



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 2021

No. 50

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

Eternal and loving God, we pray Your blessing on us this day. In our duties, give us courage to press on with hearts open to emulating the forbearance and sacrifice You have demonstrated in Your steadfast love for us and for this world.

As brothers and sisters of Your creation, we pray the faith to leave behind all that has kept us from living into this Your gracious plan. And as we strain toward what is ahead, toward the goal of a higher calling, we pray Your favor.

May all who trust in You receive this Your benediction on today's journey:

May the raindrops fall lightly on your brow.

May the soft winds freshen your spirit.

May the sunshine brighten your heart.

May the burdens of the day rest lightly upon you.

And may God enfold you in the mantle of His love.

We offer ourselves to You, praying in the strength of Your name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MRVAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MRVAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

GUARANTEE WOMEN EQUALITY

(Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I stand in favor of removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, and I ask the following question: What do the following women have in common?

Teacher Melissa Falkowski, who saved 19 children during the massacre at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School;

Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH, who lost both her legs in a combat mission in Iraq;

Chemist Alice Ball, who revolutionized the treatment for leprosy;

Joy Harjo, who was the first Native American poet laureate;

Dolores Huerta, civil rights activist;

The nearly 9 out of 10 nurses and two-thirds of the workers at grocery store checkouts and fast-food counters who are women.

What do they have in common? No matter the sacrifice or contribution to society, if you are a woman or a girl in the United States of America, you are not guaranteed equality under the law.

After 245 years since the birth of our Nation, it is time to pass the equal rights amendment.

REDEVELOPING ABANDONED MINE LAND

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Mr. MATT CARTWRIGHT, once again as cosponsor on the RECLAIM Act. This bipartisan legislation focuses on reauthorizing the abandoned mine land fund, or the AML fund.

My district, Pennsylvania 15, has the most abandoned coal mines in the country, and reauthorizing the AML fund will provide opportunities and funding to clean up the abandoned land, not just in my district, but across the Nation.

Coal mining built America. It powered us onto the world's stage. It helped us win two world wars and brought our Nation into the modern era.

The AML is set to expire this year. While we continue to make progress on environmental restoration, reauthorizing the fund is crucial to support clean-up efforts and spur economic development.

Madam Speaker, Congress has a great opportunity to do right by Pennsylvania and other great coal mining States by reauthorizing the abandoned mine land fund, which is not funded by tax dollars but by a fee that has been placed on every ton of coal mined since 1977. Those moneys are sitting there in the Federal Treasury, and we need to reauthorize that abandoned mine land fund to further the redevelopment of the scars of the water and the land in those abandoned lands.

ENSURING EQUALITY FOR WOMEN

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, every single constitution in the world

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1417

drafted since 1950 has the equivalent of the equal rights amendment, except the United States of America.

Though some might say otherwise, it is clear that women need the equal rights amendment, and we need it now. We need the ERA to strengthen the movement women have been building to achieve paycheck fairness and paid family leave, to prevent discrimination against women who are pregnant in the workplace, and to fight for comprehensive reproductive health for all women and girls.

Today, I will vote for the equal rights amendment to assure that my granddaughters, that women and girls throughout the world and throughout the country, are not only strong, powerful, and resilient, but also equal here in the United States under the Constitution.

HONORING CONNIE LAWSON

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

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor Indiana Secretary of State Connie Lawson.

Since 2012, Connie has overseen Indiana's elections and modernized how Hoosiers and businesses interact with the State. Connie championed comprehensive election reforms that included election security and expanded our voting access for Hoosiers.

Connie is a fierce advocate for Hoosiers to be financially literate and has advocated high schools offer a free financial class to all students.

Connie modernized State government departments by implementing an efficient one-stop portal for businesses to register, file, report, and make payments to State agencies.

Prior to being secretary of state, Connie served 16 years in the Indiana State Senate and, before that, was clerk of the Hendricks County Circuit Court.

I congratulate Connie on her retirement. On behalf of all Hoosiers, we will miss your 33 years of dedicated public service.

SUPPORTING IMMIGRANT FARMWORKERS

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of our Nation's immigrants, the farmworkers who toil in our fields to feed us, and our Dreamers, the exceptional young people who are the promise and future of America.

Our immigration laws should reflect our shared values as a Nation, especially the importance of keeping families and communities together.

In my district in Ventura County, California, agriculture is a cornerstone of our regional economy. Immigrant farmworkers are essential to putting food on America's table.

Because of the essential role farmworkers play in our economy and our communities, I support the creation of an earned pathway to citizenship.

I also stand with our Dreamers, many of whom have known no other home than the United States. Dreamers are the embodiment of the American Dream. Dreamers represent the very best of our country, and they are realizing their fullest potential. Their success is America's success.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Farm Workforce Modernization Act and the American Dream and Promise Act.

HONORING JOEL BENSON

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

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor an august leader within my hometown community in western North Carolina, a proven entrepreneur and a great business leader who is about to open a second quick-service restaurant in my district, which will employ over 100 people.

Not only will this restaurant employ 100 people, this restaurant will also feed 100 families. This restaurant will help house 100 families.

Not only will these employees get to have the honor of being able to earn a living to provide for their families, but they will also be under the careful tutelage of their new employer, Joel Benson, who everyone in my community will recognize is one of the most influential people in my district. Joel is excellent at maximizing the potential in everyone in his care and in his sphere of influence.

Today, I rise to honor a great mentor of mine and a great business leader who is providing jobs and a strong economy to North Carolina, Joel Benson.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. Benson for his service to our community.

HONORING WOMEN OF STEEL

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

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in observance of Women's History Month to honor Women of Steel, an advocacy-arm of the United Steelworkers.

Throughout the years, women from diverse backgrounds have played an instrumental role in paving the way for women in the steel industry.

Among these remarkable leaders was Ola Kennedy, a resident of Gary, Indiana, who worked for 28 years at Hammond Valve. A devoted community leader, Ola was involved in many union and civic organizations and was one of the founding members of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists.

I also want to celebrate Roberta Wood who, along with Ola, cofounded

the steelworker women's caucus in the Chicago-Gary district of the Steelworkers union. In 1976, Roberta was elected the first female member of the USWA Local 65's executive board and is currently a member of the Steelworkers Organization of Active Retirees.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to celebrate Women's History Month and recognize the role Women of Steel have played to organize, unionize, rally, and inspire workers to fight for justice. These extraordinary women continue to be fearless, strong, and vocal advocates for more women in leadership and carry on the march to fight for full gender equality in the workplace. I commend these women.

PROTECTING SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say how honored I am to be able to file two amendments to the critical reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

My first amendment aims to protect the safety and privacy of survivors by creating a statutory mandate that a victim's safety should be central to housing decisions made by covered housing providers. This amendment will ensure that housing providers do not evict survivors, keep their information confidential, and prioritize their safety when considering admissions, assistance, transfers, and more.

My second amendment is a direct response to an issue in my home State of North Carolina. Sexual assault nurse examiners, or SANE nurses, play a critical role in providing medical care to sexual assault survivors and collecting evidence for criminal prosecution.

Unfortunately, in North Carolina, SANE nurses can be difficult to locate, and some survivors travel to multiple hospitals and have to wait hours to see a SANE nurse. My amendment allows certain grants in the bill to be used to create databases.

□ 1015

ST. PATRICK'S DAY IN SAVANNAH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize St. Patrick's Day in Savannah, Georgia.

The first St. Patrick's Day parade in Savannah began in 1824, and it is now a parade that gathers hundreds of thousands of visitors from all over the world.

The second-largest St. Patrick's Day in the United States is important for everyone in Savannah, but it is especially important for the Savannah

Irish community. Savannah has a historically large Irish community that is integral to the fabric of the city, and the St. Patrick's Day parade is the direct result of this impact.

Unfortunately, the parade and election of the grand marshal was canceled this year due to the pandemic. However, it is important that we continue to celebrate and honor the heritage and culture of the Irish. I look forward to continuing this special tradition and celebrating St. Patrick's Day in Savannah with everyone once the pandemic ends.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, today, we will vote to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, one of the most important bills in history to protect women and girls.

This photograph is of then-Senator Joe Biden, myself, and other women leaders when we introduced this important bill in 1994. It is still important. We need to reauthorize it. There is no doubt he will sign it into law.

We live in a world where 1 in 4 women have experienced sexual violence. Reauthorizing VAWA is about creating a future where all those experiencing dating and gender-based violence feel supported to seek help, and where survivors are given the tools they need to heal. It is about ensuring a better, safer future for the next generation. I urge a "yes" vote by all of my colleagues.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

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

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the equal rights amendment.

From the beginning, gender equality was left out of the Constitution. Generations of women and LGBTQ-plus Americans lived and died without ever having the equal rights and dignity that they deserve under the law.

We know that the ERA is necessary by the words of its opponents, including the late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, who argued that the Constitution does not prohibit discrimination based on sex. We can change that.

Madam Speaker, 38 States have ratified the ERA. The only hurdle that remains is the arbitrary deadline set by Congress, a deadline that passed before I was born, but a deadline that never stopped the pursuit of justice. With every vote we take in this Chamber, we have the chance to correct past mistakes and repeal past wrongs. That is what we will do again today.

Madam Speaker, our march for equal rights is not done. It will not stop, and it does not expire.

REMOVING THE DEADLINE FOR THE RATIFICATION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 17

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any time limit contained in House Joint Resolution 208, 92d Congress, as agreed to in the Senate on March 22, 1972, the article of amendment proposed to the States in that joint resolution shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the United States Constitution whenever ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 17.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, H.J. Res. 17 is long-overdue legislation to ensure that the equal rights amendment can finally become the 28th Amendment to the United States Constitution. The House passed identical legislation last Congress on a bipartisan basis, and I hope it will do so again today.

Madam Speaker, in 1923, Alice Paul first introduced an amendment to the Constitution to guarantee full equal protection for women. The text of the amendment is simple and clear: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

That amendment passed with overwhelming bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate in 1972.

Unfortunately, it fell just short of being ratified by the requisite number of States before the arbitrary deadline

imposed by Congress ran out in 1982. In the 40 years since, we have made great strides in this country to ensure equality. Women have secured the right to vote, protection against workplace discrimination, and through case law decided under the 14th Amendment, many other critical protections denied them for too long on the basis of sex.

Without the ERA, millions of women have still had to march in support of their rights, their healthcare, their reproductive freedom and abortion access, and their dignity as equal citizens. Through the Me Too movement, we have had long-overdue, and sometimes painful, conversations about the violence and harassment that women and others experience—whether in the workplace, at homes, or in schools and universities.

But still, to this day, the Constitution does not explicitly recognize and guarantee that no one can be denied equal protection of the laws on the basis of sex. The ERA would enshrine those principles and take the final, critical step of ensuring that laws disadvantaging women and gender minorities are subject to the most rigorous form of scrutiny.

Last year, Virginia became the 38th and last necessary State to ratify the ERA, and, today, in passing H.J. Res. 17, we will be one step closer to enshrining it into law. This resolution removes a previous deadline Congress set in the amendment's proposing clause for ratifying the ERA, and will, therefore, ensure that recent ratifications by Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia are given full effect.

We are on the brink of making history, and no deadline should stand in the way. The Constitution itself places no deadlines on the process for ratifying amendments. Congress, just as clearly, has the authority to extend or remove any deadlines that it previously chose to set in the first place.

The recent ruling by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia refusing to recognize the recent State ratifications makes it even more imperative that Congress act now in removing this deadline. We must make it absolutely clear that Congress does not want language put in the proposing clause of a resolution 40 years ago to stand in the way of full equality now.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative SPEIER for introducing this resolution, which takes that important step. This resolution will ensure, at long last, that the equal rights amendment can take its rightful place as part of our Nation's Constitution.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

H.J. Res. 17 is not a resolution to revive the equal rights amendment; it is

a messaging vehicle. That is why Democrats bypassed the Committee on the Judiciary and brought this resolution directly to the floor, a common theme for this majority. There was no process for this resolution, a resolution that Democrats claim is a priority. We are here today for a headline so the Democrats can say they supported the ERA when it was in the House.

But the fact is, Madam Speaker, that men and women in the United States are already equal under law. The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution require as much, guaranteeing equal protection for all under the laws of this country. To me, the ERA is unnecessary, redundant, and divisive. The only thing it will do is empower the far-left special interest groups and lead to activist litigation.

Just last year, the head of Planned Parenthood declared: "There is no equal rights for women without access to abortion, plain and simple."

Or according to NARAL Pro-Choice America: "With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion."

Madam Speaker, we should take them at their word.

For years, groups like Planned Parenthood and others have advocated for adoption of the ERA so they can use it to pursue their pro-abortion agendas. If the ERA became law, it would allow these organizations to advance the radical policies through the courts without being in full view of the American people. These groups have hijacked the ERA and are seeking to use it as a tool to challenge States' pro-life laws.

But the reality is that this resolution is unconstitutional. Article V of the Constitution empowers Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution by a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate. After Congress proposes an amendment, the amendment is sent to the States for ratification. Three-fourths of the States must ratify the amendment in order for it to become effective.

The equal rights amendment was proposed in 1972. The amendment set an explicit deadline. It gave the States 7 years, until 1979, for ratification. Setting a deadline for ratification is part of Congress' authority to determine the mode of ratification under Article V.

In 1920, the Supreme Court held in *Dillon v. Gloss* that there was no doubt that Congress can set a date for ratifying an amendment. The deadline to ratify the ERA has long since passed, and the amendment fell short of the required number of States. When proposing a constitutional amendment, the deadline for ratification is just as important as the substance.

The District Court for D.C., less than 2 weeks ago, denied an effort by Virginia, Nevada, and Illinois to force the adoption of the ERA, despite the 1979 deadline. In denying the effort of those States, the courts said that a deadline for ratification still receives the assent

of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, and putting it in the resolving clause does not evade Article V's procedural requirements in any way.

Because setting a deadline takes a two-thirds vote of Congress, it would be absurd to say that changing that deadline requires anything less. If a simple majority of Congress could alter a proposed amendment after it has been sent to the States, the two-thirds requirement of Article V would be meaningless.

A partisan majority cannot rewrite a proposed amendment at will after there has been an agreement in Congress. However, that is just what H.J. Res. 17 and the Democrats propose to do.

The ERA expired in 1979, and this joint resolution is a legal fiction advanced for political purposes.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to oppose this resolution.

□ 1030

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman errs, the deadline for ratification is not part of the amendment, it is part of the resolution proposing the amendment. And if Congress can propose a deadline, it can revoke that proposal since it is not part of the amendment at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, this is a glorious day for women in America. With the passage of the ERA and the Violence Against Women Act, we are making great strides forward.

This particular resolution does one thing. We want in the Constitution, plain and simple.

Antonin Scalia, the great jurist, said once: Does the Constitution require discrimination based on sex? The answer is no.

But if the question is: Does the Constitution prohibit discrimination based on sex?

The answer is also no.

That should send a chilling feeling in each of us that in the Constitution of the United States women are not protected.

In fact, we are the only country with a written Constitution that does not prohibit discrimination based on sex. Shame on us.

There can be no expiration date on equality. This is a bipartisan bill. We are proud to bring it to the floor.

My colleagues across the aisle may say we don't need the ERA, women are already equal under the law, that it is redundant.

Well, tell that to Christy Brzonkala, who was raped by two football players at Virginia Tech. She sought justice under VAWA, but the Supreme Court struck down the civil suit provision, claiming Congress lacked the power to pass it.

Or Tracy Rexroat, whose starting salary at the Arizona Department of Education was \$17,000 less than her colleague. They based the salaries on

what their prior salary was from whatever job they came, so she receives \$17,000 less than her colleague. She too filed an action under the Equal Pay Act, and the courts held that there was some reasonable expectation.

Well, there is nothing reasonable about that. And until we have the ERA in the Constitution that provides the same level of scrutiny as race discrimination, this will continue to be a problem.

Or ask Jessica Gonzales if she thinks it is redundant. Jessica's estranged husband kidnapped and murdered their three young daughters after the police refused to enforce a restraining order.

If we had the ERA, these cases would have had different outcomes. The ERA will create stronger legal recourse against sex discrimination, it will empower Congress to better enforce and enact laws protecting women, and it will confirm the rightful place of gender equality in the Constitution where it belongs.

I believe most of us recognize that this is the right thing to do. The ERA is about building an America that we want. It is about forming a more perfect union, it is about equality, survival, dignity, and respect.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, some lawmakers continue to ignore, trivialize, or deny the fact that abortion activists plan to aggressively use the Federal ERA—as they have used State ERAs—in a litigation strategy designed to overturn pro-life laws and policies, including restrictions supported by huge majorities of Americans.

As the Marist Poll found recently in January: Seven in 10 Americans, including nearly half who identify as pro-choice, want significant restrictions on abortions. While I fundamentally disagree with abortion activists who refuse to recognize an unborn child's inherent dignity, worth and value, many on both sides now agree that how the ERA is written will be used in court to massively promote abortion.

NARAL Pro-Choice America said the ERA would "reinforce the constitutional right to abortion" and "require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws."

The National Organization for Women said: "An ERA—properly interpreted—could negate the hundreds of laws that have been passed restricting access to abortion. . . ."

Those laws include the Hyde amendment, waiting periods, parental involvement statutes, women's right-to-know laws, conscience rights, and late term abortion ban, like the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act.

By now, my colleagues know that the Supreme Court of New Mexico ruled that the State was required—required to fund abortion, based solely on the State ERA.

In like manner, the Supreme Court of Connecticut invalidated its State ban on abortion funding based on its ERA.

Ensuring equal rights for women and serious protections against violence and exploitation requires laws, policies, and spending priorities to achieve those noble and necessary goals, without—I say again, without putting unborn baby girls and boys at risk of death.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am glad the gentleman recognizes that equality includes the right of each woman and man to make their own decision about their reproductive choices. There can be no equality of the sexes when one class of people is denied the ability to control their own bodies.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate this Women's History Month by reflecting on the achievement of so many women who have blazed a trail for the generations that followed them; women who didn't listen when they were told that they couldn't, they shouldn't, or that they didn't belong.

American women have fought for the right to vote, the right to equal education, the right to reproductive healthcare, and the right to financially provide for our families and be compensated the same as men. And we will continue these fights until our Constitution declares that women are equal in the eyes of the law.

It is time for full constitutional equality. The American people overwhelmingly support this bipartisan legislation. I am proud to vote for it again today in honor of the generations of women that have made strides toward equality. I know that we will soon achieve it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, I think it is a good discussion to have, but I would suggest to my colleagues from the other side, if they do believe this issue is still valid and necessary, to actually restart this process from the beginning, because we are wasting our time right here. A 1972 amendment cannot be ratified, it doesn't exist. It has expired. It is unconstitutional. A lot of things have changed.

We can debate if it is necessary or not, but if we want to have a real debate, we need to restart this from the beginning and not waste time debating something that doesn't exist. So I would ask not to support this amendment, and it is unconstitutional.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his time, and I want to thank Mrs. MALONEY and Ms. SPEIER for their long work on this, and the many women before them who have worked hard on this effort.

Congress created the limitation on years on the passage of the ERA, and

Congress can change it, and Congress should change it.

I am the product of the work of a woman, my mother, and her mother produced her. We should not forget women and their commitment and invaluable contributions at our birth.

Every woman should have the same rights as a man. They don't get paid the same, they are discriminated in the workplace, they are harassed, they are abused. They should have equal rights. That has not occurred in America, and it won't happen until we pass this bill.

I favor the passage and I appreciate the spirit in which it is offered.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. This push to remove the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment is an unnecessary and unconstitutional power-grab.

This bill is unconstitutional. Congress set a deadline for the ERA; it was 1979. With only 35 of the 38 States needed for ratification at the time, Congress extended the deadline to 1982, but no other States joined in, ending the ratification process for the equal rights amendment.

Even the late Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said that the deadline for the ERA ratification had long passed. She said: "I would like to see a new beginning. I'd like it to start over. There's too much controversy about latecomers—Virginia, long after the deadline passed. Plus, a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So, if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that said, 'We've changed our minds?'" If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to ratify the ERA, they have to start over.

Women also already have equal rights under the law. In decision after decision, the United States Supreme Court has underscored that the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution gives women equal rights and prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, rendering, I believe, the ERA unnecessary.

Finally, if ratified, the ERA would be used to codify the right to abortion, undoing pro-life protections, and forcing taxpayers to fund abortions.

The New Mexico Supreme Court ruled that their State's ERA provision required the State to fund abortions. Numerous pro-abortion groups have already made the case for ratifying the ERA on the basis of expanding their abortion agenda. Just listen to the words of the organizations pushing this legislation themselves.

The National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League, NARAL, has claimed that, "With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion."

Planned Parenthood and the Women's Law Project has said that State bans and government funding of elec-

tive abortions are "contrary to a modern understanding of the ERA."

The National Organization for Women has said, "An ERA—properly interpreted—could negate the hundreds of laws that have been passed restricting access to abortion care and contraception."

With this unconstitutional bill, my colleagues across the aisle are hiding behind the rhetoric of equality for women to eliminate any and all protections for unborn babies, half of which would be girls, then women, if given the chance to live.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

□ 1045

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee will control the time.

Mr. COHEN. Unlike Alexander Haig, I am only here temporarily.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is from the East Side and who, as chairperson, brought us the great hearing last year on the ERA.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, there is no time limit on equality. The equal rights amendment passed the needed 38 States, including the great State of New York. Enough is enough. It is long past time for women to be in the Constitution.

We may not always be able to control, nor should women's rights be dependent upon who controls State governments, who is in the White House or Congress, or who sits on the Supreme Court.

Our rights shouldn't be determined by these types of things. It should be in the document, the document they interpret and that they are bound by.

It is long past time to spell out equality in our Constitution with the ERA.

Unfortunately, we are seeing the effects of gender inequality acutely during this pandemic. An estimated 1 million more women than men have lost their jobs, and a disproportionate number of those suffering are Black women and Latinas.

We need to pass it. It is urgently needed. Let's just imagine if the ERA had been ratified in the 1970s, as it should have been.

Would we have needed today a dramatic Me Too, Time's Up movement with hundreds of thousands of women having to tell their often painful personal stories in order to get justice?

Or would the Violence Against Women Act and other legislation addressing sexual assault have been passed, if it had been passed much sooner, without the risk of a Supreme Court ruling limiting a woman's right to sue? Women could sue directly if they were in the Constitution.

We have the opportunity to make equal rights under the law a reality for our mothers, our daughters, our granddaughters, and ourselves. We must recognize that there is no time limit on equality and vote to pass today's resolution now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentlewoman please pull her mask up.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the chairman of the committee, that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will control the balance of the time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, discrimination against women is a part of America's history, but it should not be our future. That is why we need the equal rights amendment.

It was not an accident that women were left out of the Constitution. The Founders very much believed us to be unequal and, as such, we could not own property, vote, hold certain jobs, or even serve on a jury.

The impacts of that discrimination are still felt today. Women are paid less than men and still face discrimination for being pregnant.

The Founders were wrong, and this is our chance to fix it by doing what they refused to do: assert in the Constitution that women, too, have rights.

The ERA will not end discrimination, but it will empower us to fight it in court. Already, 38 States have ratified this amendment, which satisfies the requirements in the Constitution. The vast majority of Americans support it.

Congress set a deadline for ratification, which means we can repeal it. It is time to affirm that there is no expiration date on equality.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the language of the equal rights amendment is simple, but don't be deceived by its simple language.

The reviving of the deadline and ratifying of this amendment would destroy all distinctions between men and women, enshrine abortion, and empower the woke feminist mob.

The equal rights amendment is dead and should remain dead. The States and Congress missed the deadline to have the amendment passed in 1979. The Trump Department of Justice issued a legal opinion in January that the deadline for the ERA has already passed, by any legal measure.

The ERA would be a new constitutional right guaranteeing abortion on demand. Have we not murdered enough people in the womb in this country, over 62 million?

Guaranteeing abortion on demand is completely wrong. It is not a constitutional right. As a matter of fact, the person in the womb should have the constitutional right. It is not a "my body, my choice" issue because the person in the womb is not the same body as the woman.

Also, NARAL Pro-Choice America claims: "With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion."

If anything, we should be guaranteeing a constitutional right to people in the womb. They should have the constitutional right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let's carry on. VAWA, Violence Against Women Act. Democrats have hijacked a program designed to help marginalized women and have turned it into a political weapon that erases gender and destroys all religious freedom.

On the wall right here, it says: In God We Trust. God states that He created male and female, not a plethora of genders that anyone can choose from.

They want to let men calling themselves women sleep with women in domestic abuse shelters. The Democrats will not be satisfied until every battered woman is endangered so long as their sexual orientation and gender identity ideology advances.

That is not science. Science says that there are only two genders, male and female, according to the chromosomes.

Make no mistake about it, Democrats want to destroy our country. They want to close every church and nonprofit that doesn't capitulate to their oppressive agenda. Democrats want to put domestic violence abusers in the same room as their victims. Democrats want to dissolve all sex-based protection for women and girls through the relentless onslaught of gender identity.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, every amendment since the 22nd, except for the 27th, has had a deadline for ratification inserted in the resolution. But if you look at the Constitution, Madam Speaker, you won't find the deadline. That is because the deadline is part of the congressional resolution proposing the amendment, not part of the amendment itself.

What Congress can propose, Congress can alter, which is all we are proposing to do today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is wonderful to see Members of Congress wearing white today to observe the fact that we are making history by passing legislation about equality in our country.

I thank Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER for her relentless championing of this equal rights amendment in terms of the date that the distinguished chair of the Judiciary Committee referenced. I also thank CAROLYN MALONEY for her long-term advo-

cacy of the equal rights amendment. I thank Chairman NADLER for enabling us to have this legislation on the floor today and for his leadership on this issue over time.

Madam Speaker, 100 years ago, in 1921, a solemn promise was made to the women of our country, one honoring our most fundamental truth as a nation, as the equal rights amendment was first introduced. When it was first introduced, it said: "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

Simple, clear, fair, and just. Yet, a century later, that promise remains unfulfilled. The equal rights amendment still has not been enshrined in the Constitution, and American women still face inequality under the law and, therefore, in their lives.

In recent years, American women have renewed the legal fight for the equal rights amendment. Women of all backgrounds—students, mothers, seniors, communities of color, indigenous women, et cetera—have taken up the mantle of the suffragists before them, standing on suffragists' shoulders as they marched, mobilized, protested, and picketed for their rights. Because of their courage and commitment, 38 States have now ratified the equal rights amendment.

But one final barrier remains: removing the artificial, arbitrary time limit for ratification. As the distinguished chairman pointed out, that deadline timetable is not in the Constitution. Until we remove that arbitrary time limit, the ERA cannot become part of our Constitution.

Last year, the House passed legislation to remove this arbitrary time limit, but unfortunately, the Senate failed to do so. So, today, the House will, once again, pass this legislation and send it to the Senate for a vote. We are proud to be doing it in Women's History Month.

We salute again Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, our champion on the legislation on the floor today, and Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY, who has been our lead sponsor of the ERA for 25 years now.

Madam Speaker, I thank Members from both sides of the aisle, including cosponsor Representative TOM REED from New York, for their bipartisan support in the Congress, which reflects the overwhelming bipartisan support in the country. A full 94 percent of the public supports the equal rights amendment, including 99 percent, nearly unanimous support, among millennials and Generation Z.

Let us not forget that, in 1972, the equal rights amendment was passed with bipartisan supermajorities in both Chambers of Congress, and it enjoyed the strong support of President Nixon, who wrote in 1968 that "the task of achieving constitutional equality between the sexes is still not completed" and pointed out that all Republican National Conventions since 1940 have

supported the longtime movement for equality.

There is no reason why today, after 80 years of Republican support, the ERA should not have full bipartisan support in the Congress. The resolution on the floor today will pave the way to passage of the equal rights amendment, which is one of the most important steps that we can take to affirm and ensure women's equality in America.

The text of the equal rights amendment states: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

"On account of sex" recalls to mind the beautiful documentary about Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

Passing the equal rights amendment will create essential avenues for legal recourse for people who face discrimination under the laws on the basis of sex. It will ensure that the Supreme Court applies the same standard of review for sex discrimination cases as it applies to cases of discrimination based on race and national origin. It will help Congress pass laws for better legal protections against injustice, including those related to sexual assault, domestic violence, and paycheck unfairness. It will confirm the rightful place of gender equality in all aspects of life.

There are some who say that the equal rights amendment is not needed. To them, I quote the late Justice Antonin Scalia, who said: "Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It does not."

These are not just words. This is the daily reality for America's women who face inequality and injustice in so many arenas of life, from a massive wage gap, to pregnancy discrimination, to sexual harassment in the workplace, to economic disparities that have worsened during coronavirus.

□ 1100

Passing this resolution, and then the ERA, will not only help women, but by unleashing the full economic potential of women, it will help families and boost our economy, all while advancing justice and equality in America for everyone.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote on this strong step toward equality for women, progress for families, and a stronger America—affirming the truth, Madam Speaker, that you have espoused that when women succeed, America succeeds.

I commend the leadership on this issue, the distinguished chairman, and the sponsors of the resolution, JACKIE SPEIER and CAROLYN MALONEY.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH) to control the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Georgia will control the time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the achievements women have made and reaffirm that we are already equal under current law.

Women represent 51 percent of the population, comprise over half of college students, make up the majority of medical and law school students, and run 12.3 million women-owned businesses while generating \$1.8 trillion each year.

Little girls can be whatever they want to be, whether that is an astronaut, a doctor, a full-time mom working at home, or a Member of Congress.

The ERA would not add to the rights already guaranteed by the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, but it could jeopardize them.

How? Two ways.

First, by making it discriminatory to offer benefits to women not offered to men; women's scholarships, women's colleges, job protection for pregnant women, and safe spaces may all be on the chopping block.

When the equal rights amendment was first proposed a century ago, many women's rights advocates recognized the negative ramifications it would bring. In fact, future First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt expressed concerns that legislation protecting women in the workplace could be eliminated should the ERA become part of the U.S. Constitution.

Secondly, because the 1972 definition of sex as male and female is no longer accepted by many today and, instead, will require new protections for sexual orientation and gender identity. This is a path that has already proven to be a threat to women's privacy, safety, and equality. Don't take it from me. Talk to the nine women in California who were sexually harassed in a women's shelter by a biological male identifying as a woman.

The equal rights amendment would not only codify inequality for women, but also destroy the rights of the unborn. The ERA advocates have been unequivocal about their support for abortion and for using the ERA to overturn pro-life laws.

Courts have already used State versions of the ERA to force taxpayers to fund abortions. A Federal ERA would threaten State pro-life laws, Federal protections like the Hyde amendment, and conscience protections for American medical professionals who may otherwise be forced to perform an abortion.

Fortunately, the time limit to pass the ERA expired decades ago, and there is agreement that Congress cannot go back and remove a deadline from a previous constitutional amendment initiative. For example, the Supreme Court has already recognized that the 1972 ERA expired, and the Department of Justice issued a ruling saying: "Congress may not revive a proposed amendment after a deadline, for its ratification has expired."

Just over a week ago, a Federal district court ruled that the deadline to

ratify the ERA "expired long ago." And the recent ratifications of the amendment arrived "too late to count."

Pretending we can remove the deadline for passage is both futile and deceptive. The ERA is a threat to the historical strides women have made. It will eradicate State and Federal pro-life laws and policies, and the process is blatantly unconstitutional.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution and to, instead, uphold the Constitution, promote life, and protect women's rights.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our esteemed leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Women's History Month, we do so with an awareness that so much work in the fight for equality remains. Much has been accomplished, but much remains to be done. This is one of those.

That is what the House is focusing on this week, women's equality, women's safety and justice, and women's opportunity. I am proud that we are taking action to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act within the first 3 months of the new Congress.

I was a cosponsor—and proud of it—of the original 1994 Violence Against Women Act. We passed the original VAWA on a bipartisan basis and reauthorized it with bipartisan support in 2000 and again in 2005. Those were overwhelming votes of 371–1 and 415–4.

Now we are talking about the equal rights amendment, I understand.

In 2013, we did it again on VAWA, 87 Republicans joining all 199 Democrats in the House vote. Every time we reauthorized the law, we made it stronger, ensuring protections for more women who were victimized by domestic abuse, stalking, and other crimes.

Last Congress, our House Democratic majority passed a VAWA reauthorization that included these expanded protections, but Senate Republicans blocked it from consideration. Not that they offered an alternative, not that they said: This is a problem and we need to solve it. It has been bipartisan, so here is our view and we will go to conference on it.

They simply blocked it.

It is essential, Madam Speaker, that Congress take action with a long-term reauthorization of VAWA, made all the more critical by the rise in domestic violence we have seen during the COVID-19 pandemic and more people having to stay home; an epidemic of domestic violence. Let's send a message to the women and men of America that Congress will continue to do its part to root out domestic violence and abuse.

I was just with Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, the sponsor and the chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee. Chairman

NADLER is now speaking. I said then, as I say now: It is critical that we pass this legislation.

I agree with President Biden, the author of the original 1994 Violence Against Women Act, that strengthening and renewing VAWA is long past due. Once we pass it in the House, I hope the Senate will send it quickly to President Biden to sign it into law.

Madam Speaker, I am speaking on both VAWA, obviously, and the ERA, two very critically important pieces of legislation.

Last year, Virginia became the 38th State to ratify the equal rights amendment. When I hear the opposition to the equal rights amendment, you would think that we were organizing to defeat women's rights. I think some of these speeches were written by Lewis Carroll.

After Virginia passed and became the 38th State, the House passed a resolution to affirm that, with Virginia's action, the equal rights amendment had been duly added to our Constitution as the 28th Amendment. However, the Republican-led Senate refused to do the same.

Now, with the Democratic-led Senate, I am hopeful that Congress can affirm the adoption of that amendment and provide strong, legal backing to those seeking to have it recognized by our courts as a full part of our Constitution.

What little faith we demonstrate in the courts of the United States of America when it is going to be interpreted, according to some, as not affirming equal rights for women, but somehow undermining equal rights. That is why I say that I think these speeches were written by Lewis Carroll.

The amendment simply states, as I am sure has been said: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

How can that be misinterpreted to say somehow we are enunciating a proposition that would undermine rather than protect and lift up the rights of women?

It is long overdue that we, as a Nation, affirm this truth: that all men and women are created equal. Not the same, quite obviously, but equal, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Madam Speaker, I have two granddaughters and I have three great-granddaughters. The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg—the famous or, as she would say from time to time, the infamous RGB—said this: "I would like to see my granddaughters, when they pick up the Constitution, to see that notion—that women and men are persons of equal stature—I'd like them to see that it is a basic principle of our society."

Madam Speaker, that is what this amendment is about. It should have

been passed two centuries ago, but it is never too late to do the right thing. And we can take a major step forward this week to make that happen by passing the bipartisan resolution offered by Representatives JACKIE SPEIER and TOM REED.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting both H.J. Res. 17 and the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Both will articulate our concern for women, for mothers, for daughters, for sisters, for neighbors, for friends.

We have a chance this week to send a message that Congress will not tolerate violence or discrimination against women, and we have an opportunity to mark this Women's History Month, not just with words, but with actions that mean something by making history in a very positive way, benefiting not only women, but our Nation as a whole.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support these two very important pieces of legislation.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) to control the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will control the time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, every person, regardless of sex, must be treated equally under the law. H.J. Res. 17 reaffirms this core American value. It makes clear that the arbitrary deadline in the equal rights amendment may not stand in the way of achieving full equality for women.

With women losing their jobs at disproportionately high rates, the COVID-19 pandemic has only further revealed the need for this amendment.

In 2020, American women lost more than 5 million jobs. A vote for this resolution is a vote for equal access to healthcare. It is a vote for equal pay for the same work. It is a vote for equal opportunity and basic human rights in all other aspects of life for women in this country.

Congress must act now to remove this arbitrary deadline. There must be no time limit on guaranteeing equal rights under the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 17.

□ 1115

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, nearly a half century ago, Congress passed the equal rights amendment and sent it to the States with a 7-year deadline for ratification. When that deadline expired in 1979, it was three States short of passage.

Many States rejected it because it was duplicative of the Fifth and 14th

Amendments to the Constitution. Our Constitution already guarantees that all Americans receive equal protection under the law, and indeed these provisions have driven our progress as a society.

More importantly, many felt that the ERA would unleash a crippling avalanche of activist litigation that could have unforeseen and unintended implications to issues ranging from abortion to freedom of conscience and freedom of speech.

Today, 50 years after its adoption, the Democrats propose to retroactively amend the ERA to remove its deadline. They argue that Congress can alter amendments it has sent to the States, even a half century later, and yet still count their ratification votes from a half century ago.

This would allow them to add three States that voted to ratify long after the deadline was passed for the very amendment that established that deadline.

Of course, they don't explain how to deal with the five States that have since rescinded their ratification votes.

The courts have already ruled against this approach as brazenly unconstitutional.

As Ruth Bader Ginsburg, an ardent supporter of the ERA, pointed out a few years ago: "So, if you count a late-comer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that said, 'We've changed our minds?'"

If the majority were serious, it would reintroduce the ERA and debate it openly and constitutionally, as Justice Ginsburg suggested. They won't, because they know that in the nearly half century that has passed since the ERA was proposed, the world itself has passed them by.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, as a young woman in Texas, I marched with hundreds of other women in support of the equal rights amendment. Today, I stand with all my colleagues here to affirm our support for women's equality.

Women are behind some of the Nation's greatest achievements. We flew across the Atlantic, fought for civil rights, set athletic records, sent men to space, and then went there ourselves. We have forged our own paths and put many cracks in the glass ceiling, but there is still much more to do.

"Women deserve equality." "Las mujeres merecemos igualdad."

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 17.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of the equal rights amendment and to debunk some of the nonsense being spouted by my colleagues across the aisle.

This legislation is not about special rights, it is not about preferential treatment, and it is not about erasing sex differences. It is about finally guaranteeing equal rights, plain and simple.

Critics of the ERA know that, or at least they would if they actually read the legislation. It is right there for all of us to see. "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex," period.

Everyone in this Capitol has a mother, and some of us are blessed to have daughters. This amendment is about them. It is about completing the work of generations of women before us who marched for full equality, and it is about finishing that journey so that the next generation will experience nothing other than full and fair rights under the law.

I urge my colleagues to give our daughters that chance. Join us and pass this resolution.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of removing this arbitrary time limit for ratifying the equal rights amendment.

I ask all my colleagues: Are we going to tell our mothers, our sisters, daughters, nieces, and granddaughters that there is an expiration date on equality? I hope that answer is no.

This pandemic has only worsened the inequality that women are facing, especially women of color. Making the equal rights amendment a part of our Constitution guarantees that men and women are truly treated equal under the law.

Today, the House can send a clear message that we will not tolerate sexual discrimination, that gender equality should be the law of the land.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, today, we confront one of America's lingering legacies of discrimination.

At America's founding, women were intentionally left out of the Constitution and, as second-class citizens, we did not have the right to vote or own property.

Today, we still receive less pay for the same work, and we face actual or imminent threats of violence and harassment daily.

But the equal rights amendment rejects that.

After over a century, the ERA is on the cusp of ratification, and we finally have a President who will make this long overdue provision of our Constitution a reality.

Women's rights should not depend on which party is in power. These basic

fundamental rights must be guaranteed. We must secure equality for women under the law, in the Constitution, and in our daily lives.

If we want to hand a more perfect union over to our daughters—and I have two—this Women's History Month, let's seize the moment and end sex discrimination once and for all.

I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution to remove the arbitrary and outdated deadline for ratifying the ERA.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, for nearly 50 years, our country has strived to make equal rights for women a foundational value in the United States Constitution through the equal rights amendment. Women deserve nothing less than equal treatment, whether it be equal pay for equal work, freedom from discrimination, freedom from sexual assault, or freedom from domestic violence. The equal rights amendment will help to fill those gaps.

We now have enough States for that to become the law of the land. This resolution will help clear the path for this much-needed change, and I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution so that every woman and every girl can have equal justice under the law.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: What are you afraid of? Why? Why can you not affirm equal rights for women in the United States of America? It is not a hard mountain to climb. But it says every woman and every girl can have equal justice under the law.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, we are prepared to close.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I oppose H.J. Res. 17. I believe that the speakers we have had here today on our side have agreed with that and made very, very effective points on why to oppose this resolution.

Men and women are already equal under the Constitution. This legislation would make us no more equal. It is merely a vehicle for the far-left's special interest groups to use to enact their pro-abortion agenda. It is unconstitutional. It is unnecessary. And it should not become law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, Alice Paul's equal rights amendment was introduced in both Houses of Congress way back in 1923. But 96 years later, the United States Constitution still does not explicitly declare that women have equal rights under the law.

We are the only western democracy without such a clause in its Constitution. Today, we have an opportunity to rectify that glaring omission.

The arbitrary deadline for ratification that Congress imposed, and later extended, can be just as easily removed, and that is all this legislation does. It can be just as easily removed, because it is not part of the amendment, as some of our Republican friends said.

Every amendment since the 22nd Amendment, except for the 27th, has had such a clause. And if you look at the text of the Constitution, it is not there. That is because the deadline is part of the resolution proposing the constitutional amendment, not part of the constitutional amendment. If Congress can establish a deadline by resolution, it can certainly, by resolution, extend or change the deadline. That is all this resolution does.

Adopting the ERA would bring our country closer to truly fulfilling values of inclusion and equal opportunity for all people. Adopting this legislation would help make this a reality.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

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

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we have just been engaged in presenting to the public the Violence Against Women Act. But all of it stands on the shoulders of the equal rights amendment, which has been long overdue.

What an amazing journey that this legislation has taken, and how sad it is to acknowledge that we are one of only a few nations that does not have an equal rights amendment in its constitution.

I remember going to Afghanistan and working with the women of Afghanistan to include the rights of women in their Constitution. I want to say that again: To include the rights of women in their Constitution.

So let me speak clearly to vital points of this resolution. This is not an abortion bill. However, we realize that the right to choose is embedded in the Constitution in the Ninth Amendment. But this is not that.

It is a bill that says that women have a right, as Alice Paul said so many years ago, to be able to have rights of equality under this flag, under this Constitution. Are we suggesting that that should not be?

In addition, let it be very clear that any court decision that was issued, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, that is, the Commonwealth of Virginia v. Ferriero, we can explain that case, because the Court said the only authority to extend the deadline was Congress, and here we are. Congress is now intending to extend that deadline.

Nothing in the Constitution prohibits that. It is not embedded in the amendment. And by Article V, we are able to deal with deadlines. Deadlines are a simple process of statutory authority, and that is what we are doing today.

I don't think my friends on the other side of the aisle want to leave without recognizing the fact that women make 80 cents for every \$1 a man earns, and that they are treated unfairly in the workplace.

If you want equal dignity, if you want the rights of women to be promoted, vote for the ERA.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.J. Res. 17. H.J. Res. 17, introduced by Representative JACKIE SPEIER with 209 co-sponsors, would take a critical step towards ensuring that the Equal Rights Amendment, or "ERA", becomes part of the Constitution.

The resolution provides that notwithstanding the ratification deadline of 1979 that Congress set for the ERA and later extended to 1982, the ERA "shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution whenever ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States."

The purpose of the ERA is simple and fundamental: It ensures that everyone is treated equally under the law, regardless of sex or gender. Almost one hundred years ago, Alice Paul, who helped lead the campaign to secure women's right to vote, proposed the first version of the ERA.

She and her fellow suffragists knew that if women were to achieve true equality, our Nation's founding document needed to be amended to reflect that core principle. Nearly a century later, it is long past time to make that dream a reality.

In 1971 and 1972, the House and Senate, respectively, passed the ERA by well more than the constitutionally-mandated two-thirds majority in each chamber.

It contained these simple words: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." In the years that quickly followed, dozens of States ratified the ERA through their legislatures.

By the end of the 1970s, the ERA was just a few States short of full ratification. But then progress slowed, and the deadline Congress had set for ratification passed. A well-organized counter-movement scared the American people into thinking that a guarantee of equality would somehow harm women who stay at home to raise their children or would erode American families. What had started as a matter of broad consensus became another divisive wedge in the culture wars.

Today we know better. We know that in the year 2021, it is unacceptable that women still make only 80 cents for every dollar men earn. We know that when women are treated with equal dignity and respect in the workplace, in the home, by our institutions of government, and in our society at large, all of the American people stand to benefit. And we know that a simple but fundamental guarantee of equality should be welcomed rather than feared.

Thankfully, the momentum for ERA ratification has picked back up. Nevada ratified the ERA in 2017, and Illinois followed suit the next year. Then, in January 2020, Virginia made history and became the 38th State to pass a resolution ratifying the ERA. So long as these

last three ratifications are valid, the ERA will become law.

Unfortunately, a federal district court ruled two weeks ago that these states were too late because the ratification deadline that Congress set had expired already in 1982.

Importantly, that court affirmed that Congress has the power to set ratifications deadlines, as Article V of the Constitution, which governs the constitutional amendment process, does not itself provide for ratification deadlines of any kind. Of course, the power to set deadlines necessarily includes the power to remove those deadlines.

By removing the ratification deadline that Congress set previously, H.J. Res. 17 ensures that the recent ratifications by Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia are counted and that the ERA becomes part of our Constitution.

We are on the verge of a breakthrough for equality in this country, despite all the obstacles in our current political and social climate. This resolution will ensure that no deadline stands in the way. Therefore, I strongly support H.J. Res. 17 and urge its passage by the House.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for H.J. Res. 17, a resolution removing the time limit for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Women in the United States make extraordinary contributions to our workforce and communities—and even more so in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic. Yet, unfortunately, we remain unprotected under the law from discrimination. This long-overdue legislation will enshrine in our Constitution the principle of women's equality and explicitly prohibit discrimination based on sex.

The Equal Rights Amendment states simply: "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." And in this simple text is guaranteed the following:

Avenues of legal recourse for people who face sex-based discrimination,

Prompting of Supreme Court to consider cases of sex discrimination with rigorous standards, and

The power for Congress to enact laws that ensure sex equality in all aspects of life.

It is for these reasons, and many others not listed, that we must act to remove the arbitrary time limit for ratification and codify this Amendment.

As a member of the Democratic Women's Caucus, I am steadfast in my commitment to advancing women's rights both in my district and across the nation. My tenure in Congress has been in part defined by my advocacy on behalf of women and their successes—but I stand on the shoulders of generations of heroines fighting for equality. It is in their honor that I support this legislation today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 17.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I include the following letters of endorsement for H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women's Act (VAWA) into the RECORD.

Letters are from: The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, The National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community, YWCA, End Sexual Violence, National Coalition Against Domestic Vi-

olence, National Congress of American Indians, LegalMomentum: The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund, JWI, and Casa de Esperanza.

MARCH 8, 2021.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN JACKSON LEE, REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK, AND CHAIRMAN NADLER: The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, (NCADV) applauds you for introducing the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) is one of the three pillars of the Federal response to domestic violence. First passed in 1994 under the leadership of then-Senator Biden, VAWA has been reauthorized three times since then, most recently in 2013. VAWA's authorization lapsed in 2018.

Every reauthorization included critical updates to enhance America's response to domestic violence and other forms of gender-based violence. These enhancements reflect the evolution of our understanding of the dynamics of violence and the needs of impacted communities. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 is the successor bill to these previous reauthorizations and is a slightly updated version of the H.R. 1585/S. 2843, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, which passed the House of Representatives with strong bipartisan support before dying in the Senate.

Like its predecessor, the updated 2021 bill invests in prevention; keeps guns out of the hands of adjudicated dating abusers and stalkers; promotes survivors' economic stability; ends impunity for non Natives who commit gender-based violence on Tribal lands by expanding special tribal criminal jurisdiction beyond domestic violence; and increases survivors' access to safe housing. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 also recognizes the disparate impact of gender-based violence on communities of color due to systemic racism and increases funding for culturally specific organizations serving these communities. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 expands VAWA's life-saving provisions to increase access to safety and justice for all survivors.

It is particularly critical to reauthorize and improve VAWA as we continue to battle the COVID-19 pandemic. In a recent survey of domestic violence programs, 84% reported that intimate partner violence has increased in their community during the pandemic. Fifty percent reported the use of firearms against intimate partners has increased, and one-third reported intimate partner homicides have increased in their communities. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 responds to the needs of survivors and supports the programs that serve them.

We thank you, again, for your leadership, and we urge the House to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 as a matter of utmost urgency.

Sincerely,

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER
ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE,
Harrisburg, PA, March 8, 2021.

Hon. JERRY NADLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES NADLER, JACKSON LEE AND FITZPATRICK: On behalf of the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, which has worked since 1993 to strengthen and transform efforts to end domestic violence, I am writing to express our support for the Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 2021 and our gratitude for your leadership in ensuring that survivors are able to access life-saving programs and services.

With each reauthorization of VAWA, Congress has made important steps forward to better address the needs of survivors and communities. Based on extensive conversations with and feedback from local programs and advocates about current strengths and disparities in VAWA, we—along with our partners in the domestic and sexual violence movements—recommended several key enhancements to the current statute. We are very pleased that your legislation includes the targeted improvements that programs across the country need to do their jobs and support survivors.

According to the Centers for Disease Control's National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men are the victim of physical violence, contact sexual violence and/or stalking by an intimate partner and experience negative impacts such as injury, fear, concern for safety, or a need for services. In just one day in 2019, 77,226 domestic violence victims and their children received services at a local program in their community, including emergency shelter, transitional housing, counseling, legal advocacy, and children's support groups. However, on that same day, 11,336 requests for services went unmet because programs lacked the resources to meet victims' needs. Of those unmet requests for services, 68% were for housing. Indeed, safe housing is among the most pressing concerns for survivors who have left or are planning to leave an abusive relationship. Thirty-eight (38) percent of all domestic violence victims become homeless at some point in their lives. And among mothers with children experiencing homelessness, more than 80 percent had previously experienced domestic violence. We are particularly grateful that your legislation would strengthen protections for survivors in public housing, including by ensuring that survivors can transfer units when necessary for safety reasons, as well as other housing protections that are critical for survivors seeking safety and stability.

We are also supportive of other key proposals in your legislation, including:

- Supporting Communities of Color;
- Investing in prevention;
- Ending impunity for non-Native perpetrators of sexual assault, child abuse co-occurring with domestic violence, stalking, sex trafficking, and assaults on tribal law enforcement officers on tribal lands;
- Improving enforcement of court orders that require adjudicated domestic abusers to relinquish their firearms;
- Improving access to housing for victims and survivors;
- Protecting victims of dating violence from firearm homicide;
- Helping survivors gain and maintain economic independence;

Updating the federal definition of domestic violence for the purposes of VAWA grants only to acknowledge the full range of abuse victims suffer (does not impact the criminal definition of domestic violence);

Maintaining existing protections for all survivors; and

Improving the healthcare system's response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

Again, thank you for championing the needs of victims and survivors and for supporting the work of domestic and sexual violence programs across the country. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your colleagues in Congress to ensure bipartisan support for VAWA 2021 and to pass legislation that will provide needed services and supports to survivors and their families and communities.

Sincerely,

FARZANA Q. SAFIULLAH,
Chief Executive Officer.

THE NATIONAL CENTER ON VIOLENCE
AGAINST WOMEN IN THE BLACK
COMMUNITY,

Washington, DC, March 10, 2021.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES JACKSON LEE, FITZPATRICK, AND NADLER: Ujima Inc., The National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community (Ujima, Inc.) is pleased to support H.R. 1620, the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. Ujima, Inc. is a national Culturally Specific Services Issue Resource Center that mobilizes the Black community and allies through its education and outreach; training and technical assistance; resource development; research; and public policy efforts. We work with local, state, and national partners to promote strategies to improve responses to Black survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and community violence. We appreciated the opportunity to give voice to the needs of Black survivors during the collaborative process of H.R. 1585 and we are encouraged to see the enhancements in H.R. 1620 as COVID-19, racial justice movements, and economic strife have presented complex challenges for those we serve since the passage of H.R. 1585 in 2019.

Since 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has made significant shifts in the cultural and legal landscape for prevention and intervention strategies to address gender-based violence. Specialized courts, prosecution units, law enforcement departments, community-based programs, coordinated community responses, and discretionary grant funding for innovate solutions have been the central tenets of ground-breaking legislation to save lives. However, Black women still experience the highest rates of homicide related to intimate partner violence compared to other racial and ethnic populations. In 2018, Black females were murdered by males at a rate nearly three times higher than white females. Despite the prevalence of domestic violence, Black survivors are less likely to seek help from systems-based stakeholders because institutional bias coupled with racial loyalty/collectivism directly impact how she perceives, reacts to, and reports violence in her life. Institutionalized and internalized oppression at the intersections of race and gender have created the foundation for unrecognized, unaddressed trauma and violence in the lives

of Black women and they have been denied adequate resources and access to legal systems, funding, crisis services, and other programs.

Thank you for not only hearing the needs of Black survivors, but also addressing them in H.R. 1620 which provides measured enhancements for the bipartisan support and passage of such critical provisions as strengthening and enforcing public housing protections, improving access to healthcare options, expanding civil legal representation, promoting firearm surrender protocols, reducing bench warrants for victims who fear to appear in court, creating restorative practices that are solutions-based, expanding tribal sovereignty over specific crimes committed by non-Native perpetrators, and prioritizing sexual assault prevention to ameliorate intervention.

Additionally, the following provisions will greatly improve services for Black survivors and we deeply appreciate the inclusion of: a \$40 million authorization for the Culturally Specific Services Program; economic justice programs that include access to unemployment insurance; and protections for all survivors accessing services thereby preventing discrimination.

Thank you for your unyielding and tireless efforts and bringing the margins to the center to ensure that VAWA, after twenty-seven years, continues to prioritize the safety of survivors and hold perpetrators accountable in a way that is survivor-centered, honors self-determination, and reduces re-victimization by systems. We are deeply moved by your commitment to social change that promotes access to services and justice for all people, and we embrace the opportunity to stand with you.

