temperatures, and their homes are 25 percent more likely to experience damage due to flooding compared to communities that were not redlined. In some cases, whether due to repeated flooding or because they are located at higher elevations, low-income communities of color, such as in Puerto Rico and Florida, are facing displacement, known as climate gentrification.

The real-life examples are far too plenty. Take for example, St. James Parish, Louisiana—a community that is often referred to as "Cancer Alley." I traveled there in 2001 to bring international attention to corporate pollution and the human costs of that pollution on communities of color. St. James Parish has a long history of inequality. The parish is located along the lower Mississippi River where enslaved Africans were forced to labor. Today, it serves as an industrial hub, with nearly 150 oil refineries, plastics plants, and chemical facilities. Not only have these facilities polluted the surrounding water and air, but they have also subjected the mostly African American residents of St. James Parish to cancer, respiratory diseases, and other health problems.

In 2005, we saw how Hurricane Katrina impacted people of color in New Orleans. Lives

were taken, whole communities were absolutely ravaged, and homes were destroyed. Even after seeing that level of destruction, not enough action has been taken to make sure that homes are resilient and safe from extreme weather events, especially those located in the hardest hit communities.

And just last year, in the middle of the pandemic, Georgia and Tennessee experienced deadly tornados that damaged and demolished more than 2,000 homes. In the wake of California's 2018 wildfires—the deadliest in the state's history—82 percent of homes that were built to pre-2008 standards were damaged. The need to ensure our homes and communities are sited and built more equitably and resiliently is more critical than ever before.

And so, I want to make it clear that America's housing infrastructure is vulnerable to the growing costs of climate change and weather disasters, which will only accelerate the need for maintenance and repair, or it will make our housing infrastructure uninhabitable. Between 2016 and 2020, these disasters have cost nearly \$616 billion in damages and have displaced tens of thousands of people from their homes. We cannot keep asking people to live like this. We must act now.

As Chairwoman of the House Committee on Financial Services, I recently introduced my historic Housing Is Infrastructure Act of 2021, which provides over \$600 billion to increase our nation's green, inclusive, affordable housing infrastructure. I'm fighting for the type of investments that will bring our housing stock into the 21st century and beyond, including working to address environmental racism and the climate emergency, strengthening our nation's commitment to fair housing, and recognizing that housing is infrastructure.

HONORING DIANE DILLON

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Diane Dillon as the recipient of the Napa County Farm Bureau's 2021 Friend of Agriculture for her ongoing work in serving Napa Valley's agricultural community.

As a fifth-generation Napa County resident, Diane has been an active community member for as long as she can remember. A UC Santa Barbara alumna, she graduated with a B.A. in Cultural Anthropology with Honors then continued her education at UCLA where she received her master's in library and information science. Diane went on to receive her J.D. from UC Davis in 1981 where she was a member of numerous school organizations. Since 2003, Diane has been serving on the Napa County Board of Supervisors as District 3 representative. As a Supervisor, Diane has made it a mission to better understand the intricacies of the state budget and finance system. To that end, she was asked to serve on the statewide Cities Counties Schools (CCS) Partnership 2009 Joint Task Force on Fiscal Reform. In January 2010, Diane held the first ever county-wide conference involving the county, municipalities, and school representatives.

Throughout her career, Diane has tirelessly worked with the agricultural community to un-

derstand and address the complex issues they face. As a co-organizer and member of "Get a Grip on Growth," she helped protect a 900+ acre piece of land from becoming developed into a commercial building area. Furthermore, Diane was co-chair on the "No on W & X Committee" where she received the Outstanding Service Award from United Napa Valley Associates for her resolute work. Diane is regarded as a passionate and dedicated member of the community and is recognized for her hard work to protect the scenic resources and beautiful lands of Napa County's agricultural industry. She is an excellent example of what it means to be a hard-working elected representative and a role model to many in leadership and the agricultural sector.

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that Diane Dillon's achievements will leave a tremendous impact in our community for generations to come. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor her here today.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF ROBERT "RENNY" CUSHING

HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Robert "Renny" Cushing, who has led a remarkable life dedicated to social activism and public service. His selfless determination to secure equitable social change for the communities he has served is a true testament to our country's civic spirit.

