United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 11, 2021 *No. 81*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for the joy You give us when we follow Your guidance. Lord, You have provided us with Your Holy Word as a light to illuminate life's journey, and Your precepts inspire us with confidence and delight.

As our lawmakers daily receive Your wisdom from devotional time with You, permit Your peace that exceeds anything we can understand to guard their hearts, even during turbulent seasons. Lord, use our Senators for Your glory, empowering them to stay productive throughout the days of their lives.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrea Joan Palm, of Wisconsin, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, ''infrastructure,'' ''court packing,'' ''crisis,'' ''Jim Crow,'' ''bipartisan''—all words that we recognize, all words with fixed, long-established meanings, and all words whose meanings are currently being twisted unrecognizably.

In the brave new world of the Biden administration, the Democratic Congress, the plain meaning of language is no longer so plain.

Take the term ''infrastructure.'' Ask anybody what they think of when they think of infrastructure, and I can guarantee what they will tell you: roads, bridges, waterways, maybe airports. I can also tell you what they won't think of: Medicaid expansion, support for Big Labor, free community college.

Why? Because none of those things has ever been part of the definition of ''infrastructure,'' until now. Now Democrats are claiming that infrastructure is pretty much whatever they want it to be.

One Democratic Senator tweeted:

Paid leave is infrastructure. Childcare is infrastructure. Caregiving is infrastructure.

Well, actually, no, they are not. Those are policy proposals—proposals that could be discussed, but they are not infrastructure. Saying something is infrastructure doesn't make it so.

And, unfortunately, Democrats' redefinition of infrastructure, as Orwellian as it is, is actually less alarming than some of Democrats' other attempts at linguistic redefinition.

Take court packing. Everyone who has ever sat through an American history class knows exactly what court packing refers to—expanding the number of Justices on the Supreme Court so that you can get the Supreme Court decisions that you want.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed it in the 1930s, and it was defeated by a bipartisan majority of Senators. And most thought the idea had been consigned to the ash heap of history, until Democrats resurrected it during the Trump administration.

Upset by the Court's current makeup and worried that the Court might not rubberstamp Democratic policies, a growing number of Democrats are getting behind the idea of court packing.

But, of course, they are eager to escape the negative connotations of the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

term. After all, President Roosevelt's Court-packing attempt is not exactly regarded as a shining moment of his Presidency. And so in a move worthy of Orwell's ''Nineteen Eighty-Four,'' Democrats are asking us to accept the fantastical notion that Republicans packed the Court—indeed, packed the entire judiciary—and that Democrats are merely seeking to restore balance.

Yes, in the Democrats' brave new world, the President performing his constitutional duty to nominate judges and Justices, and a Senate duly confirming them, is now defined as a nakedly partisan power grab akin to President Roosevelt's attempt to secure a favorable outcome for his policies from the Supreme Court.

I should say a Republican President fulfilling his constitutional duty and a Republican Senate confirming his nominees because we all know—we all know that if it were President Biden who had filled multiple seats on the Supreme Court and succeeded in having a lot of judges confirmed, his actions would not be regarded as Court packing; they would be regarded correctly as business as usual. That is what we do around here. They would be regarded correctly as a President doing his job and performing his constitutional duty.

Then there is Jim Crow. Americans know what ''Jim Crow'' means. It refers to the reprehensible period of segregation, when Black Americans were forced to live as second-class citizens and denied the equal protection of the laws.

''Jim Crow'' is one of the great stains on our country's history, and it is a term that should not be used lightly, but that is exactly what Democrats are doing.

They decided that it suits their purposes to call to mind the history of this word, and so they have applied the term to an ordinary, mainstream election reform bill in Georgia.

In fact, the President went so far as to call the Georgia law ''Jim Crow on steroids,'' as if it would not only bring us back to the era of segregation but return us to something even worse.

And all this for an election law that is squarely in the mainstream when it comes to State election laws and in some ways is more permissive than election laws in presumably utopian Democratic-led States like New York.

I could go on.

There are Democrats' attempts to redefine ''bipartisan'' from something that is supported by both parties in Congress to something that is maybe—maybe—supported by some Republican voters in some poll, no matter how dubious its reliability.

Or there is the White House's contorted refusal to call the situation at our southern border a crisis, as if by refusing to use the word they could somehow change the reality of the situation.

But let me ask a question. Why is the plain meaning of language under assault by the Democratic Party? Why are Democrats dramatically redefining ordinary words and concepts?

Well, maybe it is because reality isn't so pretty. Take court packing. The truth is that Democrats are afraid that the current Supreme Court is not going to rule the way Democrats want in cases they care about. So they want to expand the Supreme Court and let President Biden nominate new Justices so they can guarantee the outcomes that they want.

But saying that doesn't sound so great. In fact, it sounds more autocratic than democratic. So Democrats are attempting to disguise the real reason behind their partisan court-packing plan by applying the word ''Court packing'' not to their own attempts to pack the Court but to the ordinary work of the President and the Congress.

Or take infrastructure. Pretty much everybody supports infrastructure. You would be hard-pressed to find anyone who doesn't thinking the government should maintain our roads and bridges.

It would be a lot easier, on the other hand, to find people who think that maybe government shouldn't be in the business of substantially increasing spending or expanding into new areas of Americans' lives.

So Democrats have chosen to disguise their plans for massive government spending and government expansion under the heading of ''infrastructure.'' After all, everybody supports infrastructure.

So if they can sell their plans for government expansion as infrastructure, then they might be able to implement a lot of proposals that otherwise might not make it through Congress.

Or take Jim Crow. With H.R. 1 and S. 1, Democrats are pushing to pass an election law that would federalize elections, inject a massive dose of partisanship into our election system, and give Democrats what they hope will be a permanent advantage in elections going forward, but obviously they can't say that. They can't suggest that we pass H.R. 1 to improve Democrats' electoral chances so they have had to find another reason to push Americans to pass this bill.

And so they have manufactured a crisis—States are passing dangerous election laws that harken back to Jim Crow, and we need the Democrats' election bill to save the day.

Sometimes I wonder when the President is bashing the Georgia election law if he remembers that the legislature that passed that law was elected by the same voters who gave him the victory in Georgia and sent two Democrats to the U.S. Senate. Does he really want to call those voters racist?

Ultimately, Democrats' assault on language is about power. Change the language, and you can change the outcome and secure your political control.

It is no coincidence that oppressive regimes have cracked down on speech and redefined it to suit their purposes or that they manufacture crises to keep the people in need of government.

The problem for Democrats is that there is no mandate for Democrats' far-left agenda. Democrats' radical socialist candidates couldn't even make it through the Democratic primary, let alone the general election. President Biden won the Democrat primary and the election in large part because he campaigned, perhaps disingenuously, as a moderate. And as for Congress, Democrats lost seats in the House and have a paper-thin majority in both Chambers. If there was any mandate to be gathered from November, it was a mandate for moderation.

But Democrats aren't interested in moderation. They are increasingly enthralled with the far-left wing of their party, and they have a radical agenda to push and possibly a very limited window to push it. And since there is no mandate for that agenda, they have to create one.

That is why you see Democrats redefining the very plain meaning of common words. Say that you don't like the makeup of the Supreme Court, and most Americans would say: Tough, that is the way the ball bounces sometimes in our democracy.

Claim that Republicans engaged in court packing, on the other hand, and all of a sudden Democrats' radically partisan Supreme Court power grab seems a lot more acceptable.

I get Democrats' passion for their politics. I feel pretty strongly about my political principles. But their manipulation of language to advance their politics is deeply disturbing. Instead of trying to pursue a radical agenda cloaked in misleading language, I suggest Democrats turn their efforts to bipartisan cooperation. As the November election made clear, that is what the American people are looking for.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip is recognized.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the statement by my friend from South Dakota about radical socialism—radical socialism. I think what he is categorizing as radical socialism is the suggestion by the President of the United States, Joe Biden, that we should really care about providing safe, affordable, quality daycare for women who want to go to work. Radical socialism?

I am concerned about some trends that we are noting. The census reports that the birth rate in America is going down. Fewer children are being born in this country. I ask a basic question: What does that say about our country and about our future?

What it tells me is that raising a family for many is a struggle. They have to work to bring money home, and they want to have the peace of mind when they go to work that their kids are safe. That is not a radical suggestion, and the solution isn't socialism.

The solution is just caring. What do you care about? President Joe Biden does, and he has suggested, as part of his plan for American families, that the wage earners don't have more than 7 or 8 percent of their income dedicated to daycare. I don't think that is radical. I think it is realistic. It says they have some skin in the game, some investment on their own part, but they have affordable daycare affordable to them.

Republicans say they are all about infrastructure. We want to build the best highways—I do, too—the best bridges and best airports and such so that Americans in business can move from one place to another. Sign me up. That is basic infrastructure, and I agree with it. But, if I have the best highway from my home to a good place of employment and still can't find affordable daycare, many people—especially women who are out of work—can't buy into this infrastructure investment. That is not radical. Socialism, to give a mother a helping hand so that she has a safe place to leave her child during the course of the day?

And how about the other suggestions of President Biden? Is it radical socialism to suggest that we have available for all families in America—all families in America—2 additional years of training and education for children before kindergarten? I don't think it is radical.

I have the best little granddaughter in the world, who is going to be 2 years old in just a few days. She started her school experience already. We are proud of her, and I think it is going to help her to socialize with other children, learn in a classroom atmosphere, and I am glad she is there. I wish every family in the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois had the same option. But many cannot.

President Biden thinks that is a good idea. So do I.

Who would characterize that as radical socialism—2 additional years for children before kindergarten?

Here is another thing he suggests. Let's have 2 additional years after the 12th grade. The President said 2 years of community college. Is that radical socialism, to expand the offering of education an additional 2 years? If you visit community colleges and see what is going on there, you realize that many young people are making really life-changing decisions about their careers and their future.

Radical socialism? I don't think so. I think most families would say it is just common sense. It is not radical, and it is not socialism if government gives a helping hand. We have done that since the 1950s when it came to college loans. We do that today when it comes to helping school districts across this Nation. Not radical, not socialism, just common sense commitment to the American family.

So they can make the speeches all they wish, but that is the reality.

There has been an awful lot of talk on the Senate floor about infrastructure, as I mentioned. Many of my colleagues across the aisle think it is just roads and bridges and nothing more. I think that is a priority, but I don't think that is the entire challenge.

When we consider infrastructure, we ought to look to the future. We should ask important challenging questions. What kind of infrastructure investment will help us for decades to come? What does the next-generation economy in America need? What tools will our children and grandchildren need to lead healthy, productive, satisfying lives?

Tough questions, but President Biden's American Jobs Plan and the American Families Plan face these questions honestly. Broadband, education, clean energy, paid family leave, electric vehicles, daycare—the President's plan envisions all of these things and more as the future of infrastructure.

What does that future look like in practice? I had a visit last week which was amazing. I wanted to share just a little bit of my visit with you. Last Thursday, I visited a town in central Illinois called Normal. During my visit, I toured a new manufacturing plant, the Rivian plant, where production will begin in a few weeks on brand-new electric trucks, SUVs, and delivery vans. This is not a small-scale operation. Amazon has already placed an order for 100,000 emission-free delivery vans—100,000.

Not long ago, 6 years ago, in fact, another car company, Mitsubishi, occupied a plant where Rivian is today, and they left town, putting 1,000 people out of work in the process. We were pretty down on our luck at that point and despondent about the future of that facility. It sits out by Interstate 55.

Guess what happened. A year later, thanks to the leadership of many people, including my friend the mayor of Normal, IL, Chris Koos, who found a buyer for the old Mitsubishi plant. By the end of 2021, that plant will be back in business full scale with more than 2,500 employees producing the next generation of electric vehicles.

It is a manufacturing jobs boom in Normal, IL. I couldn't be more excited or happy for the people who live nearby. It was made possible by leaders and investors who refused to hang on to the past. Here was this young CEO who decided that electric vehicles were our future. He came up with that idea 5 years ago, and he has created a large class of believers.

Folks in this town will tell you infrastructure is about more than roads and bridges. For them it is about taking transportation in America to the next generation, and the President of the United States, Joe Biden, understands that.

His American Jobs Plan includes a $174 billion investment in electric vehicles and charging stations. Is this some big radical socialist government idea? No. Listen to the major producers of automobiles in America today talk about where they think the market is headed. Every one of them is talking about electric vehicles. The funds that President Biden proposes would support the growth of companies like Rivian and accelerate the installation of charging stations across the country.

I went from Normal, IL, to a multimodal facility—Amtrak, cars, buses. They all gathered downtown in a building which I helped to build. And we went to several levels of parking in this facility. At each level there were electric charging stations. That is the future.

Imagine the future where you drive from Normal to Chicago or St. Louis, or anywhere in this country, without burning a drop of gasoline? This is the new normal, a place where hard-working Illinoisans produce next-generation vehicles, and companies come together with local leaders to move us toward a cleaner, stronger economy.

Normal, IL, is stepping up to the plate to ensure the United States continues to lead in the global economy, even as competitors like China ramp up their own electric vehicle production.

Make no mistake. If we follow the lead of the Republicans and step away from investing in electric vehicles and the training and the other elements that are necessary to develop it, the Chinese are not going to drop out of the competition. They are going to unfortunately be very successful at our expense.

Normal isn't going it alone. All around my State, I am proud to say, we see efforts to create this electric vehicle future. Last week, Governor Pritzker and Lion Electric announced plans to open a new electric vehicle manufacturing plant in Joliet, IL—a $70 million investment that will create 700 new jobs.

Beginning in 2022, the plant will produce 20,000 zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. That means electric school buses and trucks built right in my home State.

A Netherlands-based manufacturer of charging stations, EVBox, set up its U.S. headquarters in Libertyville, IL, this past summer. They have plans to produce more than 200 fast-charging stations a week.

The electric transportation industry and its surrounding infrastructure already employs more than 5,000 people in my State of Illinois. One recent report projects that electric transportation employment in Illinois will grow to more than 9,500 workers by 2024. That is an 83-percent jump in 3 years.

Illinois is poised to have a nationally important role in the development of electric vehicles. Why are the companies coming to Illinois? I have a theory. Illinois has been setting the stage for this electric vehicle revolution for years.

Look at our labs—Federal labs. Scientists and engineers in our national

labs have pushed the boundaries of vehicle and battery technology for decades, always looking ahead. Today, their pioneering work will produce batteries that will last longer, charge faster, and can be recycled safely.

Look at our universities. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign produces some of the best engineers in America. In Normal, you can find Illinois State University and Heartland Community College, which produce a direct pipeline of new talent to companies like Rivian.

Illinois recognizes that science and research are the backbone for the economy. Our labs and universities prove it time and again. This research drives the electric vehicle industry forward, and companies want to be right in the middle of that environment.

Beyond batteries, Illinois leads the way in research in clean energy technology, quantum computing, artificial intelligence, and many of the other technologies we need to be part of the economy of the 21st century.

President Biden understands that we need research, too. His American Jobs Plan proposes $180 billion in investment in research and development for things just like electric vehicles. We have the opportunity to not only electrify but to supercharge our future.

Federal funding that matches the President's bold plan could transform more towns like Normal or Joliet into powerhouses of American manufacturing.

I listen to Republicans on the other side say: We shouldn't spend so much. We shouldn't spend it on so many things that might affect our future. Take it easy. Take it slow. Wait and see what happens.

I couldn't disagree more.

The Republican plan is a solid strategy for second place in the world. I don't want to be part of an effort to bring the United States second in any competition in the world. We may not always be first, but we should always strive to be first. Stepping away from President Biden's plan for manufacturing and jobs and families is, unfortunately, an easily predicted outcome. We will not be able to succeed and create the jobs of the future.

I will continue to support robust, sustained funding for electric vehicle infrastructure and innovation. I hope that both parties will. I hope my colleagues will join me in thinking in a big way about the future of America when it comes to the economy and infrastructure. I have seen the future it can create in Normal, IL, last week, and it is a bright one.

LIABILITY IMMUNITY

Mr. President, the American Rescue Plan was the Biden threshold initiative to bring to America what it desperately needed after this President was sworn in on January 20 of this year. Unfortunately, we didn't have a single Republican to support it—not one. Not a single Republican Senator or House Member would support the American Rescue Plan of President Joe Biden.

What did the plan do? Well, it bought more vaccines. It invested dramatically in the distribution of these vaccines across America. It turned around and kept the President Trump promise of the cash payment of $1,400 for each individual. It extended unemployment benefits so that people could continue to keep food on the table and pay their rent and mortgage payments until they found good jobs. And it basically said to small businesses: We are not giving up on you. We are going to help you, whether it is the restaurant industry or other businesses. We want you to be back in business. We invested that money as a nation, and it was a critical time to do it.

President Biden believed, and all the Democrats supported him in this belief, that we should move forward now or run the risk of falling behind in developing our economy. The American Rescue Plan was successful. It has given assistance across the board to families and businesses and delivered resources where they were needed the most. It really matched the crisis with an initiative that was significant in scope.

But if my Republican colleagues had had their way, the American Rescue Plan would have looked a lot more like a giant corporate giveaway because all throughout 2020, they were clamoring for massive handouts to big businesses in the form of liability immunity. I am glad that my colleague from Texas is on the floor because it is an issue that he has been interested in and has spoken on the floor many times.

All last year, we heard from the other side of the aisle that Congress needed to give sweeping Federal liability immunity to corporations when it came to their conduct during the pandemic. Well, we heard some dire warnings about the number of lawsuits that were going to be filed because of COVID–19. It was called a tsunami of lawsuits by the Republican leader of the Senate.

One year ago today, on May 11, 2020, Senator MCCONNELL spoke on the Senate floor and raised fears of ''a second job-killing epidemic of frivolous lawsuits.'' The next day, he came to the floor and kept the attack on, and he warned of ''a tidal wave of medical malpractice lawsuits.'' That is from Senator MCCONNELL on the floor of the Senate.

Senate Republicans rallied behind a bill introduced by Senator CORNYN that would give corporations immunity from accountability both in court and from regulators for conduct that could be considered negligent under current law. I argued against these corporate immunity proposals. Granting corporations legal immunity gives them an incentive to cut costs and cut corners when it comes to the health and safety of workers and consumers. It gives a pass to unreasonable and irresponsible behavior and puts people at greater risk. I don't think that is the right approach.

As I kept pointing out to my Republican colleagues, they couldn't show statistically why this was necessary. The data never justified their proposals. That tsunami of lawsuits never arrived. We are now over a year into this pandemic. Over 32 million Americans, sadly, have been infected, and nearly 600,000, tragically, have died. So how many lawsuits have been generated by all these terrible outcomes?

Well, there is a law firm, Hunton Andrews Kurth, that has tracked all of the lawsuits filed in the United States over COVID–19. I checked the totals over the weekend. You may be asking: Well, how many medical malpractice cases have been filed in the United States over the last year related to COVID–19? The number: 20—20. And how many cases alleging personal injury from exposure to COVID–19 in a public place have been filed? The number is 60 in the entire United States. That is not a flood. That is not a tsunami. It is a trickle.

In fact, the main litigation we have seen involving COVID has been one business suing another business. For example, there are 1,831 lawsuits involving insurance disputes, 640 lawsuits involving business closures and stay-at-home orders, and 772 lawsuits involving contract disputes. It was not what was predicted on the floor over and over again by Senators from the other side of the aisle.

I am always troubled how the Republican immunity proposals try to block infected workers and families from suing corporations for negligence, but let corporations continue to file their own COVID-related lawsuits by the hundreds whenever they feel like it. How is that fair?

I believe Americans deserve a chance to have a day in court when these families believe their loved ones have been harmed due to negligence or misconduct. For example, if a senior citizen dies because a nursing home refused to share what it knew about the virus's spread, I believe the families of those victims deserve a chance to go to court and seek justice.

Those types of cases are traditionally governed by State law. States can and do adjust their State liability law to fit the circumstances. As it turns out, more than half the States have changed their liability laws, either through legislation or executive action, in response to COVID. In my view, some of the States went too far, to be honest with you, in shielding negligent behavior by corporations, but that was their call to make since this is a State law issue.

I find it surprising that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want Congress to step in and impose sweeping Federal corporate immunity that would override the laws of all 50 States. There was no justification for doing so, and I am glad we didn't. It would have made us less safe.

I hope the next time we hear calls for sweeping Federal liability immunity

during a national crisis, we remember this experience and how the dire predictions of tsunamis and floods of lawsuits never came to pass. Let's continue to address this virus with targeted relief much like the American Rescue Plan did. And as we emerge from the pandemic, let's invest in the areas that actually need support. That is why Democrats support President Biden again with the American Jobs Plan and the American Families Plan, targeting investments that help the American economy.

Like President Biden said last month, we have got to build our economy from the bottom up and the middle out and not from the top down. Giant corporations don't need another handout like immunity. They already have all the help they need. I hope we can work together to deliver real relief to the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks before the vote occurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, listening to my friend, the Democratic whip, reminds me that there is one type of business that my Democratic friends always support, and that is the lawsuit business. As he pointed out, about half of the States have taken steps to protect their citizens from frivolous litigation and other litigation that would arise out of their good-faith following of the guidelines laid down by the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control. That is what we proposed here in the Senate.

And my friend's, the Senator from Illinois's view did prevail because I found out that there is one—the most powerful lobby here in Washington, DC, is the trial bar, and, unfortunately, it is not just big corporations. I am sure big companies can take care of themselves. They have got lawyers; they have got compliance officers; and they have got people who can help them figure out how to deal with the pandemic. It is the mom-and-pop businesses, the music venues, the houses of worship, the schools, and the universities—those were the ones that were reluctant to reopen, even complying with the CDC guidelines, because they were afraid of being sued into oblivion.

So my colleague's views did prevail here in the Senate, unfortunately, but, thankfully, States like mine—Texas is currently in legislative session taking appropriate steps to avoid this sort of frivolous litigation, which will be like a wet blanket on our economic recovery and on job creation. Again, this is not a get-out-of-jail free card. These are citizens—American citizens—trying to do the best they can under very difficult circumstances who have, in good faith, complied with the Centers for Disease Control guidelines.

I would like to rewind just a little bit to 2019, before the pandemic hit, and recall that the American people were reaping the benefits of one of the strongest economies in American history. The driving force behind that economic boom, I think, was, in significant part, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which we passed in 2017, which sought to help American families and the economy thrive by keeping more of what they earned and turning over less to the Federal Government. In my opinion, there is no question that it was one of the biggest contributors to our booming economy.

Our national unemployment rate had reached a 50-year low, and we saw record unemployment rates for Hispanics, African Americans, and Asian Americans. Unemployment among women fell to the lowest rate since the early 1950s. That was prepandemic.

The benefits did not stop there, though. Wages were on the rise. The poverty rate hit an alltime low, and millions of new jobs were being added to our economy. Families were bringing home more of their hard-earned paychecks, and median household income reached a record high.

But then the pandemic hit, as we know, and things took a very sharp turn downward. Businesses closed their doors; workers lost their jobs; and the unemployment rate skyrocketed from 3.5 percent to nearly 15 percent in April.

Fortunately, this dark economic picture is gradually brightening. Thanks to the investment we have made in therapeutics and vaccines in a historically short period of time, thanks to the ingenuity and perseverance of workers and business owners, combined with the assistance that Congress has given them and, like I said, advancements in modern science, we have made steady progress.