We are available to assist you at any time to facilitate the passage of this landmark bipartisan bill that is the hallmark of our work.

Respectfully,

KARMA COTTMAN,
Executive Director.
YWCA,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2021.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of YWCA USA, a network of over 200 local associations in 45 states and the District of Columbia, I write today to urge you to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2021 (H.R. 1620). As identified in YWCA's Legislative Priorities for the 117th Congress, YWCA is committed to the swift passage of VAWA in the first 100 days of the new legislative session. We urge you to vote yes and support strengthening services for survivors and their children.

For over 160 years, YWCA has been on a mission to eliminate racism, empower women, and promote peace, justice, freedom, and dignity for all. Today, we serve over 2 million women, girls and family members of all ages and backgrounds in more than 1,200 communities. As the largest network of domestic and sexual violence service providers, over 150 YWCAs across 44 states remain on the front lines providing gender-based violence services. We are proud of our staff and volunteers in providing these life-saving services. YWCAs get up and do the work of providing safe and secure housing, crisis hotlines, counseling, court assistance, and other community and safety programs to more than 535,000 women, children, and families each year.

Informed by our extensive history, the expertise of our nationwide network, and our collective commitment to meeting the needs of survivors and their families, we have seen first-hand the importance of maintaining protections for all survivors in the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). This bill works

to maintain the safety, resources, and protections critical to all survivors, particularly women of color and other marginalized communities. Of particular importance, VAWA includes the following YWCA supported provisions critical to survivors:

Improves services for victims by re-authorizing programs administered by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and U.S. Health and Human Services to prevent and address domestic violence, sexual violence, dating violence, and stalking while preserving and expanding housing protections for survivors;

Increases authorization levels for response and wrap-around services especially important following a year of increased strain on existing providers due to the COVID-19 pandemic;

Invests in prevention through increased funding for programs such as the Consolidated Youth grants which support engaging men and boys as allies and addressing children exposed to violence and trauma with specialized services. This bill also provides support to State-level health programs to partner with domestic and sexual violence organizations to improve healthcare providers' ability to work with advocates, help victims, and strengthen prevention programs;

Closes loopholes by improving enforcement of current federal domestic violence-related firearms laws and close loopholes to reduce firearm-involved abuse and intimate partner homicide, which has received bipartisan support;

Increases funding for culturally-specific service providers and increases authorization levels to hold current providers harmless;

Improves the economic security of survivors by expanding eligibility for unemployment insurance, strengthening protections against discrimination in employment based on survivor status, and increasing education on economic abuse and economic security related to survivors.

Immediate action by Congress is needed as the COVID-19 pandemic continues to put a strain on resources and the demand for assistance continues to rise with this silent epidemic. Survivors cannot wait another day for the critical protections identified in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2021. We urge you to vote yes on this critical bill.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please contact Pam Yuen, YWCA USA Director of Government Relations if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE V. BEANE,
Vice President of Public Policy & Advocacy.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE TO
END SEXUAL VIOLENCE,
March 4, 2021.

Hon SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES JACKSON LEE AND FITZPATRICK: On behalf of the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence (NAESV) representing 56 state and territorial sexual assault coalitions and more than 1500 local rape crisis centers, I am writing to convey our wholehearted support for the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021 reauthorizing and improving the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and our gratitude for your willingness to move forward to ensure we renew VAWA as swiftly as possible.

With each iteration of VAWA, Congress goes the next step to address the needs of

survivors and communities. Based on extensive conversations with local programs and advocates, we brought forward several key enhancements, and we are very pleased that your legislation includes many of these. From an increased investment in sexual violence services and prevention programs and culturally specific organizations that serve communities of color to provisions to hold offenders accountable on tribal lands to efforts to make our criminal justice system more responsive to the needs of victims, this legislation includes the realistic policies our programs need to do their jobs.

According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, one in five women has been the victim of rape or attempted rape. Nearly one in two women has experienced some form of sexual violence and one in five men has experienced a form of sexual violence other than rape in their lifetime. The study confirmed that the impacts on society are enormous. Over 80% of women who were victimized experienced significant short and long-term impacts related to the violence such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), injury (42%) and missed time at work or school (28%). The CDC report shows that most rape and partner violence is experienced before the age of 24, highlighting the importance of preventing this violence before it occurs.

High profile cases of sexual assault on campuses, our military bases, military academies, and professional sports have resulted in unprecedented media attention. This has also resulted in a tremendous increase in sexual assault survivors seeking assistance from local rape crisis centers and educators as well as community organizations requesting prevention and training services. The media attention also points to the need for comprehensive community responses to sexual violence. According to data from a 2020 survey conducted by NAESV, 62% of local sexual assault programs have a waiting list, sometimes months long, for counseling services and 35% lack a full time sexual assault therapist on staff.

For these reasons, we are incredibly grateful that your legislation increases the authorizations for the Sexual Assault Services Program and the Rape Prevention and Education Program. The local programs in our network see every day the widespread and devastating consequences of sexual violence, and this additional funding will help them respond to community requests for services and prevention education.

Of deep concern to NAESV, tribal governments are currently unable to prosecute crimes of sexual assault, trafficking, child abuse, and stalking by non-native offenders on their lands. A 2016 study from the National Institute for Justice (NIJ), found that approximately 56% of Native women experience sexual violence within their lifetime, with 1 in 7 experiencing it in the past year. Nearly 1 in 2 report being stalked. Contrary to the general population where rape, sexual assault, and intimate partner violence are usually intra-racial, Native women are more likely to be raped or assaulted by someone of a different race. 96% of Native women and 89% of male victims in the NIJ study reported being victimized by a non-Indian. Native victims of sexual violence are three times as likely to have experienced sexual violence by an interracial perpetrator as non-Hispanic White victims. Similarly, Native stalking victims are nearly 4 times as likely to be stalked by someone of a different race, with 89% of female stalking victims and 90% of male stalking victims reporting inter-racial victimization. The higher rate of inter-racial violence would not necessarily be significant if it were not for the jurisdictional complexities unique to In-

dian Country and the limitations imposed by federal law on tribal authority to hold non-Indians accountable for crimes they commit on tribal lands.

We stand with you in affirming tribes' sovereignty to prosecute non-native offenders of sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking and stalking. VAWA 2013 restored the authority of Tribes to arrest and prosecute offenders, regardless of their race, for acts of domestic violence committed within the boundaries of their jurisdiction. Since enactment, at least 16 Tribes have undertaken the steps to exercise the special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction (SDVCJ) restored by VAWA 2013—leading to over 120 arrests. Tribal victims deserve justice, and we fully support these provisions.

Many survivors of sexual assault, abuse, and harassment have housing needs. For some survivors, home may not be a safe place and they may need to leave due to sexual violence they are experiencing in their home that is perpetrated by a household member, landlord, or neighbor. Other survivors may need to find safe housing to heal and lessen the effects of sexual violence they have experienced either in their home or they may need to find new housing if the perpetrator knows where they live to stay safe. VAWA includes important protections for survivors of sexual assault in public housing, and these provisions are a critical part of the safety net for survivors.

We are very pleased to support your vital legislation that moves us forward in our work to end sexual violence. Please contact our Policy Director, Terri Poore, with any questions.

Sincerely,

MONIKA JOHNSON HOSTLER
President.

MARCH 8, 2021.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN JACKSON LEE, REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK, AND CHAIRMAN NADLER: The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) applauds you for introducing the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) is one of the three pillars of the Federal response to domestic violence. First passed in 1994 under the leadership of then-Senator Biden, VAWA has been reauthorized three times since then, most recently in 2013. VAWA's authorization lapsed in 2018.

Every reauthorization included critical updates to enhance America's response to domestic violence and other forms of gender-based violence. These enhancements reflect the evolution of our understanding of the dynamics of violence and the needs of impacted communities. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 is the successor bill to these previous reauthorizations and is a slightly updated version of the H.R. 1585/S. 2843, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, which passed the House of Representatives with strong bipartisan support before dying in the Senate.

Like its predecessor, the updated 2021 bill invests in prevention; keeps guns out of the hands of adjudicated dating abusers and stalkers; promotes survivors' economic stability; ends impunity for non-Natives who commit gender-based violence on Tribal lands by expanding special tribal criminal jurisdiction beyond domestic violence; and

increases survivors' access to safe housing. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 also recognizes the disparate impact of gender-based violence on communities of color due to systemic racism and increases funding for culturally specific organizations serving these communities. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 expands VAWA's life-saving provisions to increase access to safety and justice for all survivors.

It is particularly critical to reauthorize and improve VAWA as we continue to battle the COVID-19 pandemic. In a recent survey of domestic violence programs, 84% reported that intimate partner violence has increased in their community during the pandemic. Fifty percent reported the use of firearms against intimate partners has increased, and one-third reported intimate partner homicides have increased in their communities. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 responds to the needs of survivors and supports the programs that serve them.

We thank you, again, for your leadership, and we urge the House to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 as a matter of utmost urgency.

Sincerely,

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
AMERICAN INDIANS,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2021.

Re: Support for Passage of HR 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE AND REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK: I am writing on behalf of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), the nation's oldest and largest organization of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments, to thank you for your leadership in introducing HR 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2021, and to convey our support for your efforts. NCAI has been actively involved in the development of the tribal provisions of VAWA in each of the past reauthorizations of the bill. Each time VAWA has been reauthorized, it has included important provisions aimed at improving safety and justice for Native women.

In 2019, NCAI adopted resolution ECWS-19-005 (attached), which sets forth five priorities for reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act:

(1) include provisions, like those included in the bipartisan Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act and Justice for Native Survivors of Sexual Violence Act, that amend 25 U.S.C. 1304 to address jurisdictional gaps including: child abuse and endangerment; assaults against law enforcement officers; sexual violence; stalking; trafficking; and the exclusion of certain tribes from the law;

(2) create a permanent authorization for DOJ's Tribal Access to National Crime Information Program and ensure that TAP is available to all tribes;

(3) improve the response to cases of missing and murdered women in tribal communities;

(4) identify and address the unique barriers to safety for Alaska Native women and provide access to all programs; and

(5) reauthorize VAWA's tribal grant programs and ensure that funding is available

to cover costs incurred by tribes who are exercising jurisdiction pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1304.

We are pleased to see that your legislation continues to build on VAWA's promise and includes the key priorities that have been identified by tribal governments and advocates to further enhance safety for victims in tribal communities.

As you know, tribal communities continue to be plagued by the highest crime victimization rates in the country. A recent study by the National Institute of Justice found that over 80% of Native Americans will be a victim of intimate partner violence, sexual violence, or stalking in their lifetime. The study also found that 90% of these victims were victimized by a non-Indian perpetrator. Sadly, Native children are particularly affected by this violence. Native children are 50% more likely to experience child abuse and sexual abuse than white children. The complicated jurisdictional framework at play in Indian Country continues to undermine safety for victims of violence in tribal communities.

Eight years ago, when Congress passed VAWA 2013, it included a provision, known as Special Domestic Violence Criminal Jurisdiction (SDVCJ), that reaffirmed the inherent sovereign authority of Indian tribal governments to exercise criminal jurisdiction over certain non-Indians who violate qualifying protection orders or commit domestic or dating violence against Indian victims on tribal lands. Since passage of VAWA 2013, we have witnessed the ways in which tribal jurisdiction has transformed access to justice for some domestic violence victims, and also the ways in which it falls short for victims of sexual violence, stalking, trafficking, and child abuse. We welcome introduction of your bill, which would address many of the gaps in the existing law and make important strides toward restoring public safety and justice on tribal lands.

We are particularly grateful that your legislation recognizes that Native children are equally in need of the protections that were extended to adult domestic violence victims in VAWA 2013. The Tribal Nations implementing SDVCJ report that children have been involved as victims or witnesses in SDVCJ cases nearly 60% of the time. These children have been assaulted or have faced physical intimidation and threats, are living in fear, and are at risk for developing school-related problems, medical illnesses, post-traumatic stress disorder, and other impairments. However, federal law currently limits SDVCJ to crimes committed only against intimate partners or persons covered by a qualifying protection order. The common scenario reported by Tribal Nations is that they are only able to charge a non-Indian batterer for violence against the mother, and can do nothing about violence against the children. Your bill would change that.

Your bill will also make strides in improving the coordination and collaboration between tribal, local, and federal jurisdictions, particularly with regard to criminal justice information sharing. These reforms are desperately needed and will make a real difference for victims of crime in Indian Country. We look forward to continuing this important work with your offices and thank you for your commitment to tribal communities.

Thank you,

FAWN SHARP,
President.

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN
INDIANS RESOLUTION #ECWS-19-005

Urging Congress to Pass a Long-term Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act that Includes Key Protections for Native Women

Whereas, we, the members of the National Congress of American Indians of the United States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator upon our efforts and purposes, in order to preserve for ourselves and our descendants the inherent sovereign rights of our Indian nations, rights secured under Indian treaties and agreements with the United States, and all other rights and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws and Constitution of the United States and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian people, to preserve Indian cultural values, and otherwise promote the health, safety and welfare of the Indian people, do hereby establish and submit the following resolution; and

Whereas, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was established in 1944 and is the oldest and largest national organization of American Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments; and

Whereas, NCAI resolution STP-00-081 established the NCAI Task Force on Violence Against Native Women, which has worked since that time to identify needed policy reforms at the tribal and federal levels, including in the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA);

Whereas, VAWA was first passed in 1994, reauthorized in 2000, again in 2005, and 2013 and each of these bills included important provisions aimed at improving safety and justice for Native women;

Whereas, the last long-term reauthorization of VAWA expired on September 30, 2018 and Congress has passed a series of short-term extensions that leave VAWA currently scheduled to expire on February 15, 2019;

Whereas, Native communities continue to experience high levels of domestic violence, sexual violence, child abuse, stalking, murder, and trafficking, many of these crimes are committed by non-Indians, and there is a need to amend federal law to improve access to justice and safety for victims in tribal communities;

Whereas, VAWA 2013 included a provision that reaffirmed the inherent sovereign authority of Indian tribal governments to exercise criminal jurisdiction over certain non-Indians who violate qualifying protection orders or commit domestic or dating violence against Indian victims on tribal lands;

Whereas, by exercising jurisdiction over non-Indian domestic violence offenders many tribal communities have increased safety and justice for victims who had previously seen little of either;

Whereas, the Department of Justice (DOJ) testified before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs in 2016 that VAWA 2013 has allowed tribes to "respond to long-time abusers who previously had evaded justice," but that there are significant additional gaps that need to be addressed;

Whereas, the tribes implementing VAWA 2013 report that children have been involved as victims or witnesses in their cases nearly 60% of the time and federal law prevents tribal courts from holding non-Indian offenders accountable for these crimes;

Whereas, according to DOJ, American Indian and Alaska Native children suffer exposure to violence at rates higher than any other race in the United States, and this violence has immediate and long term effects,

including: increased rates of altered neurological development; poor physical and mental health; poor school performance; substance abuse; and overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system;

Whereas, a 2016 report from the National Institute for Justice (NIJ) confirmed that 56% of Native women experience sexual violence within their lifetime and nearly 1 in 2 report being stalked;

Whereas, according to NIJ Native victims of sexual violence are three times as likely to have experienced sexual violence by an interracial perpetrator as non-Hispanic White victims and Native stalking victims are nearly 4 times as likely to be stalked by someone of a different race, but federal law prevents tribal courts from holding non-Indian offenders accountable for these crimes;

Whereas, VAWA 2005 included, a provision directing the Attorney General to permit Indian tribes to enter information into and obtain information from federal criminal information databases;

Whereas, in 2015 DOJ announced the Tribal Access Program for National Crime Information (TAP), which provides eligible tribes with access to the Criminal Justice Information Services systems;

Whereas, there has never been funding authorized for the TAP program and some tribes report that they are unable to access the program;

Whereas, on some reservations, American Indian and Alaska Native women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average;

Whereas, in many cases, law enforcement has failed to adequately respond to cases of missing and murdered American Indian and Alaska Native women, leaving family members to organize their own searches and community marches for justice and without access to support or services; and

Whereas, Alaska Native women experience some of the highest rates of violence in the country and geographical remoteness, extreme weather, the lack of transportation infrastructure, and unique jurisdictional complexities present unique challenges to Native women's safety;

Whereas, certain tribes subject to restrictive settlement acts have not been able to implement the tribal jurisdiction provision of VAWA 2013.

Now therefore be it resolved, that NCAI calls on Congress to move swiftly to pass a long-term reauthorization of VAWA that will:

Include provisions like those included in the Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act and Justice for Native Survivors of Sexual Violence Act that amend 25 USC 1304 to address jurisdictional gaps including: child abuse and endangerment; assaults against law enforcement officers; sexual violence; stalking; trafficking; and the exclusion of certain tribes from the law;

Create a permanent authorization for DOJ's Tribal Access to National Crime Information Program and ensure that TAP is available to all tribes;

Improve the response to and classification of incidents of missing and murdered Indian women consistent with NCAI Resolution PHX-16-077;

Identify and address the unique barriers to safety for Alaska Native women, based upon meaningful findings, and provide access to all programs; and

Reauthorize VAWA's tribal grant programs and ensure that funding is available to cover costs incurred by tribes who are exercising jurisdiction pursuant to VAWA;

Be it further resolved, that NCAI will oppose any VAWA reauthorization bill that undermines tribal sovereignty, unfairly penalizes tribes in accessing federal funds, or that

diminishes tribal inherent authority to define and address crimes of domestic or dating violence, sexual violence, stalking, or trafficking; and

Be it finally resolved, resolution shall be the policy of NCAI until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Executive Committee at the Executive Council Winter Session of the National Congress of American Indians, held at the Capital Hilton, February 12, 2019, with a quorum present.

Attest:

JUANA MAJEL DIXON,
Recording Secretary.
JEFFERSON KEEL,
President.

LEGAL MOMENTUM—THE WOMEN'S LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND,

New York, March 8, 2021.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE AND REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK: Legal Momentum, the Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund commends you for introducing the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. Legal Momentum is the nation's first and longest-serving advocacy organization dedicated to advancing gender equality. We make these advancements through targeted litigation, innovative public policy, and education. Preventing and responding to gender-based violence is a core pillar of Legal Momentum's work, in recognition of the fact that freedom from violence is central to achieving true equality.

Legal Momentum is proud to have been closely involved in developing the landmark bipartisan legislation that became the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994. Our organization played a critical role in drafting and advocating for VAWA's passage, beginning this effort with then-Senator Joe Biden in 1990. We have since worked in coalition with the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence to see enhanced services and protections included in each reauthorization of VAWA, each of which had bipartisan support. Legal Momentum is grateful to you for your dedication to reauthorizing VAWA in a way that responds to the needs of all those affected by gender-based violence.

The updates to the existing Violence Against Women Act that are included in your bill reflect the real needs of victims and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. In particular, we are pleased that this reauthorization of VAWA meets the needs of communities of color. We applaud your commitment to pass a bipartisan reauthorization of this critical legislation. We support introducing the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 and hope that your colleagues across the political spectrum will recognize the importance of these enhancements and join in supporting it.

Thank you for your leadership and dedication to protecting victims and survivors.

Sincerely,

LYNN HECHT SCHAFFRAN, Esq.,
Senior Vice President.

JWI,

Washington, DC, March 8, 2021.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN JACKSON LEE, REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK, AND CHAIRMAN NADLER: Jewish Women International (JWI), the leading Jewish organization working to end gender-based violence, applauds your steadfast dedication and leadership in introducing the bipartisan Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 (H.R. 1620).

As a Steering Committee member of the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, convener of the Interfaith Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence and Clergy Task Force to End Domestic Abuse in the Jewish Community, and co-chair of Faiths United to Prevent Gun Violence, JWI supports this bill that builds on VAWA's previous successes and adds key enhancements to ensure the safety of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) is our nation's single most effective tool in responding to the devastating crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking—providing lifesaving programs and services. Since its initial passage, VAWA has dramatically enhanced and improved our nation's response to violence against women. VAWA is essential in the funding of programs and services that survivors rely on every day. This commonsense legislation protects victims and survivors, helps save lives, and makes our communities safer places to worship, heal, and thrive.

Even with all of the advancements in the last twenty-seven years, there is still a tremendous amount of work that remains. One third of all women (nearly 52 million women) in the United States have been victims of physical violence by an intimate partner. In 2016 alone, there were 1.1 million domestic violence victimizations, 54% of which involved domestic partners. The Department of Justice's Criminal Victimization 2016 Bulletin found that more than 10% of all violent crime is due to intimate partner violence.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 responds to the urgent issues survivors face every day by supporting programming to prevent gender-based violence, closing Tribal and firearms loopholes to protect all survivors, strengthening public housing protections for survivors, expanding the ability of providers to respond to sexual harassment, and prioritizing support for Communities of Color.

JWI and our 75,000 members and supporters greatly appreciate your dedication and leadership in advancing the critical mission of passing a targeted bill that will have a broad impact on all survivors. Congress now has an opportunity to come together and pass meaningful legislation to help save the lives of victims of gender-based violence—we are grateful that you are spearheading this effort.

Thank you again for being tireless champions of survivors.

Sincerely,

MEREDITH JACOBS,
JWI CEO.

CASA DE ESPERANZA,
March 8, 2021.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Hon. BRIAN FITZPATRICK,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES NADLER, JACKSON LEE AND FITZPATRICK: I am writing on behalf of Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities to convey our support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 (VAWA Reauthorization, H.R. 1620). We greatly appreciate your leadership and effort to fulfil the promise of the landmark Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

Casa de Esperanza was founded in 1982 in Minnesota to provide emergency shelter and support services for women and children experiencing domestic violence. In 2009, Casa de Esperanza launched the National Latin@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities, which is a national resource center that provides training & technical assistance, research, and policy advocacy on addressing and preventing gender-based violence in Latin@ communities. Through offering direct services in Minnesota and nationwide advocacy, we are very aware of the critical role that VAWA has played in enhancing access to services, safety, and justice for all survivors.

VAWA Reauthorization is a necessary part of our nation's commitment to ending gender-based violence. It includes narrowly focused, yet critical, enhancements to address gaps identified by survivors and direct service providers. Among many provisions, the measure maintains vital protections for all survivors, invests in prevention, improves access to safe housing and economic independence, and includes long overdue funding for culturally specific communities.

Since the enactment of VAWA in 1994 and during each subsequent reauthorization of VAWA in 2000, 2005, and 2013, Congress has continued to support and improve protections for survivors in a bipartisan manner. During this time in which we are experiencing the dual crises of the Coronavirus and gender-based violence, we are reminded of the fragility of life. It is not now or ever acceptable to merely maintain the status quo, let alone undermine current protections and reduce access to safety and justice for victims and survivors, particularly those from vulnerable communities which also have been more deeply impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

In addition to ensuring important pathways to safety, justice, and well-being for all survivors, H.R. 1620 includes important enhancements that improve access to intervention and prevention services. We are enthusiastic about the funding for legal and housing services that are life-saving resources for survivors of domestic and sexual violence. We are also very encouraged by the funds provided for culturally specific programs in H.R. 1620.

We appreciate your commitment to moving this bill forward with bipartisan support and continue the longstanding commitment of Congress to support enhanced services and protections in each reauthorization of VAWA. Thank you for being a champion on behalf of all victims and survivors and for your commitment to improving the well-being of individuals, families, and communities.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA J. TOTOTZINTLE,
CEO.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1620, the "Violence Against Women Act of 2021," that will reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994.

The Violence Against Women Act is landmark legislation first enacted in 1994 and signed into law by President Bill Clinton which has—through policy reforms, interstate cooperation and grant allocation—been pivotal in providing a national response to protecting half of the population.

Equally important, it has ushered in a seismic transformation on how society perceives violence against women.

VAWA was enacted in response to the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence, and the significant impact of such violence on the lives of women.

I remember those days well because I was serving on the board of the Houston Area Women's Center (HAWC), at that time the sole shelter in the Houston area offering sanctuary to victims and women at risk of domestic violence.

Despite its import, VAWA has been expired since September 30, 2018, and we as a body are now called upon by survivors to reauthorize it.

VAWA has a proven success record—in the quarter-century since it passed, domestic violence has decreased by approximately two-thirds, and intimate partner homicides decreased by approximately one-third.

However, despite these gains, domestic violence and sexual assault cases I have rapidly increased during this COVID-19 crisis, where perpetrators are spending significant amount of time at home with their victims.

This landmark, transformative legislation is needed now more than ever.

Police departments around the country have reported increases in domestic violence: 18 percent increase in San Antonio; 22 percent increase in Portland, Oregon; 10 percent increase in New York City.

A recent meta-analysis of 18 different studies concerning domestic violence during the pandemic found that domestic violence cases have increased an average of over 8 percent across the country.

In the United States, an estimated 10 million people experience domestic violence every year, and more than 15 million children are exposed to this violence annually.

According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, about 20 people per minute are physically abused by an intimate partner.

About 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men experience severe intimate partner physical violence, sexual violence, and/or partner stalking with injury.

Today, in Texas, 35.10 percent of women and 34.5 percent of men are subjected to domestic violence.

We cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Yashica Fontenot, who was murdered in Harris County, Texas, by her husband just one day after Christmas last year while she was trying to escape her relationship.

Nor can we forget Debra Seidenfaden, who was murdered by her husband in Houston after an argument.

Nor can we forget the Houston woman who was tied up and sexually assaulted in her own home just last week; or the Houston woman who was shot multiple times by her husband at a medical office this month; or the Houston mother and grandmother who was murdered by her son-in law while she attempted to protect her daughter and grandchildren.

There are countless stories like this throughout this country, which is why it is imperative to reauthorize VAWA by passing H.R. 1620.

The stories of these women remind us of the urgency to protect survivors now, before it is too late, because many of these deaths are preventable.

Since VAWA's codification in 1994, more victims report episodes of domestic violence to the police and the rate of non-fatal intimate partner violence against women has decreased by almost two-thirds.

VAWA has also led to a significant increase in the reporting of sexual assault.

From 1994 to 2015, the rate of women murdered by men in single victim/single offender incidents dropped 29 percent.

In the first 15 years of VAWA's validity, rates of serious intimate partner violence declined by 72 percent for women and 64 percent for men.

Research suggests that referring a victim to a domestic violence or sexual assault advocate has been linked to an increased willingness to file a police report—survivors with an advocate filed a report with law enforcement 59 percent of the time, versus 41 percent for individuals not referred to a victim advocate.

Prior to VAWA, law enforcement lacked the resources and tools to respond effectively to domestic violence and sexual assault, and this progress cannot be allowed to stop.

Congress must continue sending the clear message that violence against women is unacceptable.

VAWA has been reauthorized three times—in 2000, 2005, and 2013—with strong bipartisan approval and overwhelming support from Congress, states, and local communities.

Each reauthorization of VAWA has improved protections for women and men, while helping to change the culture and reduce the tolerance for these crimes.

H.R. 1620 continues that tradition, and therefore, is intended to make modifications, as Congress has done in the past to all previous reauthorizations of VAWA.

H.R. 1620 is a bipartisan bill, reflecting a reasonable and compromise approach to reauthorize grant programs under the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

These moderate enhancements will address the many growing and unmet needs of victims and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

H.R. 1620 addresses the needs of sex trafficking victims while creating a demonstration program on trauma-informed training for law enforcement.

H.R. 1620 increases access to grant programs for culturally specific organizations and ensure culturally specific organizations are included in the development and implementation of service, education, training, and other grants.

H.R. 1620 adds a purpose area to assist communities in developing alternatives to housing ordinances that punish survivors for seeking law enforcement intervention.

H.R. 1620 expands protections for vulnerable populations such as youth, survivors without shelter, Native American women, and LGBTQ persons.

H.R. 1620 ensures Deaf people are included in grants relating to people with disabilities.

VAWA is central to our nation's effort to fight the epidemic of domestic, sexual, and

dating violence and stalking, and we as a body are now called upon by survivors to reauthorize it.

It is important to note that H.R. 1620 did not happen on its own.

It was the product of a collaborative effort of stakeholders, including victim advocates.

It was the product of those willing to share their stories of the abuse suffered at the hands of those who were entrusted to love, but instead harmed.

The courage, strength, and resilience displayed by survivors has reminded all that we must continue to foster an environment for victims of violence to come forward and expose episodes of violence against women.

Having listened to concerned stakeholders from all pockets of the country, we have put pen to paper and produced a bill that is endorsed by the bipartisan National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NTF), which is a national collaboration comprising a large and diverse group of 35 national, tribal, state, territorial, and local organizations, advocates, and individuals that focus on the development, passage and implementation of effective public policy to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

This bill recognizes the urgency and dire need faced by the victims and survivors throughout this country during a significant moment of ongoing domestic violence caused by this pandemic and experienced by both women and men.

The love for a spouse, the comfort of a mother and the best wishes for a sister know no political allegiance.

I am determined to work with my colleagues and others to complete the mission I accepted in the 115th Congress when the House passed the VAWA legislation I authored, H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2018, all the way this time through passage by the Senate and to presentment for signature to President Biden, a strong supporter of the bill and the original creator of VAWA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SPANBERGER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to Resolution 233, the pre-vision question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

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

□ 1130

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I call up

the bill (H.R. 1620) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-3, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117-12, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1620

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Universal definitions and grant conditions.

Sec. 3. Agency and Department Coordination.

Sec. 4. Effective date.

Sec. 5. Availability of funds.

Sec. 6. Sense of Congress.

TITLE I—ENHANCING LEGAL TOOLS TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

Sec. 101. Stop grants.

Sec. 102. Grants to encourage improvements and alternatives to the criminal justice response.

Sec. 103. Legal assistance for victims.

Sec. 104. Grants to support families in the justice system.

Sec. 105. Outreach and services to underserved populations grants.

Sec. 106. Criminal provisions.

Sec. 107. Rape survivor child custody.

Sec. 108. Enhancing culturally specific services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Sec. 109. Grants for lethality assessment programs.

TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS

Sec. 201. Sexual assault services program.

Sec. 202. Sexual Assault Services Program.

Sec. 203. Rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and child abuse enforcement assistance program.

Sec. 204. Grants for training and services to end violence against people with disabilities and Deaf people.

Sec. 205. Training and services to end abuse in later life.

Sec. 206. Demonstration program on trauma-informed, victim-centered training for law enforcement.

TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS

Sec. 301. Rape prevention and education grant.

Sec. 302. Creating hope through outreach, options, services, and education (CHOOSE) for children and youth.

Sec. 303. Grants to combat violent crimes on campuses.

TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES

Sec. 401. Study conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Sec. 402. Saving Money and Reducing Tragedies (SMART) through Prevention grants.

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE

Sec. 501. Grants to strengthen the healthcare systems response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS

Sec. 601. Housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Sec. 602. Ensuring compliance and implementation; prohibiting retaliation against victims.

Sec. 603. Protecting the right to report crime from one’s home.

Sec. 604. Transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

Sec. 605. Addressing the housing needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Sec. 606. United States Housing Act of 1937 amendments.

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS

Sec. 701. Findings.

Sec. 702. National Resource Center on workplace responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence.

Sec. 703. Provisions related to Unemployment Compensation and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program.

Sec. 704. Study and reports on barriers to survivors’ economic security access.

Sec. 705. GAO Study.

Sec. 706. Education and information programs for survivors.

Sec. 707. Severability.

TITLE VIII—HOMICIDE REDUCTION INITIATIVES

Sec. 801. Prohibiting persons convicted of misdemeanor crimes against dating partners and persons subject to protection orders.

Sec. 802. Prohibiting stalkers and individuals subject to court order from possessing a firearm.

TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

Sec. 901. Findings and purposes.

Sec. 902. Authorizing funding for the Tribal access program.

Sec. 903. Tribal jurisdiction over covered crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, obstruction of justice, sexual violence, sex trafficking, stalking, and assault of a law enforcement officer or corrections officer.

TITLE X—OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Sec. 1001. Establishment of Office on Violence Against Women.

Sec. 1002. Office on Violence Against Women a Deputy Director for Culturally Specific Communities.

TITLE XI—IMPROVING CONDITIONS FOR WOMEN IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

Sec. 1101. Improving the treatment of primary caretaker parents and other individuals in federal prisons.

Sec. 1102. Public health and safety of women.

Sec. 1103. Research and report on women in federal incarceration.

Sec. 1104. Reentry planning and services for incarcerated women.

TITLE XII—LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY

Sec. 1201. Notification to law enforcement agencies of prohibited purchase or attempted purchase of a firearm.

Sec. 1202. Reporting of background check denials to state, local, and Tribal authorities.

Sec. 1203. Special assistant U.S. attorneys and cross-deputized attorneys.

TITLE XIII—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE

Sec. 1301. Short title.
 Sec. 1302. Prohibition on engaging in sexual acts while acting under color of law.
 Sec. 1303. Incentives for States.
 Sec. 1304. Reports to Congress.
 Sec. 1305. Definition.

TITLE XIV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 1401. National stalker and domestic violence reduction.
 Sec. 1402. Federal victim assistants reauthorization.
 Sec. 1403. Child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners reauthorization.
 Sec. 1404. Sex offender management.
 Sec. 1405. Court-appointed special advocate program.
 Sec. 1406. Sexual assault forensic exam program grants.
 Sec. 1407. Review on link between substance use and victims of domestic violence dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
 Sec. 1408. Interagency working group to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence.
 Sec. 1409. National Domestic Violence Hotline.
 Sec. 1410. Deputy Assistant Attorney General on Culturally Specific Communities within the Office of Justice Programs.

TITLE XV—CYBERCRIME ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 1501. Local law enforcement grants for enforcement of cybercrimes.
 Sec. 1502. National Resource Center Grant.
 Sec. 1503. National strategy, classification, and reporting on cybercrime.

TITLE XVI—KEEPING CHILDREN SAFE FROM FAMILY VIOLENCE

Sec. 1601. Short title.
 Sec. 1602. Findings.
 Sec. 1603. Purposes.
 Sec. 1604. Definition of covered formula grant.
 Sec. 1605. Increased funding for formula grants authorized.
 Sec. 1606. Application.
 Sec. 1607. Rule of construction.
 Sec. 1608. Grant term.
 Sec. 1609. Uses of funds.
 Sec. 1610. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. UNIVERSAL DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.

Section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291) is amended—

(I) in subsection (a)—
 (A) by striking “In this title” and inserting “In this title, and for the purpose of all grants authorized under this title”;
 (B) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:
 “(5) COURT-BASED AND COURT-RELATED PERSONNEL.—The terms ‘court-based personnel’ and ‘court-related personnel’ mean persons working in the court, whether paid or volunteer, including—
 “(A) clerks, special masters, domestic relations officers, administrators, mediators, custody evaluators, guardians ad litem, lawyers, negotiators, probation, parole, interpreters, victim assistants, victim advocates, and judicial, administrative, or any other professionals or personnel similarly involved in the legal process;
 “(B) court security personnel;
 “(C) personnel working in related, supplementary offices or programs (such as child support enforcement); and
 “(D) any other court-based or community-based personnel having responsibilities or authority to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the court system.”;

(C) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following new paragraph:
 “(8) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term ‘domestic violence’ means a pattern of behavior involving the use or attempted use of physical, sexual, verbal, psychological, economic, or technological abuse or any other coercive behavior committed, enabled, or solicited to gain or maintain power and control over a victim, by a person who—
 “(A) is a current or former spouse or dating partner of the victim, or other person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim;
 “(B) is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or dating partner;
 “(C) shares a child in common with the victim;
 “(D) is an adult family member of, or paid or nonpaid caregiver in an ongoing relationship of trust with, a victim aged 50 or older or an adult victim with disabilities; or
 “(E) commits acts against a youth or adult victim who is protected from those acts under the family or domestic violence laws of the jurisdiction.”;
 (D) in paragraph (9)—
 (i) by striking “consideration of” and inserting “consideration of one or more of the following factors”;
 (ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;
 (iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and
 (iv) by inserting the following new subparagraph:
 “(D) the cultural context of the relationship.”;
 (E) in the matter following paragraph (9), by inserting the following:
 “Sexual contact is not a necessary component of such a relationship.”;
 (F) in paragraph (10)—
 (i) by striking “person—” and inserting “dating partner.”; and
 (ii) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B).
 (G) by striking paragraphs (11) and (12);
 (H) by striking paragraph (19) and inserting the following new paragraph:
 “(19) LEGAL ASSISTANCE.—
 “(A) The term ‘legal assistance’ means assistance provided by or under the direct supervision of a person described in subparagraph (B) to a person described in subparagraph (C) relating to a matter described in subparagraph (D).
 “(B) A person described in this subparagraph is—
 “(i) a licensed attorney;
 “(ii) in the case of an immigration proceeding, a Board of Immigration Appeals accredited representative; or
 “(iii) any person who functions as an attorney or lay advocate in a Tribal court; and
 “(C) A person described in this subparagraph is an adult or youth victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
 “(D) A matter described in this subparagraph is a matter related to—
 “(i) divorce, parental rights, child support, Tribal, territorial, immigration, employment, administrative agency, housing, campus, education, healthcare, privacy, contract, consumer, civil rights, protection or order or other injunctive proceedings, related enforcement proceedings, and other similar matters;
 “(ii) criminal justice investigations, prosecutions and post-conviction matters (including sentencing, parole, probation, and vacatur or expungement) that impact the victim’s safety, privacy, or other interests as a victim; or
 “(iii) alternative dispute resolution, restorative practices, or other processes intended to promote victim safety, privacy, and autonomy, and offender accountability, regardless of court involvement.
 For purposes of this paragraph, intake or referral, by itself, does not constitute legal assistance.”;

(I) in paragraph (39)—

“who cannot access, or” before “who face barriers”;
 (II) by striking “and using victim services” and inserting “; using, or receiving appropriate victim services”; and
 (III) by striking “alienage” and inserting “immigration”;
 (H) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:
 “(46) ABUSE IN LATER LIFE.—The term ‘abuse in later life’—
 “(A) means—
 “(i) neglect, abandonment, economic abuse, or willful harm of an adult aged 50 or older by an individual in an ongoing relationship of trust with the victim; or
 “(ii) domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking of an adult aged 50 or older by any individual; and
 “(B) does not include self-neglect.
 “(47) RESTORATIVE PRACTICE.—The term ‘restorative practice’ means a process, whether court-referred or community-based, that—
 “(A) involves, on a voluntary basis, and to the extent possible, those who have committed a specific offense and those who have been harmed as a result of the offense, as well as the affected community;
 “(B) has the goal of collectively seeking accountability from the accused, and developing a process whereby the accused will take responsibility for his or her actions, and a plan for providing relief to those harmed, through allocution, restitution, community service or other processes upon which the victim, the accused, the community, and the court (if court-referred) can agree;
 “(C) is conducted in a framework that protects victim safety and supports victim autonomy; and
 “(D) includes protocols to address the use of information disclosed during such process for other law enforcement purposes.
 “(48) DIGITAL SERVICES.—The term ‘digital services’ means services, resources, information, support or referrals provided through electronic communications platforms and media, whether via mobile device technology, video technology, or computer technology, including utilizing the internet, as well as any other emerging communications technologies that are appropriate for the purposes of providing services, resources, information, support, or referrals for the benefit of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.
 “(49) ECONOMIC ABUSE.—The term ‘economic abuse’, in the context of domestic violence, dating violence, and abuse in later life, means behavior that is coercive, deceptive, or unreasonably controls or restrains a person’s ability to acquire, use, or maintain economic resources to which they are entitled, including using coercion, fraud, or manipulation to—
 “(A) restrict a person’s access to money, assets, credit, or financial information;
 “(B) unfairly use a person’s personal economic resources, including money, assets, and credit, for one’s own advantage; or
 “(C) exert undue influence over a person’s financial and economic behavior or decisions, including forcing default on joint or other financial obligations, exploiting powers of attorney, guardianship, or conservatorship, or failing or neglecting to act in the best interests of a person to whom one has a fiduciary duty.
 “(50) INTERNET ENABLED DEVICE.—The term ‘internet enabled device’ means devices that have a connection the Internet, send and receive information and data, and may be accessed via mobile device technology, video technology, or computer technology, away from the location where the device is installed, and may include home automation systems, door locks, and thermostats.
 “(51) TECHNOLOGICAL ABUSE.—The term ‘technological abuse’ means an act or pattern of behavior that occurs within domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence or stalking and is

intended to harm, threaten, intimidate, control, stalk, harass, impersonate, exploit, extort, or monitor, except as otherwise permitted by law, another person, that occurs using any form of information technology, including: internet enabled devices, online spaces and platforms, computers, mobile devices, cameras and imaging platforms, apps, location tracking devices, communication technologies, or any other emerging technologies.

“(52) FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.—The term ‘female genital mutilation’ has the meaning given such term in section 116 of title 18, United States Code.

“(53) ELDER ABUSE.—The term ‘elder abuse’ has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act. The terms ‘abuse,’ ‘elder,’ and ‘exploitation’ have the meanings given those terms in section 2011 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397j).

“(54) FORCED MARRIAGE.—The term ‘forced marriage’ means a marriage to which one or both parties do not or cannot consent, and in which one or more elements of force, fraud, or coercion is present. Forced marriage can be both a cause and a consequence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking.

“(55) HOMELESS.—The term ‘homeless’ has the meaning given such term in section 41403(6).”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter before paragraph (1), by inserting “For the purpose of all grants authorized under this title”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

“(H) DEATH OF THE PARTY WHOSE PRIVACY HAD BEEN PROTECTED.—In the event of the death of any victim whose confidentiality and privacy is required to be protected under this subsection, such requirement shall continue to apply, and the right to authorize release of any confidential or protected information be vested in the next of kin, except that consent for release of the deceased victim’s information may not be given by a person who had perpetrated abuse against the deceased victim.

“(I) USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—Grantees and subgrantees may use telephone, internet, and other technologies to protect the privacy, location and help-seeking activities of victims using services. Such technologies may include—

“(i) software, apps or hardware that block caller ID or conceal IP addresses, including instances in which victims use digital services; or

“(ii) technologies or protocols that inhibit or prevent a perpetrator’s attempts to use technology or social media to threaten, harass or harm the victim, the victim’s family, friends, neighbors or co-workers, or the program providing services to them.”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “designed to reduce or eliminate domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking” the following: “, provided that the confidentiality and privacy requirements of this title are maintained, and that personally identifying information about adult, youth, and child victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking is not requested or included in any such collaboration or information-sharing”;

(D) in paragraph (6), by adding at the end the following: “Such disbursing agencies must ensure that the confidentiality and privacy requirements of this title are maintained in making such reports, and that personally identifying information about adult, youth and child victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking is not requested or included in any such reports.”;

(E) in paragraph (8), by striking “under this title” and inserting “under this title. In this title, including for the purpose of grants authorized under this title, the term ‘violent crimes against women’ includes violent crimes against a person of any gender.”;

(F) in paragraph (11), by adding at the end the following: “The Office on Violence Against

Women shall make all technical assistance available as broadly as possible to any appropriate grantees, subgrantees, potential grantees, or other entities without regard to whether the entity has received funding from the Office on Violence Against Women for a particular program or project.”;

(G) in paragraph (13)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting after “the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013” the following: “(Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 54)”;

(II) by striking “the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (title IX of Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, and any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women” and inserting “the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, and any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, and other assistance administered by the Office on Violence Against Women”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “section 3789d of title 42, United States Code” and inserting “section 809 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10228)”;

(H) in paragraph (14)

(i) by inserting after “are also victims of” the following: “‘forced marriage, or’; and

(ii) by inserting “, and includes services and assistance to adult survivors of child sexual assault” before the period at the end;

(I) by striking paragraph (15); and

(J) in paragraph (16)—

(i) by striking paragraph (A)(iii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(iii) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall be eligible to receive prompt, individualized technical assistance to resolve the audit finding and to prevent future findings, for a period not to exceed the following 2 fiscal years.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (C)(i)—

(I) by striking “\$20,000” and inserting “\$100,000”; and

(II) by striking “unless the Deputy Attorney General or” and inserting “unless the Director or Principal Deputy Director of the Office on Violence Against Women, the Deputy Attorney General, or”.

SEC. 3. AGENCY AND DEPARTMENT COORDINATION.

The heads of Executive Departments responsible for carrying out this Act are authorized to coordinate and collaborate on the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including sharing best practices and efficient use of resources and technology for victims and those seeking assistance from the Government.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until October 1 of the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECTIVE ON DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Sections 106, 107, 205, 304, 606, 702, 801, 802, 903, and 1406 and any amendments made by such sections shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

Any funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations under this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress—

(1) that sex trafficking victims experience sexual violence and assault; and

(2) that Federal recognition of their recovery is important.

TITLE I—ENHANCING LEGAL TOOLS TO COMBAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING

SEC. 101. STOP GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10441 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2001(b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “including implementation of the non-discrimination requirements in section 4002(b)(13) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994”;

(B) in paragraph (5), by inserting “and legal assistance” after “improving delivery of victim services”;

(C) in paragraph (9)—

(i) by striking “older and disabled women” and inserting “people 50 years of age or over, people with disabilities, and Deaf people”; and

(ii) inserting “legal assistance,” after “counseling,”; and

(iii) by striking “older and disabled individuals” and inserting “people”;

(D) in paragraph (11), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, including rehabilitative work with offenders, restorative practices, and similar initiatives”;

(E) in paragraph (19), by striking “and” at the end;

(F) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(G) by inserting after paragraph (20), the following:

“(21) developing and implementing laws, policies, procedures, or training to ensure the lawful recovery and storage of any dangerous weapon by the appropriate law enforcement agency from an adjudicated perpetrator of any offense of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and the return of such weapon when appropriate, where any Federal, State, Tribal, or local court has—

“(A)(i) issued protective or other restraining orders against such a perpetrator; or

“(ii) found such a perpetrator to be guilty of misdemeanor or felony crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(B) ordered the perpetrator to relinquish dangerous weapons that the perpetrator possesses or has used in the commission of at least one of the aforementioned crimes;

Policies, procedures, protocols, laws, regulations, or training under this section shall include the safest means of recovery of, and best practices for storage of, relinquished and recovered dangerous weapons and their return, when applicable, at such time as the individual is no longer prohibited from possessing such weapons under Federal, State, or Tribal law, or posted local ordinances;

“(22) developing, enlarging, or strengthening culturally specific victim services programs to provide culturally specific victim services regarding, responses to, and prevention of female genital mutilation; and

“(23) providing victim advocates in State or local law enforcement agencies, prosecutors’ offices, and courts and providing supportive services and advocacy to urban American Indian and Alaska Native victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.”;

(2) in section 2007—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) proof of compliance with the requirements regarding training for victim-centered prosecution, described in section 2017;

“(6) proof of compliance with the requirements regarding civil rights under section 40002(b)(13) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994;”

(B) in subsection (i)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “and the requirements under section 40002(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b))”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(C)(iv), by inserting after “ethnicity,” the following: “sexual orientation, gender identity.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(k) **REVIEWS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH NON-DISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If allegations of discrimination in violation of section 40002(b)(13)(A) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(13)(A)) by a potential grantee under this part have been made to the Attorney General, the Attorney General shall, prior to awarding a grant under this part to such potential grantee, conduct a review and take steps to ensure the compliance of the potential grantee with such section.

“(2) **ESTABLISHMENT OF RULE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, the Attorney General shall by rule establish procedures for such a review.

“(3) **BIENNIAL REPORT.**—Beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, and once every 2 years thereafter, the Attorney General shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the House of Representatives regarding compliance with section 40002(b)(13)(A) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(13)(A)) by recipients of grants under this part, including a report on the number of complaints filed and the resolution of those complaints.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“**SEC. 2017. GRANT ELIGIBILITY REGARDING COMPELLING VICTIM TESTIMONY.**

“In order for a prosecutor’s office to be eligible to receive funds under this part, the head of the office shall certify to the State, Indian Tribal government, or territorial government receiving a grant under this part, and from which the office will receive funds, that the office implemented and trained its personnel regarding victim-centered approaches in domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking cases, including policies addressing the use of bench warrants, body attachments, and material witness warrants for victims who fail to appear. The training shall be developed by experts in the fields of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, and prosecution.”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 1001(a)(18) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(18)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 102. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE IMPROVEMENTS AND ALTERNATIVES TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSE.

(a) **HEADING.**—Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461 et seq.) is amended in the heading, by striking “GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES” and inserting “GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE IMPROVEMENTS AND ALTERNATIVES TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESPONSE”.

(b) **GRANTS.**—Section 2101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this part is to assist States, Indian Tribal governments, State and local courts (including juvenile courts), Tribal courts, and units of local government to improve the criminal justice response to domestic

violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to seek safety and autonomy for victims.”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “proarrest” and inserting “offender accountability and homicide reduction”;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “legal advocacy service programs” and inserting “legal advocacy and legal assistance programs”;

(C) in paragraph (7), strike “and tribal jurisdictions” and insert “tribal jurisdictions, coalitions, and victim service providers”;

(D) in paragraph (8)—

(i) by striking “older individuals (as defined in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002))” and inserting “people 50 years of age or over”; and

(ii) by striking “individuals with disabilities (as defined in section 3(2) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(2)))” and inserting “people with disabilities (as defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102)) and Deaf people”;

(E) in paragraph (19), by inserting before the period at the end the following “, including victims among underserved populations (as defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994)”;

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(25) To develop and implement restorative practices.

“(26) To develop and implement laws, policies, procedures, and training—

“(A) for the purpose of homicide prevention, preventing lethal assaults, and responding to threats of lethal assaults through effective enforcement of court orders prohibiting possession of and mandating the recovery of firearms from adjudicated domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking offenders; and

“(B) to address victim safety, safe storage of contraband during the pendency of the court order and, where appropriate, safe return of such contraband at the conclusion of the court order.

“(27) To develop and implement alternative methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies. For purposes of this paragraph, a punitive program or policy is a program or policy that—

“(A) imposes a penalty on a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, on the basis of a request by the victim for law enforcement or emergency assistance; or

“(B) imposes a penalty on such a victim because of criminal activity at the property in which the victim resides.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “encourage or mandate arrests of domestic violence offenders” and inserting “encourage arrests of offenders”; and

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “encourage or mandate arrest of domestic violence offenders” and inserting “encourage arrest of offenders”; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) certify that, not later than 2 years after the date of its first award received under this subchapter after enactment of this subparagraph, the grantee has implemented and trained on victim-centered approaches to prosecution in domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking cases, including policies addressing the use of bench warrants, body attachments, and material witness warrants for victims who fail to appear, which have been developed by experts in the fields of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, and prosecution; and”;

(4) insert after subsection (g) the following:

“(h) **ALLOCATION FOR CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES.**—Of the amounts appropriated for purposes of this part for each fiscal year, not less than 5 percent shall be available for grants to culturally specific victim service providers.”.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 1001(a)(19) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(19)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 103. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20121) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after “no cost to the victims.” the following: “When legal assistance to a dependent is necessary for the safety of a victim, such assistance may be provided.”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) any person providing legal assistance through a program funded under this section—
“(A)(i) is a licensed attorney or is working under the direct supervision of a licensed attorney;

“(ii) in immigration proceedings, is a Board of Immigration Appeals accredited representative; or

“(iii) is any person who functions as an attorney or lay advocate in tribal court; and

“(B)(i) has demonstrated expertise in providing legal assistance to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the targeted population; or

“(ii)(I) is partnered with an entity or person that has demonstrated expertise described in clause (i); and

“(II) has completed, or will complete, training in connection with domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault and related legal issues, including training on evidence-based risk factors for domestic and dating violence homicide.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), strike “or local” and insert the following: “local, or culturally specific”;

(C) in paragraph (4), after “dating violence,” insert “stalking,”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1)—

(A) by striking “\$57,000,000” and inserting “\$75,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

(b) **GAO REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the return on investment for legal assistance grants awarded pursuant to section 1201 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20121), including an accounting of the amount saved, if any, on housing, medical, or employment social welfare programs.

SEC. 104. GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

Section 1301 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12464) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “educate” and inserting “(A) educate”;

(ii) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) establish community-based initiatives within the court system (such as court watch programs, victim assistants, pro se victim assistance programs, or community-based supplementary services);”.

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (8)—

(i) by striking “to improve” and inserting “improve”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) develop and implement restorative practices (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994).”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 105. OUTREACH AND SERVICES TO UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS GRANTS.

Section 120 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20123) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this grant program is to ensure that all underserved populations (as such term is defined in section 40002 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)) are given non-exclusionary consideration in each grant cycle. Periodic priority may be placed on certain underserved populations and forms of violence to meet identified needs and must be accompanied by a non-priority option.”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “effectiveness” and inserting “response”;

(ii) by inserting “population-specific” before “training”;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) developing, enlarging, or strengthening culturally specific programs and projects to provide culturally specific services regarding, responses to, and prevention of female genital mutilation; or

“(7) strengthening the response of social and human services by providing population-specific training for service providers on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in underserved populations.”; and

(3) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “\$2,000,000” and inserting “\$10,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 106. CRIMINAL PROVISIONS.

Section 2265 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(3)—

(A) by striking “restraining order or injunction.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The prohibition under this paragraph applies to all protection orders for the protection of a person residing within a State, territorial, or Tribal jurisdiction, whether or not the protection order was issued by that State, territory, or Tribe.”; and

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following: “This applies to all Alaska Tribes without respect to ‘Indian country’ or the population of the Native village associated with the Tribe.”.

SEC. 107. RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY.

Section 409 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (34 U.S.C. 21308) is amended by striking “2015 through 2019” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 108. ENHANCING CULTURALLY SPECIFIC SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Section 121 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20124) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “shall take 5 percent of such appropriated amounts” and inserting “shall take 10 percent of such appropriated amounts for the program under subsection (a)(2)(A) and 5 percent of such appropriated amounts for the programs under subsection (a)(2)(B) through (E)”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to the amounts made

available under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

“(4) **DISTRIBUTION.**—Of the total amount available for grants under this section, not less than 40 percent of such funds shall be allocated for programs or projects that meaningfully address non-intimate partner relationship sexual assault.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by adding at the end the following: “At least one such organization shall have demonstrated expertise primarily in domestic violence services, and at least one such organization shall have demonstrated expertise primarily in non-intimate partner relationship sexual assault services.”; and

(3) by striking subsection (e).