His journey began at the young age of 15 while advocating alongside civil rights activist Allard Lowenstein to end the Vietnam War and to lower the voting age nationwide. A year later, he left Hampton, New Hampshire with only \$40 in his pocket and an itch to see the world. Renny soon traveled thousands of miles and worked numerous blue-collar jobs. He picked oranges in Florida, plucked grapes in the San Joaquin Valley of California, collected waste in Atlanta and harvested tobacco in Mexico. After a few years of travelling, he decided to bring all the knowledge he acquired about people and life back home.

When he returned to Hampton, Renny co-founded the Clamshell Alliance, a group that would protest the construction of a nuclear station that individuals and families throughout his community voted against. He also later co-founded the Murder Victims' Families for Human Rights, an international non-government organization of family members of murder victims fearlessly dedicated to opposing the death penalty. Renny, whose father was tragically murdered, spent decades advocating for the abolishment of New Hampshire's death penalty law, which the state did repeal in 2019.

He officially began his career as a legislator in 1986, after winning his first election as a Representative of the New Hampshire State House. Following multiple non-consecutive terms, Renny was nominated as the Democratic Leader of the New Hampshire State House of Representatives in 2020. While serving as the Democratic Leader, Renny received a heartbreaking stage four prostate cancer diagnosis after he was hospitalized with acute kidney failure.

Renny did not allow this devastating news to deter his commitment to serving others. Now the Democratic Minority Leader, Renny continues to serve in the New Hampshire State House where he has fought to ensure remote access to House hearings for disabled legislators, expand availability of medical marijuana for cancer patients and ensure the removal of harmful PFAS chemicals in nearby wells.

Renny has devoted his life to the betterment of our nation and our communities and the uplifting of all our people. His unwavering commitment and tenacious attitude even in the toughest of times exemplify what it means to be a patriotic American.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize the important accomplishments of Robert "Renny" Cushing, and I hope this Chamber will join me in celebrating his remarkable life and career.

HONORING JAMES W. FLINT

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and a champion of the LGBTQ+ community, James W. Flint, on his 80th birthday.

At just 17, Jim enlisted in the Navy. He quickly became an accomplished service member before returning home to Illinois. Since the early 1960s, Jim has been the lifeblood of Chicago's LGBTQ+ community, dedicating his time, resources, and talents to expanding and creating the LGBTQ+ nightlife scene. For over 60 years, Jim has been a trailblazer and inspiration to many across the state of Illinois and beyond, and has been a committed activist and business leader.

He started his career as a bartender and quickly became the entrepreneur we know and love by opening his first locale, the Baton Show Lounge, in downtown Chicago. It was a first of its kind drag bar, featuring drag queen entertainers before these kinds of shows became as popular as they are today. In the decades since, Jim has owned many fabulous establishments, including Annex 2, Annex 3, Redoubt, Redoubt Atlanta, and River North Travel, in addition to the Baton Show Lounge, which is still open today and was recently relocated to my very own 9th Congressional district.

In addition to his extraordinary bars, in 1980, Jim founded the Miss Gay Continental Pageant, a national level drag showcase. He was motivated to start the pageant when he learned that many other pageants were discriminating against drag performers we would today identify as transgender. At that time, many of the pageants created rules and barriers that excluded entertainers that were living as women or who had any kind of plastic surgery. Today, now known as the Miss Continental Pageant, it has expanded to a pageant system that celebrates male and female entertainers from all across the country and around the world, and occurs in Chicago annually.

He was also a co-founder of the Windy City Athletic Association, which gave LGBTQ+ Chicagoans the opportunity to compete in amateur athletics with their counterparts from all across the nation.

Jim's deep community roots quickly positioned him as an activist and community organizer. In 1986 he ran for the Cook County Board of Commissioners, and although his bid was not successful, it was groundbreaking as he was one of the first openly gay people to run for public office in Illinois.

As is the case for all trailblazers, Jim has faced and overcome significant challenges in his personal and professional life. From witnessing rampant domestic violence, drug abuse, and homicide within the LGBTQ community to the many lives we lost to the AIDS epidemic in Chicago and across the country, Jim has withstood phenomenal pain.

Throughout times of unthinkable tragedy, Jim's warm energy and generous spirit have never wavered. His drive, compassion, and fantastic flamboyance are remarkable and have allowed him to be incredibly successful. He has played a tremendous role in shaping the LGBTQ community around the country, and his impact on the City of Chicago is immeasurable. As a businessman in the LGBTQ and Chicago community, he has blazed trails and opened doors for so many others.