The unemployment rate has steadily declined over the last year, reaching 6 percent in March, but the new data from April is a cause for concern. The unemployment rate increased by a tenth of a percentage point. It didn't go down. It went up. It is a bump that wouldn't have raised any red flags before the pandemic. But this single data point is not the only indication of how our economy is faring. Last month, only 266,000 new jobs were added to the economy. That is a quarter—25 percent—of what economists had predicted. Now, again, 266,000 new jobs would not have been a bad jobs report before the pandemic because we were literally at nearly full employment, but we aren't currently in a build mode. We are currently digging our way out of a hole, a recession, to be specific.

We are still missing 8 million jobs that existed prior to the pandemic. I don't think anyone expected all those jobs to come back overnight, but we did expect to be faring far better than this. As I said, the economists said this is a quarter of what they anticipated.

Well, this is the first full month of data since our Democratic colleagues passed their $2 trillion so-called rescue plan on top of the trillions of dollars that we spent in 2020. If things continue to go the rate we are on now, we are in for an extremely long recovery. In other words, sometimes policies that emanate from Washington actually make the recovery harder, not easier.

Unfortunately, the administration is doing more to slow down the recovery than they are to solve it. Last year, Republicans and Democrats worked together to provide unprecedented assistance to workers and their families hit by this economic downturn. Bolstered unemployment benefits were intended to provide laid-off workers with the money they needed to support their families until they could return to work, and over the last year, many of those workers have, fortunately, gotten back on the job.

These benefits were a lifeline for millions of families and, today, there are still workers unable to find a new job. But there are, unfortunately, also people abusing the system, the generosity of the American people, the American taxpayer. The partisan relief bill our Democratic colleagues pushed through earlier this year extended supplemental unemployment benefits through September of this year, far beyond the amount of time anyone would have expected that those benefits, the supplemental benefits to the State unemployment benefits, would be needed.

Even as vaccinations were on the rise, our Democratic colleagues insisted on extending these benefits through September, and many of us predicted the outcome. Last spring, workers couldn't find jobs. Now, businesses can't find workers.

Between bolstered unemployment benefits and a steady stream of stimulus checks, many people who lost their jobs can't be convinced to return to the workforce. One restaurant owner in Texas said he had had plenty of applicants; people just won't show up for the interviews. One day, when he had scheduled eight interviews for potential employment, only one applicant showed up. The next day, the same thing happened—five scheduled interviews; one person showed up. He said: It makes you wonder, are they just filling these applications out to collect unemployment? Because, of course, most unemployment benefits require you to apply for work and accept it if it is offered. But apparently here, whatever the incentives are, they are simply persuading some people to fill out applications but then not to seriously pursue work.

In a year's time, we have gone from the strongest economy in a generation to the government paying people to stay home. This reminds me of the discussion we had a couple of years ago when the Green New Deal was launched. An overview of the bill was listed on the website of one of its authors and said that the government would foot the bill for any person who is ''unable or unwilling to work.'' ''Unable or unwilling to work,'' that the

government would foot the bill—that was the proposal initially when the Green New Deal was rolled out. ''Unwilling to work.'' Don't like the job? Don't want to get out of bed in the morning? Don't worry; hard-working Americans who are getting up and going to work every day will foot the bill so you can stay home. I am sure it comes as no surprise that this received a great deal of criticism and even ridicule 2 years ago.

Unfortunately for the taxpayers who actually do get up every morning and go to work, we are seeing this play out in real time. Folks who lost their jobs and who are now able but unwilling to return to work can continue to reap the bolstered unemployment benefits that our Democratic colleagues provided for them through September.

Another restaurant owner in Texas said that between the stimulus checks and the enhanced unemployment benefits, it is tough to find people who want to work at all. He said:

I believe our biggest competition in the job market is the government.

This isn't an isolated problem. In Texas, the average unemployment benefits equal more than $36,000 a year. In Washington State, you can receive $39,000 a year in unemployment benefits. In Massachusetts, it is $41,000 a year.

A few Governors have said their States will stop offering the bolstered benefits because it is a disincentive for workers to get back on the job. If you are able to stay home and bring in as much money or maybe even more than you were earning while you were actually working, what is the incentive to go back?

This poor job report isn't a surprise to anyone who has spoken to employers, as I have, who have said repeatedly that no one wants to return to work when they can get paid to stay home.

Another factor that has likely contributed to the slow recovery is the slow reopening of schools. Despite the fact that in many States, teachers are among the first individuals to get vaccinated, the return to classrooms has been incredibly slow. Less than half the school districts throughout the country are operating fully in person.

The nearly $2 trillion that our Democratic colleagues rammed through Congress in March did little to get us back on track. It sent more than $120 billion more to K–12 schools that were already flush with cash but attached no requirement that the money be used to actually get children back in the classroom, where we know they will learn best.

If at least one parent has to be home with their children for even part of the week, that makes it incredibly difficult for them to return to work. For single parents, it is virtually impossible.

If we are ever going to get our economy back on track, we need to get our children safely back in school. We need to get people who are able but who are currently unwilling to work to get back on the job. And we need to supply the businesses that managed to survive this past year with a reliable workforce.

Right now, the biggest hurdle to our economic recovery is the government itself. That needs to change. If you asked the President or a number of our Democratic colleagues in the Senate, they would say the solution is easy—the American Jobs Plan. Let's spend more money.

This proposal is part social safety net, part infrastructure, and part taxpayer-funded spending spree. It is really designed to transform America into Europe—a social safety net economy.

It spends more than $2.5 trillion on things like electric vehicle chargers and home healthcare, which we are happy to debate in any other context, but what we really need is a jobs plan to get America back to work, not another Trojan horse like we saw passed earlier this year and is currently being advertised, for example, under the guise of being an infrastructure bill.

In order to finance this plan, along with the President's American Families Plan, our Democratic colleagues want to enact the largest tax hike in a generation. So contrary to what we did in 2017 by lowering the tax burden and giving people more of what they earned—and we have seen those tremendous economic results as a consequence—our Democratic colleagues want to, while we are still at 6 percent unemployment, raise taxes, which will further retard the economic recovery.

So to recap, the plan for economic recovery is to make it more expensive for businesses to operate and nearly impossible for them to find workers. No wonder the economy isn't rebounding like we had hoped. That is what happened to the million jobs that were projected to be in the latest jobs report, but it was unfortunately a disappointing 25 percent of those million jobs.

So instead of building on the successes of 2017 and the prepandemic economy, the administration wants to double down on the old, tired belief that America can tax and spend and regulate itself to prosperity. We don't need dramatic tax increases for sweeping social safety programs to get our economy back on track. We need to replicate the same factors that led to our banner prepandemic recovery. We need to get our children safely back in the classroom so their parents can return to the workforce. We need to stop paying workers to sit on the sidelines, and we need to give the job creators the ability to drive our economy forward.

Democrats don't have an ''American Something Plan'' for every problem. Sometimes all the government has to do is get out of the way.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON PALM NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Palm nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Ex.]

YEAS—61

Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Capito	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Luján	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Sullivan
Collins	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cornyn	Murkowski	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Crapo	Murray	Warren
Duckworth	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Durbin	Padilla	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	
Gillibrand	Portman	

NAYS—37

Barrasso	Hoeven	Rubio
Blackburn	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Boozman	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Braun	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Lummis	Toomey
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young
Hagerty	Paul	
Hawley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich	Leahy

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN.) Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill 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. 65, Cynthia Minette Marten, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Education.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Michael F. Bennet, Jack Reed, Jeanne Shaheen, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Catherine Cortez Masto, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy

Baldwin, Tammy Duckworth, Chris Van Hollen, Tim Kaine, Thomas R. Carper, Amy Klobuchar, Margaret Wood Hassan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Cynthia Minette Marten, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Education, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 181 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Burr	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Luján	Sinema
Carper	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Hagerty	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young
Graham	Risch	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich	Leahy

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Cynthia Minette Marten, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Education.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:57 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, this week is National Police Week, and I rise today in honor of the service and sacrifice of law enforcement across this country.

In North Carolina, we lost 10 law enforcement officers in 2020, and we tragically lost 6, so far, in 2021. Some of these officers were victims of COVID, others were involved in car accidents, and some made the ultimate sacrifice being killed in the line of duty.

Recent tragedies in Cabarrus, Gaston, Henderson, and Watauga Counties in my State of North Carolina have been met with an outpouring of gratitude, appreciation, and love from the residents for the communities they help keep safe.

Last September, we lost Deputy Ryan Hendrix of the Henderson County Sheriff's Office after he was shot and killed responding to a break-in. Officer Hendrix was only 35 years old. He had two young children and was set to be married to his fiance the following month.

Last December, Tyler Herndon of the Mount Holly Police Department was tragically killed in the line of duty just days before his 26th birthday.

In December, Officer Jason Shuping of the Concord Police Department was shot and killed while responding to an attempted carjacking. Officer Shuping was only 25 years old. He left behind his wife Haylee, a high school sweetheart whom he had been in love with for years and married for 2. Last week, I had the honor—the sad honor—of joining Cabarrus County to commemorate Law Enforcement Day and to honor Officer Shuping's service.

Most recently, on April 28, North Carolina tragically lost two more law enforcement officers: Sergeant Chris Ward and K–9 Deputy Logan Fox of the Watauga County Sheriff's Office. They were conducting a welfare check that turned into a deadly, hours-long standoff. Sergeant Ward was only 36 years old. He was an 8-year law enforcement veteran. He leaves behind a wife, who was also his high school sweetheart, and two daughters. Deputy Fox was only 25 years old. He was a 2-year veteran of the Watauga Sheriff's Office, and he was a partner with a K–9 named ''Raven.'' He was engaged and soon to be married.

The people of North Carolina came together to pay their final respects to these brave officers just a little over a week ago. During the procession from Winston-Salem back to Boone, many stood on the side of the road to salute the officers and proudly wave American flags.

I told the audience and the police officers present last week in Concord that you need to know that the majority of Americans still greatly appreciate your service to law enforcement. They recognize the vast majority of men and women serving in law enforcement are good people who put their uniforms on every day, willing to sacrifice their own lives to protect us.

Being a law enforcement officer is not an easy job, and it is certainly not safe. We saw that on Capitol Hill on January 6. But being an officer is becoming harder and harder as they handle more stress, more pressure, and more responsibilities than ever before. If their jobs weren't hard enough already, there are some people, including people on Capitol Hill, who are actively demonizing all of law enforcement, arguing that they are unworthy of taxpayer funding and the people's respect.

It is no wonder why many law enforcement officers across the Nation—officers across the Nation—have low morale. We are seeing the real-world consequences: a decrease in applications to go in academies, early exits, and more retirements. It has gotten to dangerous levels in several cities across the country.

The demonization of law enforcement will have lasting consequences, and it will ultimately make all of us less safe. This is why Congress must do everything we can to support law enforcement and to stop efforts to demean and demonize them. The best way to do that is to recognize law enforcement for their remarkable service and the dangers they face to protect us.

That is why I recently reintroduced the Protect and Serve Act. This legislation would make it a Federal crime to intentionally assault a law enforcement officer. It ensures prosecutors have every tool available to punish those who attack and target them. In 2018, the Protect and Serve Act passed the House by a vote of 382 to 35, and it had the support of every current Member of the House Democratic leadership.

If President Biden is serious about unity, I can think of no better bill for him to support. This week, I will be reintroducing another important piece of legislation, the Probation Officer Protection Act. This bill would give probation officers the arrest authority they need to fully enforce the law and protect public safety. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will cosponsor this bill and work with me to send it to the President's desk, along with the Protect and Serve Act.

I know every Member of Congress has seen the heroism of law enforcement firsthand. I did too. We all saw it on January 6, when Capitol Police and DC Police risked their lives to ensure our safety. We ultimately lost two Capitol Police officers, and we lost another since then. More than 440 of our Capitol Police and DC Police were injured in the events of January 6.

I hope the respect and appreciation we show to law enforcement this week can be sustained year-round. Let us commit ourselves to doing all we can to support the men and women in blue who protect and serve us every single day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I rise today in recognition of National Police Week, where we honor, remember, and support public servants who dedicate their lives to keeping our communities safe.

Today, I specifically recognize Louisiana law enforcement officers who lost their lives in 2020 performing their duty. We should all thank God for law enforcement officers and their willingness to put their lives between us and danger, knowing that they may have to sacrifice their lives, as 15 did in Louisiana this past year.

To the families, wives, husbands, and children of these fallen Louisiana police officers, we share your pain, and we share your pride for he or she who was here for us all.

These are the officers in Louisiana who died this past year in the line of service: Deputy Constable Levi Kelling Arnold, New Orleans First City Court; Trooper George Bowman Baker, Louisiana State Police; SRO/Dare Officer Kejuane Artez Bates, Vidalia Police Department; Reserve Captain Raymond Andrew Boseman, New Orleans Police Department; Probation and Parole Officer Kaitlin Marie Cowley, Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections; Captain Steven Michael Gaudet, Jr., Pearl River Police Department; Deputy Sheriff Claude Winston Guillory, Jefferson Davis Parish Sheriff's Office; Senior Police Officer Mark Albert Hall, Sr., New Orleans Police Department; Lieutenant Glenn Dale Hutto, Jr., Baton Rouge Police Department; Correctional Deputy Kietrell Michael Pitts, Tangipahoa Parish Sheriff's Office; Deputy Sheriff Donna Michelle Richardson-Below, DeSoto Parish Sheriff's Office; Captain Kevin Paul Trahan, Church Point Police Department; Captain Randy Michael Vallot, Richland Parish Sheriff's Office; Officer Marshall Lee Waters, Jr., Mangham Police Department; and Senior Police Officer Sharon M. Williams, New Orleans Police Department.

Their passing—each of theirs—was felt throughout our States, and they are tragic reminders of the danger law enforcement officers face every day when they report for duty. And they know it; they accept the risk; their families accept the risk; and their spouse and their children. We must honor their sacrifice.

I ask that we all join in prayer for the families of these fallen officers and that we keep in prayer those who protect us during the day. It is a difficult time, but knowing our country supports them can make all the difference.

Just last week, the Audubon Zoo canceled the annual Blue at the Zoo event that seeks to promote and foster positive, interactive experiences with the New Orleans Police Department. The New Orleans Police Department superintendent, Shaun Ferguson, said he was ''disheartened as a result of that decision.''

Any opportunity for a positive conversation is an opportunity to improve relationships between law enforcement and communities. We need more events, not fewer. We have much work to do.

But today, let's acknowledge those who put their lives on the line every day they put on a uniform. Let's remember those we have lost too soon. Let's honor the work they do to keep us safe.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

VOTE ON MARTEN NOMINATION

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we begin the vote now, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Marten nomination?

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Burr	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Luján	Sinema
Carper	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Hagerty	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young
Graham	Risch	

NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich	Leahy

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The Senator from Maryland.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY RELATING TO ''NATIONAL BANKS AND FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AS LENDERS''—Motion to Proceed

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 57, S.J. Res. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 57, S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF CURRENCY RELATING TO ''NATIONAL BANKS AND FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS AS LENDERS''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res 15) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of 5 USC 802, there will now be up to 10 hours of debate equally divided.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I will be back a little later to debate the resolution.

For the information of my colleagues, we expect a vote on passage of the joint resolution of disapproval around 5:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 15.

This is a misguided resolution. It would overturn an important banking

resolution, the OCC's true lender rule. That is a rule that helps give consumers more access to credit.

Overturning the true lender rule is a bad idea. It would reduce access to credit for consumers, especially those who have the most difficulty obtaining credit. It would stifle innovation, and it would inhibit the functioning of our markets, our Nation's banking and credit markets.

Let me explain why preserving this rule is so important. In the last decade, we have seen financial technology companies, often referred to as fintechs, use technology to revolutionize financial services.

Community and midsized banks that often lack the resources to develop banking technology in-house are partnering with these fintechs to compete more effectively and to offer their customers terrific services at ever-better prices. That is what these partnerships do. They help consumers because they increase competition in lending markets, they lower the price of financial products, they improve credit options, and they expand consumer choice.

Unfortunately, a patchwork of different legal tests in different courts had made it difficult to predict whether the bank or the fintech partner, when they have teamed up, would be considered legally responsible for a given loan they would make together. So last year, the OCC issued its true lender rule to provide the needed regulatory clarity. The rule—a simple version of this is, it simply holds that a national bank will be responsible for a loan if it is named in the loan agreement or if it funds the loan, which banks often do when they team up with fintechs in these ways.

Some of our Democratic colleagues have claimed that the rule, the true lender rule, allows unaccountable ''rent-a-charter'' arrangements, as they call them, but in fact, the true lender rule prevents the rent-a-charter scheme, and it does so because it ensures that the national banks are accountable for the loans they issue through these lending partnerships, and it requires the OCC to supervise those loans for compliance with consumer protection and anti-discrimination laws.

Other colleagues have expressed concerns that the rule will ''trap'' consumers in arrangements with high interest rates and a principal balance that can never be paid back, but actually that is not possible with these OCC-chartered banks, which are the only ones affected by this rule. That is because a bank is required under the OCC resolution to assess a borrower's ability to repay before making the loan. If a bank is systemically approving loans by this fintech partnership to consumers who can't repay the debt, they will face serious consequences from their regulator, and that is a lot more protection than what would otherwise exist for consumers.

Some of my Democratic colleagues claim that the true lender law fundamentally changes existing laws around interest rates. In fact, it preserves existing law. For over four decades, Federal law has allowed banks to essentially export the State law governing interest rates from the home State where the bank is based. So this allows the bank to comply with 1 law of the bank's home State rather than have to try to comply with 50 different laws of the 50 States in which its customers may reside. Having this single standard allows for a competitive national credit market.

The true lender rule simply allows fintechs that partner with banks to get the same treatment. It is really not very different from what happens today with credit cards. And may I remind everyone, credit cards can often have high interest rates.

So if you believe that bank-fintech providers shouldn't be able to ''export'' interest rates from the State in which the bank is headquartered, then I suppose you ought to be in favor of eliminating credit cards for all Americans.

Well, that would be a terrible policy. It would be a bad policy to get rid of the true lender rule as well. Now, I have heard the argument that the true lender rule somehow harms low-income consumers. In fact, the true lender rule benefits low-income consumers most by preserving their access to well-regulated, bank-issued credit.

Absent the rule, uncertainty about which partner, whether it is the bank or the fintech company, is the true lender means there would be uncertainty about what laws to apply to the transaction and whether or not the loan would be considered valid. Well, without the rule, without that certainty, the secondary market for these loans would be disrupted, and, again, that disproportionately harms lower income borrowers.

Why is that? Well, it is because banks frequently sell these loans after they are made so that they free up the capital to make the next loan. Banks can issue far fewer loans if they can't reliably sell the ones that they have into the secondary market. Uncertainty, as we would have in the absence of the true lender rule, diminishes their ability to sell into the secondary market, and that means fewer loans are going to get booked altogether. Those that are are going to be more expensive, and they will be limited to people of higher credit ratings.

And this isn't just my opinion. Forty-seven leading financial economists from Harvard, Stanford, and other leading universities made exactly these points in an amicus brief supporting the existing rule.

And we have empirical proof. Studies show that after a 2015 court ruling created uncertainty about the ability to export interest rates to New York, it became significantly harder for higher risk borrowers to get loans in New York.

This is not surprising. This is exactly what you would expect. This is what will happen nationally if this CRA is successful in repealing the true lender rule.

Now, some of my colleagues want to overturn the true lender rule because doing so would subject more loans to State interest rate caps, they say. But, in fact, the more likely effect is that the loans will just never get made in the first place, and that is terrible for the low-income consumer for whom that loan is the best available option.

The true lender rule preserves access to well-regulated, bank-offered credit.

At end of the day, we need to remember, if the CRA is successful and the true lender rule is repealed, demand for credit won't disappear. The need for credit doesn't go away because we get rid of a good rule. You simply make it harder for people who need loans to get them, and you will drive consumers to unregulated alternatives.

Voting in favor of the CRA, which would kill this rule, is also a direct assault on fintech. It will make it harder for Congress to legislate in this area. It will make it harder for regulators to issue guidance and rules to promote the healthy competition that fintechs represent. Courts will see this as Congress buying into this completely false notion that fintechs are somehow inherently ''predatory''—they are not—and it will scare away State legislators from promoting fintech.

If you believe financial innovation and competition are good things for consumers, as I do, then you should oppose this CRA.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against S.J. Res. 15.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

ALS CAUCUS AND AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, today I am proud to join my colleague Senator COONS in relaunching the bipartisan Senate ALS Caucus.

Currently, there are no effective treatments or cures available to stop or slow the disease, and we still do not know what really causes ALS.

More than 5,000 Americans are diagnosed each year. Yet there is no ALS survivor community. Individuals diagnosed with ALS and their loved ones rely on their elected officials to advocate on their behalf.

That is why the mission of the Senate ALS Caucus is to raise awareness about the difficulties faced by ALS patients and their families and to advance policies that improve their quality of life to advocate for meaningful research.

May also marks ALS Awareness Month. Last Congress, Senator COONS and I introduced and passed a resolution to designate May 2020 as ALS Awareness Month. This effort, like the ALS Caucus, will raise awareness about the impact of ALS on those who are diagnosed, their loved ones, and their caregivers.

I look forward to reintroducing again here in May 2021 the awareness month for ALS, and I hope my colleagues will help to pass this resolution again this year.

There is more to be done, though, in really battling ALS. Promising therapies that have demonstrated clinical safety and efficacy are on the horizon for those with ALS. Failure to approve those promising treatments means the difference between life and premature death for these patients, and, sadly, the paradigm of the past has been to not be erring on the side, when there is a promising treatment, to push it through the system. Sadly, it has been indicative of what happens often in this place, and that is that you belabor it, you stretch it out, and, in this case, it has a much different consequence.

Patients with ALS have been very clear that they are willing to take a higher degree of risk to have access to these treatments at an earlier point in time.

In September 2019, the FDA issued new guidance on developing drugs for ALS, which touted regulatory flexibility when applying the standard of safety and efficacy to drugs or diseases with serious, unmet medical needs. FDA guidance has been an empty promise, and patients with ALS lack flexible regulatory pathways to promising treatments as a result.

Indicative, in a way, of what I mentioned earlier, where we seem to always be aware of those kinds of issues, we tell the Agencies that might be involved, and then there is that natural tendency toward inertia.

For example, Amylyx, a pharmaceutical company focused on developing ALS treatments, announced clinical trial results of a promising treatment that slowed the progression of the disease and increased survival by 6 months. It may not seem like a long time, but when you take into consideration from the point of diagnosis to the point of dying from ALS, that is a lot of time, and the benefit of the doubt, when you have a promising clinical trial, needs to be given to the patient so that they have some hope.

Europeans and Canadians have put a dynamic into place that would be quicker footed than our own FDA's. We need to take that as some guidance.

Unfortunately, the FDA has expressed the need for additional clinical trials before allowing patients to access these drugs in the United States. This means Americans with ALS will not receive access when they can see others in Canada and Europe being able to.

We need to get with it, and when you have the condition of no effective treatment and it is working in other places, we need to give the benefit of the doubt.

It is failing to use its flexibility, and we have just seen—and I witnessed, all of us did, with the coronavirus—FDA, CDC squabbling out of the gate about what to do with coronavirus.

Thank goodness we did do something that was going to change that dynamic. We would still be wrestling over a vaccine if it had been business as usual.

So it is clear here, for even a better reason, that nothing is out there that is working, promising things on the horizon. We need to do better. That is why I will be reintroducing the Promising Pathway Act, the legislative solution to give those struggling with life-threatening illnesses, like ALS, a fighting chance of access to timely, meaningful treatments, especially when they are overwhelmingly wanting it, willing to take the risk.