SEC. 109. GRANTS FOR LETHALITY ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, Indian Tribes, domestic violence victim service providers, and State or Tribal Domestic Violence Coalitions for technical assistance and training in the operation or establishment of a lethality assessment program.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “lethality assessment program” means a program that—

(1) rapidly connects a victim of domestic violence to local community-based victim service providers;

(2) helps first responders and others in the justice system, including courts, law enforcement agencies, and prosecutors of Tribal government and units of local government, identify and respond to possibly lethal circumstances; and

(3) identifies victims of domestic violence who are at high risk of being seriously injured or killed by an intimate partner.

(c) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—To be eligible for a grant under this section, an applicant shall demonstrate experience in developing, implementing, evaluating, and disseminating a lethality assessment program.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out this section for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(e) **DEFINITIONS AND GRANT CONDITIONS.**—In this section, the definitions and grant conditions in section 40002 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291).

TITLE II—IMPROVING SERVICES FOR VICTIMS

SEC. 201. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41601 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 202. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511(f)(1)) is amended by striking “\$40,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$60,000,000 to remain available until expended for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 203. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 40295 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “women” and inserting “adults, youth,”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 204. GRANTS FOR TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND DEAF PEOPLE.

Section 1402 of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20122) is amended—

(1) in the heading—

(A) by striking “WOMEN” and inserting “PEOPLE”;

(B) by inserting after “DISABILITIES” the following: “AND DEAF PEOPLE”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “individuals” each place it appears and inserting “people”;

(B) by inserting after “with disabilities (as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102))” the following: “and Deaf people”.

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “disabled individuals” each place it appears and inserting “people with disabilities and Deaf people”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting after “law enforcement” the following: “and other first responders”;

(C) in paragraph (8), by striking “providing advocacy and intervention services within” and inserting “to enhance the capacity of”;

(4) in subsection (c), by striking “disabled individuals” and inserting “people with disabilities and Deaf people”;

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 205. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END ABUSE IN LATER LIFE.

Section 40801 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12421)—

(1) in the heading, by striking “ENHANCED TRAINING” and inserting “TRAINING”;

(2) by striking subsection “(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—” and all that follows through paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting the following: “The Attorney General shall make grants to eligible entities in accordance with the following:”;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (5) of subsection (b) as paragraphs (1) through (4);

(4) in paragraph (1) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this subsection)—

(A) by striking “, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, exploitation, and neglect” each place it appears;

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “elder abuse” and inserting the following: “abuse in later life”;

(ii) in clause (iv), by striking “advocates, victim service providers, and courts to better serve victims of abuse in later life” and inserting “leaders, victim advocates, victim service providers, courts, and first responders to better serve older victims”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “or other community-based organizations in recognizing and addressing instances of abuse in later life” and inserting “community-based organizations, or other professionals who may identify or respond to abuse in later life”;

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking “subparagraph (B)(ii)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(B)”;

(5) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (iv), by striking “with demonstrated experience in assisting individuals over 50 years of age or older”;

(ii) in clause (v), by striking “with demonstrated experience in addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “at a minimum” and inserting “at least two of”;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end, and inserting “or”;

(iii) in clause (iv), by striking “in later life;” and inserting “50 years of age or over.”; and

(6) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 206. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON TRAUMA-INFORMED, VICTIM-CENTERED TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 10101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“Subtitle Q—Trauma-informed, Victim-centered Training for Law Enforcement

“SEC. 41701. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON TRAUMA-INFORMED, VICTIM-CENTERED TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘Attorney General’ means the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women;

“(2) the term ‘covered individual’ means an individual who interfaces with victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including—

“(A) an individual working for or on behalf of an eligible entity;

“(B) a school or university administrator or personnel (including a campus police officer or a school resource officer); and

“(C) an emergency services or medical employee;

“(3) the term ‘demonstration site’, with respect to an eligible entity that receives a grant under this section, means—

“(A) if the eligible entity is a law enforcement agency described in paragraph (4)(A), the area over which the eligible entity has jurisdiction; and

“(B) if the eligible entity is an organization or agency described in paragraph (4)(B), the area over which a law enforcement agency described in paragraph (4)(A) that is working in collaboration with the eligible entity has jurisdiction; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State, local, territorial, or Tribal law enforcement agency; or

“(B) a national, regional, or local victim services organization or agency working in collaboration with a law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A).

“(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out the demonstration program under this section by implementing evidence-based or promising policies and practices to incorporate trauma-informed, victim-centered techniques designed to—

“(A) prevent re-traumatization of the victim;

“(B) ensure that covered individuals use evidence-based practices to respond to and investigate cases of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

“(C) improve communication between victims and law enforcement officers in an effort to increase the likelihood of the successful investigation and prosecution of the reported crime in a manner that protects the victim to the greatest extent possible;

“(D) increase collaboration among stakeholders who are part of the coordinated community response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(E) evaluate the effectiveness of the training process and content by measuring—

“(i) investigative and prosecutorial practices and outcomes; and

“(ii) the well-being of victims and their satisfaction with the criminal justice process.

“(2) TERM.—The Attorney General shall make grants under this section for each of the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

“(3) AWARD BASIS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section to mul-

iple eligible entities for use in a variety of settings and communities, including—

“(A) urban, suburban, Tribal, remote, and rural areas;

“(B) college campuses; or

“(C) traditionally underserved communities.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant to—

“(1) train covered individuals within the demonstration site of the eligible entity to use evidence-based, trauma-informed, and victim-centered techniques and knowledge of crime victims’ rights throughout an investigation into domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including by—

“(A) conducting victim interviews in a manner that—

“(i) elicits valuable information about the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(ii) avoids re-traumatization of the victim;

“(B) conducting field investigations that mirror best and promising practices available at the time of the investigation;

“(C) customizing investigative approaches to ensure a culturally and linguistically appropriate approach to the community being served;

“(D) becoming proficient in understanding and responding to complex cases, including cases of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking—

“(i) facilitated by alcohol or drugs;

“(ii) involving strangulation;

“(iii) committed by a non-stranger;

“(iv) committed by an individual of the same sex as the victim;

“(v) involving a victim with a disability;

“(vi) involving a male victim; or

“(vii) involving a lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (commonly referred to as ‘LGBT’) victim;

“(E) developing collaborative relationships between—

“(i) law enforcement officers and other members of the response team; and

“(ii) the community being served; and

“(F) developing an understanding of how to define, identify, and correctly classify a report of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(2) promote the efforts of the eligible entity to improve the response of covered individuals to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking through various communication channels, such as the website of the eligible entity, social media, print materials, and community meetings, in order to ensure that all covered individuals within the demonstration site of the eligible entity are aware of those efforts and included in trainings, to the extent practicable.

“(d) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM TRAININGS ON TRAUMA-INFORMED, VICTIM-CENTERED APPROACHES.—

“(1) IDENTIFICATION OF EXISTING TRAININGS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall identify trainings for law enforcement officers, in existence as of the date on which the Attorney General begins to solicit applications for grants under this section, that—

“(i) employ a trauma-informed, victim-centered approach to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(ii) focus on the fundamentals of—

“(I) trauma responses; and

“(II) the impact of trauma on victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(B) SELECTION.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall select one or more of the approaches employed by a training identified under subparagraph (A) to test within the demonstration site of the eligible entity.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall consult with the Director of the Office for Victims of

Crime in order to seek input from and cultivate consensus among outside practitioners and other stakeholders through facilitated discussions and focus groups on best practices in the field of trauma-informed, victim-centered care for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Justice, shall require each eligible entity that receives a grant under this section to identify a research partner, preferably a local research partner, to—

“(1) design a system for generating and collecting the appropriate data to facilitate an independent process or impact evaluation of the use of the grant funds;

“(2) periodically conduct an evaluation described in paragraph (1); and

“(3) periodically make publicly available, during the grant period—

“(A) preliminary results of the evaluations conducted under paragraph (2); and

“(B) recommendations for improving the use of the grant funds.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The Attorney General shall carry out this section using amounts otherwise available to the Attorney General.

“(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to interfere with the due process rights of any individual.”.

TITLE III—SERVICES, PROTECTION, AND JUSTICE FOR YOUNG VICTIMS

SEC. 301. RAPE PREVENTION AND EDUCATION GRANT.

Section 393A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following “or digital services (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994)”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “professionals” and inserting “professionals, including school-based professionals, to identify and refer students who may have experienced or are at risk of experiencing sexual violence”; and

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking “sexual assault” and inserting “sexual violence, sexual assault, and sexual harassment”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Indian tribal” and inserting “Indian Tribal”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) through (d) as subsections (d) through (e), respectively;

(4) by inserting the following new subsection:

“(c) MEANINGFUL INVOLVEMENT OF STATE SEXUAL ASSAULT COALITIONS, CULTURALLY SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONS, AND UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.—In granting funds to States, the Secretary shall set forth procedures designed to ensure meaningful involvement of the State or territorial sexual assault coalitions, culturally specific organizations, and representatives from underserved communities in the application for and implementation of funding.”.

(5) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “\$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$110,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following: “Not less than 80 percent of the total amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year shall be awarded in accordance with this paragraph.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) STATE, TERRITORIAL, AND TRIBAL SEXUAL ASSAULT COALITION ALLOTMENT.—Of the total amount made available under this subsection in each fiscal year, not less than 15 percent shall be available to state, territorial, and tribal sexual assault coalitions for the purposes of coordinating and providing prevention activities, providing assistance to prevention programs, and

collaborating and coordinating with Federal, State, Tribal, and local entities engaged in sexual violence prevention. From amounts appropriated for grants under this subsection for each fiscal year, not less than 10 percent of funds shall be available for grants to tribal sexual assault coalitions, and the remaining funds shall be available for grants to State and territorial coalitions, and the Attorney General shall allocate an amount equal to $\frac{1}{6}$ of the amounts so appropriated to each of those State and territorial coalitions. Receipt of an award under this subsection by each sexual assault coalition shall not preclude the coalition from receiving additional grants or administering funds to carry out the purposes described in subsection (a)."

(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(f) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall submit to Congress, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on the activities funded by grants awarded under this section and best practices relating to rape prevention and education."

SEC. 302. CREATING HOPE THROUGH OUTREACH, OPTIONS, SERVICES, AND EDUCATION (CHOOSE) FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

Section 41201 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12451) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "stalking, or sex trafficking" and inserting "or stalking"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: "Grants awarded under this section may be used to address sex trafficking or bullying as part of a comprehensive program focused primarily on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking "target youth who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking" and inserting "target youth, including youth in underserved populations who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking"; and

(II) by striking "specific services" and inserting "specific services, restorative practices";

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "or" at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) clarify State or local mandatory reporting policies and practices regarding peer-on-peer dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking; or

"(E) develop, enlarge, or strengthen culturally specific victim services and response related to, and prevention of, female genital mutilation.";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "stalking, or sex trafficking" and inserting "stalking, sex trafficking, or female genital mutilation";

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the semicolon and inserting the following "and restorative practices";

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting "confidential" before "support services"; and

(iv) in subparagraph (E), by inserting after "programming for youth" the following: "including youth in underserved populations,";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "stalking, or sex trafficking" and inserting "or stalking"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking "paragraph (1)" and inserting "subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1)";

(4) in subsection (d)(3), by striking "stalking, and sex trafficking" and inserting "and stalking, including training on working with youth in underserved populations (and, where intervention or programming will include a focus on female genital mutilation, or on sex trafficking, sufficient training on those topics)"; and

(5) in subsection (f), by striking "\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "\$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026".

SEC. 303. GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIMES ON CAMPUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20125) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) To develop, strengthen, and implement campus policies, protocols, and services that more effectively identify and respond to the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, including the use of technology to commit these crimes, and to train campus administrators, campus security personnel, and all participants in the resolution process, including personnel from the Title IX coordinator's office, student conduct office, and campus disciplinary or judicial boards on such policies, protocols, and services.";

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) To provide prevention and education programming about domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including technological abuse and reproductive and sexual coercion, that is age-appropriate, culturally relevant, ongoing, delivered in multiple venues on campus, accessible, promotes respectful non-violent behavior as a social norm, and engages men and boys. Such programming should be developed in partnership or collaboratively with experts in intimate partner and sexual violence prevention and intervention.";

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting after "improve delivery of" the following: "primary prevention training and";

(D) in paragraph (9), by striking "and provide" and inserting "provide, and disseminate";

(E) in paragraph (10), by inserting after "or adapt" the following "and disseminate"; and

(F) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

"(11) To train campus health centers and appropriate campus faculty, such as academic advisors or professionals who deal with students on a daily basis, on how to recognize and respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including training health providers on how to provide universal education to all members of the campus community on the impacts of violence on health and unhealthy relationships and how providers can support ongoing outreach efforts.

"(12) To train campus personnel in how to use a victim-centered, trauma-informed interview technique, which means asking questions of a student or a campus employee who is reported to be a victim of sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking, in a manner that is focused on the experience of the reported victim, that does not judge or blame the reported victim for the alleged crime, and that is informed by evidence-based research on trauma response. To the extent practicable, campus personnel shall allow the reported victim to participate in a recorded interview and to receive a copy of the recorded interview.

"(13) To develop and implement restorative practices (as such term is defined in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994).";

(2) in subsection (c)(3), by striking "2014 through 2018" and inserting "2022 through 2026";

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking "for all incoming students" and inserting "for all students";

(B) by amending paragraph (3)(D) to read as follows:

"(D) The grantee shall train all participants in the resolution process, including the Title IX coordinator's office and student conduct office, to respond effectively to situations involving domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.";

(C) in paragraph (4)(C), by inserting after "sex," the following: "sexual orientation, gender identity,"; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking "\$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "\$16,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026".

(b) REPORT ON BEST PRACTICES REGARDING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING ON CAMPUSES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit to Congress a report, which includes—

(1) an evaluation of programs, events, and educational materials related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) an assessment of best practices and guidance from the evaluation described in paragraph (1), which shall be made publicly available online to universities and college campuses to use as a resource.

TITLE IV—VIOLENCE REDUCTION PRACTICES

SEC. 401. STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

Section 402 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "violence against women" and inserting "violence against adults, youth,"; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking "2014 through 2018" and inserting "2022 through 2026".

SEC. 402. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES (SMART) THROUGH PREVENTION GRANTS.

Section 41303 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12463) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) strategies within each of these areas addressing the unmet needs of underserved populations.";

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(B), by inserting "culturally specific," after "after-school,";

(3) in subsection (d)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) include a focus on the unmet needs of underserved populations.";

(4) in subsection (f), by striking "\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018" and inserting "\$45,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026"; and

(5) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

"(3) REMAINING AMOUNTS.—Any amounts not made available under paragraphs (1) and (2) may be used for any set of purposes described in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b), or for a project that fulfills two or more of such sets of purposes."

TITLE V—STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE

SEC. 501. GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Section 399P of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-4) is amended—

- (I) in subsection (a)—
 - (A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “community health workers, violence prevention advocates working with health providers,” after “health staff,”;
 - (B) in paragraph (2)—
 - (i) by inserting “(including midwives and doulas)” after “residents”;
 - (ii) by striking “and” at the end;
 - (C) in paragraph (3)—
 - (i) by striking “response” after “improve the” and inserting “capacity”;
 - (ii) by inserting “prevent and respond to” after “(including behavioral and mental health programs) to”;
 - (iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;
 - (D) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the development or enhancement and implementation of training programs to improve the capacity of early childhood programs to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking among families they serve; and

“(5) the development or enhancement and implementation of comprehensive statewide strategies for health and violence prevention programs to work together to promote primary prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.”;
- (2) in subsection (b)(1)—
 - (A) in subparagraph (A)(i)—
 - (i) by inserting “provide universal education on healthy relationships” after “providers to”;
 - (ii) by striking “identify”;
 - (iii) by inserting “trauma-informed” after “and provide”;
 - (iv) by striking “and” at the end;
 - (B) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—
 - (i) by inserting “, including labor and sex trafficking” after “other forms of violence and abuse”;
 - (ii) by striking “culturally competent clinical” after “plan and develop”;
 - (iii) by inserting after “training components” the following: “that center the experiences of and are developed in collaboration with Black and Indigenous people and People of Color, and include community-defined practices such as the use of doulas, midwives, and traditional healers,”;
 - (iv) by striking “disparities” and inserting “inequities”;
 - (C) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) are designed to be inclusive of the experiences of all individuals including LGBTQ+ individuals and include training on equity and anti-racism approaches to health services delivery; disparities in access to health-care services and prevention resources; and current and historic systemic racism in health care services; and

“(iv) include training on the use of universal prevention education approach to both prevent and respond to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in health care settings.”;
- (D) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i)—
 - (i) by striking “response” after “improve the” and inserting “capacity”;
 - (ii) by inserting “prevent and respond to” after “system to”;
 - (E) in subparagraph (B)(i)—
 - (i) by inserting “and promoting prevention of” after “responding to”;
 - (ii) by inserting “during in person or virtual visits and” after “and stalking”;
 - (iii) by inserting after “follow-up care” the following: “ and to maximize victim choice on

the use and sharing of their health information”;

- (F) in subparagraph (B)(ii)—
 - (i) by striking “on-site access to”;
 - (ii) by striking “patients by increasing” and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting the following: “patients by—
 - “(I) increasing the capacity of existing health care professionals, including professionals who specialize in trauma and in behavioral and mental health care (including substance abuse disorder), community health workers, and public health staff to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and children exposed to violence;
 - “(II) contracting with or hiring advocates for victims of domestic violence or sexual assault to provide such services; or
 - “(III) providing funding to State domestic and sexual violence coalitions to improve the capacity of such coalitions to coordinate and support health advocates and other health system partnerships.”;
- (G) in subparagraph (B)(iii)—
 - (i) by striking “identification” after “practice of” and inserting “prevention”;
 - (ii) by inserting “during in person or virtual visits,” after “and stalking”;
 - (iii) by striking “and” at the end;
- (H) in subparagraph (B)(iv)—
 - (i) by inserting “and promote prevention during in person or virtual visits,” after “or stalking,”;
 - (ii) by striking the period at the end;
- (I) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:
 - “(v) the development, implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of best practices, tools, and training materials, including culturally relevant tools, for behavioral health professionals to identify and respond to domestic violence, sexual violence, stalking, and dating violence; and
 - “(vi) the development and provision of culturally relevant training and follow-up technical assistance to health care professionals, and public health staff, and allied health professionals to identify, assess, treat, and refer clients who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking from culturally specific communities and promote prevention, using tools and training materials, developed by and for culturally specific communities, with priority given to trainings provided by culturally specific organizations; and”;
 - (J) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) design and implement comprehensive strategies to prevent domestic or sexual violence including through the use of universal education in clinical and public health settings, hospitals, clinics and other health settings.”.
- (3) in subsection (b)(2)(A)—
 - (A) in the heading, by striking “CHILD AND ELDER ABUSE” and inserting the following: “CHILD ABUSE AND ABUSE IN LATER LIFE”;
 - (B) by striking “child or elder abuse” and inserting the following: “child abuse or abuse in later life”;
 - (4) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(i), by striking “elder abuse” and inserting “abuse in later life”;
 - (5) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(ii), by inserting “programs that promote the prevention of sexual assault as well as” after “implementation of”;
 - (6) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iii)—
 - (A) by inserting “and exposure to violence against generations” after “abuse”;
 - (B) by striking “or” at the end;
 - (7) in subsection (b)(2)(C)(iv)—
 - (A) by inserting “mental health,” after “dental,”;
 - (B) by striking “exams.” and inserting “exams and certifications.”;
 - (8) in subsection (b)(2)(C), by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) providing funding to culturally specific organizations to improve the capacity of such

organizations to engage and partner with healthcare providers to support victims and meet increased referrals from health systems;

- “(vi) development of a State-level pilot program to—
- “(I) improve the response of substance use disorder treatment programs, harm reduction programs for people who use substances, and systems to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;
- “(II) improve the capacity of substance use disorder treatment programs, harm reduction programs for people who use substances, and systems to serve survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking dealing with substance use disorder; and
- “(III) improve the capacity of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking programs to serve survivors who has substance use history with substance abuse disorder; or
- “(vii) development and utilization of existing technical assistance and training resources to improve the capacity of substance use disorder treatment programs and harm reduction programs for people who use substances to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking among patients the programs serve.”;
- (9) in subsection (c)(3)(A) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “and—
- “(i) culturally specific and population specific organizations, and specifically organizations whose leadership include Black or Indigenous people, People of Color, or LGBTQ+ individuals; and
- “(ii) programs developing and implementing community-driven solutions to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, instead of carceral and law enforcement intervention.”;
- (10) in subsection (c)(3)(B)(i)(III) by inserting after “nonprofit entity” the following “, including a culturally-specific organization or community-based organization working to address the social determinants of health.”;
- (11) in subsection (c)(3)(C)(ii)—
 - (A) by striking “strategies for” and inserting “(I) strategies for”;
 - (B) by inserting “and generations” after “lifespan”;
 - (C) by striking “settings,” and inserting “settings; and”
 - (D) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) strategies to address primary prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking over the lifespan and generations including strategies that address related social determinants of health and center economic justice, anti-racism, and that are inclusive of all genders and identities including LGBTQ+ individuals.”;
- (12) in subsection (c)(3)(C)(iii)—
 - (A) by inserting “culturally specific organizations” after “advocacy organizations”;
 - (B) by striking “State or tribal law enforcement task forces (where appropriate)”;
- (13) in subsection (c)(3)(C)(iv) by inserting “(including culturally specific organizations)” after “service providers”;
- (14) in subsection (d)(2)(A)—
 - (A) by inserting “or behavioral health” after “of health”;
 - (B) by inserting “behavioral” after “physical or”;
 - (C) by striking “mental” before “health care”;
 - (D) by inserting “, including substance use disorder treatment” before “; or”;
- (15) in subsection (d)(2)(B)—
 - (A) by striking “or health system” and inserting “behavioral health treatment system”;
 - (B) by striking “mental” and inserting “behavioral”;
 - (C) by inserting “, or a community-based organization with a history of partnership with programs in the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and health

care, including physical, mental, or behavioral health care” before the period at the end;

(16) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$15,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”; and

(17) in subsection (h), by striking “herein” and “provided for”.

TITLE VI—SAFE HOMES FOR VICTIMS

SEC. 601. HOUSING PROTECTIONS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41411 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “brother, sister,” and inserting “sibling,”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “including the direct loan program under such section”;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “the program under subtitle A of” and inserting “the programs under”;

(iii) in subparagraph (I)—

(I) by striking “sections 514, 515, 516, 533, and 538 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, and 1490p–2)” and inserting “sections 514, 515, 516, 533, 538, and 542 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484, 1485, 1486, 1490m, 1490p–2, 1490r)”;

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(v) by adding at the end the following: “(K) the provision of assistance from the Housing Trust Fund established under section 1338 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4501);

“(L) the provision of assistance for housing under the Comprehensive Service Programs for Homeless Veterans program under subchapter II of chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code;

“(M) the provision of assistance for housing and facilities under the grant program for homeless veterans with special needs under section 2061 of title 38, United States Code;

“(N) the provision of assistance for permanent housing under the program for financial assistance for supportive services for very low-income veteran families in permanent housing under section 2044 of title 38, United States Code;

“(O) housing assisted under the rent supplement program under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s); and

“(P) any other Federal housing programs providing affordable housing to low- and moderate-income persons by means of restricted rents or rental assistance as identified by the appropriate agency.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COLLABORATIVE APPLICANT.—The term ‘collaborative applicant’ has the meaning given the term in section 401 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360).

“(5) CONTINUUM OF CARE.—The term ‘Continuum of Care’ means the Federal program authorized under subtitle C of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11381 et seq.).

“(6) COVERED HOUSING PROVIDER.—The term ‘covered housing provider’—

“(A) means the individual or entity under a covered housing program that has responsibility for the administration or oversight of housing assisted under a covered housing program; and

“(B) includes public housing agencies, sponsors, owners, mortgagors, managers, grantees under the Continuum of Care, State and local governments or agencies thereof, and nonprofit or for-profit organizations or entities.

“(7) DRUG-RELATED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.—The term ‘drug-related criminal activity’ has the meaning given the term in section 3(b)(9) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(9)).

“(8) EMERGENCY SOLUTIONS GRANT.—The term ‘emergency solutions grant’ means a grant provided under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11371 et seq.).

“(9) EMERGENCY TRANSFER.—The term ‘emergency transfer’—

“(A) except as provided under subparagraph (B), means a transfer under subsection (e) from a unit of a covered housing provider to any other unit of the same principal, affiliate, or management agent of the covered housing provider; and

“(B) with respect to a project funded under the Continuum of Care, means a transfer under subsection (e) to any unit of the same covered housing provider under the same covered housing program.

“(10) EXTERNAL REFERRAL.—The term ‘external referral’—

“(A) except as provided under subparagraph (B), means a referral provided to a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking by a covered housing provider to the applicable regional office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to facilitate a move from a unit of a covered housing provider under the same or a different covered housing program; and

“(B) with respect to a project funded under the Continuum of Care, including any local system funding by the Continuum of Care or a recipient or subrecipient of an Emergency Solutions Grant, means the facilitation of a move from a unit of a covered housing provider to a unit of a different covered housing provider under the same covered housing program.

“(11) HUD REGIONAL OFFICE.—The term ‘HUD regional office’ means a regional office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

“(12) NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELOCATION POOL VOUCHER.—The term ‘National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher’ means a housing voucher provided under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)).

“(13) PROGRAM PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘program participant’ means an individual (including an unaccompanied youth) or family who is assisted by programs under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.).

(2) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting after “CRIMINAL ACTIVITY” the following: “AND FAMILY BREAK-UP”;

(B) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) DENIAL OF ASSISTANCE, TENANCY, AND OCCUPANCY RIGHTS PROHIBITED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A tenant, program participant, or resident of a unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking shall not be denied assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program solely on the basis of criminal activity directly relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking that is engaged in by a member of the household of the tenant, program participant, resident, or any guest or other person under the control of the tenant, program participant, or resident, if the tenant, program participant, resident or an affiliated individual of the tenant, program participant, or resident is the victim or threatened victim of such domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(ii) CRIMINAL ACTIVITY ENGAGED IN BY PERPETRATOR OF ABUSE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A tenant, program participant, or resident of a unit who is an unreported

member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking shall not be denied assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program solely on the basis of criminal activity, including drug-related criminal activity, engaged in by the perpetrator of the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(II) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subclause (I) shall be construed to limit the authority to terminate assistance to a tenant or program participant or evict or terminate a tenant or program participant from housing assisted under a covered housing program if a public housing agency or an owner, recipient or subrecipient, or a manager of the housing demonstrates an actual and imminent threat to other tenants, program participants, or individuals employed at or providing service to the housing if the assistance is not terminated or the tenant or program participant is not evicted.

“(iii) REVIEW PRIOR TO TERMINATION FOR CURRENT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—Before terminating assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights to housing assisted under a covered housing program to a tenant or program participant who is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking on the basis of criminal activity of the tenant or program participant, including drug-related criminal activity—

“(I) the covered housing provider shall consider—

“(aa) the seriousness of the case;

“(bb) the extent of participation or culpability of the tenant or program participant, including whether the tenant or program participant was coerced by the perpetrator of the domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(cc) whether the criminal activity was related to a symptom of a disability, including a substance use disorder;

“(dd) in cases involving drug-related criminal activity or criminal activity involving alcohol abuse, whether the tenant or program participant is participating in, or has successfully completed, a supervised drug or alcohol rehabilitation program, or has otherwise been rehabilitated successfully; and

“(ee) any other relevant mitigating circumstances; and

“(II) the covered housing program shall provide the tenant or program participant with—

“(aa) a written summary of the review conducted by the covered housing program; and

“(bb) an opportunity to invoke the applicable grievance policy of the covered housing program to dispute the findings of the review.”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “BIFURCATION” and inserting “FAMILY BREAK-UP”;

(ii) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as clauses (ii) and (iii), respectively;

(iii) by inserting before clause (ii), as so redesignated, the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a family break-up results from an occurrence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and the perpetrator no longer resides in the unit and was the sole tenant or program participant eligible to receive assistance under a covered housing program, the covered housing provider shall—

“(I) provide any other tenant, program participant, or resident of the unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking the opportunity to establish eligibility for the covered housing program; or

“(II) provide a tenant, program participant, or resident described in subclause (I) with not less than 180 days—

“(aa) to remain in the unit under the same terms and conditions as the perpetrator; and

“(bb) find new housing or establish eligibility for another covered housing program.”;

(iv) in clause (ii), as so redesignated—

(I) in the heading, by striking “IN GENERAL” and inserting “EVICTION”; and

(II) by inserting after “a public housing agency” the following: “, participating jurisdictions, grantees under the Continuum of Care, grantees,”; and

(v) by striking clause (iii), as so redesignated;

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) to be limited by any provision in the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) that provides less protection than subparagraph (A) for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”; and

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) EARLY TERMINATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A covered housing provider shall permit a tenant or program participant assisted under the covered housing program to terminate the lease at any time prior to the end date of the lease, without penalty, if the tenant or program participant has been a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and the tenant or program participant—

“(I) sends notice of the early lease termination to the landlord in writing prior to or within 3 days of vacating the premises unless a shorter notice period is provided for under State law;

“(II)(aa) reasonably believes that the tenant or program participant is threatened with imminent harm if the tenant or program participant remains within the same dwelling unit subject to the lease; or

“(bb) has experienced a sexual assault that occurred on the premises during the 90-day period preceding the request for lease termination; and

“(III) provides a form of documentation consistent with the requirements outlined in subsection (c)(3).

“(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to preclude any automatic termination of a lease by operation of law. Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law regarding the early termination of leases that provides greater protection than this subsection for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “Any information submitted to a public housing agency or owner or manager” and inserting “Covered housing providers shall ensure any information submitted”; and

(B) by inserting after “owner or manager” the following: “of housing assisted under a covered housing program”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “an applicant for or tenants of” and inserting “all individuals and families seeking housing or services from programs under title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360 et seq.), all program participants of, all adult members of applicant households for, and all adult tenants of”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “guidance issued by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development” and inserting “title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and any guidance issued by the appropriate agencies related to language access for persons with limited English proficiency”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) TRANSLATION AND AVAILABILITY OF STANDARDIZED DOCUMENTS.—Each appropriate

agency shall ensure that standardized documents relating to the implementation of this title are—

“(A) translated into and made available in multiple languages and are available in formats accessible to persons with disabilities; and

“(B) made accessible to covered housing providers within a reasonable time after adoption of the documents by the appropriate agency.”;

(5) by amending subsection (e) to read as follows:

“(e) EMERGENCY TRANSFERS AND NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELOCATION POOL POLICIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A tenant, program participant, or resident of a unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking who is a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking may apply for an emergency transfer or a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher, or both.

“(2) RESPONSIBLE ENTITY.—

“(A) EMERGENCY TRANSFERS.—A covered housing provider shall grant an emergency transfer to a tenant or program participant described in paragraph (1) if—

“(i) the covered housing provider and the tenant or program participant determine that a safe dwelling unit is available; and

“(ii) the tenant or program participant meets the eligibility criteria described in paragraph (3).

“(B) VOUCHERS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and a covered housing provider authorized to determine eligibility for National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers under policies and procedures established under subsection (f)(1) shall approve a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher for a tenant, program participant, or resident of a unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking described in paragraph (1) if the tenant, program participant, or resident meets the eligibility criteria described in paragraph (3).

“(3) CRITERIA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable responsible entity under paragraph (2) shall approve an application submitted by a tenant, program participant, or resident described in paragraph (1) for an emergency transfer, a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher, or both, if—

“(i) the tenant, program participant, or resident expressly requests the emergency transfer or National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher, or both, from the applicable responsible entity; and

“(ii)(I) the tenant, program participant, or resident reasonably believes that the tenant or program participant is threatened with imminent harm from further violence if the tenant or program participant remains within the same dwelling unit assisted under a covered housing program; or

“(II) the tenant, program participant, or resident experienced a sexual assault that occurred on the premises during the 90-day period preceding the request for the emergency transfer or National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher.

“(B) GOOD STANDING.—Regardless of whether a tenant, program participant, or resident is in good standing, the tenant, program participant, or resident retains the right to an emergency transfer or a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher if the tenant, program participant, or resident otherwise meets the eligibility requirements in this subsection. The tenant, program participant, or resident shall also meet the eligibility requirements of the program to which the tenant, program participant, or resident intends to transfer unless the eligibility requirement is waived by the covered housing program.

“(4) POLICIES.—Each appropriate agency shall, in the timeframe outlined in subsection

(f)(2), adopt emergency transfer, external referral, and National VAWA Victim Relocation Pool voucher policies for use by covered housing programs, which shall—

“(A) reflect the variations in program operation and administration by covered housing program type and are in accordance with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development’s National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers policies and procedures issued within the timeframe outlined in subsection (f)(1);

“(B) at a minimum, describe a process that—

“(i) permits tenants, program participants, or residents who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to move to another available and safe dwelling quickly through an emergency transfer, a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher, or an external referral; and

“(ii) provides that the tenant, program participant, or resident can request an emergency transfer or a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher, or both, whichever is safe and available for the tenant, program participant, or resident; and

“(C) with respect to a request for an emergency transfer, provide that—

“(i) not later than 5 days after the date on which a covered housing provider receives an emergency transfer request from a tenant or program participant, the covered housing provider shall determine whether the tenant or program participant can be transferred to a safe and available unit;

“(ii) if a safe unit is available, an emergency transfer shall occur not later than 10 days after the date on which the covered housing provider approves the request;

“(iii) if a safe unit is not available, the covered housing provider shall provide to the tenant or program participant—

“(I) a written status report regarding the status of the emergency transfer request of the tenant or program participant; and

“(II) information about National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers; and

“(iv) if the emergency transfer request has been denied due to reasons unrelated to the availability of a safe and suitable unit, the tenant or program participant may appeal the decision through the applicable grievance or hearing process of the covered housing provider;

“(D) with respect to a request for a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher—

“(i) the request may be made to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by a tenant; program participant; resident of the unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking; a collaborative applicant of the local Continuum of Care or designee of the collaborative applicant; Emergency Solutions Grant recipient or subrecipient; a public housing agency; or the covered housing provider; and

“(ii) not later than 10 days after the date on which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development receives a request for a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher and the selected relocation jurisdiction of the tenant or program participant, the Secretary shall process the request and refer administration of the National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher to the appropriate public housing agency of the selected jurisdiction of the tenant; program participant; or resident of the unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking;

“(E) allow a victim of domestic violence dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to temporarily relocate, while maintaining eligibility for the covered housing program without the loss of their housing status, if there are no alternative comparable housing program units available, until an emergency transfer, a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher, or an external referral resulting in comparable safe housing is obtained;

“(F) mandate that emergency transfers take priority over non-emergency transfers;

“(G) mandate that emergency transfers are not considered new applicants and take priority over existing external waiting lists for a covered housing program;

“(H) incorporate confidentiality measures to ensure that the appropriate agency and the covered housing provider do not disclose any information regarding a tenant, program participant, or resident who is victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including the location of a new dwelling unit to any person or entity without the time-limited written authorization of the tenant or program participant, and communication by a covered housing provider with a victim must be in a form and manner that the victim determines to be safe; and

“(I) mandate that when a tenant or program participant submits an emergency transfer request to a covered housing provider, the covered housing provider shall provide contact information for—

“(i) local organizations offering assistance to tenants and other housing providers who may have safe and available housing; or

“(ii) contact information for the regional HUD office or applicable public housing agency.

“(5) DUTIES OF COLLABORATIVE APPLICANTS OF A LOCAL CONTINUUM OF CARE.—In addition to adopting the policies described in paragraph (4) in an emergency transfer policy, the collaborative applicant of each local Continuum of Care, or a designee of the collaborative applicant, shall—

“(A) coordinate and facilitate emergency transfers and external referrals across projects funded under the Continuum of Care;

“(B) prioritize an external referral across projects funded under the Continuum of Care for the next available safe housing option for which a tenant or program participant may be eligible;

“(C) coordinate external referrals with the collaborative applicant of the local Continuum of Care, or designee of the collaborative applicant, in other jurisdictions in cases where a tenant or program participant requests an out-of-jurisdiction transfer;

“(D) ensure that a tenant or program participant is not required to be reassessed and retains chronically homeless status, if applicable, through the local Continuum of Care intake process when seeking an emergency transfer or external referral placement; and

“(E) ensure costs associated with temporary relocations described in paragraph (4) are considered eligible costs of supportive services under the Continuum of Care program.

“(6) REGIONAL OFFICES.—Each HUD regional office shall—

“(A) in collaboration with public housing agencies and the entities described in paragraph (2), develop and implement a regional emergency transfer and external referral plan, which shall—

“(i) set forth how covered housing providers shall coordinate external referrals with the HUD regional office;

“(ii) be submitted to the Violence Against Women Director described in section 41413 and made publicly available; and

“(iii) include any additional policies, priorities, and strategies set by the entities described in paragraph (5); and

“(B) in consultation with the Violence Against Women Director described in section 41413, facilitate external referral requests for tenants or program participants who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking if the tenant or program participant cannot obtain an emergency transfer or a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher.

“(7) COVERED HOUSING PROVIDERS.—Each covered housing provider shall develop and implement an emergency transfer and external refer-

ral plan consistent with the requirements in paragraph (4) or (5).”;

(6) by amending subsection (f) to read as follows:

“(f) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY TRANSFER AND NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELOCATION POOL VOUCHERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall establish policies and procedures under which a tenant, program participant, or resident of a unit who is an unreported member of the household because of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking may receive, under subsection (e), subject to the availability of funds, a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool voucher.

“(2) APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, the head of each appropriate agency shall establish the policies required under subsection (e) with respect to emergency transfers and external referrals. Each appropriate agency shall also establish agency-specific policies and procedures in accordance with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development’s National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers policies and procedures.”;

(7) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h);

(8) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) TRAINING AND REFERRALS.—

“(1) TRAINING FOR STAFF OF COVERED HOUSING PROGRAMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in partnership with domestic and sexual violence experts, shall develop mandatory in-person or electronic training for staff of covered housing providers to provide a basic understanding of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to facilitate implementation of this section.

“(B) APPROPRIATE STAFF.—Each covered housing provider shall identify—

“(i) appropriate staff to attend the basic understanding training described in subparagraph (A) periodically; and

“(ii) appropriate staff engaged in tenant, program participant, or resident services to attend both the basic understanding training and the implementation training described in subparagraph (A) as necessary.

“(2) REFERRALS.—The appropriate agency with respect to each covered housing program and the local Continuum of Care shall supply all appropriate staff of the covered housing providers with a referral listing of public contact information for all domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking service providers offering services in its coverage area.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.”; and

(9) by inserting after subsection (h), as so redesignated, the following:

“(i) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to limit any right, remedy, or procedure otherwise available to enforce the Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 2960) and subsequent amendments prior to the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021; or

“(2) to supersede any provision of any Federal, State, or local law that provides greater protection than this section for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.”.

(b) NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELOCATION POOL VOUCHERS.—Section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(21) NATIONAL VAWA VICTIMS RELOCATION POOL VOUCHERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall set aside, from amounts made available for rental assistance under this subsection, amounts for use only for providing such assistance for the creation of a National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool, which shall provide rental assistance on behalf of tenants, program participants, or residents who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking eligible for assistance under section 41411(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491(e)).

“(B) TERMINATION OF VOUCHERS UPON TURN-OVER.—A public housing agency shall not re-issue assistance that is made available from appropriated funds under this subsection for a tenant, program participant, or resident when the assistance for the tenant, program participant, or resident is lawfully terminated, unless specifically authorized by the Secretary.

“(C) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Beginning in fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, there are authorized to be appropriated \$20,000,000 to provide vouchers for rental assistance under this paragraph.”.

SEC. 602. ENSURING COMPLIANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION; PROHIBITING RETALIATION AGAINST VICTIMS.

Chapter 2 of subtitle N of title IV of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 41411 the following:

“SEC. 41412. COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.

“(a) REGULAR COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each appropriate agency shall establish a process by which to review compliance with the requirements of this subtitle, which shall—

“(A) in consultation with the Violence Against Women Director described in section 41413 and any other relevant officials of the appropriate agency, be incorporated into other existing compliance review processes of the appropriate agency; and

“(B) examine—

“(i) covered housing provider compliance with requirements prohibiting the denial of assistance, tenancy, or occupancy rights on the basis of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(ii) covered housing provider compliance with confidentiality provisions set forth in section 41411(c)(4);

“(iii) covered housing provider compliance with the notification requirements set forth in section 41411(d)(2);

“(iv) covered housing provider compliance with accepting documentation set forth in section 41411(c);

“(v) covered housing provider compliance with emergency transfer, external referral, and National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool Voucher requirements set forth in section 41411(e); and

“(vi) covered housing provider compliance with the prohibition on retaliation set forth in section 41414.

“(2) FREQUENCY.—Each appropriate agency shall conduct the review described in paragraph (1) on a regular basis, as determined by the appropriate agency.

“(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, each appropriate agency shall issue regulations to implement subsection (a), which shall—

“(1) define standards of compliance for covered housing providers;

“(2) include detailed reporting requirements, including the number of emergency transfers, external referrals, and National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers requested and granted, as well as the length of time needed to process emergency transfers, National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and external referrals; and

“(3) include standards for corrective action plans where a covered housing provider has failed to meet compliance standards.

“(c) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Each appropriate agency shall ensure that an agency-level assessment of the information collected during the compliance review process completed pursuant to this subsection—

“(1) includes an evaluation of each topic identified in subsection (a); and
“(2) is made publicly available.

“SEC. 41413. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN DIRECTOR.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be, within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a Violence Against Women Director (in this section referred to as the ‘Director’).

“(b) DUTIES.—The Director shall—
“(1) support implementation of the provisions of this subtitle;

“(2) coordinate development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to the implementation of this subtitle, at each agency administering a covered housing program;

“(3) advise and coordinate with designated officials within the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Justice concerning legislation, implementation, and other issues relating to or affecting the housing provisions under this subtitle;

“(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and support to each appropriate agency regarding advancing housing protections and access to housing for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including compliance with this subtitle;

“(5) ensure that adequate technical assistance is made available to covered housing providers regarding implementation of this subtitle, as well as other issues related to advancing housing protections for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including compliance with this subtitle;

“(6) act as a liaison with the judicial branches of Federal, State, and local governments on matters relating to the housing needs of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

“(7) implement a quality control system and a corrective action plan system for those covered housing providers that fail to comply with this subtitle, wherein—

“(A) covered housing providers completing corrective action plans shall be required to consult with national, State, or local programs focused on victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

“(B) the corrective action plans shall include provisions requiring covered housing providers to review and develop appropriate notices, procedures, and staff training to improve compliance with this subtitle, in consultation with national, State, or local programs focused on victims described in subparagraph (A);

“(8) establish a formal reporting process to receive individual complaints concerning non-compliance with this subtitle;

“(9) coordinate the development of inter-agency guidelines to improve the availability of centralized information concerning available dwelling units for use in facilitating the emergency transfer process;

“(10) coordinate the process for tracking of requests, notice, and approval of National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and further implement, as necessary, any policies or procedures relating to the National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers;

“(11) work with HUD regional offices to develop a mechanism to implement regional exter-

nal referral plans and officials at each appropriate agency relating to the development of Federal regulations, policy, protocols, and guidelines regarding uniform timeframes for the completion of emergency transfers, National VAWA Victims Relocation Pool vouchers, and external referrals;

“(12) coordinate with each appropriate agency to ensure that standardized documents relating to the implementation of this title are translated into and made available in multiple languages, are accessible to persons with disabilities, and made accessible to covered housing providers within a reasonable time upon adoption of the documents by the appropriate agency;

“(13) ensure that the documents described in paragraph (11), including guidance and notices to victims, are distributed in commonly encountered languages by covered housing providers consistent with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and any guidance issued by the appropriate agencies in accordance with Executive Order 13166 (42 U.S.C. 2000d–1 note; relating to access to services for persons with limited English proficiency); and

“(14) in consultation with each appropriate agency, identify existing compliance review processes that could incorporate the compliance reviews required under section 41412(a).

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

“SEC. 41414. PROHIBITION ON RETALIATION.

“(a) NONDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENT.—No covered housing provider shall discriminate against any person because that person has opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this subtitle, or because that individual testified, assisted, or participated in any matter related to this subtitle.

“(b) PROHIBITION ON COERCION.—No covered housing provider shall coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with, or retaliate against, any person in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of the person having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of the person having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any rights or protections under this subtitle, including—

“(1) intimidating or threatening any person because that person is assisting or encouraging an individual entitled to claim the rights or protections under this subtitle; and

“(2) retaliating against any person because that person has participated in any investigation or action to enforce this subtitle.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THE SECRETARY.—The authority of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Office for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity to enforce this section shall be the same as the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3610 et seq.).”

SEC. 603. PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO REPORT CRIME FROM ONE’S HOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2 of subtitle N of title IV of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491 et seq.), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 41414 the following:

“SEC. 41415. RIGHT TO REPORT CRIME AND EMERGENCIES FROM ONE’S HOME.

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘covered governmental entity’ means any municipal, county, or State government that receives funding under section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306).

“(b) RIGHT TO REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, and guests of, and applicants for, housing—

“(A) shall have the right to seek law enforcement or emergency assistance on their own behalf or on behalf of another person in need of assistance; and

“(B) shall not be penalized based on their requests for assistance or based on criminal activity of which they are a victim or otherwise not at fault under statutes, ordinances, regulations, or policies adopted or enforced by covered governmental entities.

“(2) PROHIBITED PENALTIES.—Penalties that are prohibited under paragraph (1) include—

“(A) actual or threatened assessment of penalties, fees, or fines;

“(B) actual or threatened eviction;

“(C) actual or threatened refusal to rent or renew tenancy;

“(D) actual or threatened refusal to issue an occupancy permit or landlord permit; and

“(E) actual or threatened closure of the property, or designation of the property as a nuisance or a similarly negative designation.

“(c) REPORTING.—Consistent with the process described in section 104(b) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(b)), covered governmental entities shall—

“(1) report any of their laws or policies, or, as applicable, the laws or policies adopted by subgrantees, that impose penalties on landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, guests, or housing applicants based on requests for law enforcement or emergency assistance or based on criminal activity that occurred at a property; and

“(2) certify that they are in compliance with the protections under this subtitle or describe the steps the covered governmental entities will take within 180 days to come into compliance, or to ensure compliance among subgrantees.

“(d) OVERSIGHT.—Oversight and accountability mechanisms provided for under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) shall be available to address violations of this section.

“(e) SUBGRANTEES.—For those covered governmental entities that distribute funds to subgrantees, compliance with subsection (c)(1) includes inquiring about the existence of laws and policies adopted by subgrantees that impose penalties on landlords, homeowners, residents, occupants, guests, or housing applicants based on requests for law enforcement or emergency assistance or based on criminal activity that occurred at a property.”

(b) SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE CRIME REDUCTION METHODS.—

(1) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF BYRNE-JAG FUNDS.—Section 501(a)(1) of subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10152(a)(1)) is amended by adding after subparagraph (H) the following:

“(I) Programs for the development and implementation of methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies. For purposes of this subparagraph, a punitive program or policy is a program or policy that—

“(i) imposes a penalty described in section 41415(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 on the basis of a request for law enforcement or emergency assistance; or

“(ii) imposes a penalty described in section 41415(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 on a landlord, homeowner, tenant, program participant, resident, occupant, or guest because of criminal activity at the property, including domestic violence dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, where the landlord, homeowner, tenant, program participant, resident, occupant, or guest was a victim of such criminal activity.”

(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF COPS FUNDS.—Section 1701(b) of part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (22), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (23), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) to develop and implement methods of reducing crime in communities, to supplant punitive programs or policies (as such term is defined in section 501(a)(1)(I)).”

SEC. 604. TRANSITIONAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.

Section 40299 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12351) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “the Director of the Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women”; and

(B) by inserting after “, other nonprofit, non-governmental organizations” the following: “, population-specific organizations”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “5 percent” and inserting “8 percent”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “0.25 percent” and inserting “0.5 percent”.

SEC. 605. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Section 423(a) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11383(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) Facilitating and coordinating activities to ensure compliance with subsection (e) of section 41411 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12491) and monitoring compliance with the confidentiality protections of subsection (c)(4) of such section.”

(b) COLLABORATIVE GRANTS TO INCREASE THE LONG-TERM STABILITY OF VICTIMS.—Section 41404(i) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12474(i)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

(c) GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.—Section 41405 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12475) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “the Director of the Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women”;

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(D), by inserting after “linguistically and culturally specific service providers,” the following: “population-specific organizations.”; and

(3) in subsection (g), by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting the following: “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 606. UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937 AMENDMENTS.

Section 5A(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c-1(d)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (13) to read as follows:

“(13) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING PROGRAMS.—

“(A) COPIES.—A copy of—

“(i) all standardized notices issued pursuant to the housing protections under subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including the notice required under section 41411(d) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994;

“(ii) the emergency transfer plan issued pursuant to section 41411 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; and

“(iii) any and all memoranda of understanding with other covered housing providers developed to facilitate emergency transfers under section 41411(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

“(B) DESCRIPTIONS.—A description of—

“(i) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by an agency, either directly or in partnership with other service providers, to

child or adult victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking;

“(ii) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by a public housing agency that helps child and adult victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, to obtain or maintain housing;

“(iii) any activities, services, or programs provided or offered by a public housing agency to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, or to enhance victim safety in assisted families; and

“(iv) all training and support services offered to staff of the public housing agency to provide a basic understanding of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to facilitate implementation of the housing protections of section 41411 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.”; and

(2) in paragraph (16), by inserting “the Violence Against Women Act of 1994,” before “the Fair Housing Act”.

TITLE VII—ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR VICTIMS

SEC. 701. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Over 1 in 3 women experience sexual violence, and 1 in 5 women have survived completed or attempted rape. Such violence has a devastating impact on women’s physical and emotional health, financial security, and ability to maintain their jobs, and thus impacts interstate commerce and economic security.

(2) The Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice defines domestic violence as a pattern of abusive behavior in a relationship that is used by one intimate partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner. Domestic violence can include physical, sexual, emotional, economic, or psychological actions or threats of actions that influence another person. Domestic violence includes any behaviors that intimidate, manipulate, humiliate, isolate, frighten, terrorize, coerce, threaten, blame, hurt, injure, or wound an individual.

(3) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that domestic violence or intimate partner violence is a serious public health issue for millions of individuals in the United States. Nearly 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men in the United States have suffered sexual violence, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner.

(4) Transgender and gender non-conforming people face extraordinary levels of physical and sexual violence.

(5) More than 1 in 4 transgender people have faced bias-driven assault, and this rate is higher for trans women and trans people of color.

(6) The American Foundation for Suicide Prevention has found that transgender and gender non-conforming people had an elevated prevalence of suicide attempts, especially when they have suffered physical or sexual violence.

(7) Homicide is one of the leading causes of death for women on the job. Domestic partners or relatives commit 43 percent of workplace homicides against women. One study found that intimate partner violence resulted in 142 homicides among women at work in the United States from 2003 to 2008, a figure which represents 22 percent of the 648 workplace homicides among women during the period. In fact, in 2010, homicides against women at work increased by 13 percent despite continuous declines in overall workplace homicides in recent years.

(8) Women in the United States are 11 times more likely to be murdered with guns than women in other high-income countries. Female intimate partners are more likely to be murdered with a firearm than all other means combined. The presence of a gun in domestic violence situations increases the risk of homicide for women by 500 percent.

(9) Violence can have a dramatic impact on the survivor of such violence. Studies indicate

that 44 percent of surveyed employed adults experienced the effect of domestic violence in the workplace, and 64 percent indicated their workplace performance was affected by such violence. Another recent survey found that 78 percent of offenders used workplace resources to express anger, check up on, pressure, or threaten a survivor. Sexual assault, whether occurring in or out of the workplace, can impair an employee’s work performance, require time away from work, and undermine the employee’s ability to maintain a job. Nearly 50 percent of sexual assault survivors lose their jobs or are forced to quit in the aftermath of the assaults.

(10) Studies find that 60 percent of single women lack economic security and 81 percent of households with single mothers live in economic insecurity. Significant barriers that survivors confront include access to housing, transportation, and child care. Ninety-two percent of homeless women have experienced domestic violence, and more than 50 percent of such women cite domestic violence as the direct cause for homelessness. Survivors are deprived of their autonomy, liberty, and security, and face tremendous threats to their health and safety.

(11) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that survivors of severe intimate partner violence lose nearly 8 million days of paid work, which is the equivalent of more than 32,000 full-time jobs and almost 5,600,000 days of household productivity each year. Therefore, women disproportionately need time off to care for their health or to find safety solutions, such as obtaining a restraining order or finding housing, to avoid or prevent further violence.

(12) Annual costs of intimate partner violence are estimated to be more than \$8,300,000,000. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the costs of intimate partner violence against women in 1995 exceeded an estimated \$5,800,000,000. These costs included nearly \$4,100,000,000 in the direct costs of medical and mental health care and nearly \$1,800,000,000 in the indirect costs of lost productivity. These statistics are generally considered to be underestimated because the costs associated with the criminal justice system are not included.

(13) Fifty-five percent of senior executives recently surveyed said domestic violence has a harmful effect on their company’s productivity, and more than 70 percent said domestic violence negatively affects attendance. Seventy-eight percent of human resources professionals consider partner violence a workplace issue. However, more than 70 percent of United States workplaces have no formal program or policy that addresses workplace violence, let alone domestic violence. In fact, only four percent of employers provided training on domestic violence.

(14) Studies indicate that one of the best predictors of whether a survivor will be able to stay away from his or her abuser is the degree of his or her economic independence. However, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking often negatively impact a survivor’s ability to maintain employment.