And as a public servant, activist and community leader, he has made sure that the needs of the LGBTQ community were not ignored by our government. I am honored to call Jim a friend and wish him all the best and continued success.

TRIBUTE TO YOUNG STAFF MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, in these tumultuous days of crisis and challenge, Members of Congress know well, perhaps better than most, how blessed our nation is to have in reserve such exceptional young men and women who will go on to become leaders in their local communities, states, and the nation in the areas of business, education, law, government, philanthropy, the arts and culture, and the military.

We know this because we see them and benefit from their contributions every day. Many of them work for us in our offices as junior staff members, congressional fellows, or interns and they do amazing work for and on behalf of the constituents we are privileged to represent.

Madam Speaker, I believe there is no higher calling than the call to serve a cause larger than ourselves. That is why I ran for public office. I was inspired to serve by President Kennedy who said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country," and by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who said:

"Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. . . . You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love."

By this measure, there are several other great young men and women who served as

volunteers this year in my offices. They braved the dangers of the pandemic that has wrought so much suffering and heartbreak across our nation. They cheerfully do their duty in the U.S. Capitol complex that just six months ago was the site of an insurrection attack not seen since the War of 1812. These dedicated and public-spirited men and women may toil in obscurity but their contributions to the constituents we serve are deeply appreciated. That is why today I rise to pay tribute to five extraordinary young persons for their service to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and to the American people. They are:

Alejandro Garcia Escobar Plascencia, Georgetown University;

Jacqueline White Menchaca, Arizona State University;

Idia Irele, Smith College and Harvard University;

Anthony Collier, Texas Southern University; and

Valencia Shuler, Rice University.

Madam Speaker, the energy, intelligence, and idealism these wonderful young people brought to my office and those interning in the offices of my colleagues help keep our democracy vibrant. The insights, skills, and knowledge of the governmental process they gain from their experiences will last a lifetime and prove invaluable to them as they go about making their mark in this world.

Because of persons like them the future of our country is bright, and its best days lie ahead. I wish them all well.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful that such thoughtful committed young men and women can be found working in my office, those of my colleagues, and in every community in America. Their good works will keep America great, good, and forever young.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5027–S5058

Measures Introduced: Thirty-eight bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2428–2465, and S. Res. 314–317. **Pages S5049–51**

Measures Passed:

2020 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Senate agreed to S. Res. 314, commemorating the past success of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams and supporting the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams in the 2020 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games. **Pages S5038–39**

Authorize Representation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 316, to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of *AO Alfa-Bank v. John Doe, et al.* **Page S5056**

Trevor Reed: Senate agreed to S. Res. 67, calling for the immediate release of Trevor Reed, a United States citizen who was unjustly found guilty and sentenced to 9 years in a Russian prison. **Page S5056**

Paul Whelan: Senate agreed to S. Res. 165, calling on the Government of the Russian Federation to provide evidence or to release United States citizen Paul Whelan. **Pages S5056–57**

National Cyber Director: Senate passed S. 2382, to authorize the National Cyber Director to accept details from other elements of the Federal Government on nonreimbursable basis. **Pages S5057–58**

Kim Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Todd Sunhwa Kim, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General. **Page S5038**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, July 22, 2021, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, July 26, 2021. **Page S5038**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S5038**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, July 26, 2021; and that the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination ripen at 5:30 p.m. **Page S5058**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 79 yeas to 16 nays (Vote No. EX. 277), Jill Hruby, of New Mexico, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Department of Energy. **Page S5038**

Ely Stefansky Ratner, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Shawn Graham Skelly, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Meredith Berger, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Gina Maria Ortiz Jones, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Caroline Diane Krass, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Heidi Shyu, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering. **Pages S5040–41**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Andrew Philip Hunter, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Graham Scott Steele, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Thomas R. Nides, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the State of Israel.

Tom Udall, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador to New Zealand, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Independent State of Samoa.

Tamara Cofman Wittes, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Jonathan Kanter, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General. **Page S5058**

Nomination Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Andrew Philip Hunter, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, which was sent to the Senate on July 20, 2021. **Page S5058**

Messages from the House: **Page S5044**

Measures Referred: **Page S5044**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S5044–49**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S5049**

Notice of a Tie Vote Under S. Res. 27:
Pages S5043–44

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S5051–52**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S5052–55

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Pages S5055–56

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5056**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—277) **Page S5038**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 4:08 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 26, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5058.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: On Wednesday, July 21, 2021, Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2022".