The Promising Pathway Act would require the FDA—require the FDA—to establish a rolling, realtime priority review to evaluate the progress and not make it subjective, the way it is now, to where they can do what they have been doing, and that is dragging their feet.

Under this pathway, provisional approval would be granted by the FDA to drugs demonstrating substantial evidence of safety and relevant evidence of positive therapeutic outcomes, like those demonstrated in Amylyx's clinical trials.

It is right here. We just need to do it, and you are going to be doing what ALS patients would prefer.

This also encourages further research and clinical trials in not only ALS, but this, of course, should apply to other diseases that are similar where we are still wrestling, in clinical trials, with the ability to get these across the finish line. But it does strengthen the FDA's postmarket surveillance, which is another important thing for patient safety, and grants access to promising treatments covered by insurance.

To my colleagues, it is time to roll up our sleeves and to work to advance policies that improve the quality of ALS patients. I encourage every Member to lean in on this, to be a part of it, so that we can help people that have no other hope.

It is up to us to speak for those who can no longer speak, to stand up for those who can no longer stand.

I am grateful to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are returning members of the ALS Caucus, and I welcome those who are new to the caucus this Congress.

As the ALS Caucus continues to grow its membership, our commitment to the mission of the ALS Caucus and the ALS community is strengthened along the way.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this is National Police Week, and yesterday I spoke about the importance of police in our activities, our daily life. I come to the floor now to address my colleagues about a piece of legislation I am putting in.

I recently reintroduced the Protecting America's First Responders Act, a bipartisan bill cosponsored by 11 of my colleagues. This bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent in the last Congress.

In this new Congress, it is time that we once again turn our attention to the public service officers across our Nation who steadfastly serve and protect fellow Americans. These great men and women fulfill some of our most vital and irreplaceable needs. Their duties affect every part of our communities. We have seen that clearly—very clearly—over the past year as their services have been instrumental in keeping our communities safe during the pandemic.

Our firefighters dedicate themselves to braving harrowing fires. Our police officers rush headlong into danger to protect the innocent. Emergency first responders dutifully come to the aid of the injured, no matter the threat. Despite these vast responsibilities, their purpose is very much the same: to serve and protect their communities.

We know this call to service comes with great risk. We, in Congress, will forever be indebted to the Capitol Police officers who suffered substantial injuries and even gave their lives on these very grounds.

There is no way for us to truly comprehend or repay the sacrifices made by these officers and their loved ones left behind. Yet, knowing this, our public safety officers willingly accept the responsibilities of injury and, if need be, lay down their lives to fulfill their duties and their oaths.

We owe our firefighters, law enforcement, and all of our first responders a great deal, and we don't say thank you enough. They don't hesitate to take action when we need them to, and we must be equally steadfast in coming to their aid by ensuring that those officers, disabled or killed—killed in the line of duty—receive what they are due.

They must receive what we, in Congress, first promised now four and a half decades ago through the law that is called the Public Safety Officers' Benefit Program. So the original PSOB Program was created in 1976. Yet, since that time, it has been plagued with unclear and out-of-date regulations, forcing families of our fallen heroes to continually suffer through technical interpretations and drawn-out claim processes. This cannot continue.

This bill that 11 of us have introduced, the Protecting America's First Responders Act, ensures that disability claims are consistent with Congress's original intent for the PSOB Program. It received wide bipartisan support here in the U.S. Senate in the last Congress. Unfortunately, the bill stalled in the House.

Over the last year, I worked closely with Congressman PASCRELL to alleviate opposition and work through amendments that can pass the House. I am confident that with these changes, it will reach the President's desk very quickly.

The 117th Congress has a fresh opportunity to make this bill law, and there are many waiting for us to do exactly that. I introduce this bill with strong support from organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the National Association of Police Organizations. I urge my colleagues to, once again, vote for the Protecting America's First Responders Act, thereby fulfilling the original promise to honor those whose lives were forever altered by their service.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, on another subject, I come to the floor probably to explain to my colleagues something I have done on three or four different occasions, and nobody ever seems to get it right. So I am back here again trying to explain something so we don't have to deal with it again.

So here we go again. While I was traveling throughout Iowa meeting with constituents, I kept my eyes on news reporting out of Washington, DC. I have seen a lot of bad reporting in my time. The events that occurred starting on April 30 are there at the top of bad reporting.

The Washington Post, the New York Times, and NBC all had to retract their reporting about Russian disinformation warnings given to Rudy Giuliani. I am not here to talk about Rudy Giuliani. I am talking about how this report affects me and Senator JOHNSON because, unfortunately, in the Washington Post article, my and Senator JOHNSON's investigations into the Biden family's financial dealings was tethered, once again, to Russian disinformation attempts, and that tethering is what I have been here on the floor of the Senate, over the last maybe more than a year now, trying to explain that that just is a big hoax.

The report was based on anonymous current and former U.S. officials. Apparently, the Washington Post still hasn't figured out how to read a Senate report. My staff also spent many hours talking with the Post the day before the story ran in order to help them understand. And I presume they called us; we didn't call them.

I am going to quote from my staff's emailing them the following, which, in the end, the Post completely ignored in their article. So here is a long email:

Sen. Grassley's report with Sen. Johnson relied on Obama-era U.S. government records and information from a Democrat-aligned U.S. lobby shop, which employed Telizhenko while representing the corrupt Ukrainian gas company Burisma.

The email goes on:

Sen. Grassley never received a defensive briefing related to his oversight of the Biden family's foreign business ventures. Discussions with the FBI and the Intelligence Community were initiated by requests from Democrats, as is detailed in Section Ten of the report.

The FBI and members of the Intelligence Community indicated last year that there was no reason for the committee's investigation to be halted, even with knowledge of Telizhenko's limited involvement (see report page 59).

This is what the email says to the Post. Continuing to read from my staff's email to them:

The report and its underlying transcripts further reveal that Telizhenko had deep and longstanding relationships with Obama State Department officials, National Security Council staff and left-wing lobbyists. The transcripts also illustrate that material created by Derkach was introduced by Democrats, not Republicans, and it was quickly rejected by an expert witness as disinformation.

And then in parenthesis, it says: ''([S]ee Minority Exhibit J and George Kent's response to Minority staff regarding that exhibit).''

Continuing to report from the email to the Post:

Following a classified letter authored by Democratic leadership, portions of which were later leaked and reportedly referenced Derkach, Democrats again sought an FBI and Intelligence Community briefing, which was provided in August of 2020. At that briefing, the FBI stated that it's not attempting to—

And these are the words that the FBI used—

''quash, curtail, or interfere'' in the investigation in any way.

And then in parenthesis it says: ''([S]ee report, page 59).''

That's not the sort of direction provided at defensive briefings.

This is what my staff's email says to the Post.

Obviously, we didn't rely on any of this for the report's findings on Hunter Biden's and James Biden's extensive financial entanglements with questionable foreign nationals, including some connected to the communist Chinese government. Subsequent to the report, the public has also learned that Hunter Biden is under criminal investigation relating to his financial entanglements.

Given Telizheko's longstanding ties to Blue Star Strategies and Obama administration officials, are you similarly asking them whether they played into some Russian-pushed narrative?

I am going to go back because that question needs to be repeated. It is not repeated in the email I am reading to you.

Given Telizheko's longstanding ties to Blue Star Strategies and Obama administration officials, are you—

Meaning the Post—

similarly asking them whether they played into some Russian-pushed narrative?

Given that Democrats introduced Derkach material, are you similarly asking them whether they played into some Russian-pushed narrative?

Now, that is the end of the quote, and I think those last two questions indicate—because, obviously, the newspaper article doesn't say that they asked these questions that I repeated one twice and then the other question. They aren't really interested in getting to the bottom of this.

Now, after all this information and long phone conversations, the Washington Post opted for unnamed sources rather than on-the-record comments from my staff. So they had an opportunity to quote Grassley and explain all this stuff, and what do they do? They used an anonymous source. Maybe the Post should work on putting more investigation into so-called investigative reporting instead of focusing on false Russian disinformation narratives; for example, maybe spend some time investigating the Biden family's ties to Chinese nationals connected to the Communist regime's military and intelligence services.

I have addressed these Russian disinformation issues at length in my committee report with Senator JOHNSON, as well as right here on the floor of the Senate three or four times over the course of many months, maybe stretching into more than a year. I am going to do this again even though I have better things to do. If you want every detail, read section 10 in our September 23, 2020, report.

On July 13, 2020, then-Minority Leader SCHUMER, Senator WARNER, Speaker PELOSI, and Representative SCHIFF sent a letter with a classified attachment to the FBI to express a purported belief that Congress was the subject of a foreign disinformation campaign. The classified attachment included unclassified elements that attempted and failed to tie our work to Andrii Derkach, a Russian agent. This document falsely accused us of potentially receiving material from Derkach. It was pure speculative nonsense that the liberal media ran with as what they would call or want you to believe was the truth. Do you know what it was? It was garbage. Those unclassified elements were leaked to the press to support a false campaign accusing us of using Russian disinformation.

Then, during the course of our investigation, we ran a transcribed interview of George Kent. Before that interview, the Democrats acquired Derkach's materials. During that interview, they asked the witness about it. He stated:

What you're asking me to interpret is a master chart of disinformation and malign influence.

At that interview, the Democrats introduced known disinformation into the investigative record as an exhibit. Now, more precisely, the Democrats relied upon and disseminated known disinformation from a foreign source who the intelligence community warned was actively seeking to influence U.S. politics.

But there is yet more. On July 16, then-Ranking Member WYDEN and Senator PETERS wrote a letter to me and Senator JOHNSON asking for a briefing from the intelligence community on matters relating to our investigation.

On July 28, 2020, Senator JOHNSON and I reminded those two Senators

that the FBI and relevant members of the intelligence community had already briefed the committee in March 2020 and assured us that there was no reason to discontinue the investigation we were involved in.

In August 2020, subsequent to these Democrat-led letters, Senator JOHNSON and I had a briefing from the FBI on behalf of the intelligence community. However, in that briefing, the FBI discussed matters that were already known and completely irrelevant to the substance of our investigation. The FBI also made clear that it was not attempting to—and these are the FBI's words—''quash, curtail, or interfere'' in the investigation in any way.

Any talk about an FBI briefing warning us that our investigation into the Biden family's financial and business associations was connected to Russian disinformation is complete nonsense. No such briefing ever happened. Our investigation was based on Obama administration government records and records from a Democrat-aligned lobby shop, Blue Star Strategies. If those records amount to Russian disinformation, then that means the Obama administration dealt in disinformation every day, which brings me to the ultimate point I want to bring to attention today.

The FBI assured me that the August 2020 briefing, which was a pointless briefing that shouldn't have happened, would remain confidential. That is what the FBI told us, that it would be confidential. However, I was concerned that the substance of this briefing or at least elements relating to it would leak, and I knew that once it did, the briefing would be misreported and used to paint our investigation in a false light. That is exactly what happened last week.

Although the Washington Post failed, the Wall Street Journal got it right in its May 4 editorial titled ''The FBI's Dubious Briefing.''

I ask unanimous consent to have that editorial printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[May 4, 2021]

THE FBI'S DUBIOUS BRIEFING

(By the Editorial Board)

Did the FBI set up two Members of Congress for political attack under the guise of a ''defensive briefing''? It's possible, and Senators Ron Johnson and Chuck Grassley are rightly demanding answers.

On Monday the Republicans sent a letter to FBI Director Christopher Wray and Director of National Intelligence Avril Haines asking how the Washington Post came to know about an FBI briefing to both Senators on Aug. 6, 2020. A Post story last week used the info to smear Mr. Johnson and his report on Hunter Biden's foreign business dealings, suggesting that he'd ignored FBI warnings and thus may have been manipulated by the Kremlin. The newspaper cited only anonymous ''current and former U.S. officials.''

In their letter the Senators note that the briefing came after ''pressure from Democratic Leadership.'' In July 2020, the Democratic Members of the Gang of Eight—senior Members with access to intelligence secrets—had sent a letter and classified addendum to Mr. Wray specifically citing the Johnson-Grassley probe into Hunter Biden as reason for an urgent briefing for Congress about foreign ''disinformation.'' That news was then leaked, in what was an obvious attempt to tar the work of the two Republicans.

The two Senators became more concerned when the ensuing briefing by the FBI turned out to be what they described as ''not specific'' as well as ''unconnected to our investigation.'' (Their report was based on U.S. government documents.) They specifically expressed to the FBI during the briefing their concerns that it would be ''subject to a leak'' for partisan gain. Which is exactly what happened last week, despite the FBI's promise to the Senators of confidentiality.

After the August briefing, Messrs. Johnson and Grassley sent a letter demanding that Mr. Wray and the intelligence community disclose the reason for it. They never received the answer. In light of last week's leak, they are renewing their demand to know who recommended the briefing, and the intelligence that supposedly supported it.

Whether the FBI was pressured, duped, or actively political, the bureau has again landed in the center of a partisan fight. Mr. Wray might ask how that keeps happening.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The editorial began this way:

Did the FBI set up two Members of Congress for political attack under the guise of a ''defensive briefing''? It's possible, and Senators Ron Johnson and Chuck Grassley are rightly demanding answers.

On May 3, Senator JOHNSON and I wrote to FBI Director Christopher Wray and Director of National Intelligence Avril Haines, asking to meet with them to discuss the August 20 briefing. We need answers, and we need answers now. Why did the FBI and the intelligence community brief us? Who made that decision? At the briefing, the FBI didn't even show us what intelligence product formed the basis for the briefing.

I will tell you this, even without seeing any paperwork, we were already aware of everything they talked about that very day, and it was unconnected to the substance of our investigation.

I asked the FBI whether they had any new intelligence to share because we hadn't heard anything new, and they didn't give us a single new item. So, as far as I am concerned, the briefing was totally unnecessary.

Based on the timeline of events, it appears the briefing was done because the Democrats wanted it done, which means it was a political decision.

The Wall Street Journal ended its piece by saying this:

Whether the FBI was pressured, duped, or actively political, the bureau has again landed in the center of a partisan fight. Mr. Wray might [want to] ask how that keeps happening.

That is exactly right. The FBI and the intelligence community have lots of explaining to do.

We already know that under Comey, the FBI used intelligence briefings as surveillance operations against Trump and his team. Did the FBI and the intelligence community also misuse briefing processes against congressional Members? Only Director Wray and Director Haines can answer that question, and so far, they have failed to answer those questions. Their credibility and, more importantly, their professionalism are on the line.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

SOFTWOOD LUMBER

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, we have seen across many sectors of our economy the onset of the COVID–19 pandemic and its consequences. It has dramatically shifted the supply and demand for lots of products in unexpected ways.

I am on the floor today to speak about the price of lumber and the impact the soaring costs are having on homebuilders and on home buyers.

Nationwide, construction for new homes is up 37 percent over the last year and up 87 percent in the Midwest region, where I come from. Rising demand for new home construction, as well as an upturn in do-it-yourself home projects during the pandemic, have rapidly driven up the cost of lumber. As a result, since last April, overall lumber prices are up over 300 percent.

Lumber and wood products account for roughly 15 percent of the construction costs for a single-family home. We all work to see that that single-family home is something that is available to Americans. It is the American dream. But lumber accounts for the second largest overall cost of building a new home, only behind the cost of the land the home sits on. These increases have resulted in a $36,000 increase in the price of a typical single-family home and a $13,000 increase in the market value of a multifamily unit.

The reality is that record-high lumber prices are putting the American dream of home ownership out of reach for hundreds of thousands of potential home buyers and disproportionately harming middle- and low-income families across our Nation.

At a time when residential homebuilding is booming, it is essential that homebuilders and consumers have access to the materials they need at competitive prices.

Historically, Canada has been the largest foreign supplier of softwood lumber in the United States. These imports are vital to support the ongoing housing boom but have been declining. These imports have been declining over the past 4 years.

In April 2017, the U.S. Department of Commerce announced countervailing

duties averaging 20 percent on softwood lumber products from certain Canadian producers. In December of 2020, the average tariff was reduced to 9 percent. While a reduction in tariffs for some Canadian producers is a step in the right direction, the complete elimination of these tariffs is necessary to provide additional relief for rising lumber prices.

At a recent Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Subcommittee hearing, I raised this topic with U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai and urged her to engage with her Canadian counterpart to reach a long-term agreement on softwood lumber trade. It is American home buyers, not Canadian lumber producers, who end up paying the cost of these trade restrictions.

In addition to working to resolve this trade dispute, we should also work to boost the domestic production of the types of lumber used in home construction. Additional lumber can and should be sustainably harvested from public lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Adding to the existing lumber supply and ensuring that domestic sawmills are operating at full capacity will help soften lumber prices.

It is important for Kansans to have the opportunity and economic means to own their own homes. Unfortunately, the current lumber prices are making that dream unattainable for way too many families.

Resolving the longstanding trade dispute with Canada on softwood lumber and better managing our public lands to increase lumber production will both help alleviate the problems facing homebuilders and home buyers.

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. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, in December of 2019, as a new virus was emerging on the opposite side of the world, I spoke at the National Defense University, and the title of the speech I gave was called ''American Industrial Policy and the Rise of China.''

The reaction of many people to that at the time was skepticism—from Wall Street investors who, frankly, saw no problem with the status quo on China; from these think-tank experts who mocked my claim at the time that our country relied too much on China economically in our supply chain; and from tech giants in Silicon Valley obsessed with access to the Chinese marketplace.

But the problem I pointed to at that time in that speech, almost 2 years ago—a year and a half ago—was that for over a quarter century, our economic policies have been mostly about one thing: how American investors and companies can make money by doing business with China. In that vein, it didn't matter if making money meant allowing China to steal our intellectual property, it didn't matter if making money meant stable American jobs kept disappearing, and it didn't matter if making money meant investing in Chinese companies developing technologies to help defeat our country in a future war.

Finally, Americans are waking up to what a mistake that was. It was a bipartisan consensus that was flawed.

The 21st century will be defined by the relationship between China and the United States. Frankly, I believe that this is our last chance to make sure that it is a balanced relationship.

What we do not have time for are China bills or a China bill that is a collection of half-measures and studies. Instead, an actually meaningful China bill is what we need. I believe most Members here want it, and I believe we can get to it in a bipartisan way. But, to do so, I think it has to have six things. If you want a meaningful bill on China, it must touch on six things.

The first is like I said in December of 2019: We need to identify industries which are critical for our future, and we must spur investment in these key industries. We have to remember that we are not in a strategic competition with foreign Chinese companies. We are in a strategic competition with the world's largest and second wealthiest nation-state.

There is no way to compete with China by relying only, solely on private investment, not while the Chinese Communist Party subsidizes and cheats to boost its favorite companies. From industrial corporate giants to small businesses that make up our supply chain, the private sector is the most important area of this competition. We can encourage them to step up, just like we did for semiconductors with the CHIPS Act.

Frankly, the way we developed the vaccine with Operation Warp Speed is an example of a targeted industrial policy in which government partners with the private sector to solve a big problem. You can say what you want about America's response to COVID, but we have done vaccines better than anyone else in the world—not even close—and it is due to that partnership.

But an essential part of our strategy has to be, as a result, to build a strong foundation through targeted and sustained Federal funding for American research and development. The bipartisan Endless Frontier Act is a nod in that direction. Right now, that bill makes the National Science Foundation the lead Agency in directing $100 billion in government investment. The problem is that is the same Agency that, time and again, has had the research we fund stolen by professors and graduate students who are on the payroll for China.

DARPA and other advanced research Agencies within government have a much better record of protecting research and, I believe, would be a far better choice to administer these investments, instead.

The second thing a real China bill must do is communicate that while we do not seek an armed confrontation with China, we will confront any military aggression, we will maintain our defense commitments with our allies, and we will win any conflict China starts.

We must never do anything that leads Beijing to doubt our commitment to Taiwan, and we must never accept the Chinese Communist Party's illegitimate claims on the world's most important shipping lanes in the South and East China Seas. The Strategic Competition Act we recently passed out of the Foreign Relations Committee is largely silent on this topic, but Chairman MENENDEZ has pledged to work with me to include my South China Sea and East China Sea Sanctions Act in any final bill that we take up here on the floor.

The third thing a real China bill must do is fix broken international and domestic trade laws. The World Trade Organization is failing miserably, and it must be reformed. And China's flagrant intellectual property theft, industrial espionage, and massive subsidies to Chinese companies can no longer be ignored and they must be addressed. My Fair Trade with China Enforcement Act would help protect critical industries in America from Chinese influence and possession and recover the lost value of secrets and technologies that they have stolen.

The fourth area of focus of any real China bill must be making sure China doesn't control our medicines and/or our medical technology and patient data. Last year, panic over masks and ventilators was a wake-up call for our medical dependence on Beijing.

From blood thinners to acetaminophen, which is the ingredient in Tylenol, we have allowed China to dominate the pharmaceutical manufacturing market. It is dangerous leverage over America and Americans. We should be able to make medicines here. This will not only make us safer; it will create well-paying, stable jobs for American workers. My Medical Manufacturing, Economic Development, and Sustainability Act would do exactly that and should be included in any real China bill.

As I said in September of 2019, we must immediately enact stricter guidelines to make sure that public funding never contributes to Chinese genomics efforts and beats them in that R&D race. If we allow China to dominate genetic data and that field of medicine, Americans will one day find themselves begging Chinese companies, and even the Chinese Communist Party, for access to future lifesaving treatments.

The fifth area a real China bill must address is our capital markets. Our

stock market is the most open, liquid, and profitable in the world, and it is being used by the Chinese Communist Party to fund its military and to fund their companies. Any meaningful China bill must cut off the tap and prohibit American money from being invested in communist China's military companies.

We need to start requiring more transparency from Wall Street when it comes to investing in China and Chinese Government-controlled companies. My American Financial Markets Integrity and Security Act needs to be part of the solution.

How can we claim to be dealing with Chinese manipulation of our capital markets if we don't ban Chinese companies exploiting our own stock market to hurt us? Beijing long ago figured out how to get rich and powerful Americans to use their influence in American politics.

Allowing Wall Street and Big Finance to enrich themselves by hurting Americans may make a lot of money in the short term for those individuals, but it is hurting America in the long run. It is national economic suicide.

The sixth area any real China bill must address is genocide. Today, in China, nationless corporations, cooperating with the Chinese Communist Party, force Uighur Muslims to make clothing and shoes and even solar panels. Sadly, without knowing it, you may have very well purchased a product made partially or entirely by slave labor in Xinjiang.

These companies partnering with China are complicit in these crimes. The Chinese Communist Party's reduced labor costs mean increased profits for these corporations. While they lecture us about social justice in America, these companies are making billions off of slavery in China.

My bipartisan Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act has almost half the Senate as cosponsors. We must take it up and pass it out of the Foreign Relations Committee as soon as possible.

Last year, we saw companies like Nike, Apple, Coca-Cola, and even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce lobbying against this bill. Well, soon we are going to find out what holds more power in our country: corporations making billions off genocide and slavery or our basic sense of right and wrong.

The good news is that, today, we have finally awoken to the reality of how wrong the old consensus on China was. But we woke up almost too late. We don't have time for half-measures. We must address the dangerous growing imbalance between America and China comprehensively, decisively, and swiftly, or we will live to see a future in which the world's most powerful nation is a totalitarian, genocidal, communist dictatorship and our country is relegated to the role of a once-great nation in decline.

No part of our lives will go unaffected in a world like that. We can see the shadows of it even today. American movies today are free to portray their own country here, the United States, as racist, as bigoted, anything they want, but they automatically self-censor their own movies to make sure they meet China's standards so they can show those films there.