(15) Abusers frequently seek to exert financial control over their partners by actively interfering with their ability to work, including preventing their partners from going to work, harassing their partners at work, limiting their partners’ access to cash or transportation, and sabotaging their partners’ child care arrangements.

(16) Economic abuse refers to behaviors that control an intimate partner’s ability to acquire, use, and maintain access to, money, credit, ownership of assets, or access to governmental or private financial benefits, including defaulting on joint obligations (such as school loans, credit card debt, mortgages, or rent). Other forms of such abuse may include preventing someone from attending school, threatening to or actually terminating employment, controlling or withholding access to cash, checking, or credit accounts, and attempting to damage or sabotage

the creditworthiness of an intimate partner, including forcing an intimate partner to write bad checks, forcing an intimate partner to default on payments related to household needs, such as housing, or forcing an intimate partner into bankruptcy.

(17) The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the amendments made by such Act, ensures that most health plans must cover preventive services, including screening and counseling for domestic violence, at no additional cost. In addition, it prohibits insurance companies from discriminating against patients for preexisting conditions, like domestic violence.

(18) Yet, more can be done to help survivors. Federal law in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act does not explicitly—

(A) authorize survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to take leave from work to seek legal assistance and redress, counseling, or assistance with safety planning activities;

(B) address the eligibility of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking for unemployment compensation;

(C) provide job protection to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; or

(D) prohibit insurers from disclosing information about abuse and the location of the survivors through insurance databases and other means.

(19) This Act aims to empower survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to be free from violence, hardship, and control, which restrains basic human rights to freedom and safety in the United States.

SEC. 702. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

Section 41501 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12501) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “and sexual harassment” after “domestic and sexual violence”; and

(B) by striking “employers and labor organizations” and inserting “employers, labor organizations, and victim service providers”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “and stalking” and inserting “stalking, and sexual harassment”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by adding the following new paragraph:

“(4) a plan to enhance the capacity of survivors to obtain and maintain employment to include the implementation of a demonstration pilot program ‘Pathways to Opportunity’ which builds collaborations between and among victim service providers, workforce development programs, and educational and vocational institutions to provide trauma informed programming to support survivors seeking employment and centered around culturally specific organizations or organizations that primarily serve populations traditionally marginalized in the workplace.”

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting before the period at the end “or sexual harassment”;

(4) in subsection (c)(2)(A), by inserting “or sexual harassment” after “sexual violence”; and

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “\$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” and inserting “\$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 703. PROVISIONS RELATED TO UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM.

(a) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—

(1) SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of

1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (18), by redesignating paragraph (19) as paragraph (21), and by inserting after paragraph (18) the following new paragraph:

“(19) no person may be denied compensation under such State law solely on the basis of the individual having a voluntary separation from work if such separation is attributable to such individual being a survivor of domestic violence;”.

(2) VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT OR STALKING.—Section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is further amended by inserting after paragraph (19), as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection, the following new paragraph:

“(20) no person may be denied compensation under such State law solely on the basis of the individual having a voluntary separation from work if such separation is attributable to such individual being a victim of sexual harassment or a survivor of sexual assault or stalking; and”.

(3) DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED.—Section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.—

“(1) DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of paragraphs (19) and (20) of subsection (a), a voluntary separation of an individual shall be considered to be attributable to such individual being a victim of sexual harassment or a survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking if such individual submits such evidence as the State deems sufficient.

“(2) SUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a State shall deem sufficient—

“(A) evidence of such sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking in the form of—

“(i) a sworn statement and a form of identification;

“(ii) a police or court record; or

“(iii) documentation from a professional from whom such individual has sought assistance, including those associated with medical, legal, or religious professions; and

“(B) an attestation that such voluntary separation is attributable to such sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms ‘sexual harassment’, ‘domestic violence’, ‘sexual assault’, ‘stalking’, ‘victim of sexual harassment’, and ‘survivor of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking’ have the meanings given such terms under State law, regulation, or policy.”

(b) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 303(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 503(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (12) as paragraphs (5) through (13), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) Such methods of administration as will ensure that—

“(i) applicants and potential applicants for unemployment compensation are notified of the provisions of paragraphs (19) and (20) of section 3304(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(ii) claims reviewers and hearing personnel are trained in—

“(I) the nature and dynamics of sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

“(II) methods of ascertaining and ensuring the confidentiality of personal information and documentation related to an individual’s claim about possible experiences of sexual harassment, domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘sexual harassment’, ‘domestic violence’,

‘sexual assault’, and ‘stalking’ have the meanings given such terms in section 3304(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”.

(c) TANF PERSONNEL TRAINING.—Section 402(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) CERTIFICATION THAT THE STATE WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT OR SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A certification by the chief executive officer of the State that the State has established and is enforcing standards and procedures to—

“(i) ensure that applicants and potential applicants for assistance under the State program funded under this part are notified of assistance made available by the State to victims of sexual harassment and survivors of domestic violence;

“(ii) ensure that case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part are trained in—

“(I) the nature and dynamics of sexual harassment and domestic violence;

“(II) State standards and procedures relating to the prevention of, and assistance for, individuals who are victims of sexual harassment or survivors of domestic violence; and

“(III) methods of ascertaining and ensuring the confidentiality of personal information and documentation related to an individual’s claim about possible experiences of sexual harassment or domestic violence; and

“(iii) ensure that, if a State has elected to establish and enforce standards and procedures regarding the screening for, and identification of, domestic violence pursuant to paragraph (7)—

“(I) the State program funded under this part provides information about the options under this part to current and potential beneficiaries; and

“(II) case workers and other agency personnel responsible for administering the State program funded under this part are provided with training regarding State standards and procedures pursuant to paragraph (7).

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘sexual harassment’ has the meaning given such term under State law, regulation, or policy; and

“(ii) the term ‘domestic violence’ has the meaning given such term in section 402(a)(7).”.

(d) NATIONAL GRANT PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPING A MODEL TRAINING PROGRAM FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PERSONNEL TRAINING.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Labor (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) is authorized to award a grant to a national victim service provider in order for such organization to—

(A) develop and disseminate a model training program (and related materials) for the training required under section 303(a)(4)(A)(ii) of the Social Security Act, as added by subsection (b); and

(B) provide technical assistance with respect to such model training program to unemployment compensation personnel.

(2) APPLICATION.—An entity seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form and manner, and containing such information as the Secretary specifies.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the program established under this subsection.

(B) REPORT AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the dissemination to the public of the report submitted

under subparagraph (A) not later than 10 days after the submission of such report to Congress under such subparagraph. Such procedures shall include the use of the internet to disseminate such report.

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(i) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) \$8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(B) THREE-YEAR AVAILABILITY OF GRANT FUNDS.—Each recipient of a grant under this subsection shall return to the Secretary any unused portion of such grant not later than 3 years after the date the grant was awarded, together with any earnings on such unused portion.

(C) AMOUNTS RETURNED.—Any amounts returned pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall be available without further appropriation to the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(e) NATIONAL GRANT PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPING A MODEL TRAINING PROGRAM FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PERSONNEL TRAINING.—

(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this subsection referred to as the “Secretary”) shall—

(A) develop and disseminate a model training program (and related materials) for the training required under 402(a)(8) of the Social Security Act, and if the state so elects, section 402(a)(7) of such Act; and

(B) provide technical assistance with respect to such model training program to eligible States (as defined in section 402 of the Social Security Act).

In developing the model training program under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may award grants and contracts and may develop such program in cooperation with an eligible partner.

(2) ELIGIBLE PARTNER DEFINED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “eligible partner” means an entity that is—

(A) a State or tribal domestic violence coalition or sexual assault coalition; or

(B) a State or local victim service provider with recognized expertise in the dynamics of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking whose primary mission is to provide services to survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including a rape crisis center or domestic violence program.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on the program established under this subsection.

(B) REPORT AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the dissemination to the public of the report submitted under subparagraph (A) not later than 10 days after the submission of such report to Congress under such subparagraph. Such procedures shall include the use of the internet to disseminate such report.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(A) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2022 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out the provisions of paragraph (1)(B).

(f) CONFORMITY REVIEW; EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) UNEMPLOYMENT AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CONFORMITY REVIEW.—

(i) INITIAL GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall issue guidance describing the requirements States must satisfy to conform

to the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(ii) REQUEST FOR TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION FROM STATES.—Not later than 30 days after the issuance of guidance under clause (i), the Secretary of Labor shall issue a request for the transmittal of information from States relating to the laws, regulations, and policies each State identifies to satisfy such requirements.

(iii) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES FROM STATES.—Not later than 120 days after the issuance of the request under clause (ii), each State which has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary of Labor under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act shall submit to the Secretary the laws, regulations, and policies identified pursuant to such clause.

(iv) NOTIFICATION OF THE RESULTS OF REVIEW TO STATES.—Not later than 60 days after the expiration of the deadline described in clause (iii), the Secretary of Labor shall notify each State whether the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the State under such clause satisfy the requirements described pursuant to clause (i) and, to the extent such laws, regulations, and policies fail to satisfy such requirements, the Secretary of Labor shall inform the State of the steps the State may take to remedy such failure and provide any necessary technical assistance.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT AMENDMENTS.—

(i) PROVISIONS RELATING TO SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date that is 60 days after the earlier of—

(I) the date on which a State is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(iv) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the State satisfy the requirements described pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i); or

(II) in the case of a State that is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(iv) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the State fail to satisfy such requirements, 1 year after the date of such notification.

(ii) PROVISIONS RELATING TO VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SURVIVORS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT OR STALKING.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date that is 60 days after the earlier of—

(I) the date on which a State is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(iv) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the State satisfy the requirements described pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i); or

(II) in the case of a State that is notified by the Secretary of Labor under subparagraph (A)(iv) that the laws, regulations, and policies identified by the State fail to satisfy such requirements, 2 years after the date of such notification.

(iii) PROVISIONS RELATING TO DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(3) shall apply with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) TANF AMENDMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendment made by subsection (c) shall be applicable in the next State plan submitted after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE DATE FOR STATE LAW AMENDMENT.—In the case of a State plan under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State action (including legislation, regulation, or other administrative action) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendment made by subsection (c), the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such amendment on the

basis of its failure to meet these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is considered to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 704. STUDY AND REPORTS ON BARRIERS TO SURVIVORS’ ECONOMIC SECURITY ACCESS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall conduct a study on the barriers that survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking throughout the United States experience in maintaining economic security as a result of issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(b) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall submit a report to Congress on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) CONTENTS.—The study and reports under this section shall include—

(1) identification of geographic areas in which State laws, regulations, and practices have a strong impact on the ability of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to exercise—

(A) any rights under this Act without compromising personal safety or the safety of others, including family members and excluding the abuser; and

(B) other components of economic security, including financial empowerment, affordable housing, transportation, healthcare access, and quality education and training opportunities;

(2) identification of geographic areas with shortages in resources for such survivors, with an accompanying analysis of the extent and impact of such shortage;

(3) analysis of factors related to industries, workplace settings, employer practices, trends, and other elements that impact the ability of such survivors to exercise any rights under this Act without compromising personal safety or the safety of others, including family members;

(4) the recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor with respect to resources, oversight, and enforcement tools to ensure successful implementation of the provisions of this Act in order to support the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and

(5) best practices for States, employers, health carriers, insurers, and other private entities in addressing issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

SEC. 705. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that examines, with respect to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who are, or were, enrolled at institutions of higher education and borrowed a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) for which the survivors have not repaid the total interest and principal due, each of the following:

(1) The implications of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking on a borrower’s ability to repay their Federal student loans.

(2) The adequacy of policies and procedures regarding Federal student loan deferment, forbearance, and grace periods when a survivor

has to suspend or terminate the survivor's enrollment at an institution of higher education due to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(3) The adequacy of institutional policies and practices regarding retention or transfer of credits when a survivor has to suspend or terminate the survivor's enrollment at an institution of higher education due to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(4) The availability or any options for a survivor of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking who attended an institution of higher education that committed unfair, deceptive, or abusive acts or practices, or otherwise substantially misrepresented information to students, to be able to seek a defense to repayment of the survivor's Federal student loan.

(5) The limitations faced by a survivor of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to obtain any relief or restitution on the survivor's Federal student loan debt due to the use of forced arbitration, gag orders, or bans on class actions.

SEC. 706. EDUCATION AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS FOR SURVIVORS.

(a) PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), the Attorney General (through the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women), and the grant recipient under section 41501 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 that establishes the national resource center on workplace responses to assist victims of domestic and sexual violence, shall coordinate and provide for a national public outreach and education campaign to raise public awareness of the workplace impact of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including outreach and education for employers, service providers, teachers, and other key partners. This campaign shall pay special attention to ensure that survivors are made aware of the existence of the following types of workplace laws (federal and/or State): anti-discrimination laws that bar treating survivors differently; leave laws, both paid and unpaid that are available for use by survivors; unemployment insurance laws and policies that address survivor eligibility. The provision of outreach and education under this paragraph shall be conducted in a manner that is equally effective for and accessible to people with disabilities and people without disabilities.

(2) DISSEMINATION.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, as described in paragraph (1), may disseminate information through the public outreach and education campaign on the resources and rights referred to in this subsection directly or through arrangements with health agencies, professional and nonprofit organizations, consumer groups, labor organizations, institutions of higher education, clinics, the media, and Federal, State, and local agencies.

(3) INFORMATION.—The information disseminated under paragraph (2) shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(A) the resources and rights that are—

(i) available to survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; and
(ii) established in this Act and the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291 et seq.);

(B) guidelines and best practices on prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault;

(C) resources that promote healthy relationships and communication skills;

(D) resources that encourage bystander intervention in a situation involving domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault;

(E) resources that promote workplace policies that support and help maintain the economic security of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including guidelines and best practices to promote the creation of effective employee assistance programs; and

(F) resources and rights that the heads of Federal agencies described in paragraph (2) determine are appropriate to include.

(4) COMMON LANGUAGES.—The Secretary of Labor shall ensure that the information disseminated to survivors under paragraph (2) is made available in commonly encountered languages.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMPLOYEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “employee” means any individual employed by an employer. In the case of an individual employed by a public agency, such term means an individual employed as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(e)(2)).

(B) BASIS.—The term includes a person employed as described in subparagraph (A) on a full- or part-time basis, for a fixed time period, on a temporary basis, pursuant to a detail, or as a participant in a work assignment as a condition of receipt of Federal or State income-based public assistance.

(2) EMPLOYER.—The term “employer”—

(A) means any person engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce who employs 15 or more individuals; and

(B) includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, and includes a public agency that employs individuals as described in section 3(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, but does not include any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer) or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(3) FLSA TERMS.—The terms “employ” and “State” have the meanings given the terms in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).

(c) STUDY ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES.—The Secretary of Labor, in conjunction with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a study on the status of workplace responses to employees who experience domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking while employed, in each State and nationally, to improve the access of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking to supportive resources and economic security.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SEC. 707. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of such provisions or amendments to any person or circumstance shall not be affected.

TITLE VIII—HOMICIDE REDUCTION INITIATIVES

SEC. 801. PROHIBITING PERSONS CONVICTED OF MISDEMEANOR CRIMES AGAINST DATING PARTNERS AND PERSONS SUBJECT TO PROTECTION ORDERS.

Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (32), by striking all that follows after “The term ‘intimate partner’” and inserting the following: “—

“(A) means, with respect to a person, the spouse of the person, a former spouse of the person, an individual who is a parent of a child of the person, and an individual who cohabitates or has cohabited with the person; and

“(B) includes—

“(i) a dating partner or former dating partner; and

“(ii) any other person similarly situated to a spouse.

Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to require that sexual contact between two persons have occurred to establish the existence of any relationship for purposes of this paragraph. For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘dating partner’ means, with respect to person, a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the person.”;

(2) in paragraph (33)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the term” and inserting “The term”;

(B) in clause (i), by inserting after “Federal, State,” the following: “local.”; and

(C) in clause (ii), by inserting “intimate partner,” after “spouse,” each place it appears;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (34) and (35) as paragraphs (35) and (36) respectively; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (33) the following:

“(34)(A) The term ‘misdemeanor crime of stalking’ means an offense that—

“(i) is a misdemeanor crime of stalking under Federal, State, Tribal, or municipal law; and

“(ii) is a course of harassment, intimidation, or surveillance of another person that—

“(I) places that person in reasonable fear of material harm to the health or safety of—

“(aa) that person;

“(bb) an immediate family member (as defined in section 115) of that person;

“(cc) a household member of that person; or

“(dd) a spouse or intimate partner of that person; or

“(II) causes, attempts to cause, or would reasonably be expected to cause emotional distress to a person described in item (aa), (bb), (cc), or (dd) of subclause (I).

“(B) A person shall not be considered to have been convicted of such an offense for purposes of this chapter, unless—

“(i) the person was represented by counsel in the case, or knowingly and intelligently waived the right to counsel in the case; and

“(ii) in the case of a prosecution for an offense described in this paragraph for which a person was entitled to a jury trial in the jurisdiction in which the case was tried, either—

“(I) the case was tried by a jury; or

“(II) the person knowingly and intelligently waived the right to have the case tried by a jury, by guilty plea or otherwise.

“(C) A person shall not be considered to have been convicted of such an offense for purposes of this chapter if the conviction has been expunged or set aside, or is an offense for which the person has been pardoned or has had civil rights restored (if the law of the applicable jurisdiction provides for the loss of civil rights under such an offense) unless the pardon, expungement, or restoration of civil rights expressly provides that the person may not ship, transport, possess, or receive firearms.”.

SEC. 802. PROHIBITING STALKERS AND INDIVIDUALS SUBJECT TO COURT ORDER FROM POSSESSING A FIREARM.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking “that restrains such person” and all that follows, and inserting “described in subsection (g)(8).”;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) who has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of stalking.”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

“(8) who is subject to a court order—

“(A) that was issued—

“(i) after a hearing of which such person received actual notice, and at which such person had an opportunity to participate; or

“(ii) in the case of an *ex parte* order, relative to which notice and opportunity to be heard are provided—

“(I) within the time required by State, Tribal, or territorial law; and

“(II) in any event within a reasonable time after the order is issued, sufficient to protect the due process rights of the person;

“(B) that restrains such person from—

“(i) harassing, stalking, or threatening an intimate partner of such person or child of such intimate partner or person, or engaging in other conduct that would place an intimate partner in reasonable fear of bodily injury to the partner or child; or

“(ii) intimidating or dissuading a witness from testifying in court; and

“(C) that—

“(i) includes a finding that such person represents a credible threat to the physical safety of such individual described in subparagraph (B); or

“(ii) by its terms explicitly prohibits the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against such individual described in subparagraph (B) that would reasonably be expected to cause bodily injury.”;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the comma at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) who has been convicted in any court of a misdemeanor crime of stalking.”.

TITLE IX—SAFETY FOR INDIAN WOMEN

SEC. 901. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) American Indians and Alaska Natives are 2.5 times as likely to experience violent crimes—and at least 2 times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault crimes—compared to all other races.

(2) More than 4 in 5 American Indian and Alaska Native women, or 84.3 percent, have experienced violence in their lifetime.

(3) The vast majority of Native victims—96 percent of women and 89 percent of male victims—report being victimized by a non-Indian.

(4) Native victims of sexual violence are three times as likely to have experienced sexual violence by an interracial perpetrator as non-Hispanic White victims and Native stalking victims are nearly 4 times as likely to be stalked by someone of a different race.

(5) While Tribes exercising jurisdiction over non-Indians have reported significant successes, the inability to prosecute crimes related to the Special Domestic Violence Criminal Jurisdiction crimes continues to leave Tribes unable to fully hold domestic violence offenders accountable.

(6) Tribal prosecutors report that the majority of domestic violence cases involve children either as witnesses or victims, and Department of Justice reports that American Indian and Alaska Native children suffer exposure to violence at rates higher than any other race in the United States.

(7) Childhood exposure to violence has immediate and long-term effects, including: increased rates of altered neurological development, poor physical and mental health, poor school performance, substance abuse, and overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system.

(8) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, homicide is the third leading cause of death among American Indian and Alaska Native women between 10 and 24 years of age and the fifth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age.

(9) On some reservations, Indian women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average.

(10) According to a 2010 Government Accountability Office report, United States Attorneys

declined to prosecute nearly 52 percent of violent crimes that occur in Indian country.

(11) Investigation into cases of missing and murdered Indian women is made difficult for Tribal law enforcement agencies due to a lack of resources, such as—

(A) necessary training, equipment, or funding;

(B) a lack of interagency cooperation;

(C) a lack of appropriate laws in place; and

(D) a lack of access to Federal, State, and local law enforcement databases.

(12) Domestic violence calls are among the most dangerous calls that law enforcement receives.

(13) The complicated jurisdictional scheme that exists in Indian country—

(A) has a significant negative impact on the ability to provide public safety to Indian communities;

(B) has been increasingly exploited by criminals; and

(C) requires a high degree of commitment and cooperation among Tribal, Federal, and State law enforcement officials.

(14) Restoring and enhancing local, Tribal capacity to address violence against women provides for greater local control, safety, accountability, and transparency.

(15) In States with restrictive land settlement acts such as Alaska, “Indian country” is limited, resources for local Tribal responses either nonexistent or insufficient to meet the needs, jurisdiction unnecessarily complicated and increases the already high levels of victimization of American Indian and Alaska Native women. According to the Tribal Law and Order Act Commission Report, Alaska Native women are over-represented in the domestic violence victim population by 250 percent; they comprise 19 percent of the State population, but are 47 percent of reported rape victims. And among other Indian Tribes, Alaska Native women suffer the highest rates of domestic and sexual violence in the country.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are—

(1) to clarify the responsibilities of Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments with respect to responding to cases of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, trafficking, sexual violence, crimes against children, and assault against Tribal law enforcement officers and murdered Indians;

(2) to increase coordination and communication among Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies;

(3) to empower Tribal governments with the resources and information necessary to effectively respond to cases of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sex trafficking, sexual violence, and missing and murdered Indians; and

(4) to increase the collection of data related to missing and murdered Indians and the sharing of information among Federal, State, and Tribal officials responsible for responding to and investigating cases of missing and murdered Indians.

SEC. 902. AUTHORIZING FUNDING FOR THE TRIBAL ACCESS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, to remain available until expended, for the purposes of enhancing the ability of Tribal government entities to access, enter information into, and obtain information from, Federal criminal information databases, as authorized by this section.”.

(b) INDIAN TRIBE AND INDIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION SHARING.—Section 534 of title 28, United States Code, is further amended by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

“(d) INDIAN TRIBE AND INDIAN LAW ENFORCEMENT INFORMATION SHARING.—The Attorney General shall permit Tribal law enforcement entities (including entities designated by a Tribe

as maintaining public safety within a Tribe’s territorial jurisdiction that has no federal or state arrest authority) and Bureau of Indian Affairs law enforcement agencies—

“(1) to access and enter information into Federal criminal information databases; and

“(2) to obtain information from the databases.”.

SEC. 903. TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER COVERED CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL VIOLENCE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER.

Section 204 of Public Law 90–284 (25 U.S.C. 1304) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE” and inserting “CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL VIOLENCE, SEX TRAFFICKING, STALKING, AND ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER”;

(2) in subsection (a)(6), in the heading, by striking “SPECIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CRIMINAL JURISDICTION” and inserting “SPECIAL TRIBAL CRIMINAL JURISDICTION”;

(3) by striking “special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction” each place such term appears and inserting “special Tribal criminal jurisdiction”;

(4) in subsection (a)—

(A) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) STALKING.—The term ‘stalking’ means engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person proscribed by the criminal law of the Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs that would cause a reasonable person to—

“(A) fear for the person’s safety or the safety of others; or

“(B) suffer substantial emotional distress.”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (10) and (11);

(C) by inserting before paragraph (10) (as redesignated) the following:

“(8) SEX TRAFFICKING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘sex trafficking’ means conduct—

“(i) consisting of—

“(I) recruiting, enticing, harboring, transporting, providing, obtaining, advertising, maintaining, patronizing, or soliciting by any means a person; or

“(II) benefitting, financially or by receiving anything of value, from participation in a venture that has engaged in an act described in subclause (I); and

“(ii) carried out with the knowledge, or, except where the act constituting the violation of clause (i) is advertising, in reckless disregard of the fact, that—

“(I) means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion, or any combination of such means will be used to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act; or

“(II) the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph, the terms ‘coercion’ and ‘commercial sex act’ have the meanings given the terms in section 1591(e) of title 18, United States Code.

“(9) SEXUAL VIOLENCE.—The term ‘sexual violence’ means any nonconsensual sexual act or contact proscribed by the criminal law of the Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs, including in any case in which the victim lacks the capacity to consent to the act.”;

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (6) and (7);

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4);

(F) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated), to read as follows:

“(3) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—The term ‘domestic violence’ means violence—

“(A) committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or intimate partner, or by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic- or family- violence laws of an Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violence occurs; or

“(B)(i) committed against a victim who is a child under the age of 18, or an elder (as such term is defined by Tribal law), including when an offender recklessly engages in conduct that creates a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury to the victim, or committed as described in subparagraph (A) while the child or elder is present; and

“(ii) the child or elder—
“(I) resides or has resided in the same household as the offender;

“(II) is related to the offender by blood or marriage;

“(III) is related to another victim of the offender by blood or marriage;

“(IV) is under the care of a victim of the offender who is an intimate partner or former spouse; or

“(V) is under the care of a victim of the offender who is similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic- or family- violence laws of an Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violence occurs.”;

(G) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as redesignated), the following:

“(1) ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OR CORRECTIONAL OFFICER.—The term ‘assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer’ means any criminal violation of the law of the Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs that involves the threatened, attempted, or actual harmful or offensive touching of a law enforcement or correctional officer.”; and

(H) by inserting after paragraph (4) (as redesignated), the following:

“(5) OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.—The term ‘obstruction of justice’ means any violation of the criminal law of the Indian Tribe that has jurisdiction over the Indian country where the violation occurs, and the violation involves interfering with the administration or due process of the Tribe’s laws including any Tribal criminal proceeding or investigation of a crime.”;

(5) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting after “the powers of self-government of a participating Tribe” the following: “, including any participating Tribes in the State of Maine.”;

(6) in subsection (b)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting after “over an alleged offense” the following: “, other than obstruction of justice or an act of assault of a law enforcement or corrections officer.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; or”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) is being prosecuted for a crime of sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, obstructing justice, or assaulting a police or corrections officer under the laws of the prosecuting Tribe.”;

(7) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “domestic violence” and inserting “Tribal”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AND DATING VIOLENCE” and inserting “, DATING VIOLENCE, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, SEXUAL VIOLENCE, STALKING, SEX TRAFFICKING, OR ASSAULT OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OR CORRECTIONS OFFICER”; and

(ii) by striking “or dating violence” and inserting “, dating violence, obstruction of justice, sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, or as-

sault of a law enforcement or corrections officer”;

(8) in subsection (d), by striking “domestic violence” each place it appears and inserting “Tribal”;

(9) by striking subsections (f), (g), and (h) and inserting the following:

“(f) GRANTS AND REIMBURSEMENT TO TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—

“(1) REIMBURSEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General is authorized to reimburse Tribal government authorities for expenses incurred in exercising special Tribal criminal jurisdiction.

“(B) ELIGIBLE EXPENSES.—Eligible expenses for reimbursement shall include—

“(i) expenses incurred to arrest or prosecute offenders and to detain inmates (including costs associated with providing health care);

“(ii) expenses related to indigent defense services; and

“(iii) costs associated with probation and rehabilitation services.

“(C) PROCEDURE.—Reimbursements authorized pursuant to this section shall be in accordance with rules promulgated by the Attorney General after consultation with Indian Tribes and within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act. The rules promulgated by the Department shall set a maximum allowable reimbursement to any Tribal government in a 1-year period.

“(2) GRANTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to this section shall be in accordance with rules promulgated by the Attorney General after consultation with Indian Tribes and within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act. The rules promulgated by the Department shall set a maximum allowable reimbursement to any Tribal government in a 1-year period.

“(2) GRANTS.—The Attorney General may award grants to this section shall be in accordance with rules promulgated by the Attorney General after consultation with Indian Tribes and within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act. The rules promulgated by the Department shall set a maximum allowable reimbursement to any Tribal government in a 1-year period.

“(A) to strengthen Tribal criminal justice systems to assist Indian Tribes in exercising special Tribal criminal jurisdiction, including—

“(i) law enforcement (including the capacity of law enforcement, court personnel, or other non-law enforcement entities that have no Federal or State arrest authority agencies but have been designated by a Tribe as responsible for maintaining public safety within its territorial jurisdiction, to enter information into and obtain information from national crime information databases);

“(ii) prosecution;

“(iii) trial and appellate courts (including facilities construction);

“(iv) probation systems;

“(v) detention and correctional facilities (including facilities construction);

“(vi) alternative rehabilitation centers;

“(vii) culturally appropriate services and assistance for victims and their families; and

“(viii) criminal codes and rules of criminal procedure, appellate procedure, and evidence;

“(B) to provide indigent criminal defendants with the effective assistance of licensed defense counsel, at no cost to the defendant, in criminal proceedings in which a participating Tribe prosecutes—

“(i) a crime of domestic violence;

“(ii) a crime of dating violence;

“(iii) a criminal violation of a protection order;

“(iv) a crime of sexual violence;

“(v) a crime of stalking;

“(vi) a crime of sex trafficking;

“(vii) a crime of obstruction of justice; or

“(viii) a crime of assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer;

“(C) to ensure that, in criminal proceedings in which a participating Tribe exercises special Tribal criminal jurisdiction, jurors are summoned, selected, and instructed in a manner consistent with all applicable requirements;

“(D) to accord victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual violence, stalking, sex trafficking, obstruction of justice, assault of a law enforcement or correctional officer, and violations of protection orders rights that are similar to the rights of a crime victim described in section 3771(a) of title 18, consistent with Tribal law and custom; and

“(E) to create a pilot project to allow up to five Indian Tribes in Alaska to implement special Tribal criminal jurisdiction.

“(g) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement and not supplant any other Federal, State, Tribal, or local government amounts made available to carry out activities described in this section.

“(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026 to carry out subsection (f) and to provide training, technical assistance, data collection, and evaluation of the criminal justice systems of participating Tribes.

“(i) USE OF FUNDS.—Not less than 25 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under this section in a given year shall be used for each of the purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (f), with remaining funds available to be distributed for either of the purposes described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (f), or any combination of such purposes, depending on need and in consultation with Indian Tribes.”;

(10) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

“(j) INDIAN COUNTRY DEFINED.—For purposes of the pilot project described in subsection (f)(5), the definition of ‘Indian country’ shall include—

“(1) Alaska Native-owned Townsites, Allotments, and former reservation lands acquired in fee by Alaska Native Village Corporations pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 33) and other lands transferred in fee to Native villages; and

“(2) all lands within any Alaska Native village with a population that is at least 75 percent Alaska Native.”.

TITLE X—OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

SEC. 1001. ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2002 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10442) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “a Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “an Office on Violence Against Women”;

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting after “within the Department of Justice” the following: “, not subsumed by any other office”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title VI of Public Law 103-322) or the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Division B of Public Law 106-386)” and inserting “Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title VII of Public Law 103-322), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106-386), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 54), and the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021”.

(b) DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2003 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10443) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2003. DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

“(a) APPOINTMENT.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Director for the Office on Violence Against Women (in this title referred to as the ‘Director’) to be responsible, under the general authority of the Attorney General, for the administration, coordination, and implementation of the programs and activities of the Office.

“(b) OTHER EMPLOYMENT.—The Director shall not—

“(1) engage in any employment other than that of serving as Director; or

“(2) hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Office makes any contract or

other agreement under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–386), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 54), or the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021.

“(c) VACANCY.—In the case of a vacancy, the President may designate an officer or employee who shall act as Director during the vacancy.

“(d) COMPENSATION.—The Director shall be compensated at a rate of pay not to exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.”

(c) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2004 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10444) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 2004. DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

“The Director shall have the following duties:
“(1) Maintaining liaison with the judicial branches of the Federal and State Governments on matters relating to violence against women.

“(2) Providing information to the President, the Congress, the judiciary, State, local, and Tribal governments, and the general public on matters relating to violence against women.

“(3) Serving, at the request of the Attorney General, as the representative of the Department of Justice on domestic task forces, committees, or commissions addressing policy or issues relating to violence against women.

“(4) Serving, at the request of the President, acting through the Attorney General, as the representative of the United States Government on human rights and economic justice matters related to violence against women in international fora, including, but not limited to, the United Nations.

“(5) Carrying out the functions of the Department of Justice under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (title IV of Public Law 103–322), the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–386), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162; 119 Stat. 3080), the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–4; 127 Stat. 54), and the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2021, including with respect to those functions—

“(A) the development of policy, protocols, and guidelines;

“(B) the development and management of grant programs and other programs, and the provision of technical assistance under such programs; and

“(C) the awarding and termination of grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts.

“(6) Providing technical assistance, coordination, and support to—

“(A) other components of the Department of Justice, in efforts to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to violence against women, including the litigation of civil and criminal actions relating to enforcing such laws;

“(B) other Federal, State, local, and Tribal agencies, in efforts to develop policy, provide technical assistance, synchronize Federal definitions and protocols, and improve coordination among agencies carrying out efforts to eliminate violence against women, including Indian or indigenous women; and

“(C) grantees, in efforts to combat violence against women and to provide support and assistance to victims of such violence.

“(7) Exercising such other powers and functions as may be vested in the Director pursuant to this subchapter or by delegation of the Attorney General.

“(8) Establishing such rules, regulations, guidelines, and procedures as are necessary to carry out any function of the Office.”

(d) STAFF OF OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.—Section 2005 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10445) is amended in the heading, by striking “VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OFFICE” and inserting “OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN”.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 121(a)(1) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20124(a)(1)) is amended by striking “the Violence Against Women Office” and inserting “the Office on Violence Against Women”.

SEC. 1002. OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN A DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR CULTURALLY SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES.

Part T of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (34 U.S.C. 10441 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2004 the following:

“SEC. 2004A. DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR CULTURALLY SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Office on Violence Against Women a Deputy Director for Culturally Specific Communities.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Deputy Director shall, under the guidance and authority of the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women—
“(1) oversee the administration of grants related to culturally specific services and contracts with culturally specific organizations;

“(2) coordinate development of Federal policy, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, in culturally specific communities;

“(3) advise the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women concerning policies, legislation, implementation of laws, and other issues relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in culturally specific communities;

“(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and support to other offices and bureaus in the Department of Justice to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in culturally specific communities;

“(5) ensure that appropriate technical assistance, developed and provided by entities having expertise in culturally specific communities is made available to grantees and potential grantees proposing to serve culturally specific communities; and

“(6) ensure access to grants and technical assistance for culturally specific organizations and analyze the distribution of funding in order to identify barriers for culturally specific organizations.”

TITLE XI—IMPROVING CONDITIONS FOR WOMEN IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

SEC. 1101. IMPROVING THE TREATMENT OF PRIMARY CARETAKER PARENTS AND OTHER INDIVIDUALS IN FEDERAL PRISONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Ramona Brant Improvement of Conditions for Women in Federal Custody Act”.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§4051. Treatment of primary caretaker parents and other individuals

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘correctional officer’ means a correctional officer of the Bureau of Prisons;

“(2) the term ‘covered institution’ means a Federal penal or correctional institution;

“(3) the term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Bureau of Prisons;

“(4) the term ‘post-partum recovery’ means the first 8-week period of post-partum recovery after giving birth;

“(5) the term ‘primary caretaker parent’ has the meaning given the term in section 31903 of the Family Unity Demonstration Project Act (34 U.S.C. 12242);

“(6) the term ‘prisoner’ means an individual who is incarcerated in a Federal penal or cor-

rectional institution, including a vulnerable person; and

“(7) the term ‘vulnerable person’ means an individual who—

“(A) is under 21 years of age or over 60 years of age;

“(B) is pregnant;

“(C) identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex;

“(D) is victim or witness of a crime;

“(E) has filed a nonfrivolous civil rights claim in Federal or State court;

“(F) has a serious mental or physical illness or disability; or

“(G) during the period of incarceration, has been determined to have experienced or to be experiencing severe trauma or to be the victim of gender-based violence—

“(i) by any court or administrative judicial proceeding;

“(ii) by any corrections official;

“(iii) by the individual’s attorney or legal service provider; or

“(iv) by the individual.

“(b) GEOGRAPHIC PLACEMENT.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—The Director shall establish within the Bureau of Prisons an office that determines the placement of prisoners.

“(2) PLACEMENT OF PRISONERS.—In determining the placement of a prisoner, the office established under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) if the prisoner has children, place the prisoner as close to the children as possible;

“(B) in deciding whether to assign a transgender or intersex prisoner to a facility for male or female prisoners, and in making other housing and programming assignments, consider on a case-by-case basis whether a placement would ensure the prisoner’s health and safety, including serious consideration of the prisoner’s own views with respect to their safety, and whether the placement would present management or security problems; and

“(C) consider any other factor that the office determines to be appropriate.

“(c) PROHIBITION ON PLACEMENT OF PREGNANT PRISONERS OR PRISONERS IN POST-PARTUM RECOVERY IN SEGREGATED HOUSING UNITS.—

“(1) PLACEMENT IN SEGREGATED HOUSING UNITS.—A covered institution may not place a prisoner who is pregnant or in post-partum recovery in a segregated housing unit unless the prisoner presents an immediate risk of harm to the prisoner or others.

“(2) RESTRICTIONS.—Any placement of a prisoner described in subparagraph (A) in a segregated housing unit shall be limited and temporary.

“(d) PARENTING CLASSES.—The Director shall provide parenting classes to each prisoner who is a primary caretaker parent, and such classes shall be made available to prisoners with limited English proficiency in compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

“(e) TRAUMA SCREENING.—The Director shall provide training, including cultural competency training, to each correctional officer and each employee of the Bureau of Prisons who regularly interacts with prisoners, including each instructor and health care professional, to enable those correctional officers and employees to—

“(1) identify a prisoner who has a mental or physical health need relating to trauma the prisoner has experienced; and

“(2) refer a prisoner described in paragraph (1) to the proper healthcare professional for treatment.

“(f) INMATE HEALTH.—

“(1) HEALTH CARE ACCESS.—The Director shall ensure that all prisoners receive adequate health care.

“(2) HYGIENIC PRODUCTS.—The Director shall make essential hygienic products, including shampoo, toothpaste, toothbrushes, and any other hygienic product that the Director determines appropriate, available without charge to prisoners.

“(3) GYNECOLOGIST ACCESS.—The Director shall ensure that all prisoners have access to a gynecologist as appropriate.

“(g) USE OF SEX-APPROPRIATE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS.—

“(1) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall make rules under which—

“(A) a correctional officer may not conduct a strip search of a prisoner of the opposite sex unless—

“(i) the prisoner presents a risk of immediate harm to the prisoner or others, and no other correctional officer of the same sex as the prisoner, or medical staff is available to assist; or

“(ii) the prisoner has previously requested that an officer of a different sex conduct searches;

“(B) a correctional officer may not enter a restroom reserved for prisoners of the opposite sex unless—

“(i) a prisoner in the restroom presents a risk of immediate harm to themselves or others; or

“(ii) there is a medical emergency in the restroom and no other correctional officer of the appropriate sex is available to assist;

“(C) a transgender prisoner’s sex is determined according to the sex with which they identify; and

“(D) a correctional officer may not search or physically examine a prisoner for the sole purpose of determining the prisoner’s genital status or sex.

“(2) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to affect the requirements under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15601 et seq.).”

(c) SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Section 3621(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) ELIGIBILITY OF PRIMARY CARETAKER PARENTS AND PREGNANT WOMEN.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons may not prohibit an eligible prisoner who is a primary caretaker parent (as defined in section 4051) or pregnant from participating in a program of residential substance abuse treatment provided under paragraph (1) on the basis of a failure by the eligible prisoner, before being committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, to disclose to any official of the Bureau of Prisons that the prisoner had a substance abuse problem on or before the date on which the eligible prisoner was committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.”

(d) IMPLEMENTATION DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall implement this section and the amendments made by this section.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section.

(e) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“4051. Treatment of primary caretaker parents and other individuals.”

SEC. 1102. PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF WOMEN.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Stop Infant Mortality And Recidivism Reduction Act” or the “SIMARRA Act”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (in this section referred to as the “Director”) shall establish a pilot program (in this section referred to as the “Program”) in accordance with this section to permit women incarcerated in Federal prisons and the children born to such

women during incarceration to reside together while the inmate serves a term of imprisonment in a separate housing wing of the prison.

(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are to—

(1) prevent infant mortality among infants born to incarcerated mothers and greatly reduce the trauma and stress experienced by the unborn fetuses of pregnant inmates;

(2) reduce the recidivism rates of federally incarcerated women and mothers, and enhance public safety by improving the effectiveness of the Federal prison system for women as a population with special needs;

(3) establish female offender risk and needs assessment as the cornerstones of a more effective and efficient Federal prison system;

(4) implement a validated post-sentencing risk and needs assessment system that relies on dynamic risk factors to provide Federal prison officials with a roadmap to address the pre- and post-natal needs of Federal pregnant offenders, manage limited resources, and enhance public safety;

(5) perform regular outcome evaluations of the effectiveness of programs and interventions for federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers to assure that such programs and interventions are evidence-based and to suggest changes, deletions, and expansions based on the results of such evaluations; and

(6) assist the Department of Justice to address the underlying cost structure of the Federal prison system and ensure that the Department can continue to run prison nurseries safely and securely without compromising the scope or quality of the Department’s critical health, safety and law enforcement missions.

(d) DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall carry out this section in consultation with—

(A) a licensed and board-certified gynecologist or obstetrician;

(B) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts;

(C) the Director of the Office of Probation and Pretrial Services;

(D) the Director of the National Institute of Justice; and

(E) the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(2) DUTIES.—The Director shall, in accordance with paragraph (3)—

(A) develop an offender risk and needs assessment system particular to the health and sensitivities of Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers in accordance with this subsection;

(B) develop recommendations regarding recidivism reduction programs and productive activities in accordance with subsection (c);

(C) conduct ongoing research and data analysis on—

(i) the best practices relating to the use of offender risk and needs assessment tools particular to the health and sensitivities of federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers;

(ii) the best available risk and needs assessment tools particular to the health and sensitivities of Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers and the level to which they rely on dynamic risk factors that could be addressed and changed over time, and on measures of risk of recidivism, individual needs, and responsiveness to recidivism reduction programs;

(iii) the most effective and efficient uses of such tools in conjunction with recidivism reduction programs, productive activities, incentives, and rewards; and

(iv) which recidivism reduction programs are the most effective—

(I) for Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers classified at different recidivism risk levels; and

(II) for addressing the specific needs of Federally incarcerated pregnant women and mothers;

(D) on a biennial basis, review the system developed under subparagraph (A) and the rec-

ommendations developed under subparagraph (B), using the research conducted under subparagraph (C), to determine whether any revisions or updates should be made, and if so, make such revisions or updates;

(E) hold periodic meetings with the individuals listed in paragraph (1) at intervals to be determined by the Director;

(F) develop tools to communicate parenting program availability and eligibility criteria to each employee of the Bureau of Prisons and each pregnant inmate to ensure that each pregnant inmate in the custody of a Bureau of Prisons facility understands the resources available to such inmate; and

(G) report to Congress in accordance with subsection (i).

(3) METHODS.—In carrying out the duties under paragraph (2), the Director shall—

(A) consult relevant stakeholders; and

(B) make decisions using data that is based on the best available statistical and empirical evidence.

(e) ELIGIBILITY.—An inmate may apply to participate in the Program if the inmate—

(1) is pregnant at the beginning of or during the term of imprisonment; and

(2) is in the custody or control of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

(f) PROGRAM TERMS.—

(1) TERM OF PARTICIPATION.—To correspond with the purposes and goals of the Program to promote bonding during the critical stages of child development, an eligible inmate selected for the Program may participate in the Program, subject to subsection (g), until the earliest of—

(A) the date that the inmate’s term of imprisonment terminates;

(B) the date the infant fails to meet any medical criteria established by the Director or the Director’s designee along with a collective determination of the persons listed in subsection (d)(1); or

(C) 30 months.

(2) INMATE REQUIREMENTS.—For the duration of an inmate’s participation in the Program, the inmate shall agree to—

(A) take substantive steps towards acting in the role of a parent or guardian to any child of that inmate;

(B) participate in any educational or counseling opportunities established by the Director, including topics such as child development, parenting skills, domestic violence, vocational training, or substance abuse, as appropriate;

(C) abide by any court decision regarding the legal or physical custody of the child;

(D) transfer to the Federal Bureau of Prisons any child support payments for the infant of the participating inmate from any person or governmental entity; and

(E) specify a person who has agreed to take at least temporary custody of the child if the inmate’s participation in the Program terminates before the inmate’s release.

(g) CONTINUITY OF CARE.—The Director shall take appropriate actions to prevent detachment or disruption of either an inmate’s or infant’s health and bonding-based well-being due to termination of the Program.

(h) REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section and once each year thereafter for 5 years, the Director shall submit a report to the Congress with regards to progress in implementing the Program.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the termination of the Program, the Director shall issue a final report to the Congress that contains a detailed statement of the Director’s findings and conclusions, including recommendations for legislation, administrative actions, and regulations the Director considers appropriate.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SEC. 1103. RESEARCH AND REPORT ON WOMEN IN FEDERAL INCARCERATION.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and thereafter, every other year, the National Institutes of Justice, in consultation with the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Bureau of Prisons (including the Women and Special Population Branch) shall prepare a report on the status of women in federal incarceration. Depending on the topic to be addressed, and the facility, data shall be collected from Bureau of Prisons personnel and a sample that is representative of the population of incarcerated women. The report shall include:

(1) With regard to federal facilities wherein women are incarcerated—

(A) responses by such women to questions from the Adverse Childhood Experience (ACES) questionnaire;

(B) demographic data of such women, including sexual orientation and gender identity;

(C) responses by such women to questions about the extent of exposure to sexual victimization, sexual violence and domestic violence (both inside and outside of incarceration);

(D) the number of such women were pregnant at the time that they entered incarceration;

(E) the number of such women who have children age 18 or under, and if so, how many; and

(F) the crimes for which such women are incarcerated and the length of their sentence and to the extent practicable, any information on the connection between the crime of which they were convicted & their experience of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(2) With regard to all federal facilities where persons are incarcerated—

(A) a list of best practices with respect to women's incarceration and transition, including staff led programs, services and management practices (including making sanitary products readily available and easily accessible, and access to and provision of healthcare);

(B) the availability of trauma treatment at each facility (including number of beds, and number of trained staff);

(C) rates of serious mental illness broken down by gender and security level and a list of residential programs available by site; and

(D) the availability of vocational education and a list of vocational programs provided by each facility.

SEC. 1104. REENTRY PLANNING AND SERVICES FOR INCARCERATED WOMEN.

The Attorney General, in coordination with the Chief of U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services and the Director of the Bureau of Prisons (including Women and Special Population Branch), shall collaborate on a model of gender responsive transition for incarcerated women, including the development of a national standard on prevention with respect to domestic and sexual violence. In developing the model, the Chief and the Director shall consult with such experts within the federal government (including the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice) and in the victim service provider community (including sexual and domestic violence and homelessness, job training and job placement service providers) as are necessary to the completion of a comprehensive plan. Issues addressed should include—

(1) the development by the Bureau of Prisons of a contract for gender collaborative services; and

(2) identification by re-entry affairs coordinators and responsive planning for the needs of re-entering women with respect to—

(A) housing, including risk of homelessness;

(B) previous exposure to and risk for domestic and sexual violence; and

(C) the need for parenting classes, assistance securing childcare, or assistance in seeking or securing jobs that afford flexibility (as might be necessary in the re-entry, parenting or other contexts).

TITLE XII—LAW ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY**SEC. 1201. NOTIFICATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF PROHIBITED PURCHASE OR ATTEMPTED PURCHASE OF A FIREARM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 108. NOTIFICATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF PROHIBITED PURCHASE OF A FIREARM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a background check conducted by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System pursuant to the request of a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer of firearms (as such terms are defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code), which background check determines that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(8), (g)(9), or (g)(10) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, and such determination is made after 3 business days have elapsed since the licensee contacted the System and a firearm has been transferred to that person, the System shall notify the law enforcement agencies described in subsection (b).

“(b) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES DESCRIBED.—The law enforcement agencies described in this subsection are the law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction over the location from which the licensee contacted the system and the law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction over the location of the residence of the person for which the background check was conducted, as follows:

“(1) The field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(2) The local law enforcement agency.

“(3) The State law enforcement agency.

“(4) The Tribal law enforcement agency.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 107 the following:

“Sec. 108. Notification to law enforcement agencies of prohibited purchase of a firearm.”

SEC. 1202. REPORTING OF BACKGROUND CHECK DENIALS TO STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 925A the following:

“§925B. Reporting of background check denials to State, local, and Tribal authorities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) provides a notice pursuant to section 922(t) of this title that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(8), (g)(9), or (g)(10) of section 922 of this title or State law, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with subsection (b) of this section—

“(1) report to the law enforcement authorities of the State where the person sought to acquire the firearm and, if different, the law enforcement authorities of the State of residence of the person—

“(A) that the notice was provided;

“(B) of the specific provision of law that would have been violated;

“(C) of the date and time the notice was provided;

“(D) of the location where the firearm was sought to be acquired; and

“(E) of the identity of the person; and

“(2) report the incident to local or Tribal law enforcement authorities and, where practicable, State, Tribal, or local prosecutors, in the jurisdiction where the firearm was sought and in the jurisdiction where the person resides.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR REPORT.—A report is made in accordance with this subsection if the report is made within 24 hours after the provision of the notice described in subsection (a), except that the making of the report may be delayed for so long as is necessary to avoid compromising an ongoing investigation.

“(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to require a report with respect to a person to be made to the same State authorities that originally issued the notice with respect to the person.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925A the following:

“925B. Reporting of background check denials to State, local, and Tribal authorities.”

SEC. 1203. SPECIAL ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS AND CROSS-DEPUTIZED ATTORNEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting after section 925B the following:

“§925C. Special assistant U.S. attorneys and cross-deputized attorneys

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to improve the enforcement of paragraphs (8), (9), and (10) of section 922(g), the Attorney General may—

“(1) appoint, in accordance with section 543 of title 28, qualified State, Tribal, territorial and local prosecutors and qualified attorneys working for the United States government to serve as special assistant United States attorneys for the purpose of prosecuting violations of such paragraphs;

“(2) deputize State, Tribal, territorial and local law enforcement officers for the purpose of enhancing the capacity of the agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives in responding to and investigating violations of such paragraphs; and

“(3) establish, in order to receive and expedite requests for assistance from State, Tribal, territorial and local law enforcement agencies responding to intimate partner violence cases where such agencies have probable cause to believe that the offenders may be in violation of such paragraphs, points of contact within—

“(A) each Field Division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; and

“(B) each District Office of the United States Attorneys.

“(b) IMPROVE INTIMATE PARTNER AND PUBLIC SAFETY.—The Attorney General shall—

“(1) identify no less than 75 jurisdictions among States, territories and Tribes where there are high rates of firearms violence and threats of firearms violence against intimate partners and other persons protected under paragraphs (8), (9), and (10) of section 922(g) and where local authorities lack the resources to address such violence; and

“(2) make such appointments as described in subsection (a) in jurisdictions where enhanced enforcement of such paragraphs is necessary to reduce firearms homicide and injury rates.

“(c) QUALIFIED DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified’ means, with respect to an attorney, that the attorney is a licensed attorney in good standing with any relevant licensing authority.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925B the following:

“925C. Special assistant U.S. attorneys and cross-deputized attorneys.”

TITLE XIII—CLOSING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSENT LOOPHOLE**SEC. 1301. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Closing the Law Enforcement Consent Loophole Act of 2021”.

SEC. 1302. PROHIBITION ON ENGAGING IN SEXUAL ACTS WHILE ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2243 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following: “**or by any person acting under color of law**”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) OF AN INDIVIDUAL BY ANY PERSON ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever, acting under color of law, knowingly engages in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any Federal law enforcement officer, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

“(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘sexual act’ has the meaning given the term in section 2246.”; and

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following:

“(3) In a prosecution under subsection (c), it is not a defense that the other individual consented to the sexual act.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 2246 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the term ‘Federal law enforcement officer’ has the meaning given the term in section 115.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by amending the item related to section 2243 to read as follows:

“2243. Sexual abuse of a minor or ward or by any person acting under color of law.”.

SEC. 1303. INCENTIVES FOR STATES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—The Attorney General is authorized to make grants to States that have in effect a law that—

(1) makes it a criminal offense for any person acting under color of law of the State to engage in a sexual act with an individual, including an individual who is under arrest, in detention, or otherwise in the actual custody of any law enforcement officer; and

(2) prohibits a person charged with an offense described in paragraph (1) from asserting the consent of the other individual as a defense.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Attorney General, on an annual basis, information on—

(1) the number of reports made to law enforcement agencies in that State regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law during the previous year; and

(2) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported during the previous year.

(c) APPLICATION.—A State seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, including information about the law described in subsection (a).

(d) GRANT AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant to a State under this section shall be in an amount that is not greater than 10 percent of the average of the total amount of funding of the 3 most recent awards that the State received under the following grant programs:

(1) Part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10441 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the “STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program”);

(2) Section 41601 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511) (commonly referred to as the “Sexual Assault Services Program”);

(e) GRANT TERM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide an increase in the amount provided to a State under the grant programs described in subsection (d) for a 2-year period.

(2) RENEWAL.—A State that receives a grant under this section may submit an application for a renewal of such grant at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(3) LIMIT.—A State may not receive a grant under this section for more than 4 years.