FUTURE PANDEMIC RISK

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment concluded a hearing to examine frameworks to address future pandemic risk, after receiving testimony from Evan G. Greenberg, Chubb, and Martin South, Marsh, both of New York, New York; Robert P. Hartwig, University of South Carolina Darla Moore School of Business, Columbia; Adenah Bayoh, Adenah Bayoh and Companies, Irvington, New Jersey; and Robert M. Gordon, American Property Casualty Insurance Association, and L. Charles Landgraf, Arnold and Porter, on behalf of the Business Continuity Coalition, both of Washington, D.C.

SPACE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Space and Science concluded a hearing to examine space situational awareness, space traffic

management, and orbital debris, focusing on solutions for emerging threats, after receiving testimony from Karina Drees, Commercial Spaceflight Federation, Kevin M. O'Connell, Space Economy Rising, LLC, and Tom Stroup, Satellite Industry Association, all of Washington, D.C.; Marcus J. Holzinger, University of Colorado, Boulder; and Paul Graziani, COMSPOC Corp, Canonsburg, Pennsylvania.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Robert T. Anderson, of Washington, to be Solicitor, Department of the Interior, and Shalanda H. Baker, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Minority Economic Impact, Samuel T. Walsh, of New York, to be General Counsel, and Andrew Eilperin Light, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Affairs), all of the Department of Energy.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POPULATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Chemical Safety, Waste Management, Environmental Justice, and Regulatory Oversight concluded a hearing to examine current issues adversely affecting environmental justice populations, after receiving testimony from Laura Pulido, University of Oregon, Eugene; Catherine Coleman Flowers, Center for Rural Enterprise and Environmental Justice, Montgomery, Alabama; Tracy Harden, Chuck's Dairy Bar, Rolling Fork, Mississippi; and Delbert J. Rexford, Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation, Utqiagvik, Alaska.

21ST CENTURY ECONOMY

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine American workers in a 21st century economy, focusing on the right to organize, after receiving testimony from Mark Gaston Pearce, Georgetown Law Center Workers' Rights Institute, and Heidi Shierholz, Economic Policy Institute, both of Silver Spring, Maryland; Jyoti Sarolia, Ellis Hospitality, Temecula, California, on behalf of the International Franchise Association; and Gracie Heldman, Pandora, Ohio.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Gustavo A. Gelpi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Angel Kelley, to be United States District Judge for the District of Massachusetts, Christine P. O'Hearn, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, and Helaine Ann Greenfeld, of Maryland, and Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 65 public bills, H.R. 4614–4678; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 550–551, were introduced. **Pages H3841–44**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3846–47**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows: H.R. 2497, to establish the Amache National Historic Site in the State of Colorado as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 117–100);

H.R. 2278, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the September 11th National Memorial Trail, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 117–101); and

H.R. 3110, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to expand access to breastfeeding accommodations in the workplace, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 117–102).

Page H3841

Averting Loss of Life and Injury by Expediting SIVs Act of 2021: The House passed H.R. 3985, to amend the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 to expedite the special immigrant visa process for certain Afghan allies, by a yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas to 16 nays, Roll No. 218. **Pages H3807–17**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. **Page H3807**

H. Res. 535, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2467), (H.R. 2668), and (H.R. 3985) was agreed to Tuesday, July 20th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on page H3817.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

Committee Meetings

TERRORISM AND DIGITAL FINANCING: HOW TECHNOLOGY IS CHANGING THE THREAT

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism held a hearing enti-

tled “Terrorism and Digital Financing: How Technology is Changing the Threat”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Homeland Security officials: Stephanie Dobitsch, Deputy Undersecretary, Office of Intelligence and Analysis; Jeremy Sheridan, Assistant Director, Office of Investigations, U.S. Secret Service; and John Eisert, Assistant Director, Investigative Programs, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Defense Intelligence Agency Budget Hearing”. Testimony was heard from Scott Berrier, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JULY 26, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 4502, the “Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2022” [Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Agriculture, Rural Development, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 2022], 2 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, July 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Todd Sunhwa Kim, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, July 26

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Biggs, Andy, Ariz., E800
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E798
Carter, Earl L. "Buddy", Ga., E797
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E800

Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E798, E798, E802
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E800
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E797
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E797

Raskin, Jamie, Md., E801
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E799, E801
Thompson, Glenn, Pa., E798
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E797, E798, E801
Waters, Maxine, Calif., E800



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are