American corporations threaten States whose democratically elected leaders pass laws they object to. They have every right in our democracy to object, but they will fire American employees and ban messages that risk getting their corporation kicked out of the Chinese market.

And American teenagers are already turning over valuable personal data to the Chinese Government on an hourly basis in exchange for the ability to watch what I will admit are clever videos on TikTok.

Yet, this is nothing compared to the world that awaits if we do not take action, and on this the lessons of history could not be clearer.

Athens emerged from the second Persian war a great power, but their greatness made them decadent and complacent. They thought nothing would ever change, that they could ignore important problems, that they could focus on the trivial. So when conflict finally came, initially they used their superior navy to attack Sparta and retreat behind the safety of the city's walls.

That worked for a little while. Then a plague decimated the city, and more enemies of theirs sensed their weakness and joined the fight against them. Then Athens fell.

Like Rome and Britain later, the end of Athens' golden age came as it always does for a great power. It doesn't come from the outside in; it always comes from the inside out.

Now, from across the centuries, the lessons of history cry out for our attention. Our politics are broken. We fight over the trivial because we think the past is irrelevant, because we think our place in the world will never change, and because we think the future will always belong to us automatically. We hide behind our own version of the walls, two vast oceans, believing, ultimately, we are safe from everything outside.

We should not repeat the errors of the great powers of the past. My friends, we don't have time for studies and strategy statements. We need big changes and decisive action. We need to prove that our democracy can work again, that our system of government can function, and that it can solve big problems in big ways.

If we succeed, I truly believe a new American century lies ahead. If we fail, it is a century of humiliation that awaits us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

S.J. RES. 15

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I am on the floor to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the resolution that we will be voting on shortly. This is a resolution to protect all of our constituents against predatory lenders—people who lend others money at loan shark rates and often in deceptive language that can be very confusing to consumers until they get the phone call, and they are told they owe unaffordable amounts on loans.

And States have been working very hard to protect consumers. In fact, 45 States—States with Republican Governors and Democratic Governors, Republican attorneys general and Democratic attorneys general—45 States and the District of Columbia have passed laws to protect their constituents, their consumers from these loan shark-type loans, from these predatory lending practices.

But we have seen these predatory lenders find a way around these State efforts to protect their consumers. And the tactic they used has come to be known as ''rent-a-bank.'' And the way it works is that national banks can make loans into any State, even if they are not chartered in that State. And so what has happened is, some of these lenders then go to a national bank and essentially just borrow their name, buy the rights to their name and, using that mechanism, then can make loans into all 50 States, in violation of the State law protections against these usurious loans. That is what is happening now.

Now, when this whole problem began to emerge, we saw the Federal Governor take action. In fact, the minute the OCC and the FDIC and State governments caught wind of this new trick in the loan shark playbook, they took action. In fact, under President George W. Bush, the OCC—the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency—called these ''rent-a-bank'' schemes ''an abuse of the national bank charter.'' And President Bush's Comptroller of the Currency explained that the OCC was ''greatly concerned with arrangements in which national banks essentially rent out their charters.''

And that stance and that position was echoed by State legislatures—again, legislatures from both parties, Governors from both parties who then worked to pass laws, State laws, to limit the amount that people could charge as interest rates on loans.

In fact, just last year, in the State of Nebraska, voters passed a ballot initiative with more than 70 percent support to cap interest rates at 36 percent on consumer loans. That is the same cap we have in my State of Maryland and the same cap that more and more States are adopting across the country. So States are taking measures to protect their constituents, their consumers, against these end-runs around their laws designed to prohibit these predatory practices.

But last October, in the middle of the pandemic, when many working families were plunged into economic uncertainty and turmoil, the former administration—the Trump administration—

gave these ''rent-a-bank'' schemes a free pass to exploit these loopholes again, to create an end-run around those State protections for their consumers.

In the last administration—the Trump administration—the OCC unveiled what they called the true lender rule. Well, it is a nice-sounding name, an innocent name, but the consequence of that is to unleash the full force of predatory lending on working families. And it reneges on and reverses decades of both State and Federal government policy to prevent this end-run on usury caps.

What we have seen is predatory lenders move quickly into the space when the Trump administration opened the door to it. One online lender recently told its investors that it was going to get around California's new interest rate cap by making loans through ''bank sponsors that are not subject to the same proposed State level rate limitations.''

So what you do is you go to a national bank, and you essentially rent their name. And by doing that, you create a loophole that allows you to avoid the State laws that have been put in place to protect against this kind of predatory lending. And we are seeing that now emerge like wildfire around the country.

I do want to be clear, there are many innovative fintech partnerships. These are lenders who use the internet. There are many who are not exhibiting these kind of predatory behaviors. And we should craft a rule that allows legitimate lending consistent with State laws through those fintech practices.

But the way this rule was written during the Trump administration, it opens the door to all the bad actors. It opens the door wide to the predatory lenders to exploit this loophole.

And that is why we are on the floor today, because this resolution is designed to stop the predatory lending practices that were unleashed by the OCC rule. It is to shut the door on that Trump administration OCC rule that now has allowed predatory lenders to rush through it.

And what we are seeing now are rates of 100 percent, 200 percent—whatever they want. I mean, the sky is the limit. Some of these interest rates would make loan sharks blush.

So we just saw, in fact, one OCC-regulated bank that has been helping a short-term lending company pilot an online ''rent-a-bank'' installment loan program that runs at 179-percent APR. And the OCC rule is being litigated in court right now to defend a $67,000 loan to a restaurant owner at a 268-percent APR rate that violates the State law where that restaurant is.

So this is a perfect example of where a small restaurant owner took out a loan—$67,000—deceptively portrayed, only to discover that it was 268 percent APR. And when the restaurant owner says, ''Wait a minute, I thought the limit in our State was 36 percent,'' all of a sudden they discover that the Trump OCC opened the door to this end-run against their State law protections.

That is why we have State attorneys general from red States and blue States, from Nebraska and North Carolina, who have called these ''rent-a-bank'' schemes a ''sham'' and urged us to act. They wrote to us here in the Senate, saying:

> The most efficient course to prevent unrestrained abuse and avert immediate and ongoing consumer harm would be for Congress to invalidate the [True Lender] Rule pursuant to its remedial oversight powers under the Congressional Review Act.

That is what we will be voting on soon. North Carolina's attorney general, Josh Stein, just also said in a separate statement:

> We need every tool at our disposal to uphold state law and stop [predatory lenders] from coming back into our state[s].

I hope that we will act right now to stop what is a rush by many of these predatory lenders to exploit the opening created by the Trump administration's OCC. Then let's take a pause. Let's take time to craft a proper rule that allows legitimate lenders to make loans in ways that do not violate the State protections for the consumers and do not, at the end of the day, wreak havoc with families who get sucked into unsuspecting terms through deceptive practices. So I urge the U.S. Senate to vote to pass this resolution to protect consumers around the country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, if I could just actually say one more thing, this has been something that the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee has been working on. We held a number of hearings on this. And I do just want to thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of that committee, Senator BROWN from Ohio, who has been a stalwart in protecting consumers. I don't know if he has been to the floor yet, but I just wanted to thank him and other members of the committee for their efforts and also thank the Biden administration, which just sent down a statement of administration support for overturning the OCC rule and for voting in favor of this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. President, when I joined the Senate Banking Committee last February, I pledged to fairly examine every issue that came before us, with an eye for detail and a fresh perspective—promoting innovation, free markets, and our dual banking system.

I support the policy goals of the true lender rule in promoting access to credit for underserved communities. I also recognize how vital it is to provide legal clarity to financial technology innovators during this time of change. I support all banks' powers, both State and national, to export interest rates across State lines and to make unassigned loans with clear regulatory certainty. Again, this promotes access to credit.

The issues raised by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's true lender rule and S.J. Res. 15, however, are not limited to ensuring access to credit or protecting consumers from predatory lending and have much larger implications for our banking system.

State-chartered banks have existed since the founding of our Republic. After the passage of the National Bank Act of 1864, our country fostered a dual banking system, and our country is all the stronger for it. The United States is the leader of the global financial system because we have a banking system that is based on competitive equality, flexibility, and innovation.

Under the Federal laws that protect our dual banking system, State and nationally chartered depository institutions have nearly identical powers to carry out the business of banking across State lines with legal clarity. This is because of State parity and the so-called State wild card laws, the Riegle-Neal Act, and subsequent amendments over the years. The Federal Reserve and the FDIC have broadly supported these policies as well, adopting rules that promote equality for State banks vis-à-vis national banks.

Esther George, President of the Kansas City Fed, noted in a 2012 speech that ''the dual banking system has provided and continues to offer significant benefits to our financial system and economy . . . multiple options for state and federal charters have led to considerable innovation and improvement in banking services.''

So Congress and our Federal bank supervisors, on a roundly bipartisan basis, have always been committed to maintaining parity between State and nationally chartered institutions.

This brings us to today's vote. The problem with the true lender rule before us is that it has the potential to upend parity between State and national banks. In a nutshell, the OCC true lender rule determines which banks or other financial institutions actually make a consumer loan. Many States have different legal standards for determining this. Ultimately, this would allow national banks to make and assign loans more easily than State-chartered banks, giving them a distinct advantage in the lending business.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation did not adopt companions to the OCC true lender rule. It is likely those Agencies do not have the legal authority to adopt a similar rule for State banks. The FDIC confirmed this during public remarks in December 2020. Consequently, we are left with a scenario where national banks and Federal savings associations have a great deal of legal clarity about marketplace lending and State-chartered banks do not.

Why does this matter? There are approximately 3,954 State-chartered banks in our country as of December. There are approximately 1,062 national banks and Federal savings associations that are depository institutions. That means that of the approximately 5,016 commercial banks in our dual banking system, about 79 percent are State banks and 21 percent are national banks and Federal savings institutions. The OCC true lender rule applies to only 21 percent of the banks in our country. Does a rule that applies to only 21 percent of the banks really promote parity between State and nationally chartered institutions? This chart shows plain as day that it does not.

Moreover, State-chartered banks are the primary banks currently engaged in the kind of marketplace lending envisioned by the OCC true lender rule. Many State banks have innovative and thriving partnerships with nonbank lenders today. The OCC true lender rule will cause those partnerships to shift to national banks. Why would a nonbank lender choose to partner with a State bank that lacks the legal clarity of a national bank or savings association and the preemption that follows Federal law? I do not believe they will. There would be a great deal of legal uncertainty for them because of State consumer protection laws. Many of the State bank partnerships we see today in the marketplace lending arena may disappear as the nonbank lenders naturally gravitate towards the greater legal clarity of national banks.

This rule, in effect, would make these innovative partnerships the domain of national banks, rendering State-chartered banks to be more like second-class institutions. That has not been the will of Congress in the past, and I don't believe it is today.

A prominent law firm noted in January of this year that ''for institutions that participate in marketplace lending, most of which are state-chartered banks, the lack of an FDIC rule creates a significant exception to the federal support for the marketplace lending model and appears to largely leave the issue to the states.''

Many wonder why States cannot adopt their own true lender rules on a State-by-State basis or adopt some kind of uniform law. This likely will not work for a number of reasons.

First, were a State like Wyoming to adopt its own true lender rule for its own banks, what would require another State to respect the Wyoming true lender rule and set aside its own consumer protection laws that conflict with the Wyoming law? It likely would not, and that State would likely require a Wyoming bank without a branch in that State to abide by its own consumer protection laws in doing business there. This is a basic tenet of States maintaining sovereignty within their own borders, limited only by the U.S. Constitution and Federal law.

Secondly, a uniform law adopted at the State level would likely take 3 to 5 years, and by that time, marketplace lending would firmly be the province of nationally chartered institutions. There would then be no need for the law.

So where does that leave our dual banking system? The OCC true lender rule clarifies a thorny legal question and restricts the application of State consumer protection laws, providing legal clarity in marketplace lending to 21 percent of the banks in this country, while essentially telling the other 79 percent that they should convert to a national charter or risk being left behind. That is the kind of choice Congress has rejected in the past.

Many question the value of using the Congressional Review Act against the true lender rule since it will prevent the OCC from adopting a similar rule in the future. However, again, both the FDIC and the Federal Reserve likely do not have the requisite statutory authority to adopt their own true lender rule anyway. As a result, there is no rule or Agency-based solution that fixes this problem in a satisfactory way.

For the true lender rule to apply equally to all State and national banks, Congress must act. Leaving the OCC true lender rule in place would reduce the likelihood of Congress fixing the issue. Disapproving this rule will ensure that this issue remains top-of-mind for many and can be fixed in a lasting way that ensures a level playing field. This is a classic example of an issue crying out for a uniform national standard enacted by Congress, which applies to all banks.

The United States is the leader of the global financial system for many reasons, but one of those is surely the innovation, competition, and diversity of thought brought about by our dual banking system. This is a privilege, not a right, however, and one must work hard to maintain that for future generations.

I am proud to be a vocal advocate of financial innovation in this Chamber, and I will continue to work hard towards modernizing our financial system in a responsible manner. However, for innovation to be truly lasting, it has to be built on a solid foundation and not pick winners and losers between national banks and State banks.

Only Congress can truly fix this issue. I look forward to working with my colleagues to accomplish this. In the coming days, I will be introducing legislation to do just that. Until this is fixed, the current ''valid when made'' rule will continue to provide legal clarity to Federal and State banks.

I urge my colleagues to thoughtfully consider the potential impact of the OCC true lender rule on State-chartered banks.

In order to preserve our dual banking system and Congress's past actions to ensure parity between State and nationally chartered banks, I do not have any other option but to support S.J. Res. 15.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Ohio.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is National Police Week. It is a time every year when we stop to pay tribute to our law enforcement officers around the country, the men and women in blue who serve us every day in my State of Ohio and every State represented in this Chamber.

We also remember the brave law enforcement officers who tragically died in the line of duty. We can never forget this is a dangerous profession. The National Law Enforcement Memorial and Museum reported that 2020 was the deadliest year for law enforcement in decades. In Ohio alone, we sadly lost six brave law enforcement officers over the past year. Here in the Capitol, of course, we lost three officers over the past year, including on January 6. In the course of our Nation's history, more than 24,000 officers have died in the line of duty.

I was proud to join colleagues in March in sponsoring legislation called the Protect and Serve Act, which would create Federal penalties on those who would attempt to harm or kill a police officer. I believe Protect and Serve would send a strong message to help deter these crimes. Ultimately, I think it would make our men and women in blue safer and help save lives.

This week, I urge my colleagues to join me in standing with the families of our fallen police officers and thanking them and thanking law enforcement for what they do every day to protect us. One way to express our gratitude is passing laws that will assist them in their critical work to keep us safe.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

With that in mind, I am also on the floor today to call on my colleagues to support our law enforcement by taking decisive action to help them to keep some of the deadliest drugs in the world from coming into our communities. It is not an overstatement to say that this is a matter of life or death.

Overdose deaths in the United States have sadly reached a record high during the COVID–19 pandemic. According to recent data from the Centers for Disease Control, 87,000 Americans died during the 12-month period between September 2019 and September 2020, the most recent data we have. This can be directly attributed to the circumstances surrounding the pandemic. So many families are feeling the pain of these losses. Sadly, based on the current trends, we expect calendar year 2020 in full to be even worse.

What is the main driver of these overdoses and overdose deaths? Synthetic opioids, most notably fentanyl. Fentanyl is 50 times more powerful than heroin, relatively inexpensive, deadly, and incredibly addictive. For years, this has been coming to our shores from China, first predominantly

through our mail system, and with our new legislation in place to prevent that from happening, much of it is now coming in through Mexico. In 2019, there were 70,630 deaths from opioids and other drugs, and more than half of those—36,359—involved fentanyl, sometimes mixed with other drugs like cocaine and crystal meth or heroin.

Again, of all the poisons, fentanyl is the most deadly. It does have a medical purpose and can be used to treat patients in severe pain the same way morphine is used.

Both fentanyl and morphine are classified under schedule II by the drug enforcement authorities. In order to avoid prosecution under that scheduling order, drug traffickers started making slight modifications to fentanyl, creating what we call fentanyl analogs or fentanyl-related substances, essentially copycat fentanyl.

Evil scientists in places like China, Mexico, and India, working in unregulated pharmaceutical plants, will make a slight modification to fentanyl, sometimes adjusting a single molecule, to create what are, essentially, these fentanyl copycats.

While these copycats may have the same narcotic properties as fentanyl, these tiny variations allow these traffickers to evade prosecution.

Oftentimes, by the way, these fentanyl-related substitutes, these copycats, are even more powerful than fentanyl itself. Take, for example, carfentanil.

These fentanyl-related substances are the reason I am on the floor today. In 2018—2018—in recognition of the growing threat these copycats posed to our public health, the DEA temporarily scheduled fentanyl-related substances as schedule I, the highest designation they can give.

Since then, we have passed two temporary extensions of that designation. Most recently, Congress passed a 5-month extension just ahead of the previous deadline of May 6, just a couple weeks ago, and President Biden signed that legislation into law last week.

I supported that temporary extension because the alternative was worse. The only alternative was to let these substances become legal. But I don't think kicking the can down the road for another 5 months is nearly enough to safeguard against the threat of copycat fentanyl. We need to do much more between now and when this temporary scheduling extension expires in October.

Law enforcement needs certainty, and the drug cartels and those evil scientists need to know we are serious in addressing this problem, that there will be consequences.

We need a permanent solution. Specifically, let's pass bipartisan legislation I introduced with my colleague Senator MANCHIN called FIGHT Fentanyl, which simply says: Let's not allow these illicitly manufactured and deadly synthetic opioids to suddenly become legal again. That is what law enforcement wants. That is what our communities demand. That is what we deserve to give them. It is long overdue that we make this designation permanent.

I know some of my colleagues oppose permanent scheduling of these fentanyl drugs because they are concerned about mandatory minimum sentences, and also that it could hinder research into future medications to treat addiction. Let me address both of those quickly.

First, there is this concern about the harsh punishments that don't fit the nature of the crime. I share that concern. That is why our legislation ensures that mandatory minimum sentences are not automatically imposed in any criminal case. We want the judge to look at the severity of the crime and consider all relevant factors in sentencing. So that issue has been addressed in our bipartisan legislation.

There has been a great deal of conversation about the impact of prosecutions and incarcerations on specific populations, including minority communities. What is often lost in this debate, I will say, is the growing impact of fatal overdoses in those same communities. Since 2016, while White fatalities have decreased through the period of 2019, the data we have shows that overdoses from opioids among Black Americans, particularly Black men, have actually gotten worse, not better.

From 2011 to 2016, that same time period, when White overdoses and deaths were reduced, Black Americans had the highest increase in synthetic opioid-involved overdose deaths, compared to all populations.

And while in 2017 to 2018 overall opioid-involved overdose fatalities decreased by just over 4 percent, rates among Black and Hispanic Americans actually increased. This is an issue we must address here.

Another issue my colleagues have raised, again, is concern that permanently scheduling fentanyl and its analogues somehow hinders research into treating addiction. First of all, I agree we need this research. We need it badly. One example of this is coming up with naloxone, a miracle drug based on heroin that actually reverses the effects of an overdose.

I spoke to the scientist, Roger Crystal, just last week, who developed the nasal version of this naloxone. It is a miracle. I have seen it work, and it saves lives.

Researchers have told me there are barriers to being approved to legally research schedule I substances. There is also a stigma to conducting this kind of research, even though we know that it could lead to the development of new treatments. But this is something we can easily address by allowing qualified researchers the ability to study fentanyl analogues under schedule II as opposed to schedule I. So we can address that issue.

I am open to working with my colleagues to address these barriers, and I believe that we can do that through the legislation creating flexibility in the registration system for scientists.

But I would urge my colleagues that we need to use the next 5 months to do the hard work of finding a permanent solution to this crisis before we have to once again run the risk of letting these drugs become legal and the message that that sends and the deaths that would occur as a result. The U.S. Senate can take the lead and permanently classify these dangerous narcotics that are literally killing tens of thousands of our fellow citizens every year. Instead of kicking the can down the road again for 5 months from now, let's make it permanent. The House and the Biden administration should support this effort. Lives are at stake.

It is important that we continue to focus this body, as we have, on the demand side of this equation—prevention, treatment, longer term recovery for fentanyl and for other substances.

But it is also important that we not allow these substances to come on the streets at lower and lower costs and at greater and greater volumes. That is what would happen if we do not move as a Congress to ensure that these fentanyl copycats and fentanyl itself remain illicit drugs, as they are.

Let's do the right thing for our community. Let's do the right thing for law enforcement. Let's be sure they have the predictability and certainty in law enforcement to know that these criminals can be prosecuted, these traffickers.

We need to act now to address the threat of these deadly fentanyl drugs coming into our communities. I urge the Senate to pass the FIGHT Fentanyl bill. Join us in this effort so we can better work to reverse the tragic rise in overdose deaths around the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

S.J. RES. 15

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today in support of the Congressional Review Act resolution to rescind the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's ''True Lender Rule.'' This rule was rushed through by the previous administration with complete disregard to the harm it would cause already struggling working Americans.

The true lender rule undercuts important consumer protections at the State level and greenlights high-cost ''rent-a-bank'' schemes. These schemes let predatory lenders evade State interest rate caps by funneling high-interest loans—loans that are illegal under State law—-through national banks.

We know these lenders prey upon those struggling to make ends meet and are more likely to operate in areas with higher concentrations of poverty. And they offer complicated loans that are designed to trap consumers in an endless cycle of debilitating debt.

What is especially troubling is that this rule was finalized in November of

last year at a time when so many were reeling from an unprecedented public health and economic crisis. And while so many American families struggle to put food on the table and make their rent or mortgage payments, the OCC's rule makes it easier for predatory lenders to prey on those most vulnerable, exacerbating the economic hardship of millions.

Currently, 45 States and the District of Columbia have instituted interest rate caps on installment loans to protect consumers. Earlier this year, my home State of Illinois passed into law a 36-percent cap on interest rates for consumer loans. These protections are essential to ensuring that hard-working Americans are not exploited.

The true lender rule would allow predatory lenders to evade these important State-level consumer protections. Twenty-five State attorneys general, including Illinois Attorney General Kwame Raoul, recently wrote to me and my colleagues to underscore the dangers of the OCC's true lending rule. They say in their letter, ''The OCC's Rule would be exploited by lenders seeking to circumvent these state interest-rate caps and invite, indeed welcome, predatory consumer-lending partnerships . . .''

I agree with the concerns raised by Attorney General Raoul and his counterparts. The Federal Government should be doing more to protect the financial security of Americans, not less.

Congress needs to take action—now more than ever—to protect working families from predatory lending practices. We must rescind this harmful true lender rule. However, addressing the harm of this rule is not enough. More must be done to protect vulnerable American consumers. For more than a decade, I have pushed for a Federal interest rate cap of 36 percent on all consumer loans. This standard is not radical or new. The Federal Government already affords similar protections to military servicemembers and their families. We should expand those protections to all Americans.

COVID–19 has devastated the lives of millions of Americans and brought significant economic challenges to so many households. We need to be protecting the most vulnerable populations who are just trying to get back to normal and get a fair shot at the American dream.

Let's come together on a common goal: to protect American consumers from predatory lending practices. Passing today's CRA resolution would bring us one step closer to that goal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the vote we are about to take on this Van Hollen resolution, S.J. Res. 15, is a bipartisan opportunity for us to show people whom we serve that we are on their side.