(f) USES OF FUNDS.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall use—

(1) 25 percent of such funds for any of the permissible uses of funds under the grant program described in paragraph (1) of subsection (d); and

(2) 75 percent of such funds for any of the permissible uses of funds under the grant program described in paragraph (2) of subsection (d).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this chapter \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(h) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “State” means each of the several States and the District of Columbia, Indian Tribes, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 1304. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) the information required to be reported to the Attorney General under section 3(b); and

(2) information on—

(A) the number of reports made, during the previous year, to Federal law enforcement agencies regarding persons engaging in a sexual act while acting under color of law; and

(B) the disposition of each case in which sexual misconduct by a person acting under color of law was reported.

(b) REPORT BY GAO.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on any violations of section 2243(c) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 2, committed during the 1-year period covered by the report.

SEC. 1305. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term “sexual act” has the meaning given the term in section 2246 of title 18, United States Code.

TITLE XIV—OTHER MATTERS**SEC. 1401. NATIONAL STALKER AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REDUCTION.**

Section 40603 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12402) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 1402. FEDERAL VICTIM ASSISTANTS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 40114 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 40114. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL VICTIM’S COORDINATORS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Attorneys for the purpose of appointing victim/witness coordinators for the prosecution of sex crimes and domestic violence crimes where applicable (such as the District of Columbia), \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.”.

SEC. 1403. CHILD ABUSE TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR JUDICIAL PERSONNEL AND PRACTITIONERS REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 224(a) of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20334(a)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 1404. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT.

Section 40152(c) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12311(c)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 1405. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM.

Section 219(a) of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (34 U.S.C. 20324(a)) is amended by striking “2014 through 2018” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 1406. SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EXAM PROGRAM GRANTS.

Section 304(d) of the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2004 (34 U.S.C. 40723(d)) is amended by striking “2019 through 2024” and inserting “2022 through 2026”.

SEC. 1407. REVIEW ON LINK BETWEEN SUBSTANCE USE AND VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.

Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services shall complete a review and submit a report to Congress on whether being a victim of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking increases the likelihood of having a substance use disorder.

SEC. 1408. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO STUDY FEDERAL EFFORTS TO COLLECT DATA ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish an interagency working group (in this section referred to as the “Working Group”) to study Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence and to make recommendations on the harmonization of such efforts.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Working Group shall be comprised of at least one representative from the following agencies, who shall be selected by the head of that agency:

(1) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(2) The Department of Education.

(3) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(4) The Department of Justice.

(5) The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

(c) DUTIES.—The Working Group shall consider the following:

(1) What activity constitutes different acts of sexual violence.

(2) Whether reports that use the same terms for acts of sexual violence are collecting the same data on these acts.

(3) Whether the context which led to an act of sexual violence should impact how that act is accounted for in reports.

(4) Whether the data collected is presented in a way that allows the general public to understand what acts of sexual violence are included in each measurement.

(5) Steps that agencies that compile reports relating to sexual violence can take to avoid double counting incidents of sexual violence.

(d) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Working Group shall publish and submit to Congress a report on the following:

(1) The activities of the Working Group.

(2) Recommendations to harmonize Federal efforts to collect data on sexual violence.

(3) Actions Federal agencies can take to implement the recommendations described in paragraph (2).

(4) Recommendations, if any, for congressional action to implement the recommendations described in paragraph (2).

(e) **TERMINATION.**—The Working Group shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the report is submitted pursuant to subsection (d).

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **HARMONIZE.**—The term “harmonize” includes efforts to coordinate sexual violence data collection to produce complementary information, as appropriate, without compromising programmatic needs.

(2) **SEXUAL VIOLENCE.**—The term “sexual violence” includes an unwanted sexual act (including both contact and non-contact) about which the Federal Government collects information.

SEC. 1409. NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOTLINE.

Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a national domestic violence hotline for which a grant is provided under section 313 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act shall include the voluntary feature of texting via telephone to ensure all methods of communication are available for victims and those seeking assistance.

SEC. 1410. DEPUTY ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL ON CULTURALLY SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS.

There shall be a Deputy Assistant Attorney General on Culturally Specific Communities within the Office of Justice Programs who shall, under the guidance and authority of the Assistant Attorney General Office of Justice Programs—

(1) oversee the administration of grants related to culturally specific services and contracts with culturally specific organizations;

(2) coordinate development of Federal policy, protocols, and guidelines on matters relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, in culturally specific communities;

(3) advise the Assistant Attorney General of the Office of Justice Programs concerning policies, legislation, implementation of laws, and other issues relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking in culturally specific communities;

(4) provide technical assistance, coordination, and support to other offices and bureaus in the Department of Justice to develop policy and to enforce Federal laws relating to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking in culturally specific communities;

(5) ensure that appropriate technical assistance, developed and provided by entities having expertise in culturally specific is made available to grantees and potential grantees proposing to serve culturally specific communities; and

(6) ensure access to grants and technical assistance for culturally specific organizations and analyze the distribution of funding in order to identify barriers for culturally specific organizations.

TITLE XV—CYBERCRIME ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 1501. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CYBERCRIMES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Attorney General shall award grants under this section to States and units of local government for the prevention, enforcement, and prosecution of cybercrimes against individuals.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To request a grant under this section, the chief executive officer of a State or unit of local government shall submit an application to the Attorney General within 90 days after the date on which funds to carry out this section are appropriated for a fiscal year, in such form as the Attorney General may require. Such application shall include the following:

(A) A certification that Federal funds made available under this section will not be used to supplant State or local funds, but will be used to increase the amounts of such funds that would, in the absence of Federal funds, be made available for law enforcement activities.

(B) An assurance that, not fewer than 30 days before the application (or any amendment to the application) was submitted to the Attorney General, the application (or amendment) was submitted for review to the governing body of the State or unit of local government (or to an organization designated by that governing body).

(C) An assurance that, before the application (or any amendment to the application) was submitted to the Attorney General—

(i) the application (or amendment) was made public; and

(ii) an opportunity to comment on the application (or amendment) was provided to citizens and to neighborhood or community-based organizations, to the extent applicable law or established procedure makes such an opportunity available.

(D) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant shall maintain and report such data, records, and information (programmatic and financial) as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(E) A certification, made in a form acceptable to the Attorney General and executed by the chief executive officer of the applicant (or by another officer of the applicant, if qualified under regulations promulgated by the Attorney General), that—

(i) the programs to be funded by the grant meet all the requirements of this section;

(ii) all the information contained in the application is correct;

(iii) there has been appropriate coordination with affected agencies; and

(iv) the applicant will comply with all provisions of this section and all other applicable Federal laws.

(F) A certification that the State or in the case of a unit of local government, the State in which the unit of local government is located, has in effect criminal laws which prohibit cybercrimes against individuals.

(G) A certification that any equipment described in subsection (c)(7) purchased using grant funds awarded under this section will be used primarily for investigations and forensic analysis of evidence in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals.

(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Grants awarded under this section may only be used for programs that provide—

(1) training for State or local law enforcement personnel relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify and protect victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(C) training such personnel to identify and investigate cybercrimes against individuals;

(D) training such personnel to enforce and utilize the laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;

(E) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the investigation of cybercrimes against individuals and enforcement of laws that prohibit such crimes; and

(F) the payment of overtime incurred as a result of such training;

(2) training for State or local prosecutors, judges, and judicial personnel, relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify, investigate, prosecute, or adjudicate cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) training such personnel to utilize laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;

(C) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals; and

(D) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the prosecution or adjudication of acts of cybercrimes against individuals, including the use of technology to protect victims of such crimes;

(3) training for State or local emergency dispatch personnel relating to cybercrimes against individuals, including—

(A) training such personnel to identify and protect victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) training such personnel to utilize Federal, State, local, and other resources to assist victims of cybercrimes against individuals;

(C) training such personnel to utilize technology to assist in the identification of and response to cybercrimes against individuals; and

(D) the payment of overtime incurred as a result of such training;

(4) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies in enforcing laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in performing enforcement operations, such as overtime payments;

(5) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies in educating the public in order to prevent, deter, and identify violations of laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals;

(6) assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies to establish task forces that operate solely to conduct investigations, forensic analyses of evidence, and prosecutions in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals;

(7) assistance to State or local law enforcement and prosecutors in acquiring computers, computer equipment, and other equipment necessary to conduct investigations and forensic analysis of evidence in matters involving cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in the training, maintenance, or acquisition of technical updates necessary for the use of such equipment for the duration of a reasonable period of use of such equipment;

(8) assistance in the facilitation and promotion of sharing, with State and local law enforcement officers and prosecutors, of the expertise and information of Federal law enforcement agencies about the investigation, analysis, and prosecution of matters involving laws that prohibit cybercrimes against individuals, including the use of multijurisdictional task forces; or

(9) assistance to State and local law enforcement and prosecutors in processing interstate extradition requests for violations of laws involving cybercrimes against individuals, including expenses incurred in the extradition of an offender from one State to another.

(d) **REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.**—On the date that is 1 year after the date on which a State or unit of local government receives a grant under this section, and annually thereafter, the chief executive of such State or unit of local government shall submit to the Attorney General a report which contains—

(1) a summary of the activities carried out during the previous year with any grant received by such State or unit of local government;

(2) an evaluation of the results of such activities; and

(3) such other information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(e) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than November 1 of each even-numbered fiscal year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that contains a compilation of the information contained in the report submitted under subsection (d).

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—Of the amount made available under paragraph (1) in any fiscal year, not more than 5 percent may be used for evaluation, monitoring, technical assistance, salaries, and administrative expenses.

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “cybercrimes against individuals” means the criminal offenses applicable in the relevant State or unit of local government

that involve the use of a computer to cause personal harm to an individual, such as the use of a computer to harass, threaten, stalk, extort, coerce, cause fear, intimidate, without consent distribute intimate images of, or violate the privacy of, an individual, except that—

(A) use of a computer need not be an element of such an offense; and

(B) such term does not include the use of a computer to cause harm to a commercial entity, government agency, or any non-natural persons.

(2) The term “computer” includes a computer network and an interactive electronic device.

SEC. 1502. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER GRANT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Attorney General shall award a grant under this section to an eligible entity for the purpose of the establishment and maintenance of a National Resource Center on Cybercrimes Against Individuals to provide resource information, training, and technical assistance to improve the capacity of individuals, organizations, governmental entities, and communities to prevent, enforce, and prosecute cybercrimes against individuals.

(b) *APPLICATION.*—To request a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General not later than 90 days after the date on which funds to carry out this section are appropriated for fiscal year 2022 in such form as the Attorney General may require. Such application shall include the following:

(1) An assurance that, for each fiscal year covered by an application, the applicant shall maintain and report such data, records, and information (programmatic and financial) as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(2) A certification, made in a form acceptable to the Attorney General, that—

(A) the programs funded by the grant meet all the requirements of this section;

(B) all the information contained in the application is correct; and

(C) the applicant will comply with all provisions of this section and all other applicable Federal laws.

(c) *USE OF FUNDS.*—The eligible entity awarded a grant under this section shall use such amounts for the establishment and maintenance of a National Resource Center on Cybercrimes Against Individuals, which shall—

(1) offer a comprehensive array of technical assistance and training resources to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, community-based organizations, and other professionals and interested parties, related to cybercrimes against individuals, including programs and research related to victims;

(2) maintain a resource library which shall collect, prepare, analyze, and disseminate information and statistics related to—

(A) the incidence of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) the enforcement, and prosecution of laws relating to cybercrimes against individuals; and

(C) the provision of supportive services and resources for victims of cybercrimes against individuals; and

(3) conduct research related to—

(A) the causes of cybercrimes against individuals;

(B) the effect of cybercrimes against individuals on victims of such crimes; and

(C) model solutions to prevent or deter cybercrimes against individuals or to enforce the laws relating to cybercrimes against individuals.

(d) *DURATION OF GRANT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The grant awarded under this section shall be awarded for a period of 5 years.

(2) *RENEWAL.*—A grant under this section may be renewed for additional 5-year periods if the Attorney General determines that the funds made available to the recipient were used in a manner described in subsection (c), and if the

recipient resubmits an application described in subsection (b) in such form, and at such time as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(e) *SUBGRANTS.*—The eligible entity awarded a grant under this section may make subgrants to other nonprofit private organizations with relevant subject matter expertise in order to establish and maintain the National Resource Center on Cybercrimes Against Individuals in accordance with subsection (c).

(f) *REPORT TO THE SECRETARY.*—On the date that is 1 year after the date on which an eligible entity receives a grant under this section, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant period, the entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report which contains—

(1) a summary of the activities carried out under the grant program during the previous year;

(2) an evaluation of the results of such activities; and

(3) such other information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(g) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—Not later than November 1 of each even-numbered fiscal year, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report that contains a compilation of the information contained in the report submitted under subsection (d).

(h) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(i) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *CYBERCRIMES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.*—The term “cybercrimes against individuals” has the meaning given such term in section 1501(g).

(2) *ELIGIBLE ENTITY.*—The term “eligible entity” means a nonprofit private organization that focuses on cybercrimes against individuals and that—

(A) provides documentation to the Attorney General demonstrating experience working directly on issues of cybercrimes against individuals; and

(B) includes on the entity’s advisory board representatives who have a documented history of working directly on issues of cybercrimes against individuals and who are geographically and culturally diverse.

SEC. 1503. NATIONAL STRATEGY, CLASSIFICATION, AND REPORTING ON CYBERCRIME.

(a) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *COMPUTER.*—The term “computer” includes a computer network and any interactive electronic device.

(2) *CYBERCRIME AGAINST INDIVIDUALS.*—The term “cybercrime against individuals” means a Federal, State, or local criminal offense that involves the use of a computer to cause personal harm to an individual, such as the use of a computer to harass, threaten, stalk, extort, coerce, cause fear, intimidate, without consent distribute intimate images of, or violate the privacy of, an individual, except that—

(A) use of a computer need not be an element of the offense; and

(B) the term does not include the use of a computer to cause harm to a commercial entity, government agency, or non-natural person.

(b) *NATIONAL STRATEGY.*—The Attorney General shall develop a national strategy to—

(1) reduce the incidence of cybercrimes against individuals;

(2) coordinate investigations of cybercrimes against individuals by Federal law enforcement agencies; and

(3) increase the number of Federal prosecutions of cybercrimes against individuals.

(c) *CLASSIFICATION OF CYBERCRIMES AGAINST INDIVIDUALS FOR PURPOSES OF CRIME REPORTS.*—In accordance with the authority of the Attorney General under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall—

(1) design and create within the Uniform Crime Reports a category for offenses that constitute cybercrimes against individuals;

(2) to the extent feasible, within the category established under paragraph (1), establish subcategories for each type of cybercrime against individuals that is an offense under Federal or State law;

(3) classify the category established under paragraph (1) as a Part I crime in the Uniform Crime Reports; and

(4) classify each type of cybercrime against individuals that is an offense under Federal or State law as a Group A offense for the purpose of the National Incident-Based Reporting System.

(d) *ANNUAL SUMMARY.*—The Attorney General shall publish an annual summary of the information reported in the Uniform Crime Reports and the National Incident-Based Reporting System relating to cybercrimes against individuals.

TITLE XVI—KEEPING CHILDREN SAFE FROM FAMILY VIOLENCE

SEC. 1601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Keeping Children Safe From Family Violence Act” or “Kayden’s Law”.

SEC. 1602. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Approximately one in 15 million children are exposed each year to domestic violence.

(2) Most child abuse is perpetrated in the family and by a parent. Intimate partner violence and child abuse overlap in the same families at rates of 30 to 60 percent. A child’s risk of abuse increases after a perpetrator of intimate partner violence separates from their domestic partner, even when the perpetrator had not previously directly abused the child. Children who have witnessed intimate partner violence are approximately four times more likely to experience direct child maltreatment than children who have not witnessed intimate partner violence.

(4) More than 75 percent of child sexual abuse is perpetrated by a family member or a person known to the child. U.S. Department of Justice data shows that family members are almost half (49 percent) of the perpetrators of child sexual assault victims under age 6.

(5) Research suggests a child’s exposure to a batterer is among the strongest indicators of risk of incest victimization. One study found female children whose fathers were batterers of the mother were six-and-a-half times more likely to experience father-daughter incest than female children who do not have an abusive father.

(6) Child abuse is a major public health issue in the United States. Total lifetime financial costs associated with just one year of confirmed cases of child maltreatment (including child physical abuse, sexual abuse, psychological abuse and neglect) results in \$124 billion in annual costs to the U.S. economy, or approximately one percent of the gross domestic product.

(7) Empirical research indicates that allegations of child physical and sexual abuse are regularly discounted by courts when raised in child custody cases, with fewer than one-fourth of claims that a father has committed child physical or sexual abuse believed; and where the allegedly abusive parent claimed the mother was “alienating” the child, only 1 out of 51 claims of sexual molestation by a father were believed. Independent research indicates that child sexual abuse allegations are credible 50 to 70 percent of the time.

(8) Empirical research shows that alleged or known abusive parents are often granted custody or unprotected parenting time by courts. Approximately one-third of parents alleged to have committed child abuse took primary custody from the protective parent reporting the abuse, placing children at ongoing risk.

(9) Researchers have documented nearly 800 children murdered in the United States since 2008 by a divorcing or separating parent. More

than 100 of these child murders are known to have occurred after a court ordered the child into contact with the dangerous parent over the objection of a safe parent or caregiver.

(10) Scientifically unsound theories that treat mothers' abuse allegations as likely false attempts to undermine the father are frequently applied in family court to minimize or deny parents' and children's reports of abuse. Many experts who testify against abuse allegations lack expertise in the relevant type of alleged abuse, relying instead on unsound and unproven theories.

(11) Judges presiding over custody cases with allegations of child abuse, child sexual abuse, and domestic violence are rarely required to receive training on these subjects, nor have most states established standards for such trainings.

SEC. 1603. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are to:

(1) increase the priority given to child safety in any private state court proceeding affecting children's care and custody, excluding child protective and social service proceedings;

(2) strengthen courts' abilities to recognize and adjudicate domestic violence and child abuse allegations based on valid, admissible evidence, and to enter orders which protect and minimize the risk of harm to children as the first priority; and

(3) ensure that professional personnel involved in cases containing abuse allegations receive trauma-informed and culturally appropriate training on the dynamics, signs and impact of domestic violence and child abuse, including child sexual abuse.

SEC. 1604. DEFINITION OF COVERED FORMULA GRANT.

The term "covered formula grant" means a grant under part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10441 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the "STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program").

SEC. 1605. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FORMULA GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall increase the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants in accordance with this title if—

(1) EVIDENCE.—

(A) EXPERTS.—The State has in place a law ensuring that, in a custody proceeding where a parent has been alleged to have committed domestic violence or child abuse, including child sexual abuse, evidence from court-appointed or outside professionals regarding the alleged abuse may be admitted only when the professional possesses demonstrated expertise and clinical, not solely forensic, experience in working with victims of domestic violence or child abuse, including child sexual abuse.

(B) NON-EXPERTS.—The State has in place a law ensuring that, in a custody proceeding where a parent has been alleged to have committed domestic violence or child abuse, including child sexual abuse, evidence of past sexual or physical abuse committed by a party, including but not limited to any past or current protection from abuse orders, sexual violence abuse protection orders, arrests, or convictions, must be considered in determining the truth of any allegations of family violence.

(2) EXPERTS.—The State has in place uniform required standards of domestic violence and child abuse expertise and experience for all court-appointed neutral professional opinions related to abuse, trauma, and the behaviors of victims and perpetrators, which meet the criteria in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) REMEDIES FOR A CHILD'S RESISTANCE TO CONTACT WITH A PARENT.—The state has in place a law ensuring that—

(A) NO REMOVAL OF CARE FROM SAFE PARENT.—No child shall be removed from the care of a competent protective, non-physically or sexually abusive parent or litigating party to whom

the child is bonded or attached, nor shall the child's contact with such parent be restricted, solely in order to improve a deficient relationship with the other parent.

(B) REUNIFICATION TREATMENT.—No "reunification treatment" may be ordered by the court without scientifically valid and generally accepted proof of the safety, effectiveness and therapeutic value of the particular treatment, nor may any treatment predicated on cutting off a child from the parent to whom they are bonded or attached be ordered.

(C) CAUSES OF CHILD RESISTANCE.—Any order to remediate a child's contact resistance must address the resisted parent's behaviors or contributions to the child's resistance first, before ordering the preferred parent to take steps to potentially improve the child's relationship with the parent they resist.

(4) TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The state has in place an ongoing education and training program for judges and magistrates who hear custody matters, and relevant court personnel, including guardians ad litem, best interest attorneys, counsel for children, custody evaluators, masters, and mediators, focusing solely on domestic violence and child abuse, including—

- (i) child sexual abuse;
- (ii) physical abuse;
- (iii) emotional abuse;
- (iv) coercive control;
- (v) implicit and explicit bias;
- (vi) trauma;
- (vii) long and short-term impacts of domestic violence and child abuse on children; and
- (viii) victim and perpetrator behaviors.

(B) PROVIDERS.—Training must be provided by—

- (i) professionals with substantial experience in assisting survivors of domestic violence or child abuse, such as a victim service provider; and
- (ii) where possible, survivors of domestic violence, or child physical or sexual abuse.

(C) EVIDENCE-BASED RESEARCH.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The education and training program in subparagraph (A) shall rely on evidence-based and peer-reviewed research by recognized experts in the types of abuse designated under this section.

(ii) EXCLUSION.—The education and training program shall not include theories, concepts, and belief systems unsupported by valid, credible scientific research.

(D) OBJECTIVE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—The education and training program shall be designed to improve the ability of courts to recognize and respond to child physical abuse, child sexual abuse, domestic violence, and trauma on all family victims, particularly children, and make appropriate custody decisions that prioritize child safety and well-being, and shall be culturally sensitive and appropriate for diverse communities.

(E) TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—Judges and all other personnel identified in subparagraph (A) must receive at least 60 hours of initial training on these identified topics, and at least 20 hours of this ongoing training every two years.

(F) CUSTODY EVALUATOR REQUIREMENTS.—Prior to being appointed in a case, a custody evaluator shall, at a minimum, hold a Master's degree in a relevant field and must have completed the training requirements of subparagraph (E).

(4) LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—The state shall notify parties of the importance of legal representation and shall direct the parties to appropriate resources.

(b) GRANT INCREASE.—The amount of the increase provided to a State under the covered formula grant under this title shall be equal to not more than 10 percent of the average of the total amount of funding provided to the State under the covered formula grant under the 3 most recent awards to the State.

SEC. 1606. APPLICATION.

A State seeking a grant under this title shall submit an application to the Attorney General

at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, including information regarding the law described in section 1605.

SEC. 1607. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be interpreted to discourage States from adopting additional provisions to increase safe outcomes for children; additional protective provisions are encouraged.

SEC. 1608. GRANT TERM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The term of a covered grant shall be for one year.

(b) RENEWAL.—A State that receives a covered grant may submit an application for a renewal of such grant at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(c) LIMIT.—A State shall not receive a covered grant for more than 4 years.

SEC. 1609. USES OF FUNDS.

A State that receives an increase under the covered formula grants under this title shall use the amount of the increase for subgrants pursuant to section 2007(c)(4)(C) or (D) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10446(c)(4)).

SEC. 1610. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

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

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) each will control 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1620.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA, was signed into law in 1994 to help ensure that women in America are free from violence and free from fear. At the time that VAWA was enacted, it was all too common for violent crimes against women to go without appropriate response and to remain unaddressed by the criminal justice system.

But through programs implemented under VAWA, Congress began to help provide communities in America the assistance they need to combat the crimes of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Building on this success, H.R. 1620 is bipartisan legislation that reauthorizes and strengthens the Violence Against Women Act so that it can continue delivering vital services to those in need.

VAWA, which is not gender-exclusive, addresses the needs of men and women, children, persons with disabilities, homeless persons, and LGBTQ individuals, among others.

This reauthorization would also increase access to grant programs for

culturally specific organizations and ensure that such organizations are included in the development and implementation of service, education, training, and other grants. The range of individuals VAWA helps is broad and should be as diverse as our communities around the country. I am pleased that this reauthorization continues our commitment to this principle.

VAWA has had, and continues to have, a positive impact on people who rely on its assistance, whether directly or indirectly.

Through grants to State and local governments, the Office on Violence Against Women in the Department of Justice funds the work of thousands of advocates in preventing and addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, and in assisting and training law enforcement and victim advocates.

In addition, grants administered through the Department of Health and Human Services provide funds for shelters, rape prevention and education, programs to address and reduce the sexual abuse of runaway and homeless youth, and programs to educate the community on domestic violence. The reach of the work carried out under VAWA is vast, and we must continue to support it.

This legislation expands services for older survivors of abuse and for programs targeting rural areas. It also expands the jurisdiction of some Tribal authorities over non-Indians who commit certain crimes on Tribal lands to ensure that they are held accountable.

Like the legislation the House passed last Congress, it also includes provisions protecting transgender individuals, and it bans individuals convicted of domestic abuse from purchasing firearms.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act is comprehensive and inclusive legislation that I hope will earn further bipartisan support in the long tradition of this vital law.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the chair of the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee and the sponsor of this legislation, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for their outstanding leadership in the effort to reauthorize VAWA.

I also want to thank the advocates, many of whom are survivors themselves, for the countless hours they have put into improving this legislation.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

Their efforts, and those of many other Members, have produced this important bill that will not only continue the progress enabled by VAWA as originally enacted but will also make the act an even more effective tool in addressing the horrible scourge of domestic violence.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2021.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I write concerning H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. This bill was primarily referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and additionally to the Committee on Education and Labor and other committees. As a result of Leadership and the Committee on the Judiciary having consulted with me concerning this bill generally, I agree to forgo formal consideration of the bill so the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee on Education and Labor takes this action with our mutual understanding that by forgoing formal consideration of H.R. 1620, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so we may address any remaining issues within our Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you support my request to name members of the Committee on Education and Labor to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Finally, I would appreciate a response confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1620.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2021.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I am in receipt of your March 10, 2021, letter regarding H.R. 1620, the "Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021."

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 1620 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 1620 which fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Violence Against Women Act was first signed into law almost 30 years ago with wide bipartisan support. The law recognizes that Federal laws covering domestic violence could help ease overburdened State and local criminal justice systems. It was narrowly defined and not controversial. Since its passage, it has been reauthorized on a bipartisan basis.

Unfortunately, in recent years, Democrats have politicized the law, straying further and further away from its original intent. This bill, H.R. 1620, is a continuation of the Democrats' politicization, expanding and altering the fundamental nature of the Violence Against Women Act.

The most significant change in this reauthorization effort is that it erases important distinctions between women and men. It replaces violence against "women" with "a person of any gender," extending the law's protections well-past the narrowly defined and necessary protection for women.

This rewriting of the Violence Against Women Act not only undermines the original intent of this legislation, but also jeopardizes the safety and well-being of women at risk. It does more to advance the Democrats' progressive agenda than it does to protect women.

It is not just VAWA. The Democrats' entire radical agenda hurts women. Calls to defund, dismantle, and rethink local law enforcement hurt at-risk women. Never-ending government lockdowns that require battered and abused women to stay in violent households hurt women. A southern border open to dangerous drug cartels and human traffickers caused by President Biden's border crisis hurts women. In fact, the Democrats' open border policies incentivize women to make the dangerous trip to the U.S.-Mexico border on which one-third of women report being sexually abused.

Those are not the only problems with this legislation. H.R. 1620 also threatens Americans' constitutional right to religious freedom. The bill denies faith-based exemptions for VAWA grant recipients, prohibiting religious organizations from running shelters and legal aid centers on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. The Democrats' culture war could actually force faith-based centers for abused women to close.

H.R. 1620 also expands the definition of domestic violence to include economic and emotional duress, pulling funding away from combating the severity of violent crimes.

This legislation disregards the well-being of women by promoting lofty concepts, such as restorative justice approaches to crimes against women, which are unproven and could force a woman to confront her abuser.

Democrats know that these are unnecessary additions that jeopardize the bipartisan reauthorization, so why are they choosing to proceed? Why are they putting forward this bill—with no hearings, no markups in this Congress—at the expense of women's safety and well-being?

Any crime or abuse against any single individual is abhorrent. State and Federal laws already protect individuals, women and men, from domestic violence and sexual abuse and any related reprehensible acts like dating violence and stalking. Resources should

be targeted to help those women and individuals cope and recover and also prevent further violence and abuse. This bill falls short of that goal and wildly distorts the original purpose of this law.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I stand today in a moment of history where we cannot go back. Have we heard that before? Women cannot go back. Women cannot continue in an intimidated fashion to tragically be subjected to men who violently attack them.

The LGBT community cannot go back and be subjected to those who would be violent against them.

Native American women cannot go back. They cannot go back. They cannot go back to pueblos and reservations and not have any protection for those who violate those sacred places, rape them, and then rush to jurisdictions outside and think they are protected.

Immigrant women cannot go back.

That is what this legislation is about. It is a product borne of meticulous and thoughtful research and countless engagement with those on the ground working ultimately and intimately on these very important issues daily.

We began this long journey and hard-fought battle under the leadership of Republicans—I wrote the bill in 2018—who at the time refused to engage in putting forward their own version of VAWA when it expired in 2018 while they held the majority. The President, the Senate, the House, they did nothing. The Judiciary Committee would not even take the bill up, and it was supported by over 200 groups.

But we continue to push forward on behalf of all victims and survivors to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, first led by the President of the United States, then-Senator Joe Biden.

As we all know, VAWA is a landmark piece of legislation first enacted in 1994. At that time, the President was Bill Clinton. This legislation was enacted in response to the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence and the significant impact of such violence on the lives of women.

Statistics have revealed that this form of violence impacts us all. In the United States, an estimated 10 million people experience domestic violence every year. More than 15 million children are exposed to violence annually. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, about 20 people per minute are physically abused by an intimate partner. About one in four women and one in nine men

experience severe intimate partner physical violence, sexual violence, and a partner stalking injury.

Today, in Texas, 35 percent of women and 34 percent of men are subjected to domestic violence. When discussing VAWA, we cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Ms. Fontenot, who was murdered in Harris County by her husband just 1 day after Christmas last year while she was trying to escape her relationship, and he shot at her son.

Nor can we forget Debora Seidenfaden, who was murdered by her husband in Houston after an argument.

There are countless stories like this throughout the country. That is why it is imperative that we reauthorize this bill. Enough is enough. We must pass H.R. 1620 now.

Madam Speaker, I thank all the women, including Representative Slaughter, who started this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1620, the “Violence Against Women Act of 2021.”

H.R. 1620 is a product born of meticulous and thoughtful research and countless engagement with those on the ground, working intimately on these very important issues daily.

We began this long journey, and hard-fought battle under the leadership of Republicans, who at the time refused to engage or put forward their own version of VAWA when it expired in 2018 while they held the majority.

But we continued to push forward on behalf of all victims and survivors to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994.

As we all know, VAWA is a landmark piece of legislation first enacted in 1994 and signed into law by President Bill Clinton as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

This legislation was enacted in response to the prevalence of domestic and sexual violence, and the significant impact of such violence on the lives of women.

Statistics have revealed that these form of violence impact us all.

In the United States, an estimated 10 million people experience domestic violence every year, and more than 15 million children are exposed to this violence annually. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, about 20 people per minute are physically abused by an intimate partner. About 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men experience severe intimate partner physical violence, sexual violence, and/ or partner stalking with injury.

Today, in Texas, 35.10 percent of women and 34.5 percent of men are subjected to domestic violence.

When discussing VAWA, we cannot forget the victims of domestic violence like Yashica Fontenot, who was murdered in Harris County, Texas by her husband just one day after Christmas last year while she was trying to escape her relationship.

Nor can we forget Debra Seidenfaden, who was murdered by her husband in Houston after an argument.

There are countless stories like this throughout this country.

That is why it is imperative to reauthorize this law by passing H.R. 1620 now. Because enough is enough.

Congress has reauthorized VAWA three times—in 2000, 2005, and 2013—with strong

bipartisan approval and overwhelming support from Congress, States, and local communities.

During each reauthorization, VAWA would make various meaningful improvements to the Act to meet the varied and changing needs of survivors.

H.R. 1620 continues that tradition, and therefore, is intended to make modifications, as Congress has done in the past to all previous reauthorizations of VAWA.

H.R. 1620 is a bipartisan bill, reflecting a reasonable and compromise approach to reauthorize grant programs under the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

These moderate enhancements will address the many growing and unmet needs of victims and survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

H.R. 1620 addresses the needs of sex trafficking victims while creating a demonstration program on trauma-informed training for law enforcement.

It increases access to grant programs for culturally specific organizations and ensure culturally specific organizations are included in the development and implementation of service, education, training, and other grants.

It adds a purpose area to assist communities in developing alternatives to housing ordinances that punish survivors for seeking law enforcement intervention.

H.R. 1620 expands protections for vulnerable populations such as youth, survivors without shelter, Native American women, and LGBTQ persons.

It ensures Deaf people are included in grants relating to people with disabilities.

H.R. 1620 is supported by the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, a coalition of more than 200 domestic violence groups.

VAWA expired since September 30, 2018, and we as a body are called upon by survivors to reauthorize it now.

As a tribute to our dearly departed Rep. Slaughter, who started this journey with then, Senator Biden in 1994, I respectfully urge my colleagues to join me, and the Chairman of Judiciary, along with our Republican partners—Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MCCAUL in passing H.R. 1620, a much needed thoughtful and bipartisan response to the needs of all victims and survivors.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, Democrats are using domestic violence, which is a serious issue, as a front for just their latest gun control bill. This legislation contains red flag gun confiscation language and expands the grounds for lifetime bans of firearm possession.

Red flag gun confiscation laws upend due process. Under this legislation, an individual could have their guns removed from them without having the chance to face their accuser in court. That means a complaint and a judicial order could suspend a constitutionally guaranteed right, with no chance for the accused to respond under the law.

□ 1145

This legislation makes it clear that Democrats consider gun ownership a second-class right, if it is a right at all,

and view the Constitution as a negotiable suggestion.

This bill would expand the number of nonviolent misdemeanor offenses that produce a lifetime ban on firearm ownership, which is already applied to felons.

It is ironic that in the same week that Democrats are voting in support of amnesty for illegal aliens who have committed up to two misdemeanors, they are voting to permanently suspend the constitutional rights of Americans who have committed one nonviolent misdemeanor.

I oppose this attempt to undermine due process, further restrict the Second Amendment, and expand the left's radical and relentless gun control agenda.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, before coming to Congress, I organized volunteer lawyers to represent survivors of domestic abuse, so I have seen firsthand both the need for the Violence Against Women Act and the remarkable impact of legal representation in moments of crisis.

That is why I am proud to support reauthorization of VAWA, which would, among other things, expand access to legal counsel for those who need it most.

Too often, survivors are left to navigate alone the overwhelming aftereffects of violence and abuse. Whether that means finding housing, medical, or other care in the aftermath of trauma, the process can be complicated and hard to manage.

Legal representation in these critical moments can make a life-changing difference. That is why I am proud to offer two amendments to VAWA today.

The first would expand efforts to provide legal representation in postconviction relief proceedings. The second would increase access to legal aid for veterans who have unmet legal needs.

Everyone deserves access to quality legal representation for fundamental needs, and this bill gets us one step closer to that goal.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my amendments and the underlying legislation.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Protecting women and girls from violence and abuse and keeping them safe is deeply important to me and Members on both sides of the aisle.

Shortly before I was first elected to Congress back in 1994, President Bill Clinton signed into law the Violence Against Women Act. It was the first iteration of a very good bill, which, if you can believe it, passed the House then by a voice vote. It was supported by all but four in the Senate.

When it was reauthorized in the year 2000, I supported it and voted for it, and

in 2006, VAWA again had my full support. In fact, since I have been in Congress, I have voted nearly a dozen times, both in the Judiciary Committee or here on the floor, to renew or strengthen the provisions of VAWA in an effort to do what we all can do to protect women who have been or will in the future be subjects of domestic violence, abuse, or other forms of harassment.

Historically, this legislation has been a truly bipartisan effort. Sadly, the effort put forth today by the majority is anything but bipartisan.

What has happened between then and now? It seems to me that many on the left decided that they could use this critical legislation that is intended to protect women and girls from violence as a vehicle to promote their far-left political agenda. To me, this is a disturbing development, as the safety and well-being of all women and girls in this country is far too important to jeopardize with callous political calculations that could further divide the American people.

In fact, it is possible that passing this so-called VAWA reauthorization offered by the majority could result in some faith-based institutions shutting their shelter doors so that many women and girls who relied on their help, support, and protection wouldn't have that protection.

This legislation could force women seeking protection in shelters or incarcerated in prison to be housed alongside biological males, potentially subjecting those women to further psychological, mental, or physical harm. To me, it is unconscionable to be aware of these and other shortcomings of this legislation and simply ignore it.

What should we do? We should continue to improve VAWA as we did prior to 2013. We should continue to protect those vulnerable individuals in our society who rely on our help to protect them. And we should accomplish it in a bipartisan, bicameral manner, Republicans and Democrats actually working together as we are capable of doing.

It is time we put politics and political agendas aside and reauthorize a Violence Against Women Act that continues to provide real protection for women and girls.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, unfortunately, when we talk about violence against women, we are often talking about domestic violence. Domestic violence claims the lives of far too many women, and it is especially deadly when it occurs in a household with a gun.

In the United States, there are 1 million women alive today who have reported being shot or shot at by their intimate partners, and there are many more who have been threatened or killed with a gun.

Closing the boyfriend loophole is a critical step to prevent abusers from obtaining a weapon, a weapon that will likely be used to escalate their abuse and a weapon that may have deadly consequences.

With this bill, we can truly help prevent abuse, protect our families, and keep every American safer.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This version of the Violence Against Women Act does not protect women. Instead, this bill puts partisan political priorities ahead of women in need. While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to claim they are the party of women, this partisan reauthorization proves that they only put women first when it is convenient.

I am a survivor of domestic violence from a previous marriage. I was afraid for my life, and I was afraid for my daughter's life. Thankfully, I escaped that terrible situation. So I am intimately familiar with the desperate situations many women who are victims of domestic abuse face. As a domestic violence survivor, I know just how important services and protections are to women across our Nation.

Previous reauthorizations of the Violence Against Women Act have been bipartisan, but not this one. This version is filled with partisan priorities that force women's domestic violence shelters to take in men who identify as women, strip away protections for religious organizations, and eliminate Second Amendment rights without due process.

The most egregious provisions of this bill push leftist gender ideology at the expense of important protections for women's privacy and safety. Sex-segregated shelters provide a safe place for women who have been abused, often at the hands of men, and offer them a sense of privacy and security. If this bill is enacted, these shelters, under penalty of Federal law, would be required to take in men and shelter them with women, putting vulnerable women at risk.

Religious objections are also under attack in this legislation. This bill excludes critical First Amendment protections for faith-based organizations. This almost certainly guarantees that attacks on religious organizations will continue over disagreements on religious liberty and gender ideology.

This bill is also being used to change and erode Second Amendment rights for everyone by introducing a new provision that would lower the standard by which government can take away someone's right to bear arms without due process, including for nonfelony crimes.

Passing legislation that supports women who have been victims of domestic abuse, trafficking, and sexual assault should be a bipartisan issue. In this partisan Violence Against Women

Act, women in need are not the priority. Leftist ideology is the priority.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the rates of COVID-19 spiked across the country, so did the rates of domestic violence. This pandemic within the pandemic must be stopped, and before us are the tools to save lives and end the cycle of violence.

The VAWA reauthorization makes crucial improvements to the law. It closes legal loopholes to stop violent partners from accessing firearms. It tackles the growing threat of online harassment by training law enforcement on cybercrimes. It provides services for survivors of dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. And it improves protections for Native women.

Today, we stand up for everyone by providing safety everywhere, at home, at work, on campus, and online.

Let us vote together to end domestic violence.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, the COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated, once again, the vital importance of the Violence Against Women Act.

With the Nation under stay-at-home orders, many women were unable to escape their abusers or find help in their communities.

Thanks to VAWA, organizations like the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence were able to meet women where they are, despite these obstacles.

In 2020, VAWA grants helped the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence assist over 9,000 survivors of domestic violence and answer over 17,000 helpline calls, nearly a 12 percent increase from 2019.

During the pandemic, through VAWA programs, Rhode Islanders have found transitional housing, received counseling services, and obtained assistance with seeking restraining orders.

Violence Against Women Act grants and programs can really be the difference between life or death.

Vote "yes" on H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, since being signed into law, the Violence Against Women Act has become a crucial part of legislation to aid vic-

tims of sexual abuse and domestic violence. VAWA provides lifesaving programs to help survivors navigate domestic violence and abuse situations.

Madam Speaker, in my district, I heard from innumerable counselors, activists, advocates, and attorneys about the toll the COVID-19 pandemic has taken on families, but especially families who have to experience domestic violence. Being locked in a situation with your abuser, with your attacker, was incredibly dangerous, and there has been terrible trauma inflicted.

We need to pass VAWA now. There is no reason not to support people who are victims of domestic violence. This is an enormous step forward.

I am grateful to the leaders who brought this forward, and I rise in support.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Violence Against Women Act.

Twenty persons a minute are injured by an intimate partner; that is 10 million American men and women every year. It is time to do something to continue this act and to extend it.

Madam Speaker, I have a number of amendments that have been accepted. I especially want to point out the SHIELD Act, which combats the non-consensual sharing of private, sexually explicit and nude images, commonly known as revenge porn, which now will be a crime.

My other two amendments deal with creating a task force on sexual violence and education and directing the Secretary of Education to create climate surveys on student experiences with violence. Twenty percent of our college coeds are sexually assaulted or there are attempts of sexual assault on them each year.

Finally, the last amendment incentivizes States to pass a Survivors' Bill of Rights in the States Act, which is particularly important for rape kits.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, consider this: Your spouse or partner calls you names, he insults you, puts you down.

He discourages you from going to work or school or seeing family members or friends.

He tries to control how you spend your money, where you go, or who you can see, what medicines you take.

He acts possessive, gets angry when drinking alcohol.

He tries to control when you can see a doctor; threatens you with violence; and may hit, kick, shove, slap, choke, or otherwise hurt you, your children, your pets.

He forces you to have sex against your will. He blames you for his violent behavior and tells you that you deserve it.

And this comes from someone you love.

You are in pain and embarrassed to ask for help. You are one in four women. The Violence Against Women Act is critical for your safety and economic independence.

Madam Speaker, I urge its passage.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I thank my colleague from Houston, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, for her leadership and her tireless efforts to get this critical legislation to this House floor.

The Violence Against Women Act provides essential support for survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault, and its reauthorization now is vitally important, as many of my colleagues have shared. It is critical for organizations in my community that support survivors, like the Houston Area Women's Center, which has reported a dramatic rise in requests for their services through the coronavirus pandemic—more than 6,000 more calls responded to in 2020 alone.

Madam Speaker, in 2020, the number of people the center sheltered tripled. Sadly, we have been reminded again today of the dangers that women face in our society. The Violence Against Women Act provides resources and services that are lifesaving. That is why I am proud to cosponsor this legislation and to vote in support of it today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise as the son of a single mom and as the brother of four sisters. Unfortunately, I have heard stories of abuse and assault and neglect throughout my life. I also heard these stories from my students and the many families I served throughout my time in education. The consistency throughout these stories illustrate how there is no recourse and there are no safe spaces for women to go to when they are under assault and feeling abused.

Madam Speaker, this past year, before joining Congress, I sat with a student and her mom in my office to call

a domestic violence help hotline. And we stayed on hold for hours before anyone came to the phone. There was no housing for them to go to in support of their safety. So I rise to support this legislation, and I rise to denounce the sexism and patriarchy and misogyny that continues to exist within our political arenas and within our laws.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the survivors of domestic and sexual violence.

It is completely unacceptable that we have allowed the Violence Against Women Act to expire.

I am proud to have introduced two amendments that will strengthen protections for our most vulnerable communities. The first amendment will stop punishing children who have been sex-trafficked and have been in contact with the criminal justice system. The pandemic has also illustrated the urgency on what we need to do to make sure that we reauthorize it.

Madam Speaker, as Americans, we have had to follow stay-at-home orders, and it has increased the amount of abuse among those who could not leave home. VAWA save lives. This isn't a Democrat or Republican issue. It is justice and safety. It is time we get this done and reauthorize.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. I rise today in strong support of this legislation because it includes trans women. Some of the most brutal, horrific crimes created in the minds of people have been perpetrated upon trans women.

Madam Speaker, this legislation protects them, as it protects all women. I support it and I encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, it is well past time for VAWA reauthorization. It should have never been allowed to lapse to begin with.

I stand here in support of this bill in honor of Gladys Ricart, a dear constituent of mine, who, 22 years ago, was murdered by her jealous ex-boyfriend on her wedding day, in her wedding gown. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation in her memory.

Now you have the Brides' March, an international movement across this continent and across the world that honors the memory of Gladys Ricart. They were right here in this Capitol,

and they will continue to come back until further legislation is enacted to protect women all across our country, all across the world.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. STRICKLAND).

Ms. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, the tragic shootings in Atlanta yesterday killed eight people—six of whom were Asian women.

To the families of the victims, you have my deepest condolences.

This crime has elements that we are trying to address here in Congress; gun violence, violence against women, and the meteoric rise of violence we are witnessing against the AAPI community.

Racially motivated violence must be called out for exactly what it is, and we must stop making excuses or rebranding it as economic anxiety or sexual addiction.

Madam Speaker, as a woman who is Black and Korean, I am acutely aware of how it feels to be erased and ignored, and how the default position when violence is committed against people of color or women is to defer from confronting the hate that is often the motivation.

Madam Speaker, words matter and leadership matters. We must all loudly condemn actions and language rooted in fear and bigotry that harms all of us.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, a movement led by the Texas Council on Family Violence, and so many other advocates, first won passage of the Violence Against Women Act and brought the National Domestic Violence Hotline to Austin, which has now offered 5 million lifesaving responses. This act brought much-needed funding and hope to women across America who led coalitions.

Yet, the scourge of violence has continued. In San Antonio, a Collaborative led by Judges Monique Diaz and Peter Sakai has supplemented incredible Family Services led by Marta Peleaz and Patricia Castillo's PEACE initiative. I have joined them for two town halls to listen, learn, and respond.

In Austin, Kelly White and Julia Spann continue the Safe Alliance, as Maria Johnson expands the Hays-Caldwell Center. But too many violent beatings have turned into killings. Because this reauthorization would close "the boyfriend loophole," denying a gun to an abusive partner, the NRA and its Congressional Republican allies have been blocking renewal.

Today, we call on them to choose life, to recommit to VAWA, and foster a society where every person is treated with dignity.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Speaker of the House (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and, again, for his extraordinary leadership.

Madam Speaker, this is quite a day for the chairman, with the Violence Against Women Act and the ERA, among other pieces of legislation that he is bringing to the floor. I thank him for the very prolific and excellent work of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Madam Speaker, here we are dressed in white because it is Women's History Month, and we are wearing the color of suffragists as we come to the floor on these two important pieces of legislation—earlier today, the equal rights amendment, and now the Violence Against Women Act.

It is a historic day as the House passes two landmark, potentially life-saving pieces of legislation on behalf of America's women. We do so, again, during Women's History Month. I sing the praises of Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who has been a relentless, persistent advocate for this legislation over time; KAREN BASS, one more, and our distinguished chair of the committee.

Madam Speaker, we are particularly proud to be passing this legislation under the leadership of one of its strongest champions, President Joe Biden. In the Senate, he was the guardian of this law, as he was the author of it. As a new-ish Member of Congress at the time, I was proud to follow his lead and the lead in the House, then, of Leader SCHUMER, now the distinguished majority leader in the Senate. So this is an opportunity that we have for legislation, whose provenance goes way back into the 1990s.

At that time, I was an appropriator. And after we passed the bill that had the Violence Against Women Act, it was our responsibility to make sure that it was funded properly, and that has been part of the continuing advocacy.

Madam Speaker, in 2013, the legislation was last reauthorized under the Presidency of Barack Obama and the Vice Presidency of Joe Biden, who, again, was taking the lead for the reauthorization of the legislation. It was a tough time. The bill passed first in the United States Senate. Bipartisan in the United States Senate, the bill was passed. They sent it to the House. The House refused to take it up—Republican-controlled House refused to take it up.

And then they had their own bill, which said: We are against violence against women, unless you happen to be a Native American or an LGBTQ woman or an immigrant woman.

Well, these are the most vulnerable in terms of using violence against women. So what happened was we persuaded the then-Speaker, Mr. Boehner, to bring both bills to the floor. Of

course, the Senate-passed bipartisan bill prevailed. We had a big ceremony, participated in by the Native American community, our law enforcement community, Vice President Joe Biden, and signed by the President.

□ 1215

So here we are, unable to get it reauthorized 5 years later, in 2018 under the then-majority and President, and here we are today, finally able to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor.

And as I mentioned, for nearly three decades, the Violence Against Women Act has been a transformative force for safety and security of American women. Since its passage, domestic violence rates have declined by nearly two-thirds in America. Millions of women have gained access to protections from violence and abuse, and millions of survivors, to essential services and justice.

But we cannot be complacent: One in three women today face domestic abuse. Isn't that a stunning figure? You wonder, how could it be? And partner violence is on the rise during the coronavirus pandemic, as many women are forced to quarantine in homes that are not safe.

Every time the Congress has reauthorized VAWA, we have strengthened its protections for women, based on extensive consultation with survivors, victim service providers, Indian country, law enforcement, and other experts. The authorization on the floor today continues that progress.

And as has been said by Mr. DOGGETT, we have to recognize the danger of the, shall we say, provisions in the bill that protect women from gun violence specifically.

Among its many life-saving provisions, this reauthorization makes vital new investments in prevention, improves services for victims of domestic violence, makes improvements in the criminal justice system's response to gender-based violence and to the healthcare system's response, prevents intimate partner homicide, and expands protections for victims and survivors, whether they are men or women. This is not just about women, it is the Violence Against Women Act, but it does protect anyone.

Democrats are particularly proud that this reauthorization improves the essential protections that I referenced that were objected to on the Republican bill in 2013, including women immigrants, LGBTQ, and Native American women, and it specifically supports communities of color in a culturally sensitive way.

This reauthorization is bipartisan, happily, and it is supported by more than 200 organizations representing women, women's groups, faith-based organizations, law enforcement, the public health and medical communities, civil rights groups; the list goes on.

While it is unfortunate that we don't know what will happen in the Senate,

we are optimistic that the reauthorization can be successful on the other side of the Capitol, and on the other side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this reauthorization, so that we can advance justice, safety, and dignity in America.

Madam Speaker, the term VAWA has become synonymous with justice, Violence Against Women Act. I urge an "aye" vote.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

VAWA established critical infrastructure that responds to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

For far too long, this vital update collected dust in the Senate graveyard. Thankfully, with a Democratic Senate majority and President Biden, we finally have real partners to secure justice, safety, and dignity for American women, particularly those who are most vulnerable.

The statistics remain deplorable: One in four American women are victims of domestic violence; one in six will be a sexual assault victim in their lifetime. The pandemic only exacerbated the need for services to comprehensively respond to these egregious crimes.

Now is no time to retreat from the vital work of improving the Federal response to gender-based violence. For Women's History Month, let's reaffirm our commitment to survivors everywhere, and make this world safer for all our mothers, sisters, and daughters.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this urgent legislation.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the Violence Against Women Act, this is something that should protect women.

Unfortunately, the Violence Against Women Act has expanded its protection beyond women and girls into transgender or biological males who are calling themselves women.

You see, Democrats know this is a bad policy and agenda. In order to pass it, they have to hide behind real abused women.

The Violence Against Women Act incentivizes fraud in housing by allowing people who have been evicted from government-funded housing because of criminal activity to claim, after the fact, they are domestic violence victims in order to keep their housing.

The Violence Against Women Act also allows prisoners to pick their gender and be treated and assigned by their specific preference. This isn't fair

to women who are in prison. Biological men should not be allowed to decide they are a woman and decide to tell people that they are a woman so they can be put in a women's prison.

The Violence Against Women Act provides no exemptions for religious organizations when they hire employees. That destroys religious freedom.

Democrats also refuse to support amendments to help women receive firearm safety training and self-defense courses to protect them against their abusers.

Republicans have introduced amendments having to do with gun rights. If you want to help protect women, make sure women are gun owners and know how to use a gun properly in order to protect themselves. That is the greatest defense for women.

Democrats want to use abused women to take away guns from everyone. Unfortunately, gun rights groups know how to pay attention to Democrat bills that affect Americans' gun rights.

Democrats want to completely dismantle housing contracts and leases in order to justify their hypocritical "believe all survivors" agenda, except when it comes to Governor Cuomo.

Democrats want to create a Violence Against Women czar at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Now that they have destroyed the family and housing law, they want to push a progressive gender ideology through housing policy. That doesn't fit.

Make no mistake, Democrats want to create an authoritarian woke state where neighbors, partners, citizens, and employers are afraid to do anything in order to avoid the draconian policies imposed under the guise of protecting women.

We already know of many high-profile men who abuse women. Why don't we look in the mirror and take a hard look at the real abusers? I think Governor Cuomo would be a good one to pay attention to, rather than trying to criminalize every church in America for not following the advice of the transgender coalition of gender dysphoria.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I reiterate my opposition to H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Democrats filled this legislation with politically charged, highly controversial provisions that dramatically expanded its scope, and erased the bipartisanism that originally passed this bill.

Many of those points were pointed out by the speakers on the Republican side, and unfortunately, it does nothing to address the problem of domestic violence, it threatens religious freedom and undermines the legislation's original intent.

Resources should be targeted to help women affected by the horrors of domestic abuse and help prevent further abuse. This bill does neither.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, every year approximately 7.9 million women are victims of rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner. An average of three women are killed every day by a current or former intimate partner. These grim statistics underscore the crucial need for us to act without delay to reauthorize VAWA, and to enhance and expand the Act so that it is even more effective.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for this critical bipartisan legislation today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, today I will vote to approve the Violence Against Women Extension Act (VAWA) of 2021—historic landmark legislation with a proven track record of assisting abused and battered women—authored by Congresswoman ELISE STEFANIK of New York.

As a matter of fact, I was the prime author of the law that provided for the first reauthorization of the VAWA in 2000—a five-year \$3.3 billion comprehensive program that was part of my anti-trafficking law, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Prevention Act (PL 106-386/TVPA).

Important VAWA programs include: legal assistance for victims; addressing housing needs for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking; grants to combat violent crimes on campuses; grants to encourage arrest policies and enforcement of protection orders; grants for enhanced training and services to end abuse later in life; the critical STOP grants to educate and train law enforcement personnel to address sexual assault; the CHOOSE grants, i.e. Creating Hope Through Outreach, Options, Service, and Education for Children and Youth; training and services to end violence against people with disabilities; the sexual assault services program; rural domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking and child abuse enforcement assistance; and grants for strengthening the healthcare system's response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; as well as extending other key programs.

This is consistent with my long record of support for VAWA.

I strongly supported passage of VAWA when it was first introduced in 1993, and again in 1994, when this crucial legislation was signed into law for the first time. I have supported multiple reauthorizations of VAWA, and I continue to strongly support this law as it was originally intended.

As I said earlier, I was the prime author of the law that provided for the first reauthorization of the VAWA in 2000 when I included the five-year \$3.3 billion comprehensive program in my Victims of Trafficking and Violence Prevention Act (PL 106-386/TVPA).

I also sponsored the 2005 reauthorization, fought to ensure these programs are fully funded to assist the maximum number of victims, and voted for seven of the first seven

VAWA reauthorization bills offered through 2012.

Two versions of VAWA reauthorization are under consideration by the House today. As I noted, the version I will support extends the VAWA until 2022. The other—H.R. 1620—weakens several carefully crafted protections for women and girls.

By granting biological men—who self-identify as women—access to women's shelters, H.R. 1620 removes the hard-fought gains to protect women and girls from abuse and to provide them with physical, emotional and psychological security.

Under H.R. 1620, women will no longer have a safe place of their own as they flee from male-inflicted physical and emotional abuse and intimidation.

Rather, these heroic women will now have to share their place of refuge—a shelter previously reserved for women seeking protection from male abusers—with biological men who self-identify as women.

These brave women and children deserve a place where they can feel protected and secure, so they can begin the difficult process of healing as they deal with post-traumatic stress. Forcing them to share a shelter and its facilities, including showers and sleeping areas, with biological men who self-identify as women will cause these women and children to experience insecurity, discomfort, confusion, and fear of additional assault.

VAWA has always prioritized the challenges and unique needs of battered women and children but this version, if passed, no longer will.

These women's shelters—there are about 1,500 nationwide—offer a safe space where a woman does not have to fear or worry about violence and intimidation and instead allows her to take steps toward rebuilding her life.

We must first and foremost protect victims of violence.

I oppose this provision of H.R. 1620 out of genuine concern for the women and children who are forced to flee to domestic abuse shelters and base my concern on evidence from California.

In late 2018, nine female victims residing in a women's shelter in Fresno, California—Naomi's House, operated by Poverello House—filed a lawsuit against the shelter for admitting a biological man because he had self-identified as a woman. These victims stated that they had been sexually harassed by this biological man. They said that he had made "sexual advances" on them and would "stare and leer" and make "sexually harassing comments about their bodies" while they were forced to undress in the same room with him.

After repeatedly confronting the staff of Naomi's House—both verbally and in writing—with their extreme discomfort, these women were told that they would be expelled from the shelter if they refused to comply.

If we allow biological men who self-identify as women to receive access to these women-only shelters, abused women and children will lose the 'safe space' they so desperately need.

These victims deserve better. They deserve our protection and support. We must work to ensure the safety of women, girls, and children.

Other shelters designed to help victims of diverse sexual orientations and identities who are victims of domestic abuse ought to be considered by separate legislation.

We can, and we must create bipartisan legislation which seeks to protect all women and girls, as this law originally intended.

We can, and must, do better.

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

The Violence Against Women Act is a decades-old law that helps protect some of my most vulnerable constituents from abuse. Unfortunately, the law has been expired since 2018.

At a time when the pandemic has forced many women in unsafe domestic situations to stay home, we owe them action. And I came to Congress to get results.

Today, I'll be proud to vote to advance strong and bipartisan legislation to reauthorize and update the Violence Against Women Act.

The bill is going to extend the protections the law has in place while improving violence prevention and victim services. It will ensure communities of color are well served by the law.

And what's more, the bill is forward-looking. It designs studies to assess the challenges survivors face with things like achieving economic security and paying off their student loans. Today, I'm offering an amendment to make sure these studies consider how these matters can have disparate impacts by race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and the bill before us today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HOULAHAN). All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117-12 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 233, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117-12, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. NADLER OF NEW YORK

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 233, I offer amendments en bloc.

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

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, and 41, printed in part B of House Report 117–12, offered by Mr. NADLER of New York:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS OF TEXAS

Page 226, insert after line 22 the following:
SEC. 1406A. STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE COORDINATION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC NURSE EXAM TRAINING AND PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services shall issue and disseminate guidance and best practices to improve sexual assault forensic nurse exam training and program sustainability. Such guidance shall include technical assistance and best practices with respect to—

(1) aspects of performing the medical forensic exam, including anogenital photography, other photographic documentation, photographic documentation record management, and quality assurance peer review;

(2) training and certification;

(3) leadership development;

(4) examiner program sustainability and examiner retention;

(5) education of community stakeholders, including law enforcement officials, victim advocates, and prosecutors; and

(6) use of telehealth for both training examiners and conducting the exams, including the Project ECHO model and other models.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. BUSH OF MISSOURI

Page 78, line 16, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 78, after line 16, insert the following (and redesignate the following subparagraphs accordingly):

(P) the program under Chapter 11 of subtitle B of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12351 et seq.); and

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. BUSH OF MISSOURI

Page 224, line 5, insert after “submit to Congress” the following: “and make publicly available on the Department of Justice website”.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CASE OF HAWAII

Page 168, insert after line 5, insert the following:

(16) Native Hawaiians experience a disproportionately high rate of human trafficking with 64 percent of human trafficking victims in the State of Hawai‘i identifying as at least part Native Hawaiian.

Page 219, insert the following before line 4, and conform the table of contents accordingly:

SEC. 1204. REVIEW ON NATIVE AMERICAN INTERACTIONS WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **REVIEW ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AFFECTING NATIVE HAWAIIANS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct a comprehensive review of law enforcement and other crime prevention programs targeting criminal offenses that affect Native Hawaiians, including child sexual exploitation, child abuse, intimate partner violence, human trafficking, missing or murdered individuals, and substance abuse and submit to Congress a report thereon. The review shall include for each such program the amount of Federal funding for the program that is received by Native Hawaiian-serving organizations as a percentage of the total amount disbursed by the program. The review shall also include recommendations relating to—

(1) social, educational, economic, and any other factor that may contribute to a Native Hawaiian becoming a missing or murdered Native Hawaiian; and

(2) legislation to reduce the likelihood that a Native Hawaiian may become a missing or murdered Native Hawaiian.

(b) **REVIEW OF NATIVE HAWAIIAN VICTIMS OF VARIOUS CRIMES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct a comprehensive review of programs that provide services to victims of criminal offenses affecting Native Hawaiians, including child sexual exploitation, child abuse, intimate partner violence, human trafficking, and substance abuse. The report shall include for each such program the amount of Federal funding that is received by Native Hawaiian-serving organizations as a percentage of—

(1) the total amount disbursed by the program; and

(2) the total amount of Federal funds disbursed by the program.

(c) **REPORT ON NATIVE HAWAIIANS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.**—

(1) **CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, acting through the National Institute of Justice, in coordination with the Bureau of Justice Statistics, shall report on the interaction of Native Hawaiians with the criminal justice system, including the percentage of persons who are Native Hawaiians out of the total of—

(A) all persons arrested;

(B) all persons detained in Federal, State, and local jails;

(C) all persons subject to pretrial supervision;

(D) all persons subject to post-conviction supervision;

(E) all persons incarcerated in Federal and State prisons; and

(F) all persons subject to post-release supervision.

(2) **PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.**—The report shall also include the programs and services available to and used by Native Hawaiians in various jurisdictions, including diversion programs, in-prison education programs, and reentry services. The report shall also include the number of culturally relevant programs available to Native Hawaiians who interact with the criminal justice system. The report shall also include data on the number of Native Hawaiians who are incarcerated and placed in Federal and private facilities more than 200 miles from their place of residence.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The report shall also include recommendations relating to—

(A) social, educational, economic, and any other factor that may contribute to a Native Hawaiian becoming involved in the criminal justice system; and

(B) legislation to reduce the likelihood that a Native Hawaiian may become involved in the criminal justice system.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ SEXUAL ASSAULT SURVIVORS' RIGHTS.

Section 3772(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(D) be informed of the status and location of a sexual assault evidence collection kit.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CRIST OF FLORIDA

Page 21, line 20, strike “and”.

Page 22, line 2, strike the period and all that follows on that line and insert “; and”.

Page 22, insert after line 2 the following:

“(24) paying any fees charged by any governmental authority for furnishing a victim or the child of a victim with any of the following documents:

“(A) A birth certificate of the person.

“(B) An identification card issued to the person by a State, that shows that the person is a resident of the State.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Page 150, line 10, insert after “economic security” the following: “, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on such victims’ ability to maintain economic security.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO OF NEW YORK

Page 128, after line 2, add the following (and redesignate the following paragraphs accordingly):

(7) Studies have found that individuals living in rural areas facing intimate partner violence often face barriers to accessing resources, ranging from health care to the criminal justice system.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO OF NEW YORK

Page 151, after line 10, add the following (and redesignate the following paragraphs accordingly):

(3) analysis of the unique barriers faced by survivors living in rural communities;

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ GRANTS TO STATE AND TRIBAL COURTS TO IMPLEMENT PROTECTION ORDER PILOT PROGRAMS.

Part U of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 2103, 2104, and 2105 as sections 2104, 2105, and 2106, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 2102 the following:

“SEC. 2103. GRANTS TO STATE AND TRIBAL COURTS TO IMPLEMENT PROTECTION ORDER PILOT PROGRAMS.

“(a) **DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—In this section, the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or tribal court that is part of a multidisciplinary partnership that includes, to the extent practicable—

“(1) State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency;

“(2) a State, tribal, or local prosecutor advocate group;

“(3) a victim service provider or State or tribal domestic violence coalition;

“(4) a nonprofit program or government agency with demonstrated experience in providing legal assistance or legal advice to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault;

“(5) the bar association of the applicable State or Indian Tribe;

“(6) the State or tribal association of court clerks;

“(7) a State, tribal, or local association of criminal defense attorneys;

“(8) not fewer than 2 individuals with expertise in the design and management of court case management systems and systems of integration;

“(9) not fewer than 2 State or tribal court judges with experience in—

“(A) the field of domestic violence; and

“(B) issuing protective orders; and

“(10) a judge assigned to the criminal docket of the State or tribal court.

“(b) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to grants authorized under section 2101, the Attorney

General shall make grants to eligible entities to carry out the activities described in subsection (c) of this section.

“(2) NUMBER.—The Attorney General may award not more than 10 grants under paragraph (1).

“(3) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant awarded under paragraph (1) may be not more than \$1,500,000.

“(c) MANDATORY ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds, in consultation with the partners required under subsection (a), to—

“(A) develop and implement a program for properly and legally serving protection orders through electronic communication methods to—

“(i) modernize the service process and make the process more effective and efficient;

“(ii) provide for improved safety of victims; and

“(iii) make protection orders enforceable as quickly as possible;

“(B) develop best practices relating to the service of protection orders through electronic communication methods;

“(C) ensure that the program developed under subparagraph (A) complies with due process requirements and any other procedures required by law or by a court; and

“(D) implement any technology necessary to carry out the program developed under subparagraph (A), such as technology to verify and track the receipt of a protection order by the intended party.

“(2) TIMELINE.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall—

“(A) implement the program required under paragraph (1)(A) not later than 2 years after receiving the grant; and

“(B) carry out the program for not fewer than 3 years.

“(d) DIVERSITY OF RECIPIENTS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section to eligible entities in a variety of areas and situations, including—

“(1) a State court that serves a population of not fewer than 1,000,000 individuals;

“(2) a State court that—

“(A) serves a State that is among the 7 States with the lowest population density in the United States; and

“(B) has a relatively low rate of successful service with respect to protection orders, as determined by the Attorney General;

“(3) a State court that—

“(A) serves a State that is among the 7 States with the highest population density in the United States; and

“(B) has a relatively low rate of successful service with respect to protection orders, as determined by the Attorney General;

“(4) a court that uses an integrated, statewide case management system;

“(5) a court that uses a standalone case management system;

“(6) a tribal court; and

“(7) a court that serves a culturally specific and underserved population.

“(e) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General that includes—

“(A) a description of the process that the eligible entity uses for service of protection orders at the time of submission of the application;

“(B) to the extent practicable, statistics relating to protection orders during the 3 calendar years preceding the date of submission of the application, including rates of—

“(i) successful service; and

“(ii) enforcement;

“(C) an initial list of the entities serving as the partners required under subsection (a); and

“(D) any other information the Attorney General may reasonably require.

“(2) NO OTHER APPLICATION REQUIRED.—An eligible entity shall not be required to submit an application under section 2102 to receive a grant under this section.

“(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding section 4002(b)(11) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(b)(11)), as applied under section 2106 of this part, not less than 5 percent and not more than 8 percent of the total amounts appropriated to carry out this section shall be available to the Attorney General for technical assistance relating to the purposes of this section.

“(g) REPORT TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after receiving a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report that details the plan of the entity for implementation of the program under subsection (c).

“(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after implementing the program under subsection (c), and not later than 2 years thereafter, an eligible entity shall submit to the Attorney General a report that describes the program implemented under subsection (c), including with respect to—

“(i) viability;

“(ii) cost;

“(iii) service statistics;

“(iv) challenges;

“(v) analysis of the technology used to fulfill the goals of the program;

“(vi) analysis of any legal or due process issues resulting from the electronic service method described in subsection (c)(1)(A); and

“(vii) best practices for implementing such a program in other similarly situated locations.

“(B) CONTENTS OF FINAL REPORT.—An eligible entity shall include in the second report submitted under subparagraph (A) recommendations for—

“(i) future nationwide implementation of the program implemented by the eligible entity; and

“(ii) usage of electronic service, similar to the service used by the eligible entity, for other commonly used court orders, including with respect to viability and cost.

“(h) NO REGULATIONS OR GUIDELINES REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding section 2105, the Attorney General shall not be required to publish regulations or guidelines implementing this section.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise made available to carry out this part, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for fiscal years 2019 through 2024.”

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KAHELE OF HAWAII

Page 210, line 14, by striking “and gender identity” and inserting “gender identity and status as an American Indian, Alaska Native or Native Hawaiian”.

Page 210, after line 14, insert the following (and redesignate the following subparagraphs accordingly):

(C) data on the number of women who are incarcerated and placed in federal and private facilities more than 200 miles from their place of residence;

Page 212, line 13, by striking “Justice)” and inserting “Justice, Indian Tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act), and Native Hawaiian organizations (as defined in Section 6207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)”.

Page 212, line 26, by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon.

Page 213, line 5, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”.

Page 213, after line 5, by inserting the following:

(D) other support tailored to the needs of Indigenous women, including American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 39, line 21, strike “and” at the end.

Page 39, insert after line 21 the following (and redesignate succeeding provisions accordingly):

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) to develop, expand, implement, and improve the quality of sexual assault forensic medical examination or sexual assault nurse examiner programs.”;

(3) in subsection (b)(5), by inserting after “the lack of access to” the following: “quality forensic sexual assault examinations by trained healthcare providers.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE OF MICHIGAN

Page 28, after line 18, by inserting the following:

“(28) To develop or strengthen policies and training for law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and the judiciary in recognizing, investigating, and prosecuting instances of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking against individuals who have been arrested or otherwise have contact with the juvenile or adult criminal justice system, and to develop or strengthen diversion programs for such individuals and for such individuals to receive comprehensive victim services.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE OF MICHIGAN

Page 29, strike line 19 and insert the following:

“(G) certify that the laws, policies, and practices of the State in which the eligible grantee resides prohibits the prosecution of a minor under the age of 18 with respect to prostitution; and”;

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

Page 192, insert after line 24 the following: (f) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office on Violence Against Women shall—

(1) in consultation with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, report to Congress on actions taken to prevent suicide amongst survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking; and

(2) in consultation with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, establish best practices to prevent suicide amongst survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MS. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW YORK

Page 33, line 14, by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon.

Page 33, line 16, by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”.

Page 33, after line 16, by adding the following:

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

“(h) CULTURAL RELEVANCE.—Any services provided pursuant to a grant funded under

this section shall be provided in a culturally relevant manner.”.

Page 158, after line 13, add the following:

(e) **CULTURAL RELEVANCE.**—Any outreach or education campaign conducted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in a culturally relevant manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 19, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 15, and insert the following:

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “prosecution policies” and inserting “prosecution policies, such as implementing a vertical prosecution system.”; and

(ii) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “including implementation of the non-discrimination requirements in section 40002(b)(13) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994”.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 198, insert after line 5 the following (and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly):

“(d) **INTAKE AND ASSESSMENTS.**—The Director shall administer family-focused programming at intake, such as questions about children, gauge interest in parenting resources, and concerns about their child or caregiving; and administer ongoing assessment to better inform, identify, and make recommendations about the mother’s parental role and familial needs.”.

Page 198, insert after line 21 the following (and redesignate succeeding subsections accordingly):

“(g) **FAMILY NEEDS TRAINING.**—The Director shall provide training to correctional officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons who engage with prisoners’ families on—

“(1) how to interact with children in an age-appropriate manner, and the children’s caregivers;

“(2) basic childhood and adolescent development information; and

“(3) basic customer service skills.”.

Page 212, line 26, strike “and” at the end. Page 213, line 5, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 213, insert after line 5 the following:

(D) the need to ensure a family-focused reentry, by including incarcerated mothers, their children, and their caregivers to create family reentry planning and programming; and informing reentry information to visiting families.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 199, line 5, add at the end the following:

“(1A) The Director shall make rules—

“(A) on the distribution and accessibility of sanitary products to prisoners, to ensure each prisoner who requires these products receives a quantity the prisoner deems sufficient; and

“(B) providing that no visitor is prohibited from visiting a prisoner due to the visitor’s use of sanitary products.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

At the end of title V, add the following:

SEC. ____ . MATERNAL MORTALITY OR MORBIDITY STUDY.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, in collaboration with the Center for Disease Control and Prevention and in consultation with the Attorney General, the Director of the Indian Health Service, and other stakeholders (including community based organizations), shall conduct a study on the whether victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking throughout the United States are

more at risk of maternal mortality or morbidity as a result of issues related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(b) **REPORTS.**—Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Director of the Indian Health Service, and other stakeholders (including community based organizations), shall report to Congress on the study conducted under subsection (a). The report shall include:

(1) An analysis of the extent in which domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking result in pregnancy related death.

(2) An analysis of the impact of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking on access to health care.

(3) A breakdown of individuals particularly impacted by domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, by race and ethnicity.

(4) An analysis of the impact of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking on Tribal communities and among Native Americans.

(5) An assessment of the factors that increase risks for infant and maternal mortality or morbidity among survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(6) Recommendations for legislative or policy changes to help reduce infant and maternal mortality rates.

(7) Best practices to reduce pregnancy related deaths among survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

(8) Any other information on maternal mortality or morbidity the the Secretary determine appropriate to include in the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 51, insert after line 18 the following:

SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF THE FAST INITIATIVE.

Section 41601(e) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) **FORENSIC-MEDICAL AND ADVOCACY SERVICES FOR TRIBES INITIATIVE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall make grants to eligible entities establish, sustain, or expand programs offering sexual assault medical forensic exams and sexual assault victim services in tribal communities.

“(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—An eligible entity any of the following:

“(A) A State, local, or Federally recognized tribal government.

“(B) An agency of a State, local, or Federally recognized tribal government.

“(C) A nonprofit organization.

“(D) A tribal organization.

“(E) An entity, the principal purpose of which is to provide healthcare, such as a hospital, clinic, or health department.

“(F) An institution of higher education.

“(3) **FUNDING.**—Of the amount made available to carry out this section, \$14,000,000 shall be for grants under this subsection.

“(4) **PRIORITY.**—The Attorney General shall give priority to applicants proposing innovative ways of bringing experienced sexual assault forensic exams to remote tribal communities.

“(5) **APPLICANT REQUIREMENTS.**—Applicants shall demonstrate coordination with victim service providers, law enforcement (including a crime laboratory), and prosecutors.

“(6) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Recipients of a grant under this subsection may use such funds to hire a sexual assault response team.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. NEWMAN OF ILLINOIS

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

SEC. 1411. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE ASSISTANCE FOR MICRO-BUSINESSES.

Section 41501(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12501(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting after “State and local governments” the following: “, and employers with fewer than 20 employees”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, which materials shall include a website with resources for employers with fewer than 20 employees, including live training materials”.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

Page 151, line 5, insert “ credit history,” after “health care access.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR OF MINNESOTA

Page 151, line 24, strike “and”.

Page 152, line 4, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 152, after line 4, insert the following:

(6) barriers that impede victims’ ability to pursue legal action, including legal costs and filing fees, and complexities of the jurisdiction of law enforcement agencies.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE XVII—PROTECTIONS FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRANT WOMEN

SEC. 1701. PILOT PROGRAM TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish an interim final rule establishing a six year pilot program allowing nonimmigrants authorized for employment under section 106 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1105a), and their children, to apply for lawful temporary status and travel authorization independent of the principal nonimmigrants to which their current status is or was tied. Such interim final rule shall be published and take effect not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

SEC. 1411. CIVIL ACTION RELATING TO DISCLOSURE OF INTIMATE IMAGES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **CONSENT.**—The term “consent” means, with respect to an individual, an affirmative, conscious, and voluntary authorization made by the individual free from force, fraud, misrepresentation, or coercion of the depicted individual.

(2) **COMMERCIAL PORNOGRAPHIC CONTENT.**—The term “commercial pornographic content” means any material that is subject to the record keeping requirements under section 2257 of title 18, United States Code.

(3) **DEPICTED INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “depicted individual” means an individual whose body is disclosed in whole or in part in an intimate image.

(4) **DISCLOSE.**—The term “disclose” means to transfer, publish, distribute, or make accessible an intimate image.

(5) **IDENTIFIABLE.**—The term “identifiable” means recognizable by an individual other than the depicted individual from—

(A) the intimate image itself; or

(B) information or text displayed in connection with the intimate image.

(6) **INTIMATE IMAGE.**—The term “intimate image”—

(A) means a photograph, film, video recording, or digital recording that shows—

(i) the uncovered genitals, pubic area, anus, or female nipple of an individual;

(ii) the display or transfer of bodily sexual fluids on to any part of the body of an individual;

(iii) an individual engaging in sexually explicit conduct; or

(iv) an individual being subjected to sexually explicit conduct; and

(B) includes any image described in subparagraph (A) captured or recorded while the depicted individual was in a public place if—

(i) the depicted individual did not voluntarily display the content depicted in the image; or

(ii) the depicted individual did not consent to the sexual conduct depicted in the image.

(7) **SEXUALLY EXPLICIT CONDUCT.**—The term “sexually explicit conduct” has the meaning given the term in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 2256(2) of title 18, United States Code.

(b) **CIVIL ACTION.**—

(1) **RIGHT OF ACTION.**—Except as provided in paragraph (4), a depicted individual, or in the case of a depicted individual who is a minor, the parent of the depicted individual, whose intimate image is disclosed, in or through interstate or foreign commerce or using a means of interstate or foreign commerce (including the internet), without the consent of the depicted individual, and such disclosure was made by a person who acted knowingly without, or with reckless disregard for, the consent of the depicted individual to such disclosure, may bring a civil action against that person in an appropriate district court of the United States for appropriate relief.

(2) **CONSENT.**—For purposes of an action under paragraph (1)—

(A) evidence that the depicted individual provided consent to the capture or recording of the intimate image shall not, by itself, constitute evidence that the depicted individual provided consent to the disclosure of the intimate image; and

(B) evidence that the depicted individual disclosed the image to the person alleged to have violated paragraph (1) shall not, by itself, constitute evidence that the depicted individual provided consent to the further disclosure of the intimate image.

(3) **RELIEF.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In a civil action filed under this section—

(i) an individual may recover the actual damages sustained by the individual or liquidated damages in the amount of \$150,000, and the cost of the action, including reasonable attorney’s fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred; and

(ii) the court may, in addition to any other relief available at law, order equitable relief, including a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, or a permanent injunction ordering the defendant to cease display or disclosure of the image.

(B) **PRESERVATION OF ANONYMITY.**—In ordering relief under subparagraph (A), the court may grant injunctive relief maintaining the confidentiality of a plaintiff using a pseudonym.

(4) **EXCEPTIONS.**—A depicted individual may not bring an action for relief under this section relating to—

(A) an intimate image that is commercial pornographic content unless—

(i) the content was produced by force, fraud, misrepresentation, or coercion of the depicted individual; and

(ii) the claim of force, fraud, misrepresentation, or coercion under clause (i) is dem-

onstrated through a preponderance of evidence;

(B) a disclosure made in good faith—

(i) to a law enforcement officer or agency;

(ii) as part of a legal proceeding;

(iii) as part of medical education, diagnosis, or treatment; or

(iv) in the reporting or investigation of—

(I) unlawful content; or

(II) unsolicited or unwelcome conduct;

(C) a matter of public concern or public interest; or

(D) a disclosure reasonably intended to assist the depicted individual.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 51, insert after line 18 the following:

SEC. 206. LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER SPECIFIC SERVICES PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Violence Against Women Office, shall make grants to eligible entities to enhance LGBTQ+ specific services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

(b) **PURPOSE OF PROGRAM AND GRANTS.**—

(1) **GENERAL PROGRAM PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the program required by this section is to promote the following:

(A) The maintenance and replication of existing successful LGBTQ+ specific domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking community-based programs providing services and resources for LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(B) The development of innovative LGBTQ+ specific strategies and projects to enhance access to services and resources for LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking who face obstacles to using more traditional services and resources.

(2) **PURPOSES FOR WHICH GRANTS MAY BE USED.**—The Director shall make grants to community-based programs for the purpose of enhancing LGBTQ+ specific services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Grants under the program shall support community-based efforts to address distinctive LGBTQ+ specific responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, including—

(A) providing or enhancing services for LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, including services that address the safety, emotional well-being, economic, housing, legal and workplace needs of LGBTQ+ victims;

(B) supporting programs that specifically address underserved LGBTQ+ communities, including culturally specific communities, to provide specific resources and support for LGBTQ+ underserved victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(C) working in cooperation with the community to develop education and prevention strategies highlighting LGBTQ+ specific issues and resources regarding victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;

(D) conducting outreach activities to ensure that LGBTQ+ people who are victims of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, or sexual assault receive appropriate assistance;

(E) providing training for victim service organizations, governmental agencies, courts, law enforcement and other first responders, and nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations serving the LGBT community about risk reduction, intervention, preven-

tion and the nature of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and sexual assault for LGBTQ+ individuals;

(F) developing and implementing LGBTQ+ specific programming that incorporates alternative justice responses that are focused on victim autonomy, agency and safety in order to provide resolution and restitution for the victim; and

(G) providing LGBTQ+ specific programs for LGBTQ+ parents of children exposed to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; (H) examining the dynamics of anti-LGBTQ+ bias and its impact on victimization and healing.

(3) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.**—The Director shall provide technical assistance and training to grantees of this and other programs under this Act regarding the development and provision of effective LGBTQ+ specific community-based services by entering into cooperative agreements or contracts with an organization or organizations having a demonstrated expertise in and whose primary purpose is addressing the development and provision of LGBTQ+ specific community-based services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

(c) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—Eligible entities for grants under this section include—

(1) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; and

(2) community-based programs, the primary purpose of which is providing LGBTQ+ specific services that can partner with a program having demonstrated expertise in serving victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and that agrees to receive technical assistance from a program with LGBTQ+ specific expertise.

(d) **REPORTING.**—The Director shall issue a biennial report on the distribution of funding under this section, the progress made in replicating and supporting increased services to LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and the types of LGBTQ+ specific programs, strategies, technical assistance, and training developed or enhanced through this program.

(e) **GRANT PERIOD.**—The Director shall award grants for a 2-year period, with a possible extension of another 2 years to implement projects under the grant.

(f) **EVALUATION.**—The Director shall award a contract or cooperative agreement to evaluate programs under this section to an entity with the demonstrated expertise in and primary goal of providing enhanced access to services and resources for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking who face obstacles to using more traditional services and resources.

(g) **NON-EXCLUSIVITY.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to exclude LGBTQ+ community-based programs from applying to other grant programs authorized under this Act.

(h) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Two percent the amounts appropriated to carry out a covered grant program for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026, shall be made available for grants under this section.

(2) **COVERED GRANT PROGRAM.**—In this section, the term “covered grant program” means any of the following:—

(A) Section 2101 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461).

(B) Section 1301 of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12464).

(3) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.**—In addition to the funds described in paragraph (1), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this

section \$8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026. Funds appropriated under this paragraph shall remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 121, insert after line 21 the following: “(26) To develop of statewide databases with information on where sexual assault nurse examiners are located.”

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. ROSS OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 81, insert after line 25 the following: (2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered housing provider shall prioritize the safety of victims when making housing and housing-related decisions, including admissions, terminations of assistance, evictions, transfers, referrals, family break-ups, and income determinations.”

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 30, insert after line 13 the following (and redesignate succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) to implement, expand, and establish efforts and projects to provide legal representation for post-conviction relief proceedings, including any proceedings relating to vacatur, expungement, record-sealing, or other post-conviction relief measure.”

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 8, line 4, strike “or” at the end.

Page 8, after line 4, insert the following (and redesignate provisions accordingly):

“(iii) in the case of legal services provided at a facility operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs, a representative authorized by the Secretary who is providing legal services in connection with medical services, and other unmet legal needs, such as issues related to child custody, elder law, and landlord-tenant disputes; or”

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

SEC. 1411. CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO INTIMATE VISUAL DEPICTIONS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Stopping Harmful Image Exploitation and Limiting Distribution Act of 2021” or the “SHIELD Act of 2021”.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 88 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1802. Certain activities relating to intimate visual depictions

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE.**—The term ‘communications service’ means—

“(A) a service provided by a person that is a common carrier, as that term is defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153), insofar as the person is acting as a common carrier;

“(B) an electronic communication service, as that term is defined in section 2510;

“(C) an information service, as that term is defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153); and

“(D) an interactive computer service, as that term is defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)).

“(2) **INFORMATION CONTENT PROVIDER.**—The term ‘information content provider’ has the

meaning given that term in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)).

“(3) **INTIMATE VISUAL DEPICTION.**—The term ‘intimate visual depiction’ means any visual depiction (as that term is defined in section 2256(5))—

“(A) of an individual who is reasonably identifiable from the visual depiction itself or information displayed in connection with the visual depiction;

“(B) in which—

“(i) the individual has obtained 18 years of age and is engaging in sexually explicit conduct; or

“(ii) the naked genitals, anus, pubic area or post-pubescent female nipple of the individual are visible;

“(C) in which the content described in subparagraph (B) is not simulated; and

“(D) in original or modified format.

“(4) **SEXUALLY EXPLICIT CONDUCT.**—The term ‘sexually explicit conduct’ has the meaning given that term in section 2256(2)(A).

“(b) **OFFENSE.**—Except as provided in subsection (d), it shall be unlawful to knowingly use any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce to distribute an intimate visual depiction of an individual—

“(1) with knowledge of or reckless disregard for—

“(A) the lack of consent of the individual to the distribution; and

“(B) the reasonable expectation of the individual that the depiction would remain private; and

“(2) without an objectively reasonable belief that such distribution touches upon a matter of public concern.

“(c) **PENALTY.**—Any person who violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 2 years, for each individual victim depicted, or both.

“(d) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

“(1) **LAW ENFORCEMENT, LAWFUL REPORTING, AND OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS.**—This section—

“(A) does not prohibit any lawful law enforcement, correctional, or intelligence activity;

“(B) shall not apply in the case of an individual acting in good faith to report unlawful activity or in pursuance of a legal or professional or other lawful obligation; and

“(C) shall not apply in the case of a document production or filing associated with a legal proceeding.

“(2) **SERVICE PROVIDERS.**—This section shall not apply to any provider of a communications service with regard to content provided by another information content provider unless the provider of the communications service intentionally solicits, or knowingly and predominantly distributes, content that the provider of the communications service actually knows is in violation of this section.

“(e) **THREATS.**—Any person who intentionally threatens to commit an offense under subsection (b) shall be punished as provided in subsection (c).

“(f) **VENUE AND EXTRATERRITORIALITY.**—A prosecution under this section may be brought in a district where the defendant or the depicted individual resides or in a district where the intimate visual depictions are distributed. There is extraterritorial Federal jurisdiction over an offense under this section if the defendant or the depicted individual is a citizen or permanent resident of the United States.”

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections of chapter 88 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1801 the following:

“1802. Certain activities relating to intimate visual depictions.”

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ . ONLINE SURVEY TOOL FOR CAMPUS SAFETY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Education shall, in consultation with the Attorney General, Director of the Centers for Disease Control, and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and experts in domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking, develop, design, and make available through a secure and accessible online portal, a standardized online survey tool regarding student experiences with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking.

(b) **DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEY TOOL.**—In developing the survey tool required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Education shall—

(1) use best practices from peer-reviewed research measuring domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking;

(2) consult with the higher education community, experts in survey research related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking, and organizations engaged in the prevention of and response to, and advocacy on behalf of victims of, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking regarding the development and design of such survey tool and the methodology for administration of such survey tool; and

(3) ensure that the survey tool is readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The survey tool developed pursuant to this paragraph shall be fair and unbiased, scientifically valid and reliable, and meet the highest standards of survey research.

(2) **SURVEY QUESTIONS.**—Survey questions included in the survey tool developed pursuant to this section shall—

(A) be designed to gather information on student experiences with domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking, including the experiences of victims of such incidents;

(B) use trauma-informed language to prevent retraumatization; and

(C) include the following:

(i) Questions that give students the option to report their demographic information.

(ii) Questions designed to determine the incidence and prevalence of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking.

(iii) Questions regarding whether students know about institutional policies and procedures related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking.

(iv) Questions designed to determine, if victims reported domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, or stalking—

(I) to whom the incident was reported and what response the victim may have received;

(II) whether the victim was informed of, or referred to, national, State, local, or on-campus resources; and

(III) whether the entity to whom the victim reported the incident conducted an investigation and the duration and final resolution of such an investigation.

(v) Questions regarding contextual factors, such as whether force, incapacitation, or coercion was involved.

(vi) Questions to determine whether an accused individual was a student at the institution.

(vii) Questions to determine whether a victim reported an incident to State, local, or campus law enforcement.

(viii) Questions to determine why the victim chose to report or not report an incident to the institution or State, local, or campus law enforcement.

(ix) Questions to determine the impact of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking on the victim's education, including diminished grades, dropped classes, leaves of absence, and negative financial consequences (such as costs associated with loss in paid tuition due to leaves of absence, loss in scholarship awards due to diminished grades, and cost associated with counseling, medical services, or housing changes).

(x) Questions to determine the impact and effectiveness of prevention and awareness programs and complaints processes.

(xi) Questions to determine attitudes toward sexual violence and harassment, including the willingness of individuals to intervene as a bystander of sex-based (including sexual orientation-based and gender identity-based), race-based, national origin-based, and disability-based discrimination, harassment, assault, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking.

(xii) Other questions, as determined by the Secretary of Education.

(3) **ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS.**—In addition to the standardized questions developed by the Secretary of Education under paragraph (2), an institution may request additional information from students that would increase the understanding of the institution of school climate factors unique to their campuses.

(4) **RESPONSES.**—The responses to the survey questions described in paragraph (2) shall—

- (A) be submitted confidentially;
- (B) not be included in crime statistics; and
- (C) in the case of such responses being included in a report, shall not include personally identifiable information.

(d) **ADMINISTRATION OF SURVEY.**—

(1) **FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Attorney General, Director of the Centers for Disease Control, and Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, shall develop a mechanism by which institutions of higher education may, with respect to the survey tool developed pursuant to this section—

- (A) administer such survey tool; and
- (B) modify such survey tool to include additional elements or requirements, as determined by the institution.

(2) **COSTS.**—The Secretary of Education may not require an institution of higher education to pay to modify the survey tool in accordance with paragraph (1)(B).

(3) **ACCESSIBILITY.**—The Secretary of Education shall ensure that the survey tool is administered in such a way as to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.

(4) **INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION.**—Beginning not later than one year after the date on which the Secretary of Education makes available to institutions the mechanism described in paragraph (1), and every 2 years thereafter, each institution shall administer the survey tool developed pursuant to this section.

(e) **COMPLETED SURVEYS.**—The Secretary of Education shall require each institution participating in any program under this title to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that an adequate, random, and representative sample size of students (as determined by the Secretary) enrolled at the institution

complete the survey tool developed pursuant to this section.

(f) **REPORT.**—Beginning not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall prepare a biennial report on the information gained from the standardized elements of the survey under this section and publish such report in an accessible format on the website of the Department and submit such report to Congress. The report shall include campus-level data for each school and attributed by name of each campus in a manner that permits comparisons across schools and campuses.

(g) **PUBLICATION.**—Each institution shall publish, in a manner that is readily accessible and usable by individuals, including individuals with disabilities—

(1) the campus-level results of the standardized elements of the survey under this section on the website of the institution and in the annual security report required under subsection (f) for the campuses affiliated with the institution; and

(2) the campus-level results of the additional elements modifying the survey by the institution, if any, on the website of the institution.

(h) **VIOLATION.**—Upon a determination pursuant to section 487(c)(3)(B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(c)(3)(B)) that an institution of higher education has violated or failed to carry out any provision under this section, the Secretary of Education shall impose a civil penalty upon the institution in the same amount and pursuant to the same procedures as a civil penalty is imposed under section 487(c)(3)(B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(c)(3)(B)).

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. SPELER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 231, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 1411. TASK FORCE ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN EDUCATION.

(a) **TASK FORCE ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN EDUCATION.**—Not later than September 1, 2022, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Attorney General shall establish a joint interagency task force to be known as the “Task Force on Sexual Violence in Education” that shall—

(1) provide pertinent information to the Secretary of Education, Attorney General, Congress, and the public with respect to campus sexual violence prevention, investigations, and responses, including the creation of consistent, public complaint processes for violations of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) and section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(f));

(2) provide recommendations to educational institutions for establishing sexual assault prevention and response teams;

(3) develop recommendations for educational institutions on providing survivor resources, including healthcare, sexual assault kits, sexual assault nurse examiners, culturally responsive and inclusive standards of care, trauma-informed services, and access to confidential advocacy and support services;

(4) develop recommendations in conjunction with student groups at greater statistical risk of perpetuating rape culture such as fraternities and athletic departments for best practices for responses and prevention with respect to sexual violence and dating violence for educational institutions, taking into consideration an institution's size and resources;

(5) develop recommendations for educational institutions on sex education, as appropriate, training for school staff, and various equitable discipline models;

(6) develop recommendations on culturally responsive and inclusive approaches to supporting survivors, which include consideration of race, ethnicity, national origin, migrant status, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, disability, socio-economic status, exposure to trauma, and other compounding factors;

(7) solicit periodic input from a diverse group of survivors, trauma specialists, advocates from national, State, and local anti-sexual violence advocacy organizations, institutions of higher education, and other public stakeholders;

(8) assess the Department of Education's ability under section 902 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1682) to levy intermediate fines for noncompliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) and the advisability of additional remedies for such noncompliance, in addition to the remedies already available under Federal law; and

(9) create a plan described in subsection (c).

(b) **PERSONNEL DETAILS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY TO DETAIL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of a component of any Federal agency that is funded under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925 et seq.) may detail an officer or employee of such component to the Task Force on Sexual Violence in Education or to the Secretary of Education to assist the Task Force with the duties described in subsection (a), as jointly agreed to by the head of such component and the Task Force.

(2) **BASIS FOR DETAIL.**—A personnel detail made under paragraph (1) may be made—

- (A) for a period of not more than 3 years; and
- (B) on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis.

(c) **ADDITIONAL PLAN.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Task Force on Sexual Violence in Education is established under subsection (a), the Task Force shall submit to Congress recommendations for recruiting, retaining, and training a highly-qualified workforce employed by the Department of Education to carry out investigation of complaints alleging a violation of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) or section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(f)), and enforcement of such title IX (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) or such section 485(f) (20 U.S.C. 1092(f)), with respect to sexual violence in education. Such plan shall include—

(1) an assessment to identify current gaps or challenges carrying out such investigation and enforcement, which may include surveying current investigative workforce to solicit feedback on areas in need of improvement;

(2) an examination of issues of recruiting, retention, and the professional development of such workforce, including the possibility of providing retention bonuses or other forms of compensation for the purpose of ensuring the Department of Education has the capacity, in both personnel and skills, needed to properly perform its mission and provide adequate oversight of educational institutions;

(3) an assessment of the benefits of outreach and training with both law enforcement agencies and educational institutions with respect to such workforce;

(4) an examination of best practices for making educational institutions aware of the most effective campus sexual violence prevention, investigation, and response practices and identifying areas where more research should be conducted; and

(5) strategies for addressing such other matters as the Secretary of Education considers necessary to sexual violence prevention, investigation, and responses.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Task Force on Sexual Violence in Education shall report to Congress on an annual basis, and make publicly available, a report of its activities and any update of the plan required under subsection (c), including the number of complaints received regarding sexual violence (including violence on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity), the number of open investigations, the number of complaints that continued to resolution, the number of complaints resolved using informal resolution, the average time to complete an investigation, the number of investigations initiated based on complaints, and the number of investigations initiated by the Department of Education.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “educational institution” includes an institution of higher education, an elementary school, or a secondary school.

(2) The terms “elementary school” and “secondary school” have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(3) The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1411. SURVIVORS' BILL OF RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall make grants to States that have in place a law that provides to sexual assault survivors the rights, at a minimum, under section 3772 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) GRANT AMOUNT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, a grant to a State under this section shall be equal to 10 percent of the average of the amount of funding of the 3 most recent awards that the State received under part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10411 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the “STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program”).

(c) APPLICATION.—A State seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, including information about the law described in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 1611. STUDY ON CHILD CUSTODY IN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES.

The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a study investigating whether victims who raise evidence of domestic violence are more likely to lose primary custody of children to an abusive partner or to the State, including—

(1) a review of State laws, regulations, and practices on how child neglect and custody situations are handled in domestic violence situations; and

(2) a list of recommendations on how to restructure State laws, regulations, and practices to better protect victims of domestic violence and their children.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 158, insert after line 21 the following:

SEC. 708. STUDY ON COSTS OF DIVORCE IN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES.

The Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall—

(1) conduct a study on the direct and collateral economic costs and risks of divorce from an abusive partner to a victim of domestic violence, including the payment of alimony, legal fees, spousal support, or the division of property, disaggregated on the basis of whether the individual has higher earnings than their partner; and

(2) include recommendations based on the study conducted under paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 231, insert after line 17 the following:

SEC. 1411. REPORT ON SEXUAL ASSAULT RESPONSE TEAMS AT HOSPITALS.

In order to be eligible for funds made available by the Department of Justice under this Act or an amendment made by this Act, a State or unit of local government shall submit to the Attorney General a report, on an annual basis, which contains the following:

(1) The number of hospitals in the jurisdiction that have sexual assault response teams (or their equivalent).

(2) The average response time of each such team in responding to the needs, including the emotional needs, of rape and sexual assault victims in the emergency room.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MS. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA

Page 18, insert after line 23 the following:

SEC. 6. INCLUSION OF DISPARATE IMPACT IN STUDIES.

Any study conducted under this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall include an assessment, to the extent practicable, of any disparate impacts of the matter studied, by race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment, based on the bipartisan Documents for Continued Safety Act that I introduced with Resident Commissioner Gonzalez-Colon of Puerto Rico.

This amendment would allow STOP grants from the Department of Justice to be used to replace vital documents for survivors of domestic violence, free of cost. Some survivors grab all they can when they flee, leaving vital documents behind. Other didn't have access to their vital docs.

Rebuilding can be tough, but our amendment will help survivors turn the page and write a new chapter, on their terms, safe and free.

□ 1230

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I do have one of the en bloc amendments at the desk.

Madam Speaker, this amendment requires the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to issue guidance on the issues identified by a Government Accountability Office report and the use of telehealth.

In 2018, the Energy and Commerce Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee held an eye-opening hearing on sexual assault forensic examinations that highlighted gaps in training and care related to sexual assault forensic examinations. The Government Accountability Office testified at this hearing on its 2016 report on sexual assault forensic exams, which identified gaps in aspects of performing exams, training, leadership development, examiner program sustainability, and education of community stakeholders.

This amendment is simple, and it is common sense. The Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services must issue guidance on addressing the gaps identified by GAO.

In Texas, there have been efforts to utilize telehealth, including the Project ECHO model, to provide sexual assault forensic examinations and training. The nurses involved in these programs have established their success. I am sure States have employed other useful telehealth models that should be further explored as well.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate that this amendment is endorsed by the International Association of Forensic Nurses, signaling its importance, and I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS).

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment and the underlying bill.

No one—and I mean no one—should be forced to stay in an abusive relationship because they fear deportation. Under current law, if a woman travels to the United States of America with someone on a temporary visa and that relationship turns abusive, they are trapped.

My amendment to the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act would create a pilot program for victims of domestic abuse to apply for independent immigration status. It is that simple, and it is that important.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, in New Mexico, one in three women have experienced domestic violence. We must act swiftly to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. The protections in this bill are a matter of life and death.

My State has one of the highest suicide rates. My amendment will help prevent suicide among survivors of sexual assault.

It also recognizes that our diverse communities must receive culturally relevant legal aid and outreach programs.

Let's work to end gender-based violence in all of our communities.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this has been a long journey, and I think it is important to take note of the many women who have helped us and to do this in the name of so many women who have lost their lives.

I take this moment on the floor to support the en bloc amendment but, as well, to encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle of how somber and serious a moment this is that we do not take lightly to the floor because so many of us in our own congressional districts have seen the scourge of domestic violence.

We have seen the rise in domestic violence in a meteoric manner under COVID-19. It is rabid and rampant in all our cities. Our law enforcement officers have told us it is the most dangerous call that they can possibly make.

I am particularly concerned about sex trafficking victims, and I am very glad the manager's amendment has language in there that indicates that sex trafficking victims experience sexual violence and assault, and that the Federal recognition of their recovery is important.

We look at all aspects of this important issue in our country. The en bloc amendment represents Members' concerns for improving the treatment of women and men, the LGBTQ community, Native Americans, and immigrant women who are culturally diverse.

Madam Speaker, to the 200-plus organizations of the coalition, I want to say thank you to you for advocating with us. Writing this bill in 2018 and never giving up has been the challenge that I have taken up.

I am very grateful to the many women who have joined me. Even though it was not passed when there was a Republican President, Republican Senate, and Republican House, and then it was blocked by the Republican Senate, we have now come with a fully robust and comprehensive bill that responds to the concerns of those who cannot help themselves.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Housing and other aspects of the provisions that are in this bill pointedly speak to needs that have been brought to our attention by victims. This bill deals with

victims, Madam Speaker, so when you are fleeing your home because your name is not on the lease or the mortgage, we now have provided an expedited process for you to get housing with your children.

We intervene and have cultural sensitivity training for men and boys. We have a cultural sensitivity office inside the office of domestic violence so that women of different cultural backgrounds can be responded to, along with focusing on culturally sensitive advocacy groups to help those women.

Yes, we do prevent a convicted person who has perpetrated a stalking or sexual assault from getting a gun, but this bill is controlled by due process in the Constitution.

Let's pass this bill. Women are waiting. They can't wait any longer. Men are waiting. Many communities are waiting. We can't wait any longer, and we must pass this bill to be signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 8½ minutes remaining.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the 39 amendments packed into one little grouping called en bloc.

The reason why I am opposed is that while some of these amendments are noble and worthwhile proposals on their own, they do not outweigh the underlying problems of the legislation or some of the truly bad amendments in this bloc.

These amendments include provisions that would further inject identity politics into the Violence Against Women Act, which we have heard over and over in this debate. There are studies about disparate impacts and measures that unnecessarily differentiate how we treat different groups of people.

This entire bloc of 39 amendments includes amendments that further encroach on the affairs of State and local governments by creating new grants and pilot programs and spending more of the American taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

One amendment in this bloc is designed to incentivize States to legalize prostitution engaged in by minors to help sex trafficking victims. How does this make any sense? It doesn't.

Of course, we all want to stop sex trafficking, but this proposal has not been thought through and could have disastrous unintended consequences. I am going to say disastrous consequences.

We need to return the Violence Against Women Act to its original intent that Congress passed in an overwhelmingly bipartisan manner almost 30 years ago.

H.R. 1620 will expand and alter the fundamental nature of the Violence Against Women Act by imposing the trans agenda of putting biological men in women's shelters and prisons. It does more to advance the Democrats' progressive agenda than it does to protect women who need protection.

Also concerning is the fact that this legislation did not undergo committee consideration. One would ask: Why not?

There has been no committee hearing for this bill or these en bloc amendments. Why not?

There has been no committee markup for this in Congress. Why not?

Rather than rushing to pass this bill, we should have taken the time to truly examine the issues and determine what, if any, additional resources, reviews, or studies are necessary.

We all stand in opposition to any violence against women. Unfortunately, the government lockdowns during the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in an increased amount of domestic violence, increased depression, increased suicide, and increased suffering. We have an urgent need to address violence against women—and we should at all times—but not like this, by changing this so radically and including biological men.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments and the underlying bill, H.R. 1620.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his tireless work and the work of so many women of this Caucus, including Speaker PELOSI, to bring this bill to fruition and to bring this bill to the floor.

We know, and we all believe, that violence against women and the support necessary to impede that from happening is necessary and should be reauthorized.

I rise today in strong support of the en bloc amendment. The Nadler amendment en bloc is the culmination of a yearslong effort to authorize explicit Federal legal action against the nonconsensual disclosure and public transmission of intimate visual imagery, following the lead of dozens of the States.

Nobody, under any circumstances, should have private intimate imagery shared on the internet without their consent. The pain that is caused by perpetrators who knowingly share sexually explicit or nude images of someone without their consent has ruined lives and, in many instances, the lives of their family as well. It is weaponized to humiliate, harass, intimidate, and even exploit people who are primarily women.

I am proud to support this amendment that will give prosecutors and victims important tools to bring perpetrators to justice and further deter

offenders from committing such a terrible and egregious violation of privacy. Please approve this amendment and let us pass this bill.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this en bloc amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, the en bloc amendment includes a number of very important amendments that make significant improvements to the bill. I appreciate all the Members who contributed to this en bloc amendment from both sides of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, my amendment would strengthen the Sexual Assault Survivors' Bill of Rights by providing survivors the right to be informed of the status and location of their sexual assault evidence collection kit.

The Survivors' Bill of Rights was enacted in 2016 and provides fundamental protections to survivors, including: the right to receive a free medical forensic examination; the right to have a sexual assault kit preserved and to be informed of any results related to the examination including a DNA profile match or toxicology reports; the right to be informed of any disposal of a kit; and the right to prevent such disposal if desired.

These are important protections that can be funded through Federal grants made available through the Victims of Crime Act.

This amendment would add one additional and critical protection to that bill of rights.

It would entitle survivors to know the status and location of their kits, providing greater transparency to how kits are handled and tracked by hospitals, forensic professionals, and law enforcement.

My home state of Virginia launched just such a tracking program in 2019.

In Virginia, each kit has a unique bar code and each survivor is provided with a PIN that allows them to track the status of their kit online.

Privacy concerns are allayed by the fact that no personally identifying information is included in the tracking system, and it is entirely up to the survivor whether or not they want to report their assault to law enforcement.

This is a transformative transparency regime for a process that has far too long been kept in the shadows, which has given rise to backlogs and anxiety among survivors about the status of their kits and whether they are being used to hold their attackers accountable.

The amendment is about empowering survivors, and I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

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

□ 1245

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. STEFANIK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 117–12.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all that follows after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Violence Against Women Extension Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. STOP GRANTS.

Section 1001(a)(18) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(18)), is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 3. GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE ARREST POLICIES AND ENFORCEMENT OF PROTECTION ORDERS.

Section 1001(a)(19) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(19)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 4. LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS.

Section 1201(f)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20121(f)(1)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 5. GRANTS TO SUPPORT FAMILIES IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

Section 1301(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 12464(e)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 6. SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT.

Section 40152(c) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12311(c)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 7. COURT-APPOINTED SPECIAL ADVOCATE PROGRAM.

Section 219(a) of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13014(a)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 8. RURAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, STALKING, AND CHILD ABUSE ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.

Section 40295(e)(1) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12341(e)(1)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 9. GRANTS FOR ENHANCED TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END ABUSE LATER IN LIFE.

Section 40801(b)(5) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12421(b)(5)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 10. GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIMES ON CAMPUSES.

Section 304(e) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20125(e)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 11. STUDY CONDUCTED THROUGH THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

Section 402(c) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 280b–4(c)) is amended by inserting after “for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 12. SAVING MONEY AND REDUCING TRAGEDIES THROUGH PREVENTION.

Section 41303(f) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12463(f)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 13. ADDRESSING THE HOUSING NEEDS OF VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

(a) COLLABORATIVE GRANTS TO INCREASE THE LONG-TERM STABILITY OF VICTIMS.—Section 41404(i) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12474(i)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

(b) GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING.—Section 41405(g) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12475(g)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 14. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON WORKPLACE RESPONSES TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE.