States all over the country—red and blue States, States in the South and Midwest, on both coasts—have all recognized that people need protections from predatory lenders. That is why nearly every State and the District of Columbia have passed laws to limit, to cap the interest—the amount of interest—that can be charged on payday and other loans.

In the late 1990s, payday lenders were desperate to find a way to evade State laws that limited them from charging exorbitant interest rates that trap people in a cycle of debt they can't get out of, no matter how hard they work. They came up with what the Comptroller of the Currency called ''rent-a-charter''—what we now know as a ''rent-a-bank'' scheme.

Because banks are generally not subject to these State laws, payday lenders funneled their loans through a small number of willing banks. It looked like the banks were making the loans, when it was really the payday lenders.

Federal regulators in both parties—Republicans and Democrats—saw through this very obvious ruse that hurt low-income people who were forced to get credit any way they could. Federal regulators cracked down. Under both President Bush and President Obama, the Office of Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—OCC and FDIC—shut down a series of these schemes by payday lenders and banks.

States from across the country also stepped in to protect their residents. Georgia, West Virginia, my State of Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Montana, South Dakota, Colorado, Illinois, Virginia, and Nebraska all passed new laws and regulations either to stop these schemes or to cap interest rates on payday loans at 36 percent—still a very, very high number that most of us never pay, but that people who can only get credit that way end up paying, unfortunately. It is still a high number that, obviously, will make any company making these loans plenty of money.

Several other States, including California and Ohio, also passed laws to limit the interest that can be charged on consumer loans. These new laws passed with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Now, get this: More than 75 percent of voters in Nebraska and South Dakota supported the ballot initiatives to cap interest rates on payday loans. So three-fourths of the voters going to the polls in a popular vote wanted to cap interest rates on payday loans in those two States.

In recent years, new financial technology companies emerged that partner with banks to offer responsible small-dollar loans at more affordable rates.

But we also have a separate group of online payday lenders resurrecting the same old rent-a-bank scheme to offer abusive, high-interest loans. They are not even attempting to hide it.

One online lender told its investors it would get around California's new law by making loans—these were their words, this lender's—through ''bank sponsors . . . not subject to the same proposed state level rate limitations.''

So he or she is even acknowledging that States—voters or State legislatures or both—are saying: We want to cap those interest rates so people don't take out a small loan and end up paying 200, 300 percent after these payday lenders put that on them.

Another lender said: ''There is no reason why we wouldn't be able to replace our California business with a bank program.''

So they know what they have to do. They know they are going against the intent of the legislature and the intent of the voters.

Given the broad bipartisan support for these laws, we had hoped that the Trump OCC would take action and crack down on these schemes, the same way that Bush and Obama had done—schemes that have been rejected by voters and legislatures over and over, in State after State after State.

But last year, the OCC issued what is known as the true lender rule, overruling voters of both parties, giving essentially a free pass to these abusive rent-a-bank schemes.

Now, to fight back on behalf of low-income people and on behalf of fair play, a broad bipartisan coalition is asking Congress to overturn the OCC's harmful true lender rule.

That support includes credit unions, State bank regulators—Republicans and Democrats alike—and State attorneys general of both parties. One of the most outspoken has been the Republican attorney general of Nebraska, because his State passed—his State's voters passed—a limit, 75 percent of them, to keep interest rates down.

There is support from small business groups, support from the Military Officers Association of America.

We know that payday lenders especially prey on young members of the military. One of them may be off in a foreign country while the spouse stays back at the base or stays back in a community and is struggling with just having the resources to get by. They are preyed upon so often.

Other groups are the National Association of Evangelicals, the Southern Baptist Convention, and other members of the Faith in Just Lending Coalition.

That coalition wrote to Congress:

> Predatory payday and auto title lenders are notorious for exploiting loopholes in order to offer debt-trap loans to families struggling to make ends meet. The OCC's ''True Lender'' rule creates a loophole big enough to drive a truck through.

That came from this coalition—the coalition of attorneys general, the Military Officers Association, the National Association of Evangelicals, and the Southern Baptist Convention. They are saying the OCC's true lender rule creates a loophole big enough to drive a truck through.

We know why these commonsense laws that our States passed are popular. We know why they enjoy bipartisan support in States across the country. People don't want abusive lenders to prey on them, their loved ones or their neighbors.

Some issues that come before the Senate are complicated. They divide people. There are thorny nuances to consider. This isn't one of them. It is simple. Let's protect the people whom we serve. They have clearly cried out for us to do this. We should protect those people.

I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 15 to overturn this rule.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, let me thank our chair of the Banking Committee, someone who has fought against the abuses in the financial services industry throughout his career, Senator BROWN. Let me also thank Senator VAN HOLLEN, who, again, has been one of those leaders doing great things to help people who are often taken advantage of.

Now, for millions of working Americans, one of the most dangerous things that can happen is falling victim to predatory lenders. Unscrupulous actors have always promised quick cash or credit to people with unexpected expenses or financial difficulties, only to trap them with crippling interest rates that can erase a person's life savings or even claim their homes. They are in trouble. They reach out to the lifeline, and the lifeline is a trap. Often they are trapped for years and even some for their whole lives.

That is why more than 40 States have passed laws that prohibit this behavior and placed limits on interest rates made by nonbank lenders. It runs the gamut from liberal California to conservative Texas.

Inexplicably—inexplicably—the Trump administration decided to give these predatory lenders a massive loophole to circumvent State law and once again prey on low-income Americans. Under the Trump administration's rule, so long as payday lenders found a bank to provide the cash upfront and attach their name to the transaction, interest rates in the triple digits were suddenly OK, even if the States explicitly banned it.

It is despicable and so typical of the Trump administration not caring about average folks at all and just listening to the special interests. It had devastating consequences for working families and for small businesses.

In New York, the owner of a southern food restaurant in Harlem took out a $67,000 loan from a fraudulent lender to make renovations to their restaurant. They fell behind on payments and tried to work with their lender when COVID hit and realized that their loan had an APR of 268 percent. Rather than work toward a solution, the lender went to the bank to try and foreclose on their property—their property in which they had put blood and sweat and tears—stating that the Trump rule gave them the grounds to do so. It mattered little that New York State law had a 268-percent interest rate as blatantly illegal.

So today's vote is simple. It would revoke the Trump administration's so-called true lender rule that permits predatory lenders to exploit small businesses and working Americans. In the middle of a pandemic, the last thing we should be doing is perpetrating a rule that makes it easier for payday lenders to scam working people and business owners.

With today's vote, the Senate stands up for working families and small businesses all across the country by repealing this terrible, essentially Scrooge-like rule pushed by former President Trump and his allies.

And one final point for those who say elections don't make a difference. Just look at this. Here was a rule protecting people—States protected people. The Trump administration comes in and rips away those protections, leaving so many people bare and defenseless because they were desperate; they need the money.

Elections occur. A new Democratic President, a Democratic Senate, and this horrible, horrible rule change by the Trump administration is undone. We go back to giving some help and protection to working families and small business people.

This story could be repeated not just with CRAs but up and down the line—up and down the line. Elections do make a difference, and today's vote shows one of many examples.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 15

I yield the floor and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Rubio
Blumenthal	Kelly	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Luján	Sinema
Carper	Lummis	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Heinrich

The joint resolution (S.J. Res 15) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 15

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders'' (85 Fed. Reg. 68742 (October 30, 2020)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

Mr. SCHUMER. Let me first commend my colleague from Ohio for the excellent work, not only moving this forward but the vote counting that he did, which worked with a little bit of margin of error.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Finance Committee being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Senate Finance Committee from further consideration of the nomination of Chiquita Brooks-LaSure, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with no point of order, motions, or amendments in order.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we expect a vote on the motion to discharge to occur around noon tomorrow, Wednesday, May 12.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

S.J. RES. 15

Mr. BROWN. I thank my colleagues for their vote on this resolution, which was so important to protect people from being abused by payday lenders. S.J. Res. 15 will be a big deal, saving a lot of money for a lot of low-income people who have been fleeced far too many times.

I thank the leader. I thank, in my office, Laura Swanson and Jan Singelmann for their terrific work in making sure that everybody was here and everybody was learned on this issue so well and how important that was for our State and for our country. I thank them.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, each year during Police Week, we honor the law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their communities.

This year, we add the names of four Ohioans to the National Law Enforcement Memorial who laid down their lives last year: Corporal Adam McMillan of Hamilton County Sheriff's Office, Detective James Michael Skernivitz of Cleveland, Patrolman Anthony Hussein Dia of Toledo, and Officer Kaia Grant of Springdale.

Sadly, we already know of two names who will be added to the memorial next year: Officer Brandon Stalker of the Toledo Police Department and Jason Lagore, who worked for the Ohio Department of Natural Resources. Each one of these losses is a tragedy for a family, for a community, and for their fellow officers.

Ms. Grant's mother, I know, and I talked to her about how tragic this is for her, for her family, and for the families of all of these officers who gave their lives in service to others.

Over the past year, we have had many reminders of the work that must be done to reform and reimagine public safety and to rebuild trust between law enforcement and communities. These Ohioans' lives are a reminder of the ideals we should strive for—officers who are true public servants in the best sense of the word, people who gave themselves to their communities. And these Ohioans gave so much.

Officer Anthony Dia was the father of two young sons. He married his high school sweetheart. In a letter he wrote to his family during Ramadan, the devout Muslim wrote:

> Every day I put on the uniform, it is with the intention to protect the innocent and the weak in my community.

The imam who spoke at his memorial service said:

> When you think of Islam, think of this man who gave his life on the Fourth of July to defend the values of the United States.

Detective James Skernivitz served my city of Cleveland. He served in neighborhood policing districts, and in 2013, he joined the Gang Impact Unit, working to reduce violence in Cleveland. He was a devoted father and played softball for many years, traveling to tournaments with the Steel City Enforcers.

Corporal Adam McMillan spent 19 years serving the public at the sheriff's office in Hamilton County, Cincinnati. So many in his community spoke about his kindness. His pastor said at the memorial service that ''he was the kind of guy who asked the person in the drive-thru window how their day was going.'' His generous spirit will live on. Corporal McMillan was an organ donor, and his loss is giving new life to someone else.

Kaia Grant was in the Reserve Officer Training Corps in college. After graduating and working with at-risk kids in Cincinnati, she joined the Springdale Police Department. Her coworker said:

> Instead of going into the military and then going into politics, like many do, she wanted to serve the community.

Another colleague related a story about how she saved a woman's life. The department got a call about a person considering taking her own life, and they searched and searched but found no one. They were close to giving up, but Officer Grant didn't. She found the woman in a parking garage in time to save her life.

As part of her dedication to our country, Officer Grant interned for a U.S. Senator while she was in college. That Senator's name was Joe Biden. Earlier this year, on his first trip to Ohio as President, Joe Biden met with Officer Grant's mother, Gina Mobley, to thank her for her daughter's service to him, to our country, and to her community.

We can't begin to repay the debt we owe Ms. Mobley and all these families. We can work to reform our systems to protect more officers and the communities they swear an oath to protect.

This week, I am introducing legislation, the Law Enforcement Training for Mental Health Crisis Response Act, with Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma. We have seen too many Americans, both officers and those they serve, hurt or killed when law enforcement responds to people in their communities suffering a mental health crisis. This bill would invest in training to help families resolve those situations safely for themselves and for their communities. They help officers resolve these situations safely for themselves and for the communities they serve.

Law enforcement officers, reformers, and advocates all agree we pushed too many problems onto the criminal justice system, expecting officers to be social workers and crisis responders and family mediators without the proper training to fill those roles.

We need to actually invest in mental health and education and other social support. We need to give officers the training and resources they need to help when they are called on to respond to these situations.

This Police Week, let's offer—many of us come to the floor to do this—more than empty words. Let's honor the memory of these women and men who have laid down their lives in service of their community by getting their fellow officers the tools and the training they need to do their jobs and to build trust with the communities they have sworn to protect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The Senator from Ohio.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CENTENNIAL OF MILLS, WYOMING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of Mills, WY.

On Saturday, June 12, 2021, the town of Mills will honor this milestone with a 100th Anniversary Summer Fest Celebration. The event will host a parade, concerts, and other festivities throughout the day. It is an excellent opportunity for the people of Natrona County and Wyoming to gather and commend the strong, lasting character of this community.

Mills was established in May of 1921 at a location near the Fort Caspar site along the northern banks of the North Platte River. Many pioneers traversed this area along the Oregon Trail before oil was discovered in the Salt Creek Field. In 1919, with the growth of the oil and gas industry, brothers James, William, and Thomas Mills and their Mills Construction Company purchased a homestead owned by Charles M. Hawks. Company employees and their families began to settle in the surrounding land. By 1921, over 500 people lived in the quickly developing area. A need for local organization resulted in Mills' incorporation as a town, becoming the third in Natrona County.

The story of Mills is a microcosm of the story of Natrona County and Central Wyoming. The town has navigated through the booms and busts of the oil industry throughout its century and continues to navigate its unique place across the river from Casper. Industry has always played a large role in the development of the community. From its beginnings with the Mills Construction Company, Mills now hosts a wide range of manufacturing, fabrication, heavy machinery, and oil and gas businesses. Yet, Mills still maintains its

quaint charm with Oregon Trail historic sites, river recreational opportunities, and local watering holes.

Mills held its first election on May 10, 1921. The first mayor was George E. Boyle, who was elected alongside new Councilmen Fred Hunter, Fred Shackleford, G.W. Lindsley, and Michael Kennedy. A century later, Mills is served by Mayor Seth Coleman with Councilmembers James Hollander, Darla Ives, Sara McCarthy, and Brad Neumiller. They continue their tradition of public service and stewardship.

From its incorporation as a town with a population of 500, Mills entered 1990 with over 1,500 residents. Today it boasts a population of over 4,000 people and is one of the fastest growing communities in Wyoming. On August 4, 2020, Governor Mark Gordon signed a proclamation declaring Mills a ''First-Class City.'' This is another milestone to add to the summer celebration.

It is my honor to commemorate this historic milestone for the city of Mills. Their centennial celebration is a tribute to generations of determination and community. Bobbi joins me and everyone in Wyoming in our appreciation of everything the people of Mills have contributed to our great State and Nation. We extend our congratulations as we look forward to the next 100 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DR. SAUL HERTZ

● Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize Dr. Saul Hertz, a pioneer for medical uses of radioiodine, RAI.

The son of Jewish immigrants from Poland, Dr. Hertz graduated from Harvard Medical School in 1929. While serving as director of the Massachusetts General Hospital's thyroid unit, he attended a presentation about the use of physics in medicine. Inspired by the concept, Dr. Hertz worked alongside Massachusetts Institute of Technology physicist Dr. Arthur Roberts to discover the potential for iodine radioisotopes in thyroid disease diagnosis and treatment.

On March 31, 1941, after years of experiments, Dr. Hertz administered the first therapeutic use of radioiodine to a human patient. Never before had humans been successfully treated with an artificially produced radioactive material. In 1946, Dr. Hertz was the lead author of the May issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association, which featured a 5-year study following 29 patients he treated through this method. Today, medical uses of RAI remain the gold standard of targeted precision oncology.

Dr. Hertz made a number of other outstanding contributions to the medical field. Notably, his research played an essential role in the developing field of nuclear medicine, which was critical during World War II and beyond. In 1949, he established the first Nuclear Medicine Department at the Massachusetts Women's Hospital.

Dr. Hertz passed away on July 28, 1950, but his legacy is enduring. Not only does his work continue to support extraordinary medical work, but his memory also encourages other researchers through the Saul Hertz, MD, Award. Bestowed by the Society for Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Engineering, this eponymous award honors individuals who make phenomenal strides in the radionuclide therapy field.

Dr. Hertz's archives are kept in Greenwich, CT, offering a rich history of research in this critical field and a testament to his brilliant, lifesaving work. This year, Greenwich, CT, First Selectman Fred Camillo issued a proclamation, naming March 31 ''Dr. Saul Hertz Nuclear Medicine/Radio Pharmaceutical Day.'' This recognition is a tribute to Dr. Hertz's remarkable legacy and the impact he will forever have on this field.

I applaud his many accomplishments and hope my colleagues will join me in remembering Dr. Saul Hertz.●

TRIBUTE TO RETA HAMILTON

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a prominent conservative leader, Reta Hamilton, for her long-standing commitment to serving and strengthening the Republican Party in Arkansas and nationwide.

Mrs. Hamilton launched her political activism career in 1987. In the decades since, she has made numerous contributions to mobilize the conservative cause—and with great success. Nicknamed ''the Road Warrior'' since her early days, she has driven nearly every highway in Arkansas, supporting, encouraging, and building county committees and Republican Women clubs. She is a longtime Tusk Club member, which denotes her dedication to GOP candidates and ideas.

Mrs. Hamilton's commitment and impact have been widely felt at the local level. She served as president of the Washington County Republican Women in 1989 and more than doubled its membership, for which she received a newly-created award from the Arkansas Federation of Republican Women as well as recognition from the National Federation of Republican Women. The Washington County Republican Committee honored her as Republican of the Year at its 1989 Lincoln Dinner, with Congressman John Paul Hammerschmidt participating in the presentation. That year, she was also elected as AFRW third vice-president.

Mrs. Hamilton eventually moved to Benton County and in 1994 was elected secretary of the Benton County Republican Party. She later served as a State committeewoman and was honored at the 1996 Lincoln Dinner as Republican of the Year in Rogers, AR. Mrs. Hamilton was elected one of six electors to serve both in the 2008 and 2012 electoral college.

During her years of involvement in the Republican Party of Arkansas, she became second vice chair and was appointed to the Arkansas Governor's Appointments Committee, as well as a serving a record 14 continuous years on the Executive Committee of the Arkansas GOP.

Mrs. Hamilton was appointed by the State chairman to serve over 10 years on the RPA Rules Committee. A pinnacle of her political career came in 2003, when she was elevated to the position of RPA State chairman. During this time, she was able to refocus the State party and set it on a course to majority leadership. Mrs. Hamilton was elected Arkansas Republican National Committeewoman in 2005 and served until term-limited in 2012. She also served on the RNC Rules Committee from 2010 through 2012.

She was also elected by RPA delegates to serve on the RNC Rules Committee from 1996 to 2016. Mrs. Hamilton was an elected delegate to every Republican National Convention from 1992 through 2020, serving as a Trump delegate in 2016 and 2020.

At the Reagan Rockefeller Dinner in 2016, the RPA awarded Mrs. Hamilton the ''Hi, I'm Frank White'' Award for making significant contributions to build the State party.

Having been involved with the National Federation of Republican Women since 1983, Mrs. Hamilton was appointed to serve as a nonvoting member of the NFRW Board of Directors in 2000 and served until 2020 as a regent and capital regent. She has attended nearly every NFRW biennial convention since 1987. Mrs. Hamilton was honored with an appointment and election to fill the vacancy of national committeewoman from December 2020 to June 5, 2021.

I am honored to call Reta Hamilton my friend, and I am incredibly proud of her efforts to elevate and expand the Republican Party in Arkansas. Her conservative influence on the Arkansas GOP and this Nation has made a difference. The direction of our State and growth of the Republican Party into the majority party demonstrates the power that passion and commitment to one's ideals can have. I hope her example will serve as a lesson to future generations of Arkansans and Republican leaders.●

TRIBUTE TO RYAN TUCKER

● Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of Iowans across our State to recognize the distinguished career, dedication, and lifelong hard work of Mr. Ryan G. Tucker as he concludes his time as president of the Iowa Funeral Directors Association, IFDA.

As many who know him will tell you, Ryan grew up with a spirited commitment to his community, his family, and to others. A native of Sumner, it did not take long for Ryan to begin working in the trade. As a student at North Iowa Area Community College,

Ryan started as an employee at Fullerton Family Funeral Home in Mason City. He would go on to study at Worsham College of Mortuary Science, earning an internship in Fort Dodge under a former IFDA president, Scott Graham.

His experiences early on in his career have led him to where he is today, as co-owner of Kaiser-Corson Funeral Home in Waverly, Readlyn, Shell Rock, and Denver, serving Iowa families with his critical work.

Ryan assumed his role as president of the IFDA at a time unlike any other, as the COVID–19 pandemic tragically took hold early last year, but, in the face of enormous challenges and uncertainty, Ryan displayed steadfast leadership for his colleagues that surely allowed for countless families to find comfort in such difficult times.

Ryan guided the IFDA through the pandemic, being especially focused on ensuring the hard work of our State's funeral directors could continue with safety top of mind. At the pandemic's start, Ryan issued daily briefings to IFDA members that became vital. He provided information about best practices, updates on policies and proclamations by the Governor and State government, and materials to make sure that Iowa funeral directors could continue to serve families while adhering to public health limitations.

Ryan's lifetime of work, his dedication to his craft, and his leadership in a uniquely challenging time have all undoubtedly made a positive impact on the lives of countless Iowans. As he takes the next step in his distinguished career and steps down as president of the Iowa Funeral Directors Association, we wish him, his wife Kayla, and his two sons, Colby and Griffin, all the best, and we thank Ryan for everything that he has done for our State and our communities.●

TRIBUTE TO KEN POTTS

● Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today I offer my recognition of Mr. Ken Potts for his heroic service to our country and congratulate him on his 100th birthday.

Ken was born on April 15, 1921, in Honey Bend, IL. His childhood was spent on the family farm during the difficult years of the Great Depression. Despite the difficulty of the times, the Potts family worked earnestly and happily to make ends meet. In fact, Ken has fond memories of time in his boyhood spent hunting small game with his slingshot.

At the onset of WWII, when Ken was just 18 years of age, he enlisted in the U.S. Navy. Two short years later, he was stationed in the South Pacific working as a crane operator on the largest ship in the Navy's fleet, the USS *Arizona*. The work ethic he learned as a child, on the family farm, earned him great success during his military service.

On December 7, 1941, the *Pennsylvania*-class battleship was docked at Pearl Harbor along with the rest of the U.S. Pacific Fleet. Ken was working that morning shuttling supplies to the *Arizona* when Japanese torpedo bombers descended from the sky. One of the 797–kilogram armor-piercing bombs dropped by the bombers exploded through the decks of near a supply staging area at the front the ship. Thinking quickly, Ken risked his life in a small boat to pick up dozens of sailors stranded in the burning water, dropping them off at nearby Ford Island. His heroism saved many. Of the survivors of the attack on Pearl Harbor, Ken is one of two still alive today.

Ken was undeterred by the harrowing experiences of the attack on Pearl Harbor. He remained in the Navy and served his country honorably until 1945. After the war, Ken returned to the States and moved to Provo, UT, here he has lived with his wife for 54 years.

Ken Potts embodies the very best attributes of the ''greatest generation''. He is a living testament to American bravery, honor, and dignity in defense of the American way. I wish him a very happy 100th birthday. It is my humble privilege to honor him today.●

RECOGNIZING SPACE TANGO

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize Space Tango of Lexington, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Growing up on a family farm outside Bardstown, Twyman Clements loved building and launching model rockets with his three brothers. His passion for innovation and engineering led him to the University of Kentucky, UK, where he earned a BS and MS in mechanical engineering. As a graduate student at UK, Twyman worked with Kentucky Space, a nonprofit consortium of universities and public and private groups supporting space entrepreneurship. At the time, Kentucky Space was using miniature satellites called cubesats to conduct experiments on the International Space Station. Realizing the need to simplify and reduce the cost of spacebased research and development, R&D, Twyman founded Space Tango in 2015.