Section 41501(e) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12501(e)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 15. GRANTS FOR TRIBAL JURISDICTION OVER CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

Section 204 of Public Law 90–284 (25 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968”) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 16. ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIAN WOMEN.

Section 905(b)(2) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 17. STALKER DATABASE.

Section 40603 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12402) is amended by inserting after “for fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 18. FEDERAL VICTIM ASSISTANCE REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 40114 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322; 108 Stat. 1910) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 19. GRANTS FOR STRENGTHENING THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM'S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, AND STALKING.

Section 399P(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–4(g)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 20. TRAINING AND SERVICES TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE WITH INDIVIDUALS.

Section 1402(e) of division B of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act

of 2000 (34 U.S.C. 20122(e)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 21. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES PROGRAM.

Section 41601(f)(1) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12511(f)(1)) is amended by inserting after “for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

SEC. 22. RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY.

Section 409 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (34 U.S.C. 21308) is amended by inserting after “for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2019” the following: “, and for fiscal year 2022”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, more than one in three women in this country have experienced some form of physical violence by their partner; and each year, millions of our mothers, sisters, daughters, and friends are victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse.

Tragically, new evidence shows that lockdowns, social isolation, and economic insecurity caused by the COVID-19 pandemic has led to a hidden surge in domestic violence and abuse. So now, more than ever, we must come together to combat this crisis.

In fact, Congress has a history of doing so on a bipartisan basis. The enactment of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994 and the reauthorizations that followed were noncontroversial and overwhelmingly bipartisan. Congress worked together to establish a coordinated community response to support victims and equip the justice system with the necessary resources to address these heinous crimes.

Yet, in 2019, House Democrats allowed VAWA's authorization to lapse when they shunned the bipartisan history of VAWA and advanced a bill filled with controversial provisions, rejecting Republican offers to work in good faith and prioritize the well-being of women and children.

At the time, I led the Violence Against Women's Extension Act of 2019 to extend the law and provide certainty to victims, survivors, families, and crisis centers, but House Democrats put scoring political points ahead of the interests of vulnerable women and refused our efforts to prevent VAWA's programs from going unauthorized.

This year, here we are again. Democrats are rushing their controversial bill back to the floor, bypassing committee consideration, and ignoring opportunities to work with Republicans to address the problematic provisions. They have denied new Members the opportunity to contribute to the bill, including a record number of new Republican women, Representatives whose

own lives and districts have been deeply affected by these issues.

So, once again, this House, rather than pursuing bipartisanship, is again considering a bill that promotes unproven methods of supporting victims, infringes upon Second Amendment rights without adequate due process, and imposes new barriers to prosecuting domestic violence cases.

My amendment is simple. It provides a clean extension of the Violence Against Women Act programs for the upcoming fiscal year without the controversial provisions added by Speaker PELOSI. Most importantly, it will ensure funding for critical programs that fight domestic violence and sexual abuse for the American people. A clean extension provides us the opportunity to work together to pass a truly bipartisan, long-term reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The gentlewoman is right, her amendment is simple. It does nothing. It provides no increased funding. It does not provide for women who are desperate—and men and our indigenous community—at all.

Among other things, this amendment would merely extend for 1 year, which is disastrous, rather than reauthorize for 5 years, essentially gutting the bill's most critical grant programs. Some of the programs left out of this so-called extension are as follows:

Outreach in services to underserved populations;

The rape prevention and education grant, \$110 million, a 50 percent increase from the existing bill;

Transitional housing assistance grants for VAWA victims. Women fleeing, men fleeing, victims fleeing, children fleeing without having housing, we expedite that;

Authorizing funding for the Tribal Access Program and;

Child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

By leaving these programs out, this amendment fails to recognize the range of needs that victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking violence face. It simply fails the most desperate and needy people.

This amendment also omits all of the improvements to VAWA that are contained in the underlying bill, H.R. 1620, which is a product of years of consultation with a range of stakeholders, and the failed efforts of Republicans year after year not to reauthorize. This is built on hard work, many of whom worked directly in the field with sur-

vivors and have a deep knowledge of VAWA's programs.

Relying in part on their expertise, this legislation contains dozens of important improvements to the range of programs contained in VAWA to make it an even more effective tool in addressing domestic violence.

But this amendment dismisses the needs of the victims and survivors whose voices were our guide in developing H.R. 1620. It is shameful.

For example, the underlying legislation enhances and expands victims' services. It improves the criminal justice response to gender-based violence, and it expands legal assistance. It makes additional investments in prevention. It improves access to housing for victims and survivors.

It ends impunity for non-Native perpetrators of sexual assault, which has gone on for years. Go to the reservation of Pueblo, assault a Native American woman, and have no accountability.

It supports communities of color and LGBTQ individuals. It protects victims of dating violence and firearm homicide. It improves the healthcare system's response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

But the Stefanik amendment would eliminate all of these vital programs. In essence, it would leave women and victims helpless and without hope.

Do not be fooled. This amendment does not demonstrate support for VAWA. It demonstrates a lack of commitment to ensuring that the programs contained within VAWA can best serve and protect the survivors and victims who rely on them.

Since VAWA's enactment in 1994, Congress has repeatedly enhanced the prior versions of the law, including in reauthorizations in 2000, 2005, and 2013. Since the last reauthorization, there has been an uptick in demand for the essential services under VAWA due to the Me Too movement and women coming forward out of the shadows.

There has also been an uptick in victims' and survivors' and children's needs for services due to the financial strain imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. That is why H.R. 1620 both reauthorizes and improves the law. This amendment would effectively do neither.

Victims and survivors deserve better than this half measure, and they would look to the women of this Congress to be sensitive to their plight.

Domestic violence providers and survivors all have spoken loud and clear with hundreds of organizations supporting and endorsing H.R. 1620. They have asked for the underlying bill, not a bait-and-switch that is fatally flawed and makes no meaningful improvements to the bill or to the law.

Finally, this amendment will not help the legislation move in the Senate. We have spoken with the leaders in the Senate on both sides of the aisle on this issue and they agree that we must

improve the Violence Against Women Act. It is greatly needed in order to stop the scourge of domestic violence, which is surging in our Nation, and not freeze it, as the Stefanik amendment would do.

Therefore, I urge opposition to this amendment, which would undermine H.R. 1620 and years of work, years of building on this with so many collaborators. I thank our chairman, the many women who helped me with writing this legislation, and those who offered substantial amendments to improve it, even those in the last Congress.

We don't want to freeze that behavior that will be positive. This amendment would seriously damage the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Madam Speaker, among other things, this amendment would merely extend for one year, rather than reauthorize for five years, some of the programs under the Violence Against Women Act, essentially gutting the bill's most critical grant programs. Some of the programs left out of this so-called extension are:

Outreach and services to underserved populations;

The rape prevention and education grant; Transitional housing assistance grants for VAWA victims; Authorizing funding for the Tribal Access Program; and

Child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

By leaving these programs out, this amendment fails to recognize the range of needs that victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking face.

This amendment also omits all of the improvements to VAWA that are contained in the underlying bill. H.R. 1620 is the product of years of consultation with a range of stakeholders, many of whom work directly in the field with survivors and have a deep knowledge of VAWA's programs.

Relying in part on their expertise, this legislation contains dozens of important improvements to the range of programs contained in VAWA to make it an even more effective tool in addressing domestic violence. But this amendment dismisses the needs of the victims and survivors whose voices were our guide in developing H.R. 1620.

For example, the underlying legislation enhances and expands victims' services; it improves the criminal justice response to gender-based violence and expands legal assistance; it makes additional investments in prevention; it improves access to housing for victims and survivors; and it ends impunity for non-Native perpetrators of sexual assault.

It supports communities of color and LGBTQ individuals; it protects victims of dating violence from firearm homicide; and it improves the healthcare system's response to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking.

But the Stefanik Amendment would eliminate all of these vital provisions. Do not be fooled—this amendment does not demonstrate support for VAWA, it demonstrates a lack of commitment to ensuring that the programs contained within VAWA can best serve and protect the survivors and victims who rely on them.

Since VAWA's enactment in 1994, Congress has repeatedly enhanced the prior

versions of the law, including in reauthorizations in 2000, 2005, and 2013. Since the last reauthorization, there has been an uptick in demand for the essential services under VAWA due to the "MeToo" movement and women coming forward out of the shadows. There has also been an uptick in victims' and survivors' needs for services due to the financial strain imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

That is why H.R. 1620 both reauthorizes and improves the law. This amendment would effectively do neither. Victims and survivors deserve better than what this half-measure provides.

Domestic violence providers and survivors all have spoken loud and clear with hundreds of organizations endorsing H.R. 1620. They have asked for the underlying bill, not a bait and switch that is fatally flawed and makes no meaningful improvements to the bill or to the law.

Finally, this amendment will not help the legislation move in the Senate. We have spoken with leaders in the Senate on this issue on both sides of the aisle, and they agree that we must improve the Violence Against Women Act, not freeze it as the Stefanik amendment would do.

Therefore, I urge opposition to this amendment, which would undermine H.R. 1620 and would seriously damage the Violence Against Women Act.

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, make no mistake, VAWA's authorization lapse last year is due to House Democrats' choice to ram through their partisan version of this bill rather than work on a bipartisan basis.

When my colleague across the aisle talks about conversations with the Senate, we know last year that there were no effective bipartisan conversations with the Senate, which is why they didn't take up the Democrats' partisan version.

My amendment is a clean extension of VAWA. It ensures that there is certainty and funding for these programs. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

The question is on the amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in part B of House Report 117-12.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer my amendment No. 40 to

H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, line 18, strike "and".

Page 17, strike line 19 through line 2 of page 18 and insert the following:

(i) in paragraph (C)(i) by striking "\$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General" and inserting "\$100,000 in Department funds, unless the Director or Principal Deputy Director of the Office on Violence Against Women, the Deputy Attorney General,"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(E) INELIGIBILITY.—If the Attorney General finds that a recipient of grant funds under this Act has fraudulently misused such grant funds, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, such recipient shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act for up to 5 years. A misuse of grant funds or an error that does not rise to the level of fraud is not grounds for ineligibility."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I believe we have a sacred responsibility to protect and empower women, end abuse and assault, and hold perpetrators of violence against women accountable for their crimes.

However, we need to be sure that our efforts are effective. The Department of Justice inspector general has consistently revealed fraudulent and wasteful uses of VAWA grant funds. Congress should demand accountability so that every dollar marked for helping victims and preventing violence against women actually goes to help the most vulnerable.

My commonsense amendment would prevent those who commit fraud and misuse from receiving VAWA funds. Madam Speaker, they are stealing from the victims that they are supposed to be helping by these efforts and should face the consequences.

Democrats and Republicans should agree that this amendment will advance prevention efforts and victim services. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment.

Madam Speaker, however, I want to take this opportunity to touch on something that is even more important. I am ashamed that Democrats would bring this legislation to the floor without my amendment that would allow sex trafficking victims to receive grant funding through the Creating Hope Through Outreach, Options, Services, and Education for Children and Youth program.

My amendment was removed, stripped in a partisan fashion from VAWA this Congress, stripping vital

sex trafficking funding for victims and children.

Also not allowed, Madam Speaker, was my amendment that bans the horrors of sex-selection abortions that have killed millions of girls around the world and right here in the United States. It is an unthinkable tragedy that little girls are targeted for death even before they are born solely because of their sex, and I am grieved that Democrats would not allow a vote on this basis to protect unborn girls.

These two amendments are at the very core of what it means to protect women and girls, and I am outraged that Democrats have chosen to move forward in a partisan manner without these critical provisions.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment.

While I believe it is well-intentioned, and we all want to prevent the misuse of Federal funds, I am concerned about the effect that it may have on small service providers that provide crucial services to victims and survivors.

It is also unnecessary since the underlying bill maintains existing accountability measures, which have proven to work very well.

This amendment imposes a mandatory bar on receiving grant funds up to 5 years if the grant recipient is found to have fraudulently misused such grant funds. Smaller providers, many of whom are run on a voluntary basis, are more likely to make financial errors because they lack the accounting, financial, and compliance expertise that larger organizations have.

Many of these small providers are culturally specific, rural, and Tribal programs that play a crucial role in their communities. Banning such groups from receiving funding for 5 years in these circumstances could have an unnecessarily punitive effect and could be detrimental to the victims and survivors who rely on them.

For many small service providers who rely on Federal funds to support their operations, such a severe penalty, or even the threat of one, could make a difference between continuing to serve victims and survivors in need and shutting their doors forever.

Accountability is vital in all forms, and I appreciate the spirit behind this amendment; but, for these providers, I fear it could end up doing more harm than good. It is because of these concerns that this amendment is opposed by the National Network to End Domestic Violence, among other organizations, and I must reluctantly oppose the amendment as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, this amendment will improve the underlying bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment, and join me, along with the Department of Justice and the inspector general, to make sure that we are preventing fraud and abuse in these grant programs and making sure that every dollar marked for helping victims and preventing violence against women actually goes to help the most vulnerable.

Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, the underlying bill neglects to give trafficking victims and children the resources they need and was purposefully stripped from this partisan piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I oppose H.R. 1620, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman who has offered this amendment and the opportunities that we have had to work together. I look forward to working with her going forward.

I have also worked with, over the years—really starting from the time that I stood alongside of then-Senator Joe Biden as this bill was presented for reauthorization. It went all the way through my time on the Judiciary Committee and the writing of this bill in 2018, when, unfortunately, there was no effort by the Judiciary Committee to put this bill forward for a hearing, there was no effort by the Senate Republicans, and no effort by the Republican President in 2018 to do anything about the scourge of violence against women and men and many groups.

I have worked with the 200-plus organizations that are involved in the coalition that stand against sexual assault and rape and stalking and domestic violence. They are in many different categories and sizes, but they are vital in their service.

I am concerned that this amendment would undermine those smaller organizations, who are unique in their service that they provide. They are in places where large organizations may not be. They are working with indigenous populations, Native Americans, immigrant women, LGBTQ. They are saving lives.

People of color, Hispanic, African American, we have a very sizeable portion of them and in this legislation, we are reaching out to people who cannot respond and help themselves; housing provisions, in case you have to flee, expediting your ability to get housing.

Then I am as concerned about sex trafficking as my good friend is. I have worked on this legislation. As a former member of the Houston Area Women’s Center, I am also well aware of the crisis as it relates to the need for this bill. But in the manager’s amendment, we do have language that says that we should have a placeholder for sex trafficking victims who experience sexual violence and assault; that the Federal recognition of their recovery is important.

Throughout this bill, there are provisions that will help individuals who are sex-trafficked. We have that in the bill in relationship to the particular actions that are generated if you are sexually assaulted while you are sex-trafficked.

So we know that this bill is sensitive. There is more that can be done. We look forward to a freestanding bill that deals in specifics, as we have done in the past.

I held the first hearing in my congressional district on human trafficking. I have worked with advocates and continue to work with them, and so I take issue that this bill is not sensitive to sex-trafficked individuals, and I look forward to working with the gentleman as we look forward to expanded resources and expanded response to those who have been sex-trafficked and human-trafficked, because that scourge continues.

This legislation responds to those like that woman in my district who lost her life in the days after Christmas and had her son shot at by her husband. We pay tribute to her. I ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 233, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

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

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1620 is postponed.

REMOVING THE DEADLINE FOR THE RATIFICATION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 204, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 82] YEAS—222

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

NAYS—204

Aderholt Balderson Bishop (NC)
Allen Banks Boebert
Amodei Barr Bost
Armstrong Bentz Brooks
Arrington Bergman Buchanan
Babin Bice (OK) Buck
Bacon Biggs Bucshon
Baird Bilirakis Budd

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

NOT VOTING—4

Brady Takano
Kinzinger Wilson (SC)

□ 1355

Messrs. BAIRD, GROTHMAN, and BOST changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on passage of H.J. Res. 17—Removing the Deadline for the Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 82.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids Buchanan DeSaulnier (KS) (Gimenez) (Matsui)
Axne (Stevens) Bush (Clark DesJarlais (MA)) (Fleischmann)
Barragan (Beyer) Cárdenas Garamendi
Bera (Aguilar) Bishop (GA) (Gomez) (Sherman)
Butterfield) Cleaver (Davids Garbarino (Joyce (KS)) (OH))

Grijalva (García Lieu (Beyer) Roybal-Allard (IL)) Lowenthal (Aguilar)
Hastings (Beyer) Rush
(Wasserman McEachin (Underwood)
Schultz) (Wexton) (Schneider)
Johnson (TX) Meng (Clark (Sherrill)
(Jeffries) (MA)) (Sires (Pallone)
Kahele (Mrvan) Moore (WI) Slotkin
(Beyer) (Stevens)
Kim (NJ) (Davids Moulton Timmons)
(KS)) (Underwood) (Steube)
Napolitano
Kirkpatrick (Stanton) (Correa) Waltz
Kuster (Clark (Correa) (Cammack)
(MA)) Payne Watson Coleman
(Wasserman (Pallone)
Lamborn (Walberg) Schultz) Wilson (FL)
Langevin Peters (Kildee) (Hayes)
(Lynch) Pingree Young (Joyce
Lawson (FL) (Cicilline) Porter (Wexton) (OH))
(Evans)

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WEXTON). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1620) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. NADLER OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc, printed in part B of House Report 117-12, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 83] YEAS—228

Adams Clarke (NY) Fletcher
Aguilar Cleaver Foster
Allred Clyburn Frankel, Lois
Auchincloss Cohen Gallego
Axne Connolly Garamendi
Barragan Cooper Garcia (IL)
Bass Correa Garcia (TX)
Beatty Costa Golden
Bera Courtney Gomez
Beyer Craig Gottheimer
Bishop (GA) Crist Green, Al (TX)
Blumenauer Crow Griffith
Blunt Rochester Cuellar Grijalva
Bonamici Davids (KS) Harder (CA)
Bourdeaux Davis, Danny K. Hastings
Bowman Davis, Rodney Hayes
Boyle, Brendan Dean Higgins (NY)
F. DeFazio Himes
Brown DeGette Horsford
Brownley DeLauro Houlihan
Bush DelBene Hoyer
Bustos Delgado Huffman
Butterfield Demings Jackson Lee
Cabajal DeSaulnier Jacobs (CA)
Cárdenas Jayapal
Carter (TX) Dingell Jefferson
Carson Doggett Johnson (GA)
Cartwright Doyle, Michael Johnson (TX)
Case F. Jones
Casten Escobar Joyce (OH)
Castor (FL) Eshoo Kahele
Castro (TX) Españillat Kaptur
Chu Españillat Katko
Cicilline Evans Keating
Clark (MA) Fitzpatrick

Kelly (IL) Murphy (FL) Sherrill Rouzer Steel Van Duynne Carter (TX) Herrera Beutler Palmer
 Khanna Nadler Simpson Roy Stefanik Wagner Cartwright Hice (GA) Pappas
 Kildee Napolitano Sires Rutherford Steil Walberg Cawthorn Higgins (LA) Pence
 Kilmer Neal Slotkin Salazar Steube Walorski Chabot Hill Perlmutter
 Kim (NJ) Neguse Smith (WA) Scalize Waltz Cheney Perry
 Kind Newman Soto Schweikert Stivers Weber (TX) Cicilline Hollingsworth Peters
 Kirkpatrick Norcross Spanberger Scott, Austin Taylor Webster (FL) Cline Horsford Pfluger
 Krishnamoorthi O'Halleran Speier Sessions Tenney Wenstrup Cline Horsford Pfluger
 Kuster Ocasio-Cortez Stanton Smith (MO) Thompson (PA) Westerman Hudson Phillips
 Lamb Omar Smith (NE) Tiffany Williams (TX) Cole Issa Hudson Pingree
 Langevin Pallone Stauber Smith (NJ) Timmons Wittman Jackson Posey
 Larsen (WA) Panetta Stevens Smucker Turner Womack Cooper Jacobs (NY) Reed
 Larson (CT) Pappas Strickland Spartz Valadao Zeldin Craig Johnson (LA) Reschenthaler
 Lawrence Pascrell Suozzi Swalwell Takano Johnson (OH) Rice (NY)
 Lawson (FL) Payne Perlmutter Brady Gonzalez, Kinzinger Johnson (SD) Rice (SC)
 Lee (CA) Peters Thompson (CA) Vicente Wilson (SC) Johnson (SD) Rogers (WA)
 Lee (NV) Phillips Thompson (MS) Titus Koller Jordan Joyke (PA) Rogers (KY)
 Leger Fernandez Phillips Pingree Tlaib Kellor Kelly (MS) Rose
 Levin (CA) Pocan Tlaib Kelly (PA) Rosendale
 Levin (MI) Porter Tonko Kelly (PA) Rouzer
 Lieu Pressley Torres (CA) Roy
 Lofgren Price (NC) Torres (NY) Rutherford
 Lowenthal Quigley Trahan Raskin Kind Salazar
 Luria Raskin Trone Kustoff Scalise
 Lynch Raskin Trone LaHood Schneider
 Malinowski Rice (NY) Underwood LaMalfa Schrier
 Maloney, Ross Lamb Schweikert
 Carolyn B. Roybal-Allard Scott, Austin
 Maloney, Sean Ruiz Latta Sessions
 Manning Ruppertsberger Fallon LaTurner Simpson
 Matsui Rush Lee (NV) Slotkin
 McBath Ryan Vela Smith (MO)
 McCollum Sánchez Velázquez Hastings Moulton Ferguson Lesko Smith (NE)
 McEachin Sarbanes Wasserman (KS) (Underwood) Fitzgerald Long
 McGovern Scanlon Axne (Stevens) Schultz Napolitano Loudermilk
 McNerney Schakowsky Barragán (Beyer) Johnson (TX) (Correa) Fitzpatrick Lucas
 Meeks Schiff Waters Watson Coleman Jeffries Payne Fleischmann Luetkemeyer
 Meijer Schneider Welch Kim (NJ) (Davids) (Wasserman) Fortenberry Luria
 Meng Schrader Wexton (KS) Peters (Kildee) Fox Scott
 Mfume Schrier Wild Kirkpatrick (Stanton) Pingree (Cicilline) Fulcher Mann
 Moore (WI) Scott (VA) Kuster (Clark) Porter (Wexton) Gaetz Mann
 Morelle Scott, David Rush (Underwood) Gallagher Mast
 Moulton Sewell Lamborn Garamendi Garcia (CA) McCarthy
 Mrvan Sherman Young (MA) (Walberg) Schneider (Sherrill) Gibbs
 Kim (CA) Aderholt Fischbach Kim (CA) Kustoff
 Allen Fitzgerald Kustoff Kustoff
 Amodei Fleischmann LaHood LaMalfa Loudermilk
 Armstrong Fortenberry LaMalfa Lamborn Latta
 Arrington Fox LaTurner LaTurner LaTurner
 Babin Franklin, C. Latta LaTurner Lesko
 Bacon Scott Fulcher Gaetz
 Baird Fulcher Gaetz Gallagher
 Balderson Gaetz Long Loudermilk
 Banks Gallagher Lucas
 Barr Garbarino Luetkemeyer
 Bentz Garcia (CA) Mace
 Bergman Gibbs Gimenez Malliotakis
 Bice (OK) Biggs Gohmert Mann
 Bilirakis Gonzalez, Tony Massie
 Bishop (NC) Gonzalez (OH) Mast
 Boebert Good (VA) McCarthy
 Bost Gooden (TX) McCaul
 Brooks Gosar McClain
 Buchanan Granger McClintock
 Buck Graves (LA) McHenry
 Bucshon Graves (MO) McKinley
 Budd Green (TN) Meuser
 Burchett Greene (GA) Miller (IL)
 Burgess Grothman Miller (WV)
 Calvert Guest Miller-Meeeks
 Cammack Guthrie Moolenaar
 Carl Hagedorn Mooney
 Carter (GA) Harris Moore (AL)
 Carter (TX) Harshbarger Moore (UT)
 Cawthorn Hartzler Mullin
 Chabot Hern Murphy (NC)
 Cheney Herrell Nehls
 Cline Herrera Beutler Newhouse
 Cloud Hice (GA) Norman
 Clyde Higgins (LA) Nunes
 Cole Hill Obernolte
 Comer Hinson Owens
 Crawford Hollingsworth Palazzo
 Crenshaw Hudson Palmer
 Curtis Huizenga Pence
 Davidson Issa Perry
 DesJarlais Jackson Pfluger
 Diaz-Balart Jacobs (NY) Posey
 Donalds Johnson (LA) Reed
 Duncan Johnson (OH) Reschenthaler
 Dunn Johnson (SD) Rice (SC)
 Emmer Jordan Rodgers (WA)
 Estes Joyce (PA) Rogers (AL)
 Fallon Kellor Rogers (KY)
 Feenstra Kelly (MS) Rose
 Ferguson Kelly (PA) Rosendale

NOT VOTING—4
 Gonzalez, Vicente
 Kinzinger Wilson (SC)
 □ 1443

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 118TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))	Hastings (Wasserman)	Moulton (Underwood)
Axne (Stevens)	Schultz	Napolitano (Correa)
Barragán (Beyer)	Johnson (TX)	Payne (Wasserman)
Bera (Aguilar)	(Jeffries)	Schultz
Bishop (GA)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Peters (Kildee)
(Butterfield)	Kim (NJ) (Davids)	Pingree
Blumenauer (KS)	(KS)	(Cicilline)
(Beyer)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Porter (Wexton)
Buchanan (Gimenez)	Kuster (Clark)	Rush
Bush (Clark (MA))	(MA)	(Underwood)
Lamborn	Schneider (Sherrill)	Sires (Pallone)
Cárdenas (Walberg)	(Gomez)	Langevin
Langevin	Cleaver (Davids (KS))	Lawson (FL)
Lawson (FL)	(KS)	(Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)	DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal	(Fleischmann)	Lowenthal
(Fleischmann)	Garamendi (Sherman)	(Wexton)
McEachin (Wexton)	Garbarino (Joyce (OH))	Meng (Clark (MA))
(Wexton)	Grijalva (García (IL))	Moore (WI) (Beyer)

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MRS. WAGNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STRICKLAND). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 40, printed in part B of House Report 117–12, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 174, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]
 YEAS—242

Aderholt Banks Buchanan
 Allen Barr Buck
 Allred Bentz Bucshon
 Amodei Bergman Budd
 Armstrong Bice (OK) Burchett
 Arrington Biggs Burgess
 Axne Bilirakis Bustos
 Babin Bishop (NC) Calvert
 Bacon Boebert Cammack
 Baird Bourdeaux Carl
 Balderson Brooks Carter (GA)

Palmer Pappas
 Pence Perlmutter
 Perry Peters
 Pfluger Phillips
 Pingree Posey
 Reed Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY) Rice (SC)
 Rodgers (WA) Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY) Rose
 Rosendale Rouzer
 Roy Rutherford
 Salazar Scalise
 Schneider Schrier
 Schweikert Scott, Austin
 Sessions Simpson
 Slotkin Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE) Smith (NJ)
 Smucker Spanberger
 Spartz Stauber
 Steel Stefanik
 Steil Steube
 Walorski Waltz
 Weber (TX) Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup Westerman
 Williams (TX) Wittman
 Womack Zeldin

NAYS—174

Clark (MA) Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver Clyburn Cohen
 Connolly Correa
 Courtney Cuellar
 Davis, Danny K. Dean
 DeGette DeLauro
 Demings Demings
 DeSaulnier Deutch
 Dingell Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Escobar Eshoo
 Espaillat Evans
 Fletcher Foster
 Frankel, Lois Gallego
 García (IL) García (TX)
 Golden Gomez
 Gonzalez, Vicente
 Green, Al (TX) Grijalva
 Hastings Higgins (NY)
 Himes Hoyer
 Huffman Jackson Lee
 Jacobs (CA) Jayapal
 Jeffries Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (TX) Jones
 Kahele Kaptur
 Keating Kelly (IL)
 Khanna

Kildee Nadler Sewell Moulton Porter (Wexton) Waltz
 Kilmer Napolitano Sherman (Underwood) Rush
 Kirkpatrick Neal Sherrill Napolitano (Underwood) Watson Coleman
 Krishnamoorthi Neguse Sires (Correa) Schneider (Sherrill) Pallone
 Kuster Newman Smith (WA) Payne (Wasserman) Sires (Pallone) Wilson (FL)
 Langevin Norcross Soto (Schultz) Slotkin (Stevens) Timmons (Hayes)
 Larsen (WA) O'Halleran Speier Stanton Peters (Kildee) Pingree (Cicilline) (Steube)
 Larson (CT) Ocasio-Cortez Strickland
 Lawrence Omar
 Lawson (FL) Pallone
 Lee (CA) Panetta
 Leger Fernandez Pascrell
 Levin (CA) Payne
 Levin (MI) Pocan
 Lieu Porter
 Lofgren Pressley
 Lowenthal Price (NC)
 Lynch Quigley
 Maloney, Raskin
 Carolyn B. Ross
 Maloney, Sean Roybal-Allard
 Manning Ruiz
 Matsui Ruppertsberger
 McCollum Rush
 McEachin Ryan
 McGovern Sánchez
 McNerney Sarbanes
 Meeks Scanlon
 Meng Schakowsky
 Mfume Schiff
 Morelle Schrader
 Moulton Scott (VA)
 Mrvan Scott, David

Stivers
 Wilson (SC)
 Young

NAYS—249
 Golden Napolitano
 Gomez Neal
 Gonzalez, Neguse
 Vicente Newman
 Good (VA) Norcross
 Gooden (TX) O'Halleran
 Gosar Ocasio-Cortez
 Gottheimer Omar
 Green, Al (TX) Pallone
 Greene (GA) Palmer
 Grijalva Panetta
 Harder (CA) Pappas
 Harris Pascrell
 Hartzler Payne
 Hastings Perlmutter
 Hayes Peters
 Hice (GA) Phillips
 Higgins (NY) Pingree
 Himes Pocan
 Horsford Porter
 Houlihan Pressley
 Hoyer Price (NC)
 Huffman Quigley
 Jackson Raskin
 Jackson Lee Rice (NY)
 Jacobs (CA) Rogers (AL)
 Jayapal Rose
 Jeffries Rosendale
 Johnson (GA) Ross
 Johnson (TX) Roybal-Allard
 Jones Ruiz
 Jordan Ruppertsberger
 Kabele Rush
 Kaptur Ryan
 Katko Sánchez
 Keating Sarbanes
 Kelly (IL) Scanlon
 Khanna Schakowsky
 Kildee Schiff
 Kilmer Schneider
 Kim (NJ) Kim (NJ)
 Kind Kind
 Kirkpatrick Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster Kuster
 Lamb Lamb
 Lamborn Lamborn
 Langevin Langevin
 Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
 Lawrence Lawrence
 Lawson (FL) Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA) Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV) Lee (NV)
 Leger Fernandez Leger Fernandez
 Lesko Lesko
 Levin (CA) Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI) Levin (MI)
 Lieu Lieu
 Lofgren Lofgren
 Lowenthal Lowenthal
 Luria Luria
 Lynch Lynch
 Malinowski Malinowski
 Maloney, Sean Maloney, Sean
 Carolyn B. Carolyn B.
 Manning Manning
 Torres (CA) Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY) Torres (NY)
 Trahan Trahan
 Trone Trone
 Underwood Underwood
 Vargas Vargas
 Veasey Veasey
 Vela Vela
 Velázquez Velázquez
 Wasserman Wasserman
 Schultz Schultz
 Waters Waters
 Watson Coleman Watson Coleman
 Welch Welch
 Williams (GA) Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bost Herrell
 Brady Huizenga
 Costa Joyce (OH)
 Davidson Katko
 Garbarino Kinzinger

□ 1531

Ms. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. VEASEY, BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. SCANLON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. McBATH, Messrs. POSEY, ROGERS of Alabama, and BABIN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HERRELL. Madam Speaker, I missed this vote because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 84.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 84.

Mr. GARBARINO. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 84.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I was unavailable to vote in the House on March 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall 84: “yes.”

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids) DeSaulnier Kuster (Clark (KS)) (Matsui) (MA))
 Axne (Stevens) DesJarlais Lamborn
 Barragan (Beyer) (Fleischmann) (Walberg)
 Bera (Aguilar) Garamendi Langevin
 Bishop (GA) (Sherman) (Lynch)
 (Butterfield) Grijalva (Garcia Lawson (FL))
 (IL)) (Evans)
 Blumenauer Hastings Lieu (Beyer)
 (Beyer) (Wasserman Lowenthal)
 Buchanan Schultz (Beyer)
 (Gimenez) Johnson (TX)
 Bush (Clark) (Jeffries) McEachin
 (MA) Kahele (Mrvan) (Wexton)
 Cárdenas Kim (NJ) (Davids Meng (Clark (KS)) (MA))
 (Gomez) (KS))
 Cleaver (Davids) Kirkpatrick Moore (WI)
 (KS)) (Stanton) (Beyer)

Allen Granger Newhouse
 Amodei Graves (LA) Norman
 Armstrong Graves (MO) Nunes
 Babin Green (TN) Obermole
 Bacon Griffith Owens
 Baird Grothman Palazzo
 Balderson Guest Pence
 Banks Guthrie Perry
 Barr Hagedorn Pfluger
 Bentz Harshbarger Posey
 Bergman Hern Reed
 Bice (OK) Herrell Reschenthaler
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler Rice (SC)
 Bishop (NC) Higgins (LA) Hill Rodgers (WA)
 Bost Hill Rogers (KY)
 Brooks Hinson Rouzer
 Buchanan Hollingsworth Roy
 Buck Hudson Rutherford
 Bucshon Huizenga Salazar
 Burchett Issa Scalise
 Burgess Jacobs (NY) Schweikert
 Calvert Johnson (LA) Scott, Austin
 Cammack Johnson (OH) Sessions
 Carter (GA) Johnson (SD) Simpson
 Carter (TX) Joyce (OH) Smith (MO)
 Cawthorn Joyce (PA) Smith (NE)
 Chabot Keller Kelly (MS) Smith (NJ)
 Cheney Kelly (PA) Smucker
 Cline Kim (CA) Spartz
 Cloud Kustoff Stauber
 Clyde LaHood Steel
 Cole LaMalfa Stefanik
 Comer Crawford Latta Steil
 Crenshaw LaTurner Stewart
 Curtis Long Stivers
 Davis, Rodney Loudermilk Taylor
 Diaz-Balart Lucas Tenney
 Donalds Luetkemeyer Thompson (PA)
 Duncan Mace Tiffany
 Dunn Malliotakis Timmons
 Emmer Mann Turner
 Estes Mast Upton
 Fallon McCarthy Valadao
 Feenstra McCaul Van Drew
 Ferguson McClain Van Dune
 Fischbach McClintock Wagner
 Fitzgerald McHenry Walberg
 Fleischmann McKinley Walorski
 Fortenberry Meijer Waltz
 Franklin, C. Meuser Weber (TX)
 Scott Miller (WV) Webster (FL)
 Fulcher Miller-Meeks Wenstrup
 Gallagher Moolenaar Westerman
 Garbarino Mooney Williams (TX)
 Garcia (CA) Moore (AL) Wittman
 Gibbs Moore (UT) Womack
 Gimenez Mullin Young
 Gonzales, Tony Murphy (NC) Zeldin
 Gonzalez (OH) Nehls

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. STEFANIK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACOBS of California). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 36, printed in part B of House Report 117–12, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 249, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—177

NOT VOTING—3

Brady Kinzinger Wilson (SC)

□ 1620

Ms. SEWELL, Messrs. HICE of Georgia, ROSE, and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))	Hastings (Wasserman)	Moulton (Underwood)
Axne (Stevens)	Schultz (Correa)	Napolitano (Jeffries)
Barragán (Beyer)	Johnson (TX)	Payne (Wasserman)
Bera (Aguilar)	(Jeffries)	Schultz
Bishop (GA)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Peters (Kildee)
(Butterfield)	Kim (NJ) (Davids)	Pingree (Cicilline)
Blumenauer (Beyer)	(KS)	Porter (Wexton)
Buchanan (Gimenez)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Rush (Underwood)
Bush (Clark (MA))	(MA)	Schneider (Sherrill)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Langevin (Lynch)	Sires (Pallone)
Cleaver (Davids (KS))	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin (Stevens)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	(Evans)	Timmons (Steube)
DesJarlais (Fleischmann)	Lieu (Beyer)	Waltz (Cammack)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Garbarino (Joyce (OH))	Meng (Clark (MA))	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Grijalva (García (IL))	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Young (Joyce (OH))

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LAWRENCE). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 172, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—244

Adams	Castor (FL)	Dingell
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	Doggett
Allred	Chu	Doyle, Michael
Auchincloss	Cicilline	F.
Axne	Clark (MA)	Escobar
Balderson	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Barragán	Cleaver	Español
Bass	Clyburn	Evans
Beatty	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Bera	Cole	Fletcher
Beyer	Connolly	Foster
Bice (OK)	Cooper	Frankel, Lois
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Gallego
Blumenauer	Costa	Garamendi
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	García (IL)
Bonamici	Craig	García (TX)
Bost	Crist	Gimenez
Bourdeaux	Crow	Golden
Bowman	Cuellar	Gonzalez (OH)
Boyle, Brendan	Davids (KS)	Gonzalez,
F.	Davis, Danny K.	Vicente
Brown	Davis, Rodney	Gottheimer
Brownley	Dean	Green, Al (TX)
Bush	DeFazio	Grijalva
Bustos	DeGette	Harder (CA)
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hastings
Carbajal	DelBene	Hayes
Carson	Delgado	Higgins (NY)
Carter (TX)	Demings	Himes
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Horsford
Case	Deutch	Houlihan
Casten	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer

Huffman	McEachin	Schrader
Issa	McGovern	Schrier
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Scott (VA)
Jacobs (CA)	Meeks	Scott, David
Jacobs (NY)	Meijer	Sewell
Jayapal	Meng	Sherman
Jeffries	Mfume	Sherrill
Johnson (GA)	Miller-Meeks	Simpson
Johnson (TX)	Moore (WI)	Sires
Jones	Moulton	Slotkin
Joyce (OH)	Mrvan	Smith (WA)
Kahele	Mullin	Soto
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Spanberger
Katko	Nadler	Speier
Keating	Napolitano	Stanton
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Staubert
Khanna	Neguse	Steil
Kildee	Newman	Stevens
Kilmer	O'Halleran	Stivers
Kim (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Strickland
Kim (NJ)	Omar	Suozzi
Kind	Pallone	Swalwell
Kirkpatrick	Panetta	Takano
Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Thompson (CA)
Kuster	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)
Lamb	Payne	Titus
Langevin	Pelosi	Tlaib
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Tonko
Larson (CT)	Peters	Torres (CA)
Lawrence	Phillips	Torres (NY)
Lawson (FL)	Pingree	Trahan
Lee (CA)	Pocan	Trone
Lee (NV)	Porter	Underwood
Leger Fernandez	Pressley	Upton
Levin (CA)	Price (NC)	Valadao
Levin (MI)	Qigley	Van Drew
Lieu	Raskin	Vargas
Lofgren	Reed	Veasey
Lowenthal	Rice (NY)	Vela
Luria	Ross	Velázquez
Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Malinowski	Ruiz	Schultz
Malliotakis	Ruppersberger	Waters
Maloney,	Rush	Watson Coleman
Carolyn B.	Ryan	Welch
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez	Wexton
Manning	Sarbanes	Wild
Matsui	Scanlon	Williams (GA)
McBath	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
McCaul	Schiff	Yarmuth
McCollum	Schneider	Young

NAYS—172

Aderholt	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Allen	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Fortenberry	Kustoff
Armstrong	Fox	LaHood
Arrington	Franklin, C.	LaMalfa
Babin	Scott	Lamborn
Bacon	Fulcher	Latta
Baird	Gaetz	LaTurner
Banks	Gallagher	Lesko
Barr	Garbarino	Long
Bentz	García (CA)	Lucas
Bergman	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer
Biggs	Gohmert	Mace
Bilirakis	Gonzales, Tony	Mann
Bishop (NC)	Good (VA)	Massie
Boebert	Gooden (TX)	Mast
Brooks	Gosar	McCarthy
Buchanan	Granger	McClain
Buck	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Bushon	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Budd	Green (TN)	McKinley
Burchett	Greene (GA)	Meuser
Burgess	Griffith	Miller (IL)
Calvert	Grothman	Miller (WV)
Cammack	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Carl	Hagedorn	Mooney
Cawthorn	Harris	Moore (AL)
Chabot	Harshbarger	Moore (UT)
Cheney	Hartzler	Murphy (NC)
Claine	Hern	Nehls
Cloud	Herrell	Newhouse
Clyde	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Comer	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	Obornolte
Curtis	Hill	Owens
Davidson	Hinson	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Hollingsworth	Palmer
Donalds	Hudson	Pence
Duncan	Huizenga	Perry
Dunn	Jackson	Pfluger
Emmer	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Estes	Johnson (OH)	Reschenthaler
Fallon	Johnson (SD)	Rice (SC)
Feenstra	Jordan	Rodgers (WA)
Ferguson	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Fischbach	Keller	Rogers (KY)

Rose	Spartz	Wagner
Rouzer	Steel	Walberg
Roy	Stefanik	Walorski
Rutherford	Steube	Waltz
Scalise	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Schweikert	Taylor	Webster (FL)
Scott, Austin	Tenney	Westerman
Sessions	Thompson (PA)	Williams (TX)
Smith (MO)	Tiffany	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Timmons	Womack
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Zeldin
Smucker	Van Duyne	

NOT VOTING—14

Brady	Guest	Rosendale
Cárdenas	Kinzinger	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Loudermilk	Loudermilk
Crenshaw	Morelle	Wenstrup
Gomez	Norcross	Wilson (SC)

□ 1708

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 86.

Ms. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 86.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, I am using a proxy to vote on my behalf (pursuant to House Resolution 8 and in accordance with regulation C.6.). Regretfully, my proxy was unable to arrive at the House floor within the allotted time to cast my vote for H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 86 (H.R. 1620—the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021).

Stated against:

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 86.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 86.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, had I been present to vote on rollcall No. 86, I would have voted “nay.”

Allred (Davids (KS))	Hastings (Wasserman)	Napolitano (Correa)
Axne (Stevens)	Schultz	Payne
Barragán (Beyer)	Johnson (TX)	(Wasserman)
Bera (Aguilar)	(Jeffries)	Schultz
Bishop (GA)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Peters (Kildee)
(Butterfield)	Kim (NJ) (Davids)	Pingree
Blumenauer	(KS)	(Cicilline)
(Beyer)	Kirkpatrick	Porter (Wexton)
Buchanan	(Stanton)	Rush
(Gimenez)	Kuster (Clark (MA))	(Underwood)
Bush (Clark (MA))	Langevin	Schneider
(MA)	(Lynch)	(Sherrill)
Cleaver (Davids (KS))	Lawson (FL)	Sires (Pallone)
(Evans)	Slotkin	(Stevens)
DeSaulnier	Lieu (Beyer)	Timmons
(Matsui)	Lowenthal	(Steube)
DesJarlais	(Beyer)	Waltz
(Fleischmann)	McEachin	(Cammack)
Garamendi	(Wexton)	Watson Coleman
(Sherman)	Meng (Clark (MA))	(Pallone)
Garbarino (Joyce (OH))	Moore (WI)	Wilson (FL)
(OH)	(Beyer)	(Hayes)
Grijalva (García (IL))	Moulton	Young (Joyce (OH))
	(Underwood)	

AWARDING THREE CONGRESSIONAL MEDALS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE AND THOSE WHO PROTECTED THE U.S. CAPITOL ON JANUARY 6, 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1085) to award three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 12, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—413

Adams Clark (MA) Garbarino
Aderholt Clarke (NY) Garcia (CA)
Aguilar Cleaver Garcia (IL)
Allen Cline Garcia (TX)
Allred Clyburn Gibbs
Amodei Cohen Gimenez
Armstrong Cole Golden
Auchincloss Comer Gomez
Axne Connolly Gonzales, Tony
Babin Cooper Gonzalez (OH)
Bacon Correa Gonzalez,
Baird Costa Vicente
Balderson Courtney Gosar
Banks Craig Gottheimer
Barr Crawford Granger
Barragan Crenshaw Graves (LA)
Bass Crist Graves (MO)
Beatty Crow Green (TN)
Bentz Cuellar Green, Al (TX)
Bera Davids (KS) Griffith
Bergman Davidson Grijalva
Beyer Davis, Danny K. Grothman
Bice (OK) Davis, Rodney Guest
Bilirakis Dean Guthrie
Bishop (GA) DeFazio Hagedorn
Bishop (NC) DeGette Harder (CA)
Blumenauer DeLauro Harshbarger
Blunt Rochester DelBene Hartzler
Boebert Delgado Hastings
Bonamici Demings Hayes
Bost DeSaulnier Hern
Bourdeaux DesJarlais Herrell
Bowman Deutch Herrera Beutler
Boyle, Brendan Diaz-Balart Hice (GA)
F. Dingell Higgins (LA)
Brooks Doggett Higgins (NY)
Brown Donalds Hill
Brownley Doyle, Michael Himes
Buchanan F. Hinson
Buck Duncan Hollingsworth
Bucshon Dunn Horsford
Budd Emmer Houlihan
Burchett Escobar Hoyer
Burgess Eshoo Hudson
Bush Espaillat Huffman
Bustos Estes Huizenga
Butterfield Evans Issa
Calvert Fallon Jackson
Cammack Feenstra Jackson Lee
Carbajal Ferguson Jacobs (CA)
Cárdenas Fischbach Jacobs (NY)
Carl Fitzgerald Jayapal
Carson Fitzpatrick Jeffries
Carter (GA) Fleischmann Johnson (GA)
Carter (TX) Fletcher Johnson (LA)
Cartwright Fortenberry Johnson (OH)
Case Foster Johnson (SD)
Casten Foxx Johnson (TX)
Castor (FL) Frankel, Lois Jones
Castro (TX) Franklin, C. Jordan
Cawthorn Scott Joyce (OH)
Chabot Fulcher Joyce (PA)
Cheney Gallagher Kahele
Chu Gallego Kaptur
Cicilline Garamendi Katko

Keating Morelle Sewell
Keller Moulton Sherman
Kelly (IL) Mrvan Sherrill
Kelly (MS) Mullin Simpson
Kelly (PA) Murphy (FL) Sires
Khanna Murphy (NC) Slotkin
Kildee Nadler Smith (MO)
Kilmer Napolitano Smith (NE)
Kim (CA) Neal Smith (NJ)
Kim (NJ) Neguse Smith (WA)
Kind Nehls Smucker
Kirkpatrick Newhouse Soto
Krishnamoorthi Newman Spanberger
Kuster Norcross Spartz
Kustoff Norman Speier
LaHood Nunes Stanton
LaMalfa O'Halleran Stauber
Lamb Obernolte Steel
Lamborn Ocasio-Cortez Stefanik
Langevin Omar Steil
Larsen (WA) Owens Stevens
Larsen (CT) Palazzo Stewart
Latta Pallone Stivers
LaTurner Palmer Strickland
Lawrence Panetta Suozzi
Lawson (FL) Pappas Swallow
Lee (CA) Pascrell Takano
Lee (NV) Payne Taylor
Leger Fernandez Pelosi Tenney
Lesko Pence Thompson (CA)
Levin (CA) Perlmutter Thompson (MS)
Levin (MD) Perry Thompson (PA)
Lieu Peters Tiffany
Lofgren Pfluger Timmons
Long Phillips Titus
Loudermilk Pingree Tlaib
Lowenthal Pocan Tonko
Lucas Porter Torres (CA)
Luetkemeyer Posey Torres (NY)
Luria Pressley Trahan
Lynch Price (NC) Trone
Mace Quigley Turner
Malinowski Raskin Underwood
Malliotakis Reed Upton
Maloney, Reschenthaler Valadao
Carolyn B. Rice (NY)
Maloney, Sean Rice (SC)
Mann Rodgers (WA)
Manning Rogers (AL)
Granger Rogers (KY)
Mast Rosendale
Matsui Ross
McBath Rouzer
McCarthy McCaul Roy
McCaul Griffith Roybal-Allard
McClain Grijalva Ruiz
McClintock McClintock Ruppertsberger
McCollum McEachin Rush
McEachin McGovern Rutherford
McHenry Ryan
McKinley Salazar
McNerney Sánchez
Meeks Sarbanes
Meijer Scalise
Scanlon Scanlon
Schakowsky Schiff
Schneider Williams (GA)
Schrader Williams (TX)
Schrier Wilson (FL)
Schweikert Wittman
Scott (VA) Womack
Scott, Austin Yarmuth
Scott, David Young
Sessions Zeldin

NAYS—12

Biggs Gohmert Harris
Cloud Good (VA) Massie
Clyde Gooden (TX) Rose
Gaetz Greene (GA) Steube

NOT VOTING—5

Arrington Curtis Wilson (SC)
Brady Kinzinger

□ 1757

Mr. ROSE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
Messrs. HICE of Georgia, NUNES, CARL, and WELCH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Allred (Davids Hastings Napolitano
(KS) (Wasserman (Correa)
Axne (Stevens) Schultz) Payne
Barragan (Beyer) Johnson (TX) (Wasserman
(Jeffries) Schultz)
Bera (Aguilar) Kahele (Mrvan) Peters (Kildee)
Bishop (GA) Kim (NJ) (Davids Pingree
(Butterfield) (KS)) (Cicilline)
Blumenauer (Beyer) Kirkpatrick (Stanton) Porter (Wexton)
(Rush)
Buchanan (Gimenez) Kuster (Clark (Underwood)
(MA)) Schneider
Bush (Clark Langevin (Sherrill)
(MA)) Sires (Pallone)
Cárdenas (Lynch) Lawson (FL) Slotkin
(Gomez) (Evans) Lieu (Beyer) (Stevens)
Cleaver (Davids (KS)) Lowenthal Timmons
(KS)) (Beyer) (Steube)
DeSaulnier (Matsui) McEachin Watson Coleman
(DesJarlais) (Fleischmann) (Wexton) (Pallone)
Garamendi Meng (Clark Wilson (FL)
(Sherman) (MA)) (Hayes)
Garbarino (Joyce Moore (WI) Young (Joyce
(OH)) (Beyer) (OH))
Grijalva (Garcia Moulton (Underwood)
(IL)) (Underwood)

COVID-19 BANKRUPTCY RELIEF EXTENSION ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWALWELL). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1651) to amend the CARES Act to extend the sunset for the definition of a small business debtor, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 14, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—399

Adams Buchanan Connolly
Aderholt Buck Cooper
Aguilar Bucshon Correa
Allen Burchett Costa
Allred Burgess Courtney
Amodei Bush Craig
Armstrong Bustos Crawford
Arrington Butterfield Crenshaw
Auchincloss Calvert Crist
Axne Cammack Crow
Babin Carbajal Cuellar
Bacon Cárdenas Curtis
Baird Carl Davids (KS)
Balderson Carson Davidson
Banks Carter (GA) Davis, Danny K.
Barragan Carter (TX) Davis, Rodney
Bass Cartwright DeGette
Beatty Case DeLauro
Bentz Casten DeBene
Bera Castor (FL) Delgado
Bergman Castro (TX) Demings
Beyer Cawthorn DeSaulnier
Bice (OK) Chabot DesJarlais
Bilirakis Cheney Deutch
Bishop (GA) Chu Diaz-Balart
Blumenauer Cicilline Dingell
Blunt Rochester Clark (MA) Doggett
Bonamici Clarke (NY) Donalds
Bost Cleaver Doyle, Michael
Bourdeaux Cline F.
Bowman Cloud Duncan
Boyle, Brendan Clyburn Dunn
F. Clyde Emmer
Brooks Cohen Escobar
Brown Cole Eshoo
Brownley Comer Espaillat

Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Foster
Foxy
Franklin, C.
 Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez,
 Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa

Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Nunes
Obernolte
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)

Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schiff
Schradler
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyn
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Welch
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—14
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Budd
Gaetz
Good (VA)
Greene (GA)
Harris
Hice (GA)
Massie
McClintock
Norman
Roy
Steube

NOT VOTING—16
Barr
Brady
Dean
DeFazio
Fitzgerald
Fortenberry
Frankel, Lois
Joyce (PA)
Kinzinger
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Schakowsky

□ 1843
Messrs. BAIRD and DUNCAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bills, as amended, were passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 88.