Today, Space Tango is a thriving small business enabling R&D and manufacturing in zero gravity. Since 2017, thanks to a National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, Space Act Agreement, Space Tango provides facilities on the International Space Station U.S. National Laboratory. Their CubeLabs generate scalable and efficient research and manufacturing in microgravity. Space Tango has worked with several commercial partners, including Anheuser-Busch and LambaVision. They regularly partner with educational institutions such as the University of Florida, University of Pennsylvania, and Boston University.

Over the years, local and national organizations have recognized Space Tango's groundbreaking work. Twyman was inducted into the Kentucky Entrepreneur Hall of Fame in 2017, and ranked No. 25 on Fast Company's list of the 100 Most Creative People in Business in 2018. Jim Bridenstine, former NASA Administrator, visited Space Tango in 2020, commending their biomedical research and manufacturing capabilities. In addition to working on projects for various Federal agencies, Space Tango won three NASA Utilization Awards for Low Earth Orbit of Biomedical Applications. Looking forward, Space Tango is developing ST–42, an autonomous manufacturing facility for advanced materials and biomedical devices located in Earth's orbit.

Notably, Space Tango is committed to investing in the next generation of innovators, scientists, and entrepreneurs. Twyman and his colleagues regularly host and present at educational events at Kentucky schools, universities, and scientific institutions. Space Tango's robust internship program includes students from Kentucky's universities and colleges across the country, with several former interns joining their team.

Space Tango is a testament to Kentucky innovation, ingenuity, and industry. Small businesses like Space Tango form a critical part of American's domestic manufacturing base and play a unique role educating the next generation of Kentucky engineers and entrepreneurs. Congratulations to Twyman and the entire team at Space Tango. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky and beyond.●

TRIBUTE TO FATHER MICHAEL J. GRAHAM

● Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize my friend, Father Michael J. Graham, on his retirement as the 34th president of Xavier University in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH, and to thank him for his more than 34 years of service at Xavier helping to cultivate young leaders and developing Musketeer students with the Jesuit values of becoming ''men and women for others.''

Father Graham started at Xavier in 1984 as an assistant history professor. After pursuing his master of divinity from the Weston School of Theology, he returned to Xavier in 1989. He was appointed vice president for university relations in 1994 and was inaugurated president of Xavier University on September 8, 2001.

Father Graham is the longest serving president in Xavier University's history, and over the past 20 years, he has had an incredible impact on the university, the Cincinnati community, and the more than 30,000 students who have

graduated from Xavier University during his tenure. He has helped raise over $500 million to fund scholarships, advance the academic experience, support community projects, and advance the development of the university.

In the community, Father Graham's passion to connect and collaborate with local and regional communities inspired him to establish the Community Building Institute as well as the Eigel Center for Community Engagement at Xavier. In 2017, Father Graham was asked to chair the Cincinnati Preschool Promise Board of Directors, a voter-approved initiative to ensure that quality preschool is available and affordable to all children living within the Cincinnati school district. It is one of many ways he has extended his and Xavier's reach into critical issues that impact the Cincinnati community.

Since Father Graham began his presidency, U.S. News & World Report has consistently listed Xavier among the Nation's top 10 Midwest universities. Under his leadership, the university has expanded to offer master's programs in coaching education and athlete development, health economic and clinical outcomes research, customer analytics, and others. The impact of President Graham's academic and community-based vision for Xavier is far reaching. Father Mike will be missed, but his legacy will be felt for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JIM CAMERON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Jim Cameron, who served Volusia County and its residents, as the senior vice president of government relations at the Daytona Regional Chamber of Commerce. After 38 years of service, I thank Jim for his years of work and wish him well as he retires.

In its 101-year history, Jim holds the longest tenure at the Daytona Regional Chamber of Commerce. As Vice president of government relations, he understood local, State, and Federal economic issues facing Volusia County. Throughout his tenure, Jim's professional relationships with some of Florida's most influential political and business leaders bettered his community.

In 1985, Jim's was working to receive approval from the State legislature to utilize hotel bed tax revenues towards financing a county-run convention center. After a span of 5 years, Volusia County opened the Ocean Center Convention Center in Daytona Beach Center due in part to his efforts. This is just one of many career highlights that Jim is proud of.

Jim's more recent community accomplishments include advocating for SunRail's extension in Volusia County, helping the Hard Rock Hotel establish a resort in Daytona Beach, and working with Space Florida to recruit aerospace manufacturing to Volusia County. Simultaneously, he was also instrumental in important State legislative matters and advocating for pro-job policies.

Jim is fond of the professional relationships he has formed throughout his career, with many evolving into close friendships. His personalized approach to government relations is best seen on his guarantee to pay $1,000 if he does not return your call within eight business hours.

Jim grew up in Montgomery, AL, graduating with a double major in history and political science from the University of Alabama. After graduation, he was appointed to the Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce in Anniston, AL, to oversee industrial and public affairs. He later moved to Daytona Beach, where he began working at the Daytona Regional Chamber in 1983.

I am grateful for Jim's decades of faithful and dedicated service to our State and for his work with my office. I extend my best wishes to Jim, his wife Rita, and to his family on a well-earned retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO LISA MORRIS

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Lisa Morris, New Hampshire's director of public health at the State department of health and human services, for her years of service to the Granite State. Throughout her career, first serving the people of New Hampshire's Lakes Region at the Partnership for Public Health and later the entire State at the New Hampshire Division of Public Health, Lisa has made it her mission to improve the health and well-being of the New Hampshire public. I am grateful for her service to our State, especially her work to address the COVID–19 pandemic over the past year.

Prior to her time as the New Hampshire director of public health, Lisa served for over a decade as the executive director of the Partnership for Public Health in Laconia, providing invaluable public health information and services to the people of the Lakes Region. In this role, Lisa was a leading voice in advocating for resources to meet the health needs of the region and solve the most pressing public health concerns. During her time as executive director, the Partnership for Public Health was able to provide the region with invaluable services such as a community emergency response team, an immigration welcome center, flu vaccine clinics, and other community health education programs. I especially commend Lisa for her attention to the substance misuse crisis during her time as executive director.

Lisa has served as the director of public health for the State of New Hampshire since 2016 and has provided essential leadership through several public health challenges. In 2014, contamination from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances—PFAS—was first discovered in New Hampshire at the site of the former Pease Air Force Base. In the time since, more contamination has been found throughout our State, including in the town of Merrimack and at the Coakley Landfill in North Hampton. While information about the toxicity and human health impacts of PFAS was only just emerging as the contamination was discovered, Lisa and her team worked diligently to keep the public and physicians updated with necessary information. The division of public health, which Lisa led, conducted PFAS blood testing for more than 1,800 individuals who reported exposure from contaminated drinking water while living, working, or attending childcare on or near the campus of the Pease International Tradeport. This information has been invaluable for those individuals worried about their health, and I thank Lisa for her leadership to provide this information to families.

I also commend Lisa for her leadership during the COVID–19 pandemic. As we all know, a once-in-a-lifetime pandemic has been difficult for us all, but Lisa's leadership has been an incredible asset to the State of New Hampshire. From New Hampshire's announcement of the first case of COVID–19 in March 2020 to the present, the New Hampshire Division of Public Health has been a reliable resource, providing daily reports on the number of COVID–19 cases and positivity rates, which have been an important source of data for State leaders, businesses, and the general public. With her leadership, New Hampshire was able to establish partnerships with the New Hampshire National Guard to stand up testing sites and vaccine distribution sites throughout our State. New Hampshire's vaccine distribution rollout has been recognized as one of the best in the Nation and the most efficient in reaching the public with shots in arms. These achievements can only happen with competent and forward-thinking leaders like Lisa.

On behalf of all the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in thanking Lisa for her years of service, advocacy, and leadership. I wish her well in her retirement and the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT CAMPBELL

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Robert Campbell, of Mobile, AL, who will soon step down as regional manager at Lamar Advertising.

Robert Campbell joined Lamar Advertising in 1972 as a posting manager in Mobile. Robert rose through the ranks of sales manager and general manager before being appointed regional manager in 1983. Throughout his tenure, Robert oversaw the integration of numerous meaningful acquisitions and hired and trained dozens in the company. He has served on the national legislative committee for the Outdoor Advertising Association of America, OAAA, for over two decades, and in 2007 he was inducted into the OAAA Hall of Fame.

Further, Robert is a longtime supporter of the University of Alabama and its football program. His enthusiasm for Alabama is unwavering, even though the corporate headquarters of his company is based in Baton Rouge.

Robert is an effective legislative advocate, and I appreciate his hard work throughout the years. It is with great pleasure that I join his friends, family, and colleagues in recognizing his commitment. I congratulate him on his retirement, and I wish him all the best as he transitions into a new chapter of his life.●

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MAY 10, 2021

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Ms. STABENOW for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Jewel Hairston Bronaugh, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

*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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13873 OF MAY 15, 2019, WITH RESPECT TO SECURING THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN—PM 9

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain, is to continue in effect beyond May 15, 2021.

The unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries augments the ability of these foreign adversaries to create and exploit vulnerabilities in information and communications technology or services, with potentially catastrophic effects. This threat continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 2021.*

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13611 OF MAY 16, 2012, WITH RESPECT TO YEMEN—PM 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, with respect to Yemen is to continue in effect beyond May 16, 2021.

The actions and policies of certain former members of the Government of Yemen and others continue to threaten Yemen's peace, security, and stability. These actions include obstructing the political process in Yemen and the implementation of the agreement of November 23, 2011, between the Government of Yemen and those in opposition to it, which provided for a peaceful transition of power that meets the legitimate demands and aspirations of the Yemeni people. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13611 with respect to Yemen.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 2021.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:57 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 2406(b)(3) of Public Law 116–9, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Adams Memorial Commission: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CHABOT of Ohio, and Mr. MOOLENAAR of Michigan.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Canada-United States lnterparliamentary Group: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Chair, Mr. DEFAZIO of Oregon, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELBENE of Washington, Mr. MORELLE of New York, Ms. OMAR of Minnesota, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BERGMAN of Michigan, Mr. BURCHETT of Tennessee, Mr. HAGEDORN of Minnesota, and Mr. STAUBER of Minnesota.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States lnterparliamentary Group: Mr. CUELLAR of Texas, Chair, Mr. CORREA of California, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. ESCOBAR of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN of California, Mr. CARBAJAL of California, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. CLOUD of Texas, Mr. VALADAO of California, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, and Mr. GIMENEZ of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mr. SUOZZI of New York and Mr. GARBARINO of New York.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. GUTHRIE of Kentucky, Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BERGMAN of Michigan.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following joint resolution was discharged from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, by petition, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 802(c), and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of

title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders''.

MEASURES DISCHARGE PETITION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, hereby direct that the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged of further consideration of S.J. Res. 15, a resolution on providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to ''National Banks and Federal Savings Associations as Lenders'', and, further, that the resolution be immediately placed upon the Legislative Calendar under General Orders.

Sherrod Brown, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Tammy Duckworth, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Ben Ray Luján, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Edward J. Markey, Patty Murray, Jon Tester, Maria Cantwell, Elizabeth Warren, Bernard Sanders, Tim Kaine, Catherine Cortez Masto, Chris Van Hollen, Ron Wyden, Gary C. Peters, Mark Kelly, Richard Blumenthal, Mark R. Warner, Charles E. Schumer, Tina Smith, Richard J. Durbin, Michael F. Bennet, Amy Klobuchar, Raphael G. Warnock, Alex Padilla.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATION REFERRED TO COMMITIEE

On request by Senator RAND PAUL, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pension: Gwen Graham, of Florida, to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education, vice Peter Louis Oppenheim, resigned.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–865. A communication from the Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rescission of Rules on Improved Agency Guidance Documents'' (RIN0960–AI54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–866. A communication from the Director, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Mandatory Advance Electronic Information for International Mail Shipments'' (RIN1651–AB33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–867. A communication from the Compliance Specialist, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Independent Contractor Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA): Delay of Effective Date'' (RIN1235–AA34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–868. A communication from the Compliance Specialist, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tip Regulations under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA): Delay of Effective Date'' (RIN1235–AA21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2021; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–869. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Second Quarter of fiscal year 2021''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–870. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to operation of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–871. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–872. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Discrimination on the Bases of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity'' (12 CFR Part 1002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–873. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule Amending the Somalia Sanctions Regulations'' (31 CFR Part 551) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–874. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, with respect to the stabilization of Iraq; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–875. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–876. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, with respect to the Central African Republic; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–877. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Resolution Planning'' (RIN2590–AB13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–878. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2020 Annual Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–879. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on applications made by the Government for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence during calendar year 2020 relative to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC–880. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21449'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0916)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–881. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21448'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1123)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–882. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21445'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1131)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–883. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21444'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1107)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–884. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21452'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1132)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–885. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters; Amendment 39–21450'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–4497)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–886. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters;

Amendment 39–21447'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1139)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–887. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21392'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0974)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–888. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21391'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1018)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–889. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21394'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0967)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–890. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Type Certificate Previously Held by Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH and Eurocopter Canada Ltd.) Helicopters; Amendment 39–21485'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0696)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–891. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopter; Amendment 39–21468'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1136)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–892. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21477'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0785)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–893. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Agusta S.p.A.) Leonardo Helicopters; Amendment 39–21482'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0194)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–894. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rockwell Collins, Inc. Flight Display System Application; Amendment 39–21460'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0883)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–895. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited Helicopters; Amendment 39–21473'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2021–0144)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–896. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39–21456'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2018–0309)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–897. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines. S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Turbomeca, S.A.) Turboshaft Engines; Amendment 39–21451'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1118)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–898. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21455'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1115)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–899. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21463 ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0914)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–900. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21492'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0912)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–901. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21458'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0909)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–902. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters; Amendment 39–21472'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0801)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–903. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Agusta S.p.A) Helicopters; Amendment 39–21464'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0797)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–904. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft and Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters; Amendment 39–21462'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0920)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–905. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21459'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0901)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–906. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21388'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1172)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–907. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39–21371'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2018–1046)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–908. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes; Amendment 39–21378'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0910)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–909. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes;

Amendment 39–21516'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2021–0313)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–910. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21518'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1182)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–911. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; PZL Swidnick S.A. Airplanes; Amendment 39–21510'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2021–0299)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–912. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21514'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0845)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–913. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21521'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–0319)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–914. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21507'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0851)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–915. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21499'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1165)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–916. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21511'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0300)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–917. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters; Amendment 39–21520'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2021–0317)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–918. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21537'' ((RI N2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0345)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–919. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21524'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–1116)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–920. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21440'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0096)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–921. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21434'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0847)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–922. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21395'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0673)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–923. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21438'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0791)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–924. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bell Helicopter Textron Inc.) Helicopters; Amendment 39–21441'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0270)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–925. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21470'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2021–0136)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–926. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21439'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0095)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–927. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21439'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0094)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–928. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation, Inc.; Amendment 39–21431'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0811)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–929. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21435'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1106)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–930. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes; Amendment 39–21442'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1111)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–931. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Safran Helicopter Engines, S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Turbomeca, SA), Turboshaft Engines; Amendment 39–21466'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0132)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–932. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21469'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0133)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–933. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21384'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0905)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–934. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21506'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0587)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–935. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Austro Engines GmbH Engines; Amendment 39–21517'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0311)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–936. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39–21500'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0819)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–937. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.); Amendment 39–21497'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0911)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–938. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21502'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0965)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–939. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21494'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–1071)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–940. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21498'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2019–0480)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–941. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters; Amendment 39–21512'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0305)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–942. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Garmin International GMN–00962 GTS Processor Units; Amendment 39–21509'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0991)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–943. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39–21505'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0268)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–944. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopter; Amendment 39–21493'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1077)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–945. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rockwell Collins, Inc., Global Positioning Systems; Amendment 39–21501'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0915)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–946. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21486'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0848)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–947. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters; Amendment 39–21489'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1173)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–948. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–21487'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1137)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–949. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21503'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0266)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–950. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–21475'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2020–1134)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–951. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd and Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21488'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1138)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–952. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Scientific Company Seat Restraint System Rotary Buckle Assemblies; Amendment 39–21490'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2013–0752)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–953. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–21483'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–1034)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–954. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21432'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2020–0854)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–955. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes; Amendment 39–21476'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. FAA–2021–0186)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2021; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1544. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1545. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1934 to require country-by-country reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1546. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to provide for reform in the operations of the Office of Government Ethics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply a 1 percent excise tax on large endowments of certain private colleges and universities, to require that such institutions distribute at least 5 percent of large endowments in each taxable year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1548. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the diversity of participants in research on Alzheimer's disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 1549. A bill to require a review of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration preference for domestic suppliers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1550. A bill to support Foreign Service families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1551. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to finalize a rule to protect consumers from the risks of carbon monoxide poisoning from keyless ignition motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 1552. A bill to require a report on defense and aerospace manufacturing supply chains; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1553. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to submit to Congress an annual report on peaker plants in the United States and to provide financial incentives for replacing peaker plants with technology that receives, stores, and delivers energy generated by renewable energy resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1554. A bill to make certain irrigation districts eligible for Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program pumping power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1555. A bill to shorten the extension, and the amount, of Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation in order to get Americans back to work; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 1556. A bill to require a report on the feasibility and benefits of establishing a supply chain center of excellence; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 1557. A bill to support both workers and recovery by converting expanded Federal unemployment payments into signing bonuses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1558. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that all firearms are traceable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1559. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain qualified over-the-counter securities to be treated as readily traded on an established securities market for the purpose of diversification requirements for employee stock ownership plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1560. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit for certain youth employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1561. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1562. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide funding, on a competitive basis, for summer and year-round employment opportunities for youth ages 14 through 24; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 1563. A bill to establish an open network architecture testbed at the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to develop and demonstrate network architectures and applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1564. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide support to university law school programs that are designed to provide legal assistance to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1565. A bill to provide for hands-on learning opportunities in STEM education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1566. A bill to provide grants to enable nonprofit disability organizations to develop training programs that support safe interactions between law enforcement officers and individuals with disabilities and older individuals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1567. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1568. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide a waiver of the cap on annual payments for nursing and allied health education payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1569. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to expand the eligibility of students to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, establish college student food insecurity demonstration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KELLY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1570. A bill to facilitate nationwide accessibility and coordination of 211 services and 988 services in order to provide information and referral to all residents and visitors in the United States for mental health emergencies, homelessness needs, other social and human services needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1571. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand parental leave for members of the Armed Forces, to reduce the service commitment required for participation in the career intermission program of a military department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1572. A bill to expand child care opportunities for members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1573. A bill to require Federal law enforcement and prison officials to obtain or provide immediate medical attention to individuals in custody who display medical distress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. Res. 204. A resolution establishing a Select Committee on the Outbreak of the Coronavirus in China; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 205. A resolution promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2021, which include bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 206. A resolution supporting the designation of the week of April 18 through April 24, 2021, as National Crime Victims' Rights Week; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 89

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 89, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to secure medical opinions for veterans with service-connected disabilities who die from COVID–19 to determine whether their service-connected disabilities were the principal or contributory causes of death, and for other purposes.

S. 98

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 98, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for neighborhood revitalization, and for other purposes.

S. 306

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 306, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 464

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 464, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 481

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 481, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 535

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 535, a bill to authorize the location of a memorial on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces that served on active duty in support of the Global War on Terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 545, a bill to permanently exempt payments made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) 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. 680

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Biliteracy programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language.

S. 697

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth.

S. 740

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to help charitable nonprofit organizations provide services to meet the increasing demand in community needs caused by the coronavirus pandemic, preserve and create jobs in the nonprofit sector, reduce unemployment, and promote economic recovery.

S. 747

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 747, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the adjustment of status of essential workers, and for other purposes.

S. 864

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to extend Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to recognize the right of the People of Puerto Rico to call a status convention through which the people would exercise their natural right to self-determination, and to establish a mechanism for congressional consideration of such decision, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1210

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 1238

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1238, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1251, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop

a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain voluntary markets, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1271, a bill to reauthorize the Clean School Bus Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors 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. 1315

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1315, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items under the Medicare program.

S. 1355

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1355, a bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to strike provisions that limit the disclosure of certain information by the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

S. 1360

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) were added as cosponsors of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1385, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to establish additional requirements for dealers, and for other purposes.

S. 1389

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1389, a bill to provide relief to workers impacted by COVID–19 and support for reopening businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1446

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1446, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a plan for obligating and expending Coronavirus pandemic funding made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1452

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1452, a bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes.

S. 1470

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1470, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to increase voting accessibility for individuals with disabilities and older individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1482

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1482, a bill to increase Government accountability for administrative actions by reinvigorating administrative Pay-As-You-Go.

S. 1502

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1502, a bill to make Federal law enforcement officer peer support communications confidential, and for other purposes.

S. 1511

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1511, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustain in the line of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1512, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1517

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1517, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for the operation or construction of family detention centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1535

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1535, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 35, a resolution condemning the military coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military's detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained and for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 105

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 105, a resolution condemning the coup in Burma and calling for measures to ensure the safety of the Burmese people, including Rohingya, who have been threatened and displaced by a campaign of genocide conducted by the Burmese military.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution recognizing the duty of the Senate to abandon Modern Monetary Theory and recognizing that the acceptance of Modern Monetary Theory would lead to higher deficits and higher inflation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1560. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit for certain youth employees; to the Committee on Finance.

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. 1560

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 ''Helping to Encourage Real Opportunities (HERO) for Youth Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF WORK OPPORTUNITY CREDIT FOR CERTAIN YOUTH EMPLOYEES.

(a) EXPANSION OF CREDIT FOR SUMMER YOUTH.—

(1) CREDIT ALLOWED FOR YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT.—Section 51(d)(7)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking clauses (i) and (iii) and redesignating clauses (ii) and (iv) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(B) in clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''(or if later, on May 1 of the calendar year involved),'';

(C) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) (as so redesignated) and inserting '', and''; and

(D) adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) who will be employed for not more than 20 hours per week during any period between September 16 and April 30 in which such individual is regularly attending any secondary school.''.

(2) INCREASE IN CREDIT AMOUNT.—Section 51(d)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subparagraph (F) of section 51(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''summer''.

(B) Paragraph (7) of section 51(d) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''summer'' each place it appears in subparagraphs (A);

(ii) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking ''subparagraph (A)(iv)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A)(ii)''; and

(iii) by striking ''SUMMER'' in the heading thereof.

(b) CREDIT FOR DISCONNECTED YOUTH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 51(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (J) and inserting '', or'' , and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(K) an disconnected youth.''.

(2) DISCONNECTED YOUTH.—Paragraph (14) of section 51(d) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(14) DISCONNECTED YOUTH.—The term 'disconnected youth' means any individual who—

''(A)(i) is certified by the designated local agency as having attained age 16 but not age 25 on the hiring date, and

''(ii) has self-certified (on a form prescribed by the Secretary) that such individual—

''(I) has not regularly attended any secondary, technical, or post-secondary school during the 6-month period preceding the hiring date,

''(II) has not been regularly employed during such 6-month period, and

''(III) is not readily employable by reason of lacking a sufficient number of basic skills, or

''(B) is certified by the designated local agency as—

''(i) having attained age 16 but not age 21 on the hiring date, and

''(ii) an eligible foster child (as defined in section 152(f)(1)(C)) who was in foster care during the 12-month period ending on the hiring date.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1562. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide funding, on a competitive basis, for summer and year-round employment opportunities for youth ages 14 through 24; 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. 1560

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 ''Creating Pathways for Youth Employment Act''.

SEC. 2. YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

Title I of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subtitle E (29 U.S.C. 3241 et seq.) as subtitle F; and

(2) by inserting after subtitle D (29 U.S.C. 3221 et seq.) the following:

''Subtitle E—Youth Employment Opportunities

''SEC. 176. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subtitle:

''(1) ELIGIBLE YOUTH.—The term 'eligible youth' means an individual who—

''(A) is not younger than age 14 or older than age 24; and

''(B) is—

''(i) an in-school youth;

''(ii) an out-of-school youth; or

''(iii) an unemployed individual.

''(2) HARDEST-TO-EMPLOY, MOST-AT-RISK.—The term 'hardest-to-employ, most-at-risk', used with respect to an individual, includes individuals who are homeless, in foster care, involved in the juvenile or criminal justice system, or are not enrolled in or at risk of dropping out of an educational institution and who live in an underserved community that has faced trauma through acute or long-term exposure to substantial discrimination, historical or cultural oppression, intergenerational poverty, civil unrest, a high rate of violence, or a high rate of drug overdose mortality.

''(3) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The terms 'Indian tribe' and 'tribal organization' have the meanings given the terms in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

''(4) IN-SCHOOL YOUTH; OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.—The terms 'in-school youth' and 'out-of-school youth' have the meanings given the terms in section 129(a)(1).

''(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

''(6) SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT.—The term 'subsidized employment' means employment for which the employer receives a total or partial subsidy to offset costs of employing an eligible youth under this subtitle.

''(7) TRIBAL AREA.—The term 'tribal area' means—

''(A) an area on or adjacent to an Indian reservation;

''(B) land held in trust by the United States for Indians;

''(C) a public domain Indian allotment;

''(D) a former Indian reservation in Oklahoma; and

''(E) land held by an incorporated Native group, Regional Corporation, or Village Corporation under the provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

''(8) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term 'tribal college or university' has the meaning given the term 'Tribal College or University' in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).

''(9) TRIBALLY DESIGNATED HOUSING ENTITY.—The term 'tribally designated housing entity', used with respect to an Indian tribe (as defined in this section), has the meaning given in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

''SEC. 176A. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

''(a) ALLOCATION.—Of the funds appropriated under section 176E that remain available after any reservation under subsection (b), the Secretary may make available—

''(1) not more than $1,500,000,000 in accordance with section 176B to provide eligible youth with subsidized summer employment opportunities; and

''(2) not more than $2,000,000,000 in accordance with section 176C to provide eligible youth with subsidized year-round employment opportunities.

''(b) RESERVATION.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated under section 176E to provide technical assistance and oversight, in order to assist eligible entities in applying for and administering grants awarded under this subtitle.

''SEC. 176B. SUMMER EMPLOYMENT COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) GRANTS.—Using the amounts made available under 176A(a)(1), the Secretary shall award, on a competitive basis, planning and implementation grants.

''(2) GENERAL USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall award the grants to assist eligible entities by paying for the program share of the cost of—

''(A) in the case of a planning grant, planning a summer youth employment program to provide subsidized summer employment opportunities; and

''(B) in the case of an implementation grant, implementation of such a program, to provide such opportunities.

''(b) PERIODS AND AMOUNTS OF GRANTS.—

''(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—The Secretary may award a planning grant under this section for a 1-year period, in an amount of not more than $200,000.

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The Secretary may award an implementation grant under this section for a 3-year period, in an amount of not more than $5,000,000.

''(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a planning or implementation grant under this section, an entity shall—

''(A) be a—

''(i) State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization, that meets the requirements of paragraph (2); or

''(ii) community-based organization that meets the requirements of paragraph (3); and

''(B) meet the requirements for a planning or implementation grant, respectively, specified in paragraph (4).

''(2) GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS.—An entity that is a State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization referred to in paragraph (1) shall demonstrate that the entity has entered into a partnership with State, local, or tribal entities—

''(A) that shall include—

''(i) a local educational agency or tribal educational agency (as defined in section 6132 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7452));

''(ii) a local board or tribal workforce development agency;

''(iii) a State, local, or tribal agency serving youth under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system;

''(iv) a State, local, or tribal child welfare agency;

''(v) a State, local, or tribal agency or community-based organization, with—

''(I) expertise in providing counseling services, and trauma-informed and gender-responsive trauma prevention, identification, referral, and support (including treatment) services; and

''(II) a proven track record of serving low-income vulnerable youth and out-of-school youth; and

''(vi) if the State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization is seeking an implementation grant, and has not established a summer youth employment program, an entity that is carrying out a State, local, or tribal summer youth employment program; and

''(vii) an employer or employer association; and

''(B) that may include—

''(i) an institution of higher education or tribal college or university;

''(ii) a representative of a labor or labor-management organization;

''(iii) an entity that carries out a program that receives funding under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) or section 212 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17532);

''(iv) a collaborative applicant as defined in section 401 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360) or a private nonprofit organization that serves homeless individuals and households (including such an applicant or organization that serves individuals or households that are at risk of homelessness in tribal areas) or serves foster youth;

''(v) an entity that carries out a program funded under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), including Native American programs funded under section 116 of that Act (20 U.S.C. 2326) and tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institution programs funded under section 117 of that Act (20 U.S.C. 2327);

''(vi) a local or tribal youth committee;

''(vii) a State or local public housing agency or a tribally designated housing entity; and

''(viii) another appropriate State, local, or tribal agency.

''(3) COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION PARTNERSHIPS.—A community-based organization referred to in paragraph (1) shall demonstrate that the organization has entered into a partnership with State, local, or tribal entities—

''(A) that shall include—

''(i) a unit of general local government or tribal government;

''(ii) an agency described in paragraph (2)(A)(i);

''(iii) a local board or tribal workforce development agency;

''(iv) a State, local, or tribal agency serving youth under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system;

''(v) a State, local, or tribal child welfare agency;

''(vi) if the organization is seeking an implementation grant, and has not established a summer youth employment program, an entity that is carrying out a State, local, or tribal summer youth employment program; and

''(vii) an employer or employer association; and

''(B) that may include one or more entities described in paragraph (2)(B).

''(4) ENTITIES ELIGIBLE FOR PARTICULAR GRANTS.—

''(A) ENTITIES ELIGIBLE FOR PLANNING GRANTS.—The Secretary may award a planning grant under this section to an eligible entity that—

''(i) is preparing to establish or expand a summer youth employment program that meets the minimum requirements specified in subsection (d); and

''(ii) has not received a grant under this section.

''(B) ENTITIES ELIGIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award an implementation grant under this section to an eligible entity that—

''(I) has received a planning grant under this section; or

''(II) has established a summer youth employment program and demonstrates a minimum level of capacity to enhance or expand the summer youth employment program described in the application submitted under subsection (d).

''(ii) CAPACITY.—In determining whether an entity has the level of capacity referred to in clause (i)(II), the Secretary may include as capacity—

''(I) the entity's staff capacity and staff training to deliver youth employment services; and

''(II) the entity's existing youth employment services (as of the date of submission of the application submitted under subsection (d)) that are consistent with the application.

''(d) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an eligible entity desiring to receive a grant under this section for a summer youth employment program shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including, at a minimum, each of the following:

''(A) With respect to an application for a planning or implementation grant—

''(i) a description of the eligible youth for whom summer employment services will be provided;

''(ii) a description of the eligible entity, and a description of the expected participation and responsibilities of each of the partners in the partnership described in subsection (c);

''(iii) information demonstrating sufficient need for the grant in the State, local, or tribal population, which may include information showing—

''(I) a high level of unemployment among youth (including young adults) ages 14 through 24;

''(II) a high rate of out-of-school youth;

''(III) a high rate of homelessness;

''(IV) a high rate of poverty;

''(V) a high rate of adult unemployment;

''(VI) a high rate of community or neighborhood crime;

''(VII) a high rate of violence; or

''(VIII) a high level or rate on another indicator of need;

''(iv) a description of the strategic objectives the eligible entity seeks to achieve through the program to provide eligible youth with core work readiness skills, which may include—

''(I) financial literacy skills, including providing the support described in section 129(b)(2)(D);

''(II) sector-based technical skills aligned with employer needs;

''(III) skills that—

''(aa) are soft employment skills, early work skills, or work readiness skills; and

''(bb) include social skills, communications skills, higher-order thinking skills, self-control, and positive self-concept; and

''(IV) (for the hardest-to-employ, most-at-risk eligible youth) basic skills like communication, math, and problem solving in the context of training for advancement to better jobs and postsecondary training; and

''(v) information demonstrating that the eligible entity has obtained commitments to provide the non-program share described in paragraph (2) of subsection (h).

''(B) With respect to an application for a planning grant—

''(i) a description of the intermediate and long-term goals for planning activities for the duration of the planning grant;

''(ii) a description of how grant funds will be used to develop a plan to provide summer employment services for eligible youth;

''(iii) a description of how the eligible entity will carry out an analysis of best practices for identifying, recruiting, and engaging program participants, in particular the hardest-to-employ, most-at-risk eligible youth;

''(iv) a description of how the eligible entity will carry out an analysis of best practices for placing youth participants—

''(I) in opportunities that—

''(aa) are appropriate subsidized employment opportunities with employers based on factors including age, skill, experience, career aspirations, work-based readiness, and barriers to employment; and

''(bb) may include additional services for participants, including core work readiness skill development and mentorship services;

''(II) in summer employment that—

''(aa) is not less than 6 weeks;

''(bb) follows a schedule of not more than 20 hours per week; and

''(cc) pays not less than the applicable Federal, State, or local minimum wage; and

''(v) a description of how the eligible entity plans to develop a mentorship program or connect youth with positive, supportive mentorships, consistent with paragraph (3).

''(C) With respect to an application for an implementation grant—

''(i) a description of how the eligible entity plans to identify, recruit, and engage program participants, in particular the hardest-to-employ, most-at-risk eligible youth;

''(ii) a description of the manner in which the eligible entity plans to place eligible youth participants in subsidized employment opportunities, and in summer employment, described in subparagraph (B)(iv);

''(iii) (for a program serving the hardest-to-employ, most-at-risk eligible youth), a description of workplaces for the subsidized employment involved, which may include workplaces in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors;

''(iv) a description of how the eligible entity plans to provide or connect eligible youth participants with positive, supportive mentorships, consistent with paragraph (3);

''(v) a description of services that will be available to employers participating in the youth employment program, to provide supervisors involved in the program with coaching and mentoring on—

''(I) how to support youth development;

''(II) how to structure learning and reflection; and

''(III) how to deal with youth challenges in the workplace;

''(vi) a description of how the eligible entity plans to offer structured pathways back into employment and a youth employment program under this section for eligible youth who have been terminated from employment or removed from the program;

''(vii) a description of how the eligible entity plans to engage eligible youth beyond

the duration of the summer employment opportunity, which may include—

''(I) developing or partnering with a year-round youth employment program;

''(II) referring eligible youth to other year-round programs, which may include—

''(aa) programs funded under section 176C or the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.);

''(bb) after school programs;

''(cc) secondary or postsecondary education programs;

''(dd) training programs;

''(ee) cognitive behavior therapy programs;

''(ff) apprenticeship programs; and

''(gg) national service programs;

''(III) employing a full-time, permanent staff person who is responsible for youth outreach, followup, and recruitment; or

''(IV) connecting eligible youth with job development services, including career counseling, resume and job application assistance, interview preparation, and connections to job leads;

''(viii) evidence of the eligible entity's capacity to provide the services described in this subsection; and

''(ix) a description of the quality of the summer youth employment program, including a program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential.

''(2) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—An eligible entity that is an Indian tribe or tribal organization and desires to receive a grant under this section for a summer youth employment program may, in lieu of submitting the application described in paragraph (1), submit an application to the Secretary that meets such requirements as the Secretary develops after consultation with the tribe or organization.

''(3) MENTOR.—For purposes of subparagraphs (B)(iv), (B)(v), and (C)(iv) of paragraph (1), a mentor—

''(A) shall be an individual who has been matched with an eligible youth based on the youth's needs;

''(B) shall make contact with the eligible youth at least once each week;

''(C) shall be a trusted member of the local community; and

''(D) may include—

''(i) a mentor trained in trauma-informed care (including provision of trauma-informed trauma prevention, identification, referral, or support services to youth that have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma), conflict resolution, and positive youth development;

''(ii) a job coach trained to provide youth with guidance on how to navigate the workplace and troubleshoot problems;

''(iii) a supervisor trained to provide at least two performance assessments and serve as a reference; or

''(iv) a peer mentor who is a former or current participant in the youth employment program involved.

''(e) AWARDS FOR POPULATIONS AND AREAS.—

''(1) POPULATIONS.—The Secretary shall reserve, from the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(1)—

''(A) 50 percent to award grants under this section for planning or provision of subsidized summer employment opportunities for in-school youth; and

''(B) 50 percent to award such grants to plan for planning or provision of such opportunities for out-of-school youth.

''(2) AREAS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In awarding the grants, the Secretary shall consider the regional diversity of the areas to be served, to ensure that urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas are receiving grant funds.

''(B) RURAL AND TRIBAL AREA INCLUSION.—

''(i) RURAL AREAS.—Not less than 20 percent of the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(1) for each fiscal year shall be made available for activities to be carried out in rural areas.

''(ii) TRIBAL AREAS.—Not less than 5 percent of the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(1) for each fiscal year shall be made available for activities to be carried out in tribal areas.

''(f) PROGRAM PRIORITIES.—In allocating funds under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to eligible entities—

''(1) who propose to coordinate their activities—

''(A) with local or tribal employers; and

''(B) with agencies described in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i) to ensure the summer youth employment programs provide clear linkages to remedial, academic, and occupational programs carried out by the agencies;

''(2) who propose a plan to increase private sector engagement in, and job placement through, summer youth employment; and

''(3) who have, in their counties, States, or tribal areas (as compared to other counties in their State, other States, or other tribal areas, respectively), a high level or rate described in subsection (d)(1)(A)(iii).

''(g) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may use the grant funds for services described in subsection (d).

''(2) DISCRETIONARY USES.—The eligible entity may also use the funds—

''(A) to provide wages to eligible youth in subsidized summer employment programs;

''(B) to provide eligible youth with support services, including case management, child care assistance, child support services, and transportation assistance; and

''(C) to develop data management systems to assist with programming, evaluation, and records management.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—An eligible entity may reserve not more than 10 percent of the grant funds for the administration of activities under this section.

''(4) CARRY-OVER AUTHORITY.—Any amounts provided to an eligible entity under this section for a fiscal year may, at the discretion of the Secretary, remain available to that entity for expenditure during the succeeding fiscal year to carry out programs under this section.

''(h) PROGRAM SHARE.—

''(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—The program share for a planning grant awarded under this section shall be 100 percent of the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(A).

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The program share for an implementation grant awarded under this section shall be 50 percent of the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(B).

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

''(i) may increase the program share for an eligible entity; and

''(ii) shall increase the program share for an Indian tribe or tribal organization to not less than 95 percent of the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(B).

''(C) NON-PROGRAM SHARE.—The eligible entity may provide the non-program share of the cost—

''(i) in cash or in-kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services; and

''(ii) from State, local, tribal or private (including philanthropic) sources and, in the case of an Indian tribe or tribal organization, from Federal sources.

''SEC. 176C. YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) GRANTS.—Using the amounts made available under 176A(a)(2), the Secretary shall award, on a competitive basis, planning and implementation grants.

''(2) GENERAL USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall award the grants to assist eligible entities by paying for the program share of the cost of—

''(A) in the case of a planning grant, planning a year-round youth employment program to provide subsidized year-round employment opportunities; and

''(B) in the case of an implementation grant, implementation of such a program to provide such opportunities.

''(b) PERIODS AND AMOUNTS OF GRANTS.—The planning grants shall have the periods and amounts described in section 176B(b)(1). The implementation grants shall have the periods and grants described in section 176B(b)(2).

''(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a planning or implementation grant under this section, an entity shall, except as provided in paragraph (2)—

''(A) be a—

''(i) State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization, that meets the requirements of section 176B(c)(2); or

''(ii) community-based organization that meets the requirements of section 176B(c)(3); and

''(B) meet the requirements for a planning or implementation grant, respectively, specified in section 176B(c)(4).

''(2) YEAR-ROUND YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any reference in section 176B(c)—

''(A) to a summer youth employment program shall be considered to refer to a year-round youth employment program; and

''(B) to a provision of section 176B shall be considered to refer to the corresponding provision of this section.

''(d) APPLICATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an eligible entity desiring to receive a grant under this section for a year-round youth employment program shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including, at a minimum, each of the following:

''(A) With respect to an application for a planning or implementation grant, the information and descriptions specified in section 176B(d)(1)(A).

''(B) With respect to an application for a planning grant, the descriptions specified in section 176B(d)(1)(B), except that the description of an analysis for placing youth in employment described in clause (iv)(II)(bb) of that section shall cover employment that follows a schedule—

''(i) that consists of—

''(I) not more than 15 hours per week for in-school youth; and

''(II) not less than 20 and not more than 40 hours per week for out-of-school youth; and

''(ii) that depends on the needs and work-readiness level of the population being served.

''(C) With respect to an application for an implementation grant, the descriptions and evidence specified in section 176B(d)(1)(C)—

''(i) except that the reference in section 176(d)(1)(C)(ii) to employment described in section 176B(d)(1)(B) shall cover employment that follows the schedule described in subparagraph (B); and

''(ii) except that the reference to programs in clause (vii)(II)(aa) of that section shall be considered to refer only to programs funded under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

''(2) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—An eligible entity that is an Indian tribe or

tribal organization and desires to receive a grant under this section for a year-round youth employment program may, in lieu of submitting the application described in paragraph (1), submit an application to the Secretary that meets such requirements as the Secretary develops after consultation with the tribe or organization.

''(3) MENTOR.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any reference in subparagraphs (B)(iv), (B)(v), and (C)(iv) of section 176B(d)(1) to a mentor shall be considered to refer to a mentor who—

''(A) shall be an individual described in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 176B(d)(3);

''(B) shall make contact with the eligible youth at least twice each week; and

''(C) may be an individual described in section 176B(d)(3)(D).

''(4) YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, any reference in section 176B(d)—

''(A) to summer employment shall be considered to refer to year-round employment; and

''(B) to a provision of section 176B shall be considered to refer to the corresponding provision of this section.

''(e) AWARDS FOR POPULATIONS AND AREAS; PRIORITIES.—

''(1) POPULATIONS.—The Secretary shall reserve, from the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(2)—

''(A) 50 percent to award grants under this section for planning or provision of subsidized year-round employment opportunities for in-school youth; and

''(B) 50 percent to award such grants to plan for planning or provision of such opportunities for out-of-school youth.

''(2) AREAS; PRIORITIES.—In awarding the grants, the Secretary shall—

''(A) carry out section 176B(e)(2); and

''(B) give priority to eligible entities—

''(i) who—

''(I) propose the coordination and plan described paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 176B(f), with respect to year-round youth employment; and

''(II) meet the requirements of section 176B(f)(3); or

''(ii) who—

''(I) propose a plan to coordinate activities with entities carrying out State, local, or tribal summer youth employment programs, to provide pathways to year-round employment for eligible youth who are ending summer employment; and

''(II) meet the requirements of section 176B(f)(3).

''(f) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may use the grant funds—

''(1) for services described in subsection (d);

''(2) as described in section 176B(g)(2), with respect to year-round employment programs;

''(3) as described in section 176B(g)(3), with respect to activities under this section; and

''(4) at the discretion of the Secretary, as described in section 176B(g)(4), with respect to activities under this section.

''(g) PROGRAM SHARE.—

''(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—The provisions of section 176B(h)(1) shall apply to planning grants awarded under this section, with respect to the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(A).

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The provisions of section 176B(h)(2) shall apply to implementation grants awarded under this section, with respect to the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(B).

''SEC. 176D. EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish performance measures for purposes of annual reviews under subsection (b).

''(2) COMPONENTS.—The performance measures for the eligible entities shall consist of—

''(A) the indicators of performance described in paragraph (3); and

''(B) an adjusted level of performance for each indicator described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The indicators of performance shall consist of—

''(i) the percentage of youth employment program participants who are in education or training activities, or in employment, during the second quarter after exit from the program;

''(ii) the percentage of youth employment program participants who are in education or training activities, or in employment, during the fourth quarter after exit from the program;

''(iii) the percentage of youth employment program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent (subject to subparagraph (B)), during participation in or within 1 year after exit from the program; and

''(iv) the percentage of youth employment program participants who, during a program year, are in a youth employment program that includes an education or training program that leads to an outcome specified by the Secretary, which may include—

''(I) obtaining a recognized postsecondary credential or employment; or

''(II) achieving measurable skill gains toward such a credential or employment.

''(B) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), youth employment program participants who obtain a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted as meeting the criterion under such subparagraph only if such participants, in addition to obtaining such diploma or its recognized equivalent, have obtained or retained employment or are in a youth employment program that includes an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential within 1 year after exit from the program.

''(4) LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For each eligible entity, there shall be established, in accordance with this paragraph, levels of performance for each of the corresponding indicators of performance described in paragraph (3).

''(B) IDENTIFICATION IN APPLICATION.—Each eligible entity shall identify, in the application submitted under subsection (d) of section 176B or 176C, expected levels of performance for each of those indicators of performance for each program year covered by the application.

''(C) AGREEMENT ON ADJUSTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—The eligible entity shall reach agreement with the Secretary on levels of performance for each of those indicators of performance for each such program year. The levels agreed to shall be considered to be the adjusted levels of performance for the eligible entity for such program years and shall be incorporated into the application prior to the approval of such application.

''(b) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Secretary shall carry out an annual review of each eligible entity receiving a grant under this subtitle. In conducting the review, the Secretary shall review the performance of the entity on the performance measures under this section and determine if the entity has used any practices that shall be considered best practices for purposes of this subtitle.

''(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) PREPARATION.—The Secretary shall prepare a report on the grant programs established by this subtitle, which report shall include a description of—

''(A) the eligible entities receiving funding under this subtitle;

''(B) the activities carried out by the eligible entities;

''(C) how the eligible entities were selected to receive funding under this subtitle; and

''(D) an assessment of the results achieved by the grant programs including findings from the annual reviews conducted under subsection (b).

''(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Creating Pathways for Youth Employment Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report described in paragraph (1) to the appropriate committees of Congress.

''(d) APPLICATION TO INDIAN TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary may issue regulations that clarify the application of all the provisions of this subtitle to Indian tribes and tribal organizations.

''SEC. 176E. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) to carry out section 176B, $300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026; and

''(2) to carry out section 176C, $400,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.''.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) REFERENCES.—

(1) Section 121(b)(1)(C)(ii)(II) of the Workforce Investment and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)(C)(ii)(II)) is amended by striking ''subtitles C through E'' and inserting ''subtitles C through F''.

(2) Section 503(b) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3343(b)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''(as such subtitles were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act)''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to the subtitle heading for subtitle E of title I and inserting the following:

''Subtitle E—Youth Employment Opportunities

''Sec. 176. Definitions.
''Sec. 176A. Allocation of funds.
''Sec. 176B. Summer employment competitive grant program.
''Sec. 176C. Year-round employment competitive grant program.
''Sec. 176D. Evaluation and administration.
''Sec. 176E. Authorization of appropriations.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 204—ESTABLISHING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OUTBREAK OF THE CORONAVIRUS IN CHINA

Mr. MARSHALL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 204

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE OUTBREAK OF THE CORONAVIRUS IN CHINA.

There is established a select investigative committee of the Senate, to be known as the Select Committee on the Outbreak of the Coronavirus in China (referred to in this resolution as the ''select committee''), to investigate the outbreak of the COVID–19 virus in or around Wuhan, China.

SEC. 2. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) COMPOSITION.—The select committee shall be composed of not more than 12 Senators, of whom 6 shall be appointed by the

Majority Leader and 6 shall be appointed by the Minority Leader.

(b) CHAIRPERSON; VICE-CHAIRPERSON.—The Majority Leader shall designate 1 member of the select committee as the chairperson of the select committee, and the Minority Leader shall designate 1 member of the select committee as the vice-chairperson of the select committee.

(c) EXEMPTION.—For purposes of paragraph 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, service of a Senator as a member or chairperson of the select committee shall not be taken into account.

(d) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the select committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 3. INVESTIGATION AND REPORT.

(a) INVESTIGATION.—The select committee shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study regarding—

(1) identification of the source of the COVID–19 virus and the route of human-to-human transmission beginning in or around Wuhan, China;

(2) secret research and gain-of-function zoonic research at the Wuhan Institute of Virology (referred to in this section as ''WIV'');

(3) training operations and safety standards at the WIV;

(4) cases of researchers at the WIV laboratory becoming sick or demonstrating COVID–19-like symptoms in 2019 or 2020;

(5) cables and other communications from 2017 to 2021 from employees of the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of Health and Human Services regarding activities and research at the WIV;

(6) response from officials of the Department of State and National Security Council in Washington, DC to the cables and other communications described in paragraph (5);

(7) funding distributed to the WIV by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, the National Institutes of Health, and institutions of higher education of the United States;

(8) funding of gain-of-function research by the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases during the 2014–2017 moratorium on such research;

(9) research and possible leaks from the Wuhan Center for Disease Control;

(10) information regarding efforts by the Chinese Communist Party to silence journalists and doctors, destroy samples of the COVID–19 virus, and block United States and other foreign investigators, including investigations surrounding the Chinese Communist Party's misinformation campaign through social media, traditional news outlets, and other propaganda outlets;

(11) the origination of claims that the pandemic spread from a seafood market in Wuhan, China and the closure and sanitation of the market;

(12) actions taken by the World Health Organization, including actions taken by Director-General Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus and other World Health Organization officials, to spread Chinese misinformation and the failure of the World Health Organization to meet the Organization's charter to prevent the international spread of disease; and

(13) the impact of failing to shut down travel in and out of Wuhan, China, the Hubei province, and greater China.

(b) REPORTS.—The select committee—

(1) shall issue a final report to the Senate of its findings from the investigation and study described in subsection (a) by not later than 1 year after the date of adoption of this resolution; and

(2) may issue to the Senate such interim reports as the select committee determines necessary.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITIES AND POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized in its discretion—

(1) to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction;

(2) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(3) to employ personnel;

(4) to hold hearings;

(5) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate;

(6) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents;

(7) to take depositions and other testimony;

(8) to procure the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, in accordance with section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i)); and

(9) with the prior consent of the government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) OATHS.—The chairperson of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(c) SUBPOENAS.—A subpoena authorized by the select committee—

(1) may be issued under the signature of the chairperson, the vice-chairperson, or any member of the select committee designated by the chairperson; and

(2) may be served by any person designated by the chairperson, the vice-chairperson, or other member signing the subpoena.

(d) COMMITTEE RULES.—The select committee shall adopt rules (not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate and in accordance with rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate) governing the procedure of the select committee, which shall include addressing how often the select committee shall meet, meeting times and location, type of notifications, notices of hearings, duration of the select committee, and records of the select committee after committee activities are complete.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION.

The select committee shall terminate on the day after the date the report required under section 3(b)(1) is submitted.

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—PROMOTING MINORITY HEALTH AWARENESS AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL MINORITY HEALTH MONTH IN APRIL 2021, WHICH INCLUDE BRINGING ATTENTION TO THE HEALTH DISPARITIES FACED BY MINORITY POPULATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SUCH AS AMERICAN INDIANS, ALASKA NATIVES, ASIAN AMERICANS, AFRICAN AMERICANS, HISPANICS, AND NATIVE HAWAIIANS OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 205

Whereas the origin of National Minority Health Month is National Negro Health Week, established in 1915 by Dr. Booker T. Washington;

Whereas the theme for National Minority Health Month in 2021 is ''Vaccine Ready'';

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has set goals and strategies to enhance and protect the health and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas a study by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, entitled ''The Economic Burden of Health Inequalities in the United States'', concludes that, between 2003 and 2006, the combined cost of health inequalities and premature death in the United States was $1,240,000,000,000;

Whereas African American women were as likely to have been diagnosed with breast cancer as non-Hispanic White women, but African American women were about 40 percent more likely to die from breast cancer than non-Hispanic White women between 2012 and 2016;

Whereas African American women lose their lives to cervical cancer at more than twice the rate of non-Hispanic White women;

Whereas African American men are 70 percent more likely to die from a stroke than non-Hispanic White men;

Whereas Hispanics are twice as likely as non-Hispanic Whites to suffer from end-stage renal disease caused by diabetes, and are 30 percent more likely to die of diabetes, than non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas the HIV diagnosis rate among Hispanic men is more than 3 times the HIV diagnosis rate among non-Hispanic White men;

Whereas the HIV diagnosis rate among Hispanic women is 4 times the HIV diagnosis rate among non-Hispanic White women;

Whereas, in 2018, although African Americans represented only 13 percent of the population of the United States, African Americans accounted for 42 percent of new HIV diagnoses;

Whereas, in 2018, African American youth accounted for an estimated 51 percent, and Hispanic youth accounted for an estimated 27 percent, of all new HIV diagnoses among youth in the United States;

Whereas, in 2016, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders were 1.6 times more likely to be diagnosed with HIV than non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas, in 2018, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders were 2.5 times more likely to be diagnosed with diabetes than non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders are 10 percent more likely to die from cancer than non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas, although the prevalence of obesity is high among all population groups in the United States, 48 percent of American Indian and Alaska Natives, 51 percent of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, 48 percent of African Americans, 45 percent of Hispanics, 37 percent of non-Hispanic Whites, and 12 percent of Asian Americans older than 18 years old were obese (not including overweight);

Whereas Asian Americans accounted for 30 percent of chronic Hepatitis B cases, and non-Hispanic Whites accounted for 13.5 percent of chronic Hepatitis B cases;

Whereas of the children diagnosed with perinatal HIV in 2017, 65 percent were African American, 9 percent were Hispanic, and 14 percent were non-Hispanic White;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services has identified heart disease,

stroke, cancer, and diabetes as 4 of the 10 leading causes of death among American Indians and Alaska Natives;

Whereas American Indians and Alaska Natives die from diabetes, alcoholism, unintentional injuries, homicide, and suicide at higher rates than other people in the United States;

Whereas American Indians and Alaska Natives have a life expectancy that is 5.5 years shorter than the life expectancy of the overall population of the United States;

Whereas African American women die from childbirth or pregnancy-related causes at a rate that is 3 to 4 times higher than the rate for non-Hispanic White women;

Whereas African American infants are 3.8 times more likely to die due to complications related to low birth weight than non-Hispanic White infants;

Whereas American Indian and Alaska Native infants are more than twice as likely as non-Hispanic White infants to die from sudden infant death syndrome;

Whereas American Indian and Alaska Natives have an infant mortality rate twice as high as that of non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas American Indian and Alaska Native infants are 2.7 times more likely to die from accidental deaths before their first birthday than non-Hispanic White infants;

Whereas sickle cell disease affects approximately 100,000 people in the United States, occurring in approximately 1 out of every 365 African American births and 1 out of every 16,300 Hispanic births;

Whereas 10.9 percent of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders, 6.3 percent of Asian Americans, 8.8 percent of Hispanics, 8.7 percent of African Americans, and 14 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives received mental health treatment or counseling in the past year, compared to 18.6 percent of non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas the 2019 National Healthcare Quality and Disparities Report found African Americans and American Indians and Alaska Natives received worse care than non-Hispanic Whites for about 40 percent of quality measures, Hispanics and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders received worse care than non-Hispanic Whites for 33 percent of quality measures, and Asian Americans received worse care than non-Hispanic Whites for nearly 30 percent of quality measures;

Whereas nearly 30 percent of reported COVID–19-related cases are among Hispanics compared to less than 50 percent comprising non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas nearly 3.5 times more American Indians and Alaska Natives, 2.9 times more Hispanics, and 2.8 times more African Americans were hospitalized due to COVID–19 compared to non-Hispanic Whites;

Whereas significant differences in social determinants of health can lead to poor health outcomes and declines in life expectancy; and

Whereas community-based health care initiatives, such as prevention-focused programs, present a unique opportunity to use innovative approaches to improve public health and health care practices across the United States and to reduce disparities among racial and ethnic minority populations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2021, which include bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF APRIL 18 THROUGH APRIL 24, 2021, AS NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Whereas crime and victimization in the United States have significant, and sometimes life shattering, impacts on victims, survivors, and communities across the United States;

Whereas research suggests that there are several million violent victimizations each year in the United States, yet less than half of all violent crimes are ever reported to police;

Whereas crime victims and survivors need and deserve support and access to services to help them cope with the physical, psychological, financial, and other adverse effects of crime;

Whereas Congress has recognized the importance of supporting crime victims and survivors through the passage of legislation concerning this important issue, including—

(1) the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101 et seq.);

(2) the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291 et seq.);

(3) the Survivors' Bill of Rights Act of 2016 (Public Law 114–236; 130 Stat. 966);

(4) the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.);

(5) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.);

(6) the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act (34 U.S.C. 21701 et seq.);

(7) the Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–299; 132 Stat. 4383);

(8) the Scott Campbell, Stephanie Roper, Wendy Preston, Louarna Gillis, and Nila Lynn Crime Victims' Rights Act (Public Law 108–405; 118 Stat. 2261); and

(9) the Justice for All Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–405; 118 Stat. 2260);

Whereas crime can touch the life of any individual, regardless of the age, race, national origin, religion, or gender of that individual;

Whereas a just society acknowledges the impact of crime on individuals, families, schools, and communities by protecting the rights of crime victims and survivors;

Whereas crime victims and survivors in the United States, and the families of those victims and survivors, need and deserve support and assistance to help cope with the often devastating consequences of crime;

Whereas, since Congress adopted the first resolution designating Crime Victims Week in 1985, communities across the United States have joined Congress and the Department of Justice in commemorating National Crime Victims' Rights Week to celebrate a shared vision of a comprehensive and collaborative response that identifies and addresses the many needs of crime victims and survivors and the families of those victims and survivors;

Whereas the Senate applauds the work of crime victims advocates to ensure that all crime victims and survivors, and the families of those victims and survivors, are—

(1) treated with dignity, fairness, and respect;

(2) offered support and services, regardless of whether the victims and survivors report crimes committed against them; and

(3) recognized as key participants within the criminal, juvenile, Federal, and Tribal justice systems in the United States when the victims and survivors report crimes; and

Whereas the Senate recognizes and appreciate the continued importance of—

(1) promoting the rights of, and services for, crime victims and survivors; and

(2) honoring crime victims and survivors, and the individuals who provide services for those victims and survivors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports—

(A) the designation of the week of April 18 through April 24, 2021, as National Crime Victims' Rights Week; and

(B) the theme of National Crime Victims' Rights Week 2021, ''Support Victims. Build Trust. Engage Communities.'', which emphasizes the importance of leveraging community support to help crime victims and survivors;

(2) recognizes that crime victims and survivors, and the families of those victims and survivors, should be treated with dignity, fairness, and respect;

(3) applauds the work carried out by thousands of victim assistance organizations and agencies that serve crime survivors at the local, State, Federal, and Tribal levels;

(4) remains committed to funding programs authorized by the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101 et seq.) and the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291 et seq.), among other Federal programs, which help thousands of public, community-based, and Tribal victim and survivor assistance organizations and agencies that provide essential, and often life-saving, services to millions of crime victims throughout the United States; and

(5) encourages the observance of the 40th anniversary of National Crime Victims' Rights Week with appropriate public awareness, education, and outreach activities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I have 9 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 Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

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 Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 11, 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 Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND IRS OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 11, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PROMOTING MINORITY HEALTH AWARENESS AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL MINORITY HEALTH MONTH IN APRIL 2021

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, if I could say, this is kind of like the old days, with you up there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 205, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 205) promoting minority health awareness and supporting the goals and ideals of National Minority Health Month in April 2021, which include bringing attention to the health disparities faced by minority populations of the United States such as American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If there is no further debate, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that 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 preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF APRIL 18 THROUGH APRIL 24, 2021, AS NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 206, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 206) supporting the designation of the week of April 18 through April 24, 2021, as National Crime Victims' Rights Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 2021.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 12; 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; further, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the motion to discharge the nomination of Chiquita Brooks-LaSure to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services from the Finance Committee; that at 12 noon all time be considered expired and the Senate vote on the motion to discharge the Brooks-LaSure nomination; that the cloture motions filed during yesterday's session of the Senate ripen following disposition of the motion to discharge; further, that if cloture is invoked on Executive Calendar No. 108, Ronald Stroman, all postcloture time be considered expired at 3:30 p.m.; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN. 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, following the remarks of Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

ALLIES AND PARTNERS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, Winston Churchill famously said: ''There is only one thing worse than fighting with allies, and that is fighting without them.''

Republicans and Democrats agree: Strong alliances and partnerships are key to the asymmetric advantage that the United States has over our strategic competitors.

Like every President before him, President Biden has rightly made America's alliances and partnerships a cornerstone of his administration. It is a national security policy.

Alliances and partnerships are not a substitute for a strong American military. A strong military is the foundation of our alliances. Military power creates leverage and credibility for our diplomats, and just as importantly, it creates a deterrent.

Real deterrence cannot be achieved unless it is credible, and it cannot be credible unless we properly fund our military and have our allies and partners with us. It has to be both. You can't have one or the other. Why? Because our partnerships are two-way streets. Alliances aren't just for show. They are not just empty statements that we are blindly sending money to support vague goals. These relationships are built on mutual interests. They benefit us just as much as they benefit other countries. Look at the billions of dollars that some of our allies have contributed to U.S. bases in their countries.

''National Defense Strategy''—this book is the one that was put together in 2018. It was put together by 12 people, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats, all experts in their field. In fact, one of them just this morning was in a committee hearing before our committee. This document has been our blueprint for a long period of time, so this is what we have, and this is what we feel is going to be something that will stay with us for a long time.

In this book, it states that—and I am quoting from it now—''mutually beneficial alliances and partnerships are

crucial to our strategy, providing a durable, asymmetric strategic advantage that no competitor or rival can match.'' But maintaining that asymmetrical advantage requires much more than simply saying nice things about our allies and partners.

The bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission report, written by six Democrats and six Republicans, makes this very clear. They talk about how ''these alliances and partnerships . . . have ultimately rested on a foundation of military strength.'' So when President Biden says that ''America's alliances are our greatest asset'' and then goes to underfund the military, it defies common sense. Underfunding the military threatens that very foundation that underwrites the effectiveness of our alliances and partnerships.

Let me explain a little bit of how it works. We will start with nuclear modernization.

The United States maintains a safe and effective nuclear arsenal to protect American families but also to protect our partners and allies. Our nuclear umbrella has three benefits.

First, it makes clear to China and Russia which countries stand with us. You know, they don't know otherwise, and they have a terrible practice of lying about which countries are with us or are with them. So this makes it very clear. It is on the dotted line.

Second, it has the benefit of giving those countries the security of relying on our deterrence rather than feeling like they have to develop their own nuclear weapons.

Thirdly, our umbrella of extended nuclear deterrence is a pillar of our goal of global nuclear nonproliferation. If we cut back our own nuclear deterrent and take away that umbrella, which is what would happen if we reduce our defense budget, it is likely that nuclear weapons will become more common, not less.

President Biden has said nuclear nonproliferation is one of his priorities. Do you see the disconnect here? That is why it is so concerning to me that some administration officials—now I am talking about the current administration—some of those officials are talking about drastically reducing our nuclear modernization efforts.

I am also concerned that some in the administration and in Congress are targeting our fifth-generation stealth air power. Don't get me wrong—the F–35 has had its problems. We all understand that. But it is the cornerstone of our ability to operate with allies and our partners.

The F–35 program—that is our program—has 21 allies and partners in it. For many, it is their main capability and will be their primary contribution to any kind of a high-end problem that should come forward. When we talk about cutting the program or moving away from it, their governments question our commitment. There is no substitute aircraft or capability for these countries. We want our allies and partners to fight along with us; there is no question about that.

Let's remember what happened. First of all, the F–35 is a fifth-generation vehicle, and we only had one other one, and that was the F–22. I remember so well, just a few years ago, at that time we were going to have 700 F–22 aircraft, but we only ended up with 187 of them because at the last minute, they were talking like they are talking today, a lot of people in the administration, saying maybe we don't need to have as many F–35s. Well, we absolutely do need to have them. We don't want to make the same mistake now that we made several years ago with the F–22.

Our combatant commanders have already told us that we will be outnumbered in terms of stealth fighters in the western Pacific by 2025, and it will be even worse if American F–35 cuts lead—because you know that other countries, like our allies in Australia and Japan, they would be cutting theirs if we cut ours.

That is just one of the many serious problems we have in the Indo-Pacific.

Our partners and allies are worried about U.S. force posture and our ability to deter and, if necessary, defeat China's use of military force. I heard that for myself way back in 2018 when I was in that area of the South China Sea. Many of our allies and partners in that region—they were clear. They saw firsthand how China was preparing to swiftly defeat our forces in the Pacific. They were trying to figure out how—if we would be there for them when that happened or if they would be needing to start cozying up to China. They are not going to sit around and wait for us to perform. They are going to have to know that we are going to be there for them.

Our competition out there in that area is clearly China. We know what they are doing, we know what their plans are, and we are concerned about it. Fortunately, our significant investment in the military under President Trump was an encouraging sign to our allies and partners. They were all very proud of us. But after watching China's Communist Party dismantle democracy in Hong Kong and commit genocide on the Uighurs in northwest China, our partners and allies in the Indo-Pacific are now worried that China will try to invade and annex Taiwan. How many years have we been talking about that? Now they are really concerned about it.

General McMaster testified that Taiwan is ''the most significant flashpoint that could lead to large scale war,'' saying that China would take military action against Taiwan as soon as 2022. The former and current commanders of INDOPACOM both emphasized the near-term threat. It is a real threat. It is out there.

This is the primary reason why the Armed Services Committee with overwhelmingly bipartisan support has put in place our Pacific Deterrent Initiative. We call it the PDI. The PDI is intended to bolster our degraded force posture in the Indo-Pacific to counter China's military buildup. We have to restore the favorable balance of power in the region where the problem is the most acute, and that is west of the international date line, where our partners and allies are most immediately threatened by Chinese aggression.

PDI is fundamentally about building basic infrastructure so that we can operate with our allies and partners. It will mean more distributed and smaller bases, maybe hardened communications, as well as increased and more realistic exercises with allies and partners.

If we want PDI to succeed, we need to resource it properly. Both Admirals Davidson and Aquilino told the Armed Services Committee that much just last week in a hearing we had in our committee.

After the hollow promises of the Obama administration to ''Pivot to the Pacific'' and after almost no change in the U.S. military posture in the region over the last two decades, our partners and allies in the Indo-Pacific are worried, and justly so. They want to see sustained investment matching sustained commitments, especially after President Trump rightfully pushed them to step up their own investments. They answered the call. But President Biden will create a credibility problem if we don't continue to invest as well. We want them to do that. This is the case. We are going to have to get this done.

Our INDOPACOM allies and partners throughout that region are watching closely to see what we do with the defense budget top line and with PDI. What they see is that President Biden's defense budget does not even keep up with inflation. We are talking about the defense budget that he came out with just a couple of weeks ago. That actually had a reduction. It didn't even beat inflation at that time and didn't come close to what was really recommended by this document that we are supposed to be using—it is a bipartisan document—let alone matching the real growth we need to implement the National Defense Strategy.

So over in Europe, Biden proclaimed, ''America is back,'' and that sounds good, claiming a reversal from the previous administration. It is just not true. Again, actions are not matching words. Rhetoric without resources will devastate our credibility and undermine our alliances here too.

If defense cuts impact the European Deterrence Initiative, it will serve to weaken our European posture and make our allies and partners more susceptible to Russian aggression. Without a strong defense budget, the Biden administration's goal and pledge to support NATO and deter Russia will ring hollow for our European allies and partners.

Sharing the burden is a key benefit of our international alliances and partnerships, but our NATO alliances

might see the administration's military reductions as a signal that they no longer need to meet their commitments to spend 2 percent of their GDP. Now, remember when the previous President, President Trump, talked to our allies to start bellying up and participating. NATO—those nations are our friends, but they are not coming to the level that they are going to have to do to carry their end of it.

Don't forget—whether we are facing Russia, China, or other adversaries in other parts of the world, operating jointly with our allies and partners is a core part of our ability to deter conflict in multiple theaters, but it requires investment.

Take the refueling support we provided for our French allies in Mali—6 million pounds of fuel to allow the French to take on that critical counterterrorism mission and support their troops on the ground. It would have cost us billions to do this mission by ourselves. That is why we need the allies. The same goes for Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen, and elsewhere. A good portion of our defense budget pays for our military to support our allies and partners so that we don't have to send our own troops over there and our allies can do it for us. It gives us insight into its operations.

So do you see what would happen if our military's ability to posture forward and stay ready is choked by inadequate defense spending? Our allies and partners would suffer, not improve, and the United States would end up spending more money for less security. This goes directly against the Biden administration's stated goals.

Thinking that alliances and partnerships can substitute for U.S. military capability and capacity is wishful thinking. It is illogical. That strategy will harm our national security. As former Defense Secretary Jim Mattis said, ''Throughout history, we see nations with allies thrive and nations without allies wither.'' If we want to win against our strategic competitors, it will take both a strong, fully resourced military, as well as strong alliances and partnerships. Let's be clear. One is not an alternative for the other. You got to have both.

So it is clear then that we need our allies. So how do we maintain this mutual relationship with robust defense spending of 3 to 5 percent real growth? That is what it calls for right here. This year, we should have a 3- to 5-percent increase, and the President's budget actually came out with a net decrease. That is why this whole thing is so important.

Just this morning, we had a hearing, and we had one of the authors of this book. I asked him the same question. I said: This was put together back in 2018. Is it still accurate today? He said: Yes, it is. And it doesn't even increase enough to keep up with inflation.

So Eric Edelman—he is one of the cosponsors of the NDS that we are referring to here that has been our blueprint for 5 years now. The report said it best in an article this week by Eric Edelman. He said in this article:

[I]t remains a fact that allies and adversaries will see the U.S. commitment to defense as a crucial benchmark for assessing U.S. willingness and ability to succeed at long-term competition with its authoritarian adversaries.

He continued, and this is Eric Edelman:

A tough declaratory policy without adequate military means to reinforce it is a recipe for disaster, particularly in the Indo-Pacific region.

So I would just say this: President Biden walks the walk, but when it comes to supporting our allies, they don't do it, and I and many others know that it is meaningless without a strong defense budget to back it up.

And we need a higher topline. We need a higher topline. It is going to have to be somewhere in the range that was put together by a group of Democrats and Republicans that outlined what we have to do for America to survive. So we need a higher topline, and we are going to end up getting a higher topline.

With that, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:22 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 12, 2021, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 11, 2021:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CYNTHIA MINETTE MARTEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ANDREA JOAN PALM, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.