Allred (Davids (KS))	Grijalva (García (IL))	Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Axne (Stevens)	Hastings (Wasserman)	Moulton (Underwood)
Barragán (Beyer)	Schultz	Napolitano (Correa)
Bera (Aguilar)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Payne (Wasserman)
Bishop (GA) (Butterfield)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Schultz
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Kim (NJ) (Davids (KS))	Peters (Kildee)
Buchanan (Gimenez)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Pingree (Cicilline)
Bush (Clark (MA))	Kuster (Clark (MA))	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Langevin (Lynch)	Rush (Underwood)
Cleaver (Davids (KS))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Sires (Pallone)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lieu (Beyer)	Slotkin (Stevens)
DesJarlais (Fleischmann)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Timmons (Steube)
Garamendi (Sherman)	McEachin (Wexton)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Garbarino (Joyce (OH))	Meng (Clark (MA))	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
		Young (Joyce (OH))

VOCA FIX TO SUSTAIN THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1652) to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 384, nays 38, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]
YEAS—384

Adams	DeFazio	Johnson (LA)
Aderholt	DeGette	Johnson (OH)
Aguilar	DeLauro	Johnson (SD)
Allen	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Allred	Delgado	Jones
Amodei	Demings	Joyce (OH)
Armstrong	DeSaulnier	Joyce (PA)
Auchincloss	DesJarlais	Kahele
Axne	Deuth	Kaptur
Babin	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Bacon	Doggett	Keating
Baird	Doyle, Michael	Kelly (IL)
Balderson	F.	Kelly (MS)
Banks	Dunn	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Emmer	Khanna
Barragán	Escobar	Kildee
Bass	Eshoo	Kilmer
Beatty	Espaillet	Kim (CA)
Bentz	Estes	Kim (NJ)
Bera	Evans	Kind
Bergman	Feenstra	Kirkpatrick
Beyer	Fischbach	Krishnamoorthi
Bice (OK)	Fitzgerald	Kuster
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Kustoff
Bishop (GA)	Fleischmann	LaHood
Blumenauer	Fletcher	LaMalfa
Blunt Rochester	Fortenberry	Lamb
Bonamici	Foster	Lamborn
Bost	Foxy	Langevin
Bourdeaux	Frankel, Lois	Larsen (WA)
Bowman	Franklin, C.	Larsen (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Scott	Latta
F.	Gallagher	LaTurner
Brown	Gallego	Lawrence
Brownley	Garamendi	Lawson (FL)
Buchanan	Garbarino	Lee (CA)
Bucshon	Garcia (CA)	Lee (NV)
Burchett	Garcia (IL)	Leger Fernandez
Burgess	Garcia (TX)	Lesko
Bush	Gibbs	Levin (CA)
Bustos	Gimenez	Levin (MI)
Butterfield	Gohmert	Lieu
Calvert	Golden	Lofgren
Carbajal	Gomez	Long
Cárdenas	Gonzales, Tony	Lowdermilk
Carl	Gonzalez (OH)	Lowenthal
Carson	Gonzalez,	Lucas
Carter (GA)	Vicente	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	Luria
Cartwright	Granger	Lynch
Case	Graves (LA)	Mace
Casten	Graves (MO)	Malinowski
Castor (FL)	Green (TN)	Malliotakis
Castro (TX)	Green, Al (TX)	Maloney
Cawthorn	Griffith	Carolyn B.
Chabot	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cheney	Grothman	Manning
Chu	Guest	Mast
Cicilline	Guthrie	Matsui
Clark (MA)	Hagedorn	McBath
Clarke (NY)	Harder (CA)	McCarthy
Cleaver	Hartzler	McCaul
Cline	Hastings	McClain
Clyburn	Hayes	McCollum
Cohen	Hern	McEachin
Cole	Herrera Beutler	McGovern
Comer	Higgins (NY)	McHenry
Connolly	Hill	McKinley
Cooper	Himes	McNerney
Correa	Hinson	Meeks
Costa	Hollingsworth	Meijer
Courtney	Horsford	Meng
Craig	Houlahan	Meuser
Crawford	Hoyer	Mfume
Crenshaw	Hudson	Miller (WV)
Crist	Huffman	Miller-Meeks
Crow	Huizenga	Moolenaar
Cuellar	Issa	Mooney
Curtis	Jackson	Moore (UT)
Davids (KS)	Jackson Lee	Moore (WI)
Davidson	Jacobs (CA)	Morelle
Davis, Danny K.	Jayapal	Moulton
Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Mrvan
Dean	Johnson (GA)	Mullin

Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Swalwell
Murphy (NC)	Ruiz	Takano
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Taylor
Napolitano	Rush	Tenney
Neal	Rutherford	Thompson (CA)
Neguse	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
Nehls	Salazar	Thompson (PA)
Newhouse	Sánchez	Tiffany
Newman	Sarbanes	Timmons
Norcross	Scalise	Titus
Nunes	Scanlon	Tlaib
O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Tonko
Obenrolte	Schiff	Torres (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Schneider	Torres (NY)
Omar	Schrader	Trahan
Owens	Schrier	Trone
Palazzo	Schweikert	Turner
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Underwood
Palmer	Scott, Austin	Upton
Panetta	Scott, David	Valadao
Pappas	Sessions	Van Drew
Pascarella	Sewell	Van Duyne
Payne	Sherman	Vargas
Pence	Sherrill	Veasey
Perlmutter	Simpson	Velázquez
Peters	Sires	Wagner
Pfleger	Slotkin	Walberg
Phillips	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Pingree	Smith (NE)	Waltz
Pocan	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman
Porter	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Posey	Smucker	Waters
Pressley	Soto	Watson Coleman
Price (NC)	Spanberger	Welch
Quigley	Spartz	Wenstrup
Raskin	Speier	Westerman
Reed	Stanton	Wexton
Reschenthaler	Staubert	Wild
Rice (NY)	Steel	Williams (GA)
Rice (SC)	Stefanik	Williams (TX)
Rodgers (WA)	Steil	Wilson (FL)
Rogers (AL)	Stevens	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Womack
Rose	Stivers	Yarmuth
Ross	Strickland	Young
Rouzer	Suoizzi	Zeldin

NAYS—38

Arrington	Ferguson	Mann
Biggs	Fulcher	Massie
Bishop (NC)	Gaetz	McClintock
Boebert	Good (VA)	Miller (IL)
Brooks	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Buck	Gosar	Norman
Budd	Greene (GA)	Perry
Cammack	Harris	Rosendale
Cloud	Harshbarger	Roy
Clyde	Herrell	Steube
Donalds	Hice (GA)	Weber (TX)
Duncan	Higgins (LA)	Webster (FL)
Fallon	Jordan	

NOT VOTING—7

Brady	Keller	Wilson (SC)
Dingell	Kinzinger	
Jacobs (NY)	Vela	

□ 1930

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8 117TH CONGRESS]

Allred (Davids (KS))	Cleaver (Davids (KS))	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Axne (Stevens)	DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Kahele (Mrvan (KS))
Barragán (Beyer)	Bera (Aguilar)	Kim (NJ) (Davids (KS))
Bishop (GA)	(Fleischmann)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
(Butterfield)	Garamendi	Kuster (Clark (MA))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	(Sherman)	Langevin (Lynch)
Buchanan (Gimenez)	Garbarino (Joyce (OH))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Bush (Clark (MA))	Grijalva (García (IL))	Lieu (Beyer)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Hastings (Wasserman)	Lowenthal (Beyer)
	Schultz	

McEachin (Wexton)	Payne (Wasserman)	Sires (Pallone)
Meng (Clark (MA))	Schultz	Slotkin (Stevens)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)	Peters (Kildee)	Timmons (Steube)
Moulton (Underwood)	Pingree (Cicilline)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Napolitano (Correa)	Porter (Wexton)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
	Rush (Underwood)	Young (Joyce (OH))
	Schneider (Sherrill)	

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1620, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 1620, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTING A CERTAIN MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 244

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Women's History Month to celebrate countless women across America making a difference. From coast to coast, in every community and every industry, women are getting it done.

Take Kishia Powell, the current chief operations officer and EVP of DC Water. I had the great pleasure to meet Kishia last week while visiting the

brand-new headquarters. She is working in an industry dominated by men, and Kishia has stayed dedicated to her role as a woman leader in the water utilities industry. She is literally turning sludge into a new energy utility for Washington, D.C., and the surrounding regions.

Then there is Sister Pamela Marie Buganski, a native Toledoan who dedicated her life to faith and community. I remember meeting her in Matamoros, Mexico, as she was witnessing what was happening to immigrant children and families as a result of President Trump's Remain in Mexico order. Pamela gave everything she had to others before she, sadly, passed away last year.

Women like former Member Jill Long Thompson from Indiana have played an instrumental role in advancing change and conversation across America. As a Member and as a teacher, she recently wrote a book about government ethics and how President Trump's Presidency undermined the ethics of our democracy.

Finally, there are women like Patsy Pasquale, who humbly carries on her father's Toledo shoe business and legacy in orthopedic footwear after his death from COVID-19 last December.

This Women's History Month, we strive to celebrate all that women do in this country and the lasting impact they create. Let us be thankful for their beautiful lives that elevate the worth of our families, communities, culture, and economy.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand with all my sisters this evening.

CONDEMNING WEST COAST VIOLENCE

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, we have witnessed unacceptable acts of violence across our country. We have watched lives and livelihoods being destroyed.

Even now, after one of the most challenging years Americans have faced in recent history, the violence continues. In just the past few days, in both Portland and Seattle, rioters smashed the doors and windows of local small businesses, violently assaulted police officers, and firebombed the local courthouse.

In January, I called on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take a stand against political violence. But rather than condemning these appalling acts, politicians and the media continue to turn a blind eye. They ignore, downplay, and even defend these despicable and violent actions. It is inexcusable.

When we see this violence, we must condemn it for what it is: domestic terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I stand firm against all acts of violence, and I continue to call on this body to do the same.

INVESTING IN PROGRAMS TO SUPPORT SURVIVORS

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1620, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. I am proud to cosponsor this bill, and I want to thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and Chairman JERRY NADLER for, once again, their leadership and bold efforts to bring this bill to the floor.

This reauthorization bill builds upon the landmark 1994 legislation by expanding protections and services for survivors, while also working to prevent violence from occurring in the first place. It makes vital investments in preventing sexual assaults and stalking and increases victims' access to safe housing and economic stability. It also increases funding of programs for culturally specific services.

An estimated one in three women experience domestic violence in this country. I personally know what strong and consistent support means to emerge as a survivor.

When I was in the California State Legislature, I authored the Violence Against Women Act for the State of California. And today, I am so proud, along with Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, that we passed the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act with bipartisan support. When I was in the California State Legislature, a Republican Governor signed my bill into law, so I thank the gentlewoman very much for her leadership.

COOPERATE WITH CENTRAL AMERICA'S NORTHERN TRIANGLE

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a hallmark of America is that we have opened our arms and have been a just and generous nation to people who are fleeing political violence elsewhere, who have been persecuted in their native lands, and who are coming here to seek a better way of life. But here is the problem, Mr. Speaker: chaos and disorder at our border undermine the ability of our country to extend that generosity.

A little-known fact about all of this is that for many years we have been working to get this question off of the one-yard line. But here we are again, seeing the trauma of unaccompanied children at our border and people receiving the wrong message that they can simply come here.

We spent hundreds of millions of dollars in the Northern Triangle countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras to try to rebuild the conditions for the rule of law, to stop crime, and to give people economic opportunity. That is the right policy, and we had co-

operative agreements with those countries to begin to halt the messaging that it is proper or appropriate to come here illegally. Of course, this feeds human trafficking and children being left alone.

It is unjust. We need to return to the previous policy in which we are cooperating with those countries.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate and commemorate this historic month, Women's History Month, and to celebrate the passing in the House of the equal rights amendment, as well as VAWA, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, H.R. 1620.

How grateful I am that this bill, H.R. 1620, addresses the need of sex trafficking victims while creating a demonstration program on trauma-informed training for law enforcement. It increases access to grant programs for culturally specific organizations and ensures culturally specific organizations are included in the development of programs.

It is supported by the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, a coalition of over 200 groups.

VAWA expired on September 30, 2018. We, as a body, are called upon by survivors to do our job. I am delighted to celebrate ANN KUSTER, GWEN MOORE, JACKIE SPEIER, BRENDA LAWRENCE, LOIS FRANKEL, DEBBIE DINGELL, and KAREN BASS, and the name of Sojourner Truth, the abolitionist suffragist, and Ivalita Jackson, my mother, a modern-day abolitionist and suffragist. They know that to get the job done, we must get the job done.

This bill is on to the other body, and now it is to be signed by the President of the United States. It is catapulted in Women's History Month. We celebrate ERA and the Violence Against Women Act.

PROTECTING ALL AMERICANS FROM VIOLENCE AND ABUSE

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bipartisan bill to protect Americans from violence and abuse and to ensure that survivors of domestic abuse have access to the services they need.

I rise in support of a single mom hiding in a shelter with her two children. I rise in support of a mother looking to flee an abusive marriage with her children covered in disinfectant chemicals. These are the conversations I have had with women in my district, in Michigan 11.

The Violence Against Women Act reauthorizes funding for a variety of crit-

ical grant programs, including for victim services, prevention, training, education, enforcement, economic stability, and on.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, I walked with my colleagues over to the Senate majority leader's office to demand a vote on this reauthorization, and he refused to see us. He refused to even allow a vote.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as I rise, I look forward to working with a new Senate majority leader and a new President who will commit to protecting all Americans from violence in the household.

PROVIDING EQUAL PROTECTION FOR ALL

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

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, during my first month in Congress, I visited Family Shelter Service, an organization that provides lifesaving counseling, victim protection, and a 24/7 hotline to women and children in northern Illinois. They provide nearly 11,000 nights of shelter for abused women and children every year.

To their staff, to their clients, and to the one in three women in the United States who experience domestic violence and the one in five women who are raped, the Violence Against Women Act has been a lifeline since 1994. But it needs to be updated and renewed, and that is what we have done today.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021 makes crucial updates to this landmark bill to address its gaps, expand protections, and meet increased needs. We have expanded protections to make the law more inclusive of our LGBT communities. We have closed loopholes to better protect victims from gun violence, improved victim services to help survivors heal and access justice, and increased funding for programs to help children who are exposed to domestic violence in the home.

We have made vital new investments in prevention and victim services, including an amendment that I introduced to train healthcare providers on college campuses so they can better meet the needs of the one in four undergraduate women who are victims of sexual assault.

This is for our mothers, our sisters, our daughters, and our friends. But it is also for Americans, regardless of their gender, who aspire to live in a country that truly provides equal protection and equal opportunities for all.

We have done our work here today. It is now crucial that the Senate do theirs and send this bill to the President's desk.

□ 1945

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY
MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include material on the subject of my Special Order in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as a co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus, I am pleased to lead this Special Order in celebration of Women's History Month. Throughout March, we recognize the women leaders, trailblazers, and pioneers who come before us.

We have chartered a path forward that will lift up and empower young women and girls. The soul and moral compass of our Nation rests on the shoulders of women throughout this history.

I am proud to fight every day so that we can improve the quality of life for women and girls in Michigan and across this country.

As the co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus and the vice chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have made it a mission to put women issues and Black women issues front and center in this Congress.

But before I go into the work that we have done and are doing in this Chamber, I want to recognize the inspirational women in my life who helped shape who I am.

First, I want to acknowledge my grandmother, who, without a high school education, taught me the value of education, taught me the value of being a woman, of being a wife, of being a mother. She is my rock and my foundation. She taught me that being a woman and being a Black woman in America "is to be fearless, Brenda," to never apologize, and be accountable for everything that I do, and that I work hard, get my education, and keep my faith in God. There was no door I could not walk through or no table that I did not deserve to sit at. She had strength and confidence in something I carry with me every single day.

Then there is my shero, Shirley Chisholm, who paved the way for Black women like me to be in Congress. She proved every day the power that women had to change their community. Shirley Chisholm always said: "If they don't give you a seat at the table, bring a folding chair."

And, my goodness, the majority of women who represent us here in Congress are carrying their own folding chair.

So we have our first woman, our first Black American, our first Asian-American Vice President, who has coined the phrase: "The first, but not the last."

We stand on the shoulders, all of us, of giants. We continue to build the foundation so that the next generation of girls and young women can stand on our shoulders. Look at this Congress. There are over 140 Democrat and Republican women in the House and the Senate, the most ever in the history of our country.

That translates to the work we are doing in this Chamber to better the lives of women and girls. If you look at today, we voted to pass the equal rights amendment resolution and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. These are the steps in the right direction. We have come a long way, baby, for full equality, but we still have work to do.

We, unfortunately, have a system in America that often suppress women and does not support women. But we know that, "A woman is like a tea bag," like Eleanor Roosevelt said, "you never know how strong she is until she gets in hot water."

And I know for a fact that women have continued to stand up against every barrier. You point to this pandemic and you see how women, especially women of color, have borne the brunt of this health and economic crisis. But we keep moving and we will continue in this Congress to fight for the women in America.

This is our responsibility, and I am glad that we have women leaders across the Federal, State, and local governments that we have looked up to. Every woman in this Congress today recognizes that the next generation is looking at us and asking us to stand up.

Our Vice President of the United States, our Speaker of the House, and half of President Biden's Cabinet, and even on the other side of the aisle, the chair of the House Republican Party, all are women. We are making success, and I know that we can do so much more.

I continue to work, and I want to know that when women succeed, America succeeds, as our amazing Speaker of the House reminds us.

I am so glad to share this hour with some of our amazing women leaders who will continue to tell us, while we have a month dedicated to women's history, we make history every single day.

I would like to ask for my first speaker to come to the podium.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, my friend, my colleague, my co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

I rise tonight in honor of Women's History Month and the heroic, trailblazing women of our military, who have risked their lives for our country

in the advancement of women's equity and equality.

Women have been on the front lines fighting for America's values and freedom since the founding of our Nation. Our foremothers blazed a trail for women like Loretta Walsh, who, in 1917, as America teetered on the brink of entering World War I, heard and answered the call to serve. Loretta became the first woman to enlist in the U.S. military in a position other than nursing and was our first female chief petty officer.

I also want to recognize Captain Kristen Griest and Lieutenant Shaye Haver, the first women to graduate from the Army Ranger School; Marcella Hayes, America's first Black female fighter pilot; and Mary Edward Walker, the first female U.S. Army surgeon who served in the Civil War and the only woman to receive the Presidential Medal of Honor.

The strength and courage of these women and so many more like them reinforces what we already know: There is nothing women cannot do.

When women are in positions of leadership, our country is in better hands. I believe that this is especially true in our military.

I honor General Ann E. Dunwoody, our Nation's first female four-star general; Admiral Michelle Howard, the Navy's first female four-star admiral and first African American to command a U.S. naval ship; and Air Force General Laura Richardson, the first female commander of a combatant command.

These women have served our Nation honorably. They now must open new doors for a generation of women to fulfill their dreams to serve our country under safe conditions, free from sexual assault and harassment.

All of these women warriors volunteered for duty and risked their lives while fighting rampant misogyny, including attacks from talking heads on national TV—who have never served our country—and racism for the women of color. Their unflinching courage has paved the way for thousands of women serving in our Armed Forces today. Our military is stronger and this country is safer because women serve.

We honor these military women's achievements today on the House floor. May we never forget their sacrifice, duty, and dedication. May they elevate a new generation of women in the military, free from bias, racial discrimination, and sexual assault.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my amazing co-chair for everything she does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today to honor our foremothers who first demanded equity in and outside the home, along with the sheroes

of today who still battle for it amidst this deadly pandemic both on and behind its front lines.

The onset of COVID-19 pushed so many brave women into the deadly viral fires. It also foisted upon too many of them an inordinate share of unpaid caretaker and teacher roles once they were safe at home.

Throughout all of history, it is women, especially those of color, who bear the harshest health and economic burdens and fallout from such national crises.

The data is clear: Only a full recovery that prioritizes women can reverse this “she-cession” we are in.

That is why I proudly supported the American Rescue Plan, which provides much-needed help to women across this country. This relief package includes historic expansion of the child tax credit to help lift children and families out of poverty, and provides paid-leave tax credits to help more women stay in the workforce.

It also makes the investments needed to safely reopen schools and keep the childcare industry afloat so women and families can pay for care and get back to work.

And with the inclusion of \$1,400 stimulus checks per family member and extended unemployment assistance, women can finally regain their footing as equal partners and breadwinners.

Yet, even among these many challenges women have faced over this last year, we cannot overlook that, for the first time in history, we have sworn in a Madam Vice President. The historic inauguration of Vice President Harris will inspire countless girls to higher ambitions, and it marks a milestone for all women of color whose work, leadership, and vision went unrecognized for far too long.

In the Jewish faith, one of our most important tenets is the concept of *l’dor v’dor*—from generation to generation. It is our responsibility to lift up the women of tomorrow and ensure that the world provides every opportunity for them to succeed.

This Women’s History Month, while we honor and remember the women who have carried us through this and other past national calamities, we also celebrate that the shoulders we now stand on provide an even clearer vision of the equity and fairness for which we all strive.

Women are the changemakers, the visionaries, and the leaders of the future. Today, we celebrate a world in which my two daughters and all young girls everywhere have bold, limitless visions and dreams that are now truly possible.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. LOIS FRANKEL), my co-chair.

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, my sister in good trouble.

This is Women’s History Month, a time to reflect the gains women have

made; the struggles we continue to face; and the strong, fearless, and selfless women who have and continue to pave the way.

I have often lamented, as have many of my colleagues here, that for women to reach their full potential, we must be in charge of our own reproductive destiny. No one should have to call their Governor or Member of Congress for permission to access contraception or abortion. And even after the landmark decision *Roe v. Wade*, it is a constant battle to protect a hard-fought right to legal abortion.

We have seen Republican administrations and Republican States legislatures create obstacle after obstacle to prevent women from achieving reproductive freedom, blocking access to legal abortion and even contraception.

We have seen private citizens, under the guise of protecting lives, threaten abortion providers, including assassinating physicians that provide abortions.

And then there are the angels on the ground who, day in and day out, protect our precious right to reproductive freedom.

With this background, I want to highlight a courageous woman in my hometown of West Palm Beach, Florida, who has made and continues to make history as a great champion of women’s reproductive rights. She is one of the bravest people I know, someone I am proud to call a friend. Her name is Mona Reis.

Mona’s mission began early on in life, as a teenager. Six years before *Roe v. Wade*, she participated in a Florida’s Girls State program that gives teen girls an opportunity to run the Florida State Legislature, and she actually introduced a bill to legalize abortion in the State. Of course, it didn’t pass.

But this was just the beginning of a lifelong career and a commitment to protecting a woman’s right to choose, from working at the first outpatient abortion clinic established in Florida in the 1970s to, now, building her own outpatient clinic, the Presidential Women’s Center, 41 years ago.

She has been fighting to make sure that all women, no matter their age, race, or economic status, are able to access full reproductive care, including abortion.

Her clinic has treated more than half a million women for things like prenatal care, HTDs, family planning, and pregnancy termination.

This has been a fulfilling but sometimes dangerous mission. Every week for 40 years, the clinic is surrounded by protesters who taunt patients as they enter for care.

In 2005, her clinic was burned to the ground in an arson attack, but she has continued to provide high-quality and compassionate care despite the fact that she has had to endure so much.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to talk today.

It is an honor to recognize Mona Reis, an unsung heroine who continues

to make our communities a safer and a healthier place for women and girls. It is an honor to know her, to thank her, to celebrate her as we recognize Women’s History Month.

□ 2000

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is also significant to note that the majority of the diversity in Congress is represented by the women Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), a fighter for the ERA.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. LAWRENCE for her extraordinary leadership.

In 1921, exactly 100 years ago, just after ratifying the 19th Amendment, the suffragists set their sights on another constitutional change. The vote was not enough for them. They knew we needed to put gender equality into our Constitution.

So, these women, among them my relative Alice Paul, wrote the equal rights amendment. It was first introduced in Congress in 1923 in celebration of the 75th anniversary of the Seneca Falls Convention, the first women’s rights convention in our country. It was introduced in the House by Representative Daniel Anthony, nephew of the great suffragist leader, Susan B. Anthony, to honor her work, as well as the work of many others, like the great suffrage leader Elizabeth Cady Stanton, also of New York.

Today, during Women’s History Month, we honor these women as constitution-makers. But verbal praise alone is not enough. We must also carry out their wishes. Because now, a full 100 years later, the equal rights amendment is still not part of the U.S. Constitution.

I thank JACKIE SPEIER and all the women and like-minded men in this Congress that voted to move the equal rights amendment forward.

Eighty-five percent of U.N. member states have constitutions that explicitly guarantee equality for women and girls. These constitutional guarantees have enabled national legal reforms that eliminated discriminatory laws and helped usher in new laws protecting girls and women. Where once the U.S. was a leader on gender equality, when it comes to our Constitution, we are now far, far behind.

Today, we must fulfill the hope of our suffragist foremothers and make equality a reality in our Nation’s most fundamental document.

I must say, throughout this struggle I have always said: Where are the women? When I walk around the Mall, they have museums for everything, but not women. It is hard to empower women if we don’t even recognize them. So this Women’s Caucus put in a bill to create a national women’s museum on the mall. I thought this would be easy. It took us two decades to finally pass it last year, but it is now going to be built. It was a priority of this caucus, and we made it happen.

I just want to close by saying that our Smithsonian Women's History Museum will inspire visitors of all ages and all genders for generations to come.

I am so glad to join my colleagues for tonight's Special Order to celebrate the historical achievements of women and to look forward to creating a more equal future for all and preserving this history and the contributions of women in the new Smithsonian women's museum, which is now going to be built on the mall due to this Congress and this Women's Caucus.

I thank all of my colleagues that helped this happen and helped the passage of the ERA today.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I can't wait for that museum.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), another leader and fighter for women's rights.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the Democratic Women's Caucus, Congresswomen Frankel, Speier, and Lawrence, for hosting this Special Order on Women's History Month.

I want to thank Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE for insisting that Black women and women of color be seen in this body.

Last year, we celebrated the centennial of the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which gave some women the right to vote. We know that women of color were not able to vote until decades later, and Black women fought until they got suffrage in 1965.

I am proud that this January, my bill, with the support of both Republicans and Democrats here in this body and in the Senate, passed. It is called the Women's History and Nineteenth Amendment Centennial Quarter Dollar Coin Program Act, and it was signed into law. This measure will ensure that prominent women from American history can be honored on our circulating quarter dollar coins.

The currency we use is one of the most important shared ways that we have in memorializing what is important to us as Americans. Making sure that prominent American women are featured on our coins is an important step in recognizing the contributions women have made in furthering civil rights and making our country a more equitable place.

As the mint solicits public input for these coins, it is my hope that diverse American women will be chosen and depicted, celebrating our Nation's leaders, thinkers, and innovators.

Last election also brought a record number of women in Congress, and there are, I believe, 120 women now in the House. I know my mentor, the first African-American woman elected to Congress, Congresswoman Shirley Chisolm, would be so proud. Yes, we brought our folding chairs, but I have to just tell you, we are here to stay.

I salute my late mother, Mildred Parish Massey tonight, who blazed so

many trails. She instilled in her three girls that women are equal to men, from day one.

She was one of the first 12 Black students to integrate the University of Texas at El Paso. She was the first Black female civilian at Fort Bliss, Texas, to work there for years, and she was the first in so many segregated places.

But you know what? She told my sisters and me that "can't" is not in the dictionary and that we can fulfill our dreams. But in doing that, we have to break these barriers so that others can enter, and she insisted that we open the doors for other women and girls.

It is so important that we celebrate Women's History Month and honor the women trailblazers who came before us. Not only should we celebrate women, but we should also ensure that they are protected and granted equality. I can't think of a better way to honor Women's History Month than for this body to pass bills to guarantee and enshrine women's equality. It is a shame we have to do that.

One important action we can take to do that is to remove barriers to ratifying the equal rights amendment. I have to thank my good friend, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, for her leadership on these efforts. It is way past time we do that.

For 244 years, women have not been able to claim the full protections and opportunities afforded by the Constitution. Women and girls face a devastating wage gap, gender-based violence, inadequate access to healthcare, pregnancy discrimination, sexual harassment, the list goes on. Yet, our Constitution does not explicitly protect them, and women of color have had to fight twice as hard.

I thank Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE for leading the Special Order tonight. It is an important moment for women in this country.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman LEE for being a voice for women year after year after year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who has been one of our fighters from the beginning.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks about Women's History Month with a little quiz. Who was the first woman of color to serve in this body, in the United States House of Representatives?

I think I hear somebody saying maybe it was Shirley Chisolm. Shirley Chisolm certainly was a groundbreaking leader, but she was not the first woman of color. It was a woman named Patsy Mink.

Patsy Takemoto Mink was born in the territory of Hawaii in 1927. She became a lawyer at the University of Chicago. That is my hometown. Not frequent for women to do that. In fact, she couldn't get a job, so she set up her own practice.

But she got really interested in politics, and she served in the territorial

House and Senate. And guess what? She was the first woman ever to be in that body. She was a groundbreaker.

In 1964, 5 years after Hawaii became a State, Patsy ran for the United States Congress, the first woman of color and the first Asian American and the first woman to represent Hawaii.

She championed early childhood education, introduced the first childcare bill in Congress, and she was a groundbreaker by introducing title IX. This was legislation that itself was groundbreaking. An amendment to the Higher Education Act, title IX, ensured that women could not be excluded from participating in school activities or participating in collegiate athletics. Believe me, this was not an easy bill to pass.

That same year, she actually did run for President. That was about 2 years before Shirley Chisolm did. A very short race. She was an anti-Vietnam war candidate. Then she dropped out to run for Senate and lost that race.

But she came back to the United States Congress to serve once again. I have to tell you that I had the pleasure—when I came here in 1999, Patsy Mink was here, a fierce and tiny woman whom you could not resist.

I want to say today that we need to lift the name of Patsy Mink higher. People don't know who she is or who she was or what she accomplished for women. I am determined that we will do something in this House of Representatives to acknowledge and honor the great work of Patsy Mink.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who has been a trailblazer in her own right.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan and all of the chairs and the co-chairs of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the women of the United States House of Representatives for Women's History Month. This Women's History Month marks the 101st year of women's suffrage in the United States.

Despite the fact that women have had the right to vote for 101 years, we still don't have equal justice under the law. That is why earlier today, we passed a resolution to remove the arbitrary deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, because there is no expiration date on equality.

Yet, to this day, women are still paid less for our work, face workplace harassment, and are discriminated against, simply because of who we are.

Women who work full-time, year-round, still make 82 cents on the dollar for men's earnings. Fighting against these disparities and ensuring our Federal Government and policies are reflective of the whole country is why having women at every level of government is so important, in our House, State houses, and, yes, even in the White House.

So this month, in particular, we draw strength and inspiration from those

who came before us and those remarkable women working among us today, from Shirley Chisolm, the first Black woman to serve in Congress; to NANCY PELOSI, the first and only woman Speaker of the House; to KAMALA HARRIS, the first female, first African American, and first South Asian American Vice President in United States history. She was sworn in by the first Latina Supreme Court Justice, Sonia Sotomayor.

A hundred years ago, only one woman, Alice Mary Robertson, was elected to serve in Congress. Currently, a record 144 women were elected to this Congress, with 120 women in the House of Representatives alone.

□ 2015

I am proud to say that when I was elected and sworn in in 2013, I became the 100th woman. However, there is still a lot of work to be done; 144 out of 535 Members is just 25 percent. That is just not what our country looks like. Women make up over 50 percent of this Nation.

Women's History Month is a reminder of the importance and the urgency of that work and the need for us to continue breaking those glass ceilings.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the gentlewoman and thank her for being the 100th woman to enter into Congress.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 31 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. I thank Mrs. LAWRENCE so much for gathering us all here tonight in celebration, because celebration is what we must do. We must celebrate not just Women's History Month, but everything we did today. We must celebrate that we passed the extension of the ERA, that we passed the Violence Against Women Act, that we passed the American Rescue Plan with all of those wonderful provisions that will lift women and children out of poverty.

I come from a place where for many years they didn't give us the vote, they didn't give us statehood, and there was much discrimination. But it was also a place where women and women of color have a long and proud history of transformative leadership, and I honor a few of them today.

One hundred years ago the suffragist Adelina Otero-Warren helped lead the charge to ratify the 19th amendment in New Mexico. After her success, she became the first Latina to ever run for Congress. Unfortunately, she wasn't successful, but 100 years later I am the first Latina to represent my district.

In my family, my grandmother, Isabel Lopez Leger helped to integrate the segregated city of Las Vegas, New Mexico, refusing to move when the neighbors realized she was a small, Brown, Spanish-speaking Hispana.

My big grandma, as we called her Ganga, Abelina Romero Lucero, under-

stood how central the vote was to achieving equity and representation for our communities, making calls to mobilize voters from her hospice bed. She was a Democrat until she died.

My mother, Manuelita de Atocha Lucero Leger, was punished for speaking Spanish in the schoolyard. She took this bigotry and turned it into advocacy, and she and my father helped pass the 1973 New Mexico Bilingual Multicultural Education Act because she knew that language was so essential to "our culture and heritage," "nuestra cultura y herencia," and identity.

New Mexico also claims Dolores Huerta, who proudly taught us that, "yes, it can," "si, se puede."

I close with New Mexico's beloved daughter, Secretary Deb Haaland of the Pueblo of Laguna. New Mexico has shed tears of joy over her confirmation. She takes to the Department of the Interior a fierce voice borne of resilience and the love of community and our Earth which she inherited from the 34 generations of New Mexican women before her.

Women's history is still unfolding, for we have hard work ahead of us, don't we? Women of color, especially, are disproportionately impacted by the pandemic, health disparities, and economic hardship. So I am so thankful to be here with my "sisters," "hermanas" to celebrate our history and to recommit ourselves to the hard work we have ahead of us.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the gentlewoman so much. We are standing on the shoulders of Deb Haaland and my amazing mentor and friend, MARCIA FUDGE, who have left the Halls of Congress to go to the White House to lead the administrative staff.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a community organizer who put her boots on and walked the streets, and made change, and then blessed us by coming to Congress to continue the fight.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I want to first and foremost give a great sense of thanks and debt of gratitude to my colleague, BRENDA LAWRENCE, for bringing this Special Order hour today, as we are really celebrating womanhood. That is truly what we are doing tonight.

Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the amazing and just absolutely inspirational women that are all around us. As it has been said over and over again, you know, so many amazing women reside right here in this body, and I have to personally say, I have never met in my lifetime a greater number of courageous and intelligent and just amazing women that are so committed to democracy and protecting their constituents and their communities, and I feel very humbled and honored to actually get to serve with each and every one of them.

Whether it be a mother or a scientist, a Congresswoman or the Vice President of the United States, we are eternally

thankful for the work that women do to help us thrive here at home and across the globe.

This week I had the opportunity to speak with four amazing women who are fighting for change in my community in Georgia's Sixth Congressional District.

Cobb County Chairwoman Lisa Cupid has become the first African American and first woman to serve in her position on the Board of Commissioners.

Aixa Pascual has dedicated her career to engage and advocate for Georgia's Latino population.

And after 15 years of teaching, Charisse Davis joined the Cobb County School Board to implement ideas that she learned from her experience as an educator.

Dr. Colleen Kelley, a physician at Emory University School of Medicine, has worked on the Moderna vaccine trial at Grady Hospital.

I truly want to thank these incredible women for all of the amazing work that they have done in our community, because it not only serves my community, my district, Georgia, but also the rest of the Nation.

I wish everyone a truly happy, happy Women's History Month. But I have to honestly say, as I am sitting here today listening to all of my colleagues talk about the amazing women that we know and amazing women who have done so much work throughout the course of history, I would be remiss if I did not mention my own mother, Wilma Cecelia Holman. I owe her such a great debt of gratitude because she was one of the very first women, Black women in Illinois to receive a master's in nursing and to actually teach nursing. So I know that everything that I am, all of my courage, my strength, my imagination, my creativity, my drive, and my willingness to put my boots on and get down in the dirt, in the trenches for the people that I love and care for in my community comes from her.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia.

I know there is a tradition that says, as long as you say the names of your forefathers, they will never leave you. So I just want to introduce into the RECORD Etta Cranford, who was my grandmother. At the age of 55, she inherited a 3-year-old and 5-year-old when my mother died, and she gave everything she had until her death to ensure that I would be a strong Black woman in America.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LAWRENCE for bringing us together for this Special Order hour.

In honor of Women's History Month, I rise to celebrate the League of Women Voters nonpartisan work to encourage active and informed participation in our democracy since 1920. Founded shortly before the ratification of the 19th amendment, the League has always believed in women's power to help create a more perfect democracy.

In recent years, the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania has worked to combat 21st century voter suppression tactics, including strict voter ID laws and extreme gerrymandering.

In 2018, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court issued a decision in the League of Women Voters v. Pennsylvania that declared our congressional districts had been so extremely gerrymandered that they violated our State constitution. In doing so, that decision created districts, including mine, that are more compact, contiguous, and constitutional. The League of Women Voters' decision paved the way for the election of four women, myself included, to serve in our State's congressional delegation at a time when there were none.

From the first suffragists through the present day, I want to applaud the League of Women Voters for its ongoing work to empower voters and defend our democracy.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. MANNING), a woman who has made a difference. I am looking forward to the brilliance of her future.

Ms. MANNING. I would like to thank my colleague from my hometown for holding this Special Order and for all she has done on behalf of women.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to celebrate Women's History Month by highlighting the multiple and irreplaceable roles that women play in our communities.

Generations of women have worked to balance jobs with raising children and caring for aging loved ones. This isn't new. Women have always disproportionately shouldered the burden of caring for family. But for the first time, this pandemic has highlighted the toll these various roles take on women, as so many have been forced to leave the workforce to care for others.

Over the last year, 2.3 million women have left the workforce, a nearly 3 percent drop in female participation in the labor force. Several factors have contributed to this drop, but none more than the closing of childcare facilities and schools.

The American Rescue Plan is helping women recover from this pandemic and return to work by bolstering the childcare sector, increasing the child tax credit, expanding paid leave, and safely reopening schools.

We must treat women with dignity and respect and put into place systems that allow women to care for their families and excel at work. I proudly voted to support the American Rescue Plan because it is an important step in the right direction.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LAWRENCE for her leadership and for organizing this Special Order hour on this incredible night in this incredible month of Women's History Month.

I also want to point out that all three women from the North Carolina delegation participated, and that is true sisterhood.

I rise today to highlight an extraordinary North Carolinian in honor of Women's History Month, Reverend Nancy Petty.

Nancy is a trailblazer in the community. As a member of the LGBTQ community and the faith community, she has championed marriage equality and brought these welcoming ideas to her own church, Raleigh's historic and progressive Pullen Memorial Baptist Church. I worshipped virtually with Pullen just last Sunday.

A kind and compassionate person, Nancy often preaches inclusivity and understanding. She has focused on facilitating interfaith dialogue with Raleigh's Muslim community and has partnered with the Jewish community on social justice advocacy.

She truly represents the best of our community, and I am honored to call her a friend and a neighbor. She has inspired a generation by her example to treat others the way you would want to be treated.

I am so pleased to recognize Reverend Petty for this Women's History Month and the example she sets for us all.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), our final speaker tonight, who came to Congress with a mission. She has made her voice heard, and she has made such a difference. We welcome her as not only a woman Member of Congress but as an amazing Representative.

□ 2030

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, so many of the leaders we hear about are public figures, elected officials, people with loud voices in the community, but there are so many other kinds of leaders. In particular, in connection with this month's Women's History Month, I rise to pay tribute to some who are not often noticed, the extraordinary women who have battled the COVID pandemic on its front lines in my community and across our Nation.

This historic crisis has devastated my community and communities in every corner of our country. More than 530,000 of our fellow Americans have died. Millions have lost their jobs. Unprecedented numbers of children and families have faced hunger.

Women have experienced a disproportionate share of these converging crises. As a larger share of frontline workers, they have risen to the occasion, putting the health and safety of their neighbors ahead of their own.

One woman in my community, the Greater Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, has done everything she can to make sure these heroes and our most vulnerable neighbors are not forgotten. Dr. Rajika Reed has served the people of our community for more than 20

years as a counselor, children's therapist, teacher, public health researcher, and epidemiologist. Most recently, Dr. Reed has served in one of the hospital systems in my community, St. Luke's University Health Network, first as senior director of epidemiology and strategy and now as vice president of community health.

Dr. Reed has been instrumental in keeping our community informed throughout the pandemic. Dr. Reed has been particularly incisive when speaking about the disproportionate impact of COVID on various communities throughout the Seventh District, helping all of us recognize and understand how rapidly and drastically the stakes can change depending on a person's life circumstances.

By grounding every conversation in easy-to-understand data, Dr. Reed has made sure that officials at all levels have a shared understanding of constituents' lived reality and the challenges they face, particularly the stark racial and economic disparities that have only grown during the pandemic.

Still, throughout it all, Dr. Reed's warm and calm delivery has helped soften the blow of what was at times devastating news. Her work has helped mobilize my entire community around the shared mission of taking care of our own and putting the most vulnerable among us first.

To Dr. Reed and women frontline workers in every corner of my community, including many low-wage workers who still don't have the support or pay they need, I stand with you. All of us stand with you today and every day.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 14 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to thank everyone who spoke tonight.

I want everyone to know that women are making so many strides. We are currently on target to send women to the Moon. We are on target to make sure that women continue to be leaders in education and healthcare. I am proud to say that not only do we have a woman as our Vice President, but we also have a woman as our amazing Speaker of the House. We have six chairs of our congressional committees headed by women. We also have over, as I said, 194 women in Congress currently.

With Women's History Month, sometimes the men will roll their eyes in the back of their head and say: Women, why do you need a month? Because, so often, the strides and hard work that it took for us to accomplish what was given to privileged men are often overlooked.

I am proud to stand here today to lead this Special Order hour to honor the women, as Congresswoman WILD said, the ones who often don't get a platform, don't get a mic, and they just do the work every day.

Women are the predominant group of educators. If you are educated in America, you were probably touched by a woman. Those who are in hospitals and went through COVID and all the suffering, the caregivers and nurses are predominantly women.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to the mother who gave birth to us. We are often in the kitchens and other places that women are such strong leaders, but now we have women in the CSuites. We have women manufacturing and designing. We have women in every area of America working.

The only thing that any woman wants is the opportunity to have a seat at the table to be able to show her brilliance. As my grandmother told me, never apologize for your hard work, your brilliance, or your skills and talents that you have been blessed with. You use them, and you do a good thing with them.

And as John Lewis said, get in good trouble. The suffragists taught us that the good trouble they went through gave us the right to vote in America.

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

MANAGING THE CRISIS ON THE SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand here on behalf of the freedom-loving members of the Republican Study Committee, the conservative conscience of the GOP Conference, and the largest caucus with over 150 members and our friend and fearless leader JIM BANKS from the Hoosier State.

Mr. Speaker, we come to this Chamber with grave concerns, with profound grief over what is happening to this great Nation at the southern border, along the border of States like my home State of Texas. My citizens are on the front lines, and the citizens of the Lone Star State and border States are at ground zero of this self-inflicted crisis.

Just because the President won't acknowledge that there is a crisis doesn't mean that it doesn't exist. Mr. Speaker, it is raging out of control. It is an unmitigated disaster, and as I said, it is self-inflicted.

Reinstating catch and release while we are recovering from a pandemic? Are you kidding me? We have put mandates and restrictions on the American people who have sacrificed by staying at home. Some have lost their jobs. They don't know how they are going to make ends meet for their family.

Everybody stepped up, Mr. Speaker. They did what they were told to do in some cases, but they all acted responsibly for the sake of our country and their fellow man and the country that they love. And now, we are just letting

people cross our border illegally, violate our sovereignty, break our laws, and then just be released into the interior of our country with no testing and no screening.

In Texas, Mr. Speaker, we are coming back. We have folks back to work. Kids are in school. My kids are in school. We feel normal again, and we are blessed to be in a State that puts a premium on individual liberty and personal responsibility. We have worked hard to get to where we are now.

We didn't like everything that was done to us by our government. We didn't like all the protocols and mandates, but we did the best job we could for the sake of our fellow Americans. Now, we have the potential for a flare-up in the pandemic because our hospitals are going to be overwhelmed again.

Our schools are already overwhelmed as they try to do right by their students, let them come into the classroom, have that support structure, knowing that to close your doors on these kids is to close a bright future for them. It is to lock them out of their greatest potential and to give them grief and all kinds of heartache and mental health concerns.

We have our police, who have been disparaged with cries to defund the police. They would be dismantled if the bill that passed the House supported by the Democrats ever became law and ripped away the tools that they have to not only keep our community safe but to protect them in the process. We have stripped them—or would if the bill passed—of their legal liability protections. All the while, we are putting more pressure on our local law enforcement to do the job that the Federal Government under this Commander in Chief has failed to do.

The Commander in Chief is supposed to provide for the common defense. He is supposed to be the exemplar for rule of law. He is the chief enforcer of the law. What kind of example is our President setting to just throw caution to the wind and let folks come into this country who are not our citizens, prioritizing them over the safety and health of our citizens?

I got to hear some of my colleagues express concerns over women's rights and protecting women from abuse. We all support that, and our hearts go out to any victims of abuse in this country or any country. But meanwhile, because of the policies that have been passed by this President, reinstating catch and release, empowering sanctuary cities, repealing the stay in Mexico policies, halting funding for the border wall, all of these things have sent a message that we are open for illegal business.

If you ask the cartels, business has never been better. We are lining their pockets while they exploit vulnerable people who are hopeless. They are being exploited.

Mr. Speaker, one out of every three women are sexually assaulted on their

trek to this country. That statistic is from Doctors Without Borders. Children are used as a passport, trafficked by these cartels. We have empowered these cartels. This is a disaster on so many levels, and I am glad my colleagues are here to express these same sentiments in their own words.

Mr. Speaker, I will end with this. It is clear there is a cause and effect here. It is clear that policies have consequences. They incite behavior, and the behavior is causing chaos at the border.

I believe this President is obsessed. This is just a fundamental question, why our President would allow this to happen. I believe he is obsessed with undoing anything that has the name "President Trump" on it, regardless of its merits. I believe he is equally obsessed with placating the left and their radical agenda. I have come to that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to speak to this. We are going to tell the truth. We are going to lay out the facts. We are going to call on our President to do the right thing and prioritize the American people and their safety and security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and fellow Member from Texas for yielding.

Our country's future will forever be changed based on how we manage or refuse to manage Biden's border crisis. And, yes, it is a crisis.

Steady merit-based legal immigration is stabilizing. It provides a talented pool of workers, effectively permits patriotic assimilation, and enriches our culture. We can debate how best to achieve those objectives and what immigration levels or numbers are in the best interests of our Nation and our citizens, but what is not open for honest debate, or at least debate that honestly places the interests, safety, and security of American citizens first, is the need to secure our border and eliminate illegal immigration.

President Biden's open border policies threaten our security, overtax our resources, jeopardize public health, and turn every town into a border community.

As others have said, without a border, we don't have a country; we have a landmass, one that is currently under invasion. That is an invasion that is with complicit approval from the President's policies and the support of the Democratic Party, and this is especially egregious and inexcusable.

□ 2045

The fact is that, in the 56 days since President Biden was sworn in on January 20, illegal immigration has surged and our southern border has been overrun.

We are not stopping illegal immigrants based on their inability to provide for themselves and not be a burden on our economy, our social services,

our education system, our healthcare system.

We are not stopping illegal immigrants based on whether or not they test positive for COVID.

We are not stopping illegal immigrants based on whether or not they have a criminal record.

We are not stopping illegal immigrants based on whether or not they intend to do us harm.

The bottom line is that we don't even know who is coming, and we don't even know why they are coming.

Meanwhile, the President sends FEMA to the border, not to help prevent the emergency crisis of illegal crossing, but actually to help illegal aliens get into our country.

And how does a Democrat majority respond?

With two new amnesty bills that will incentivize and reward lawless, illegal behavior with amnesty and citizenship.

Memo to the President and Democrat majority: You get more of what you incentivize.

We can only conclude this is what they want.

Mr. Speaker, these two bills combined will provide amnesty to some 5 million illegal aliens, including some with criminal backgrounds. These two bills make it more difficult for law enforcement to detain or deport illegal aliens. These bills will facilitate chain migration, leading to more non-merit-based immigration. And these two bills inexcusably provide no provisions to address the Biden border crisis.

Just today, in apparent recognition that the crisis is not playing well with the American people—you know, the forgotten citizens of the country—NBC news—not exactly a conservative news outlet—is reporting that the Biden administration is telling Border Patrol that they can no longer talk to the media or do ride-alongs that enable the media to see firsthand what is happening at the border. Instead, Border Patrol is supposed to let all communication come from Washington.

The American people are not stupid. They know what is going on, and they don't want America to be turned into a sanctuary nation.

Mr. Speaker, we, on the Republican side, are going to fight for them. We are going to fight to protect the country we have today, and we are going to fight to protect the country we want to have tomorrow.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his remarks. He talked about the incentives. We talked about cause and effect, and we talked about the consequences of bad policies.

Mr. Speaker, we have had double the apprehensions this year in January over last year in 2020, well over twice as many illegal crossings in the month of February. We are now 5,000-plus a day of people pouring into this country, 500 a day of illegal minors trafficked here by the cartels. And the CBP tells us that there will be over 120,000

by the end of the year. It will be a record year. Those are the results. And the facts don't lie, whether this President or our colleagues believe it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. BABIN), who represents Texas 36th Congressional District.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the House Border Security Caucus, I very much appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor with the Republican Study Committee to talk about the most pressing issue our Nation is facing today, right now; and, sadly, it was entirely avoidable.

There are no ifs, ands, or buts. The crisis on our southern border is a direct result of President Biden's failed immigration and border security policies—miserably failed.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have predictably done what they do best: Blamed President Trump and his administration.

But anyone with a pulse can see that this border crisis started the very day that President Biden was sworn in. On his first day in office, Biden stopped construction of the border wall, ended the national emergency declaration on the southern border. He stopped the migrant protection protocol so asylum-seekers would have to wait in Mexico.

And rather than utilizing the title 42 health restrictions to protect Americans during this pandemic, Biden and his administration are releasing COVID-positive illegal aliens into Texas to worsen the pandemic and fan out across this country.

He would go on to stop deportation, stop enforcing immigration laws, bring back “catch and release,” and end the hard-won changes that President Trump had initiated to control our southern border.

He has specifically said that Americans will not be prioritized—repeat: Will not be prioritized—over illegal immigrants for access to COVID-19 vaccines, and promised citizenship to millions upon millions of migrants here illegally, which does nothing but incentivize more illegal crossings. All of this in less than 2 months.

Who on earth is surprised that there is a massive border crisis?

Yes, President Biden owns this border crisis. The truly sad reality is this isn't Biden's first rodeo. When he was vice president, he saw surges on the border, and he knows full well what exactly that means.

He saw children being used and recycled by smugglers. He saw women and children physically abused, raped, and even murdered by the cartels, who fully control our southern border now, empowered by President Biden. He even saw American families torn apart after a loved one was killed by a dangerous criminal illegal alien.

He should know better. And you know what? He does know better. Unfortunately, he is controlled by politics and his radical leftwing base, and he won't turn back now.

The American people deserve to know that President Biden is taking advantage of them through this crisis. And while the American people were locked down for a year because of the pandemic, illegal aliens roamed free. While they worked hard, paid their taxes, and saved just to get by, illegal immigrants cost them billions every year with free education and healthcare.

My great State of Texas and the other border States cannot take another minute of Biden's border crisis. The President of the United States needs to step up and he needs to lead. Lives are at stake.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks. He mentioned as one of the policies that this current President has put in place through a unilateral action—by the way, he has done more executive orders than the last three or four Presidents combined—was to repeal or rescind the national emergency declaration. But it is so rich, so rich that at the same time he is doing this, the Democrat leadership of the House under Speaker PELOSI has lined the streets around the perimeter of the Capitol with the National Guard. The height of hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people aren't buying this. They are not. The Speaker called the walls at the southern border protecting our fellow Americans and communities immoral, until she erected razor-wire fencing around the people's House. It is offensive. It is shameful, and it is an outrage. And it is a double standard, if I have ever seen one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN), a good friend of mine, and a colleague representing Oklahoma's First District.

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Texas for yielding. I appreciate him leading this Special Order on such an important issue in our great country.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to shed light on a situation that is getting worse by the minute. The longer Joe Biden and his White House ignore the crisis on our border, the more challenging it becomes to get it under control.

But one would have to wonder: Is that what he wants by allowing this to continue on?

Under President Trump, border security was a top priority. He was ridiculed for that top priority of securing our Nation, the sovereignty of our Nation. Illegal entries plummeted under President Trump, and over 450 miles of border wall were built at the fighting and scratching every single way against our Democrat colleagues' desires.

Mr. Speaker, Biden's trend has been to reverse and dismantle anything and everything that President Trump touched over the last 4 years, no matter who it may hurt. On day one of his Presidency, he unconstitutionally halted congressionally appropriated funds

meant to secure and strengthen our southern border. He indicated a complete reversal on border policies, refusing to condemn Democrats who call for open borders. This led to thousands of immigrants to believe our borders were open and they could enter with no consequences. They even had shirts promoting the idea that Biden should let them in.

Mr. Speaker, it has been less than 2 months since Biden took office and already the situation at our southern border has reached unprecedented levels, levels like we haven't seen in 20 years. Border agents are reporting the number of illegal entries, especially children, is higher than we have seen in decades.

Detainment facilities—what the Democrats have now called reception centers and concentration camps; that is what they called them under President Trump—are over capacity. Children are being sent to Dallas, hundreds of miles away from the border, to be held at the convention center.

Americans returning from abroad are required to take COVID tests before reentering our own country, but Biden is allowing thousands of migrants into the country without even testing them for COVID, packing facilities way over capacity.

Hypocrisy is nothing new to this administration. In spite of everything I have already said, Biden refuses to call it a crisis. CNN is even calling it a crisis, but Biden doesn't want to label it. He doesn't want to own it, calling it an inherited mess from the Trump administration. Every single person in America knows that is not true. To make it worse, House Democrats rejected any amendments on their partisan immigration bills this week.

My amendments asked that known gang members not be eligible for amnesty.

How could you not allow that to be added to this bill?

That we create a tax credit for employers who want to do the right thing and implement E-Verify in their companies to make sure they are hiring legal American workers, and that illegal immigrants who have committed crimes in our country not be eligible for amnesty. Now, everywhere—except for in Congress—any good American would want those in the bill. But not here, not my Democrat colleagues.

These are all commonsense ideas that a vast majority of Americans support, but Democrats would rather have open borders with no consequences for those who break the laws in our country.

Just this week, four people on the terrorist watch list were caught attempting to illegally enter our country. If we lower the standards and restrictions on our border, we know we never would have caught them. We wouldn't have even known that they were here. That should scare us all to death.

Mr. Speaker, I and many of my Republican colleagues have been to the

border to see this terrible situation firsthand. I would encourage every Member of Congress to go see it. And for that, I thank my colleagues for standing up here tonight at this hour, for speaking up on this crisis. It is so important to the American people and the sovereignty of our Nation.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, our neighbor to the north, for his remarks. He mentioned that some political opportunists were characterizing these detention facilities under the leadership of President Trump as concentration camps. They called the men and women in uniform, our sons and daughters, who were called to duty to come alongside the Border Patrol agents to secure our southern border and defend our people, "storm troopers." They referred to our attempt to humanely and safely detain the unaccompanied minors as "kids in cages."

Mr. Speaker, where are they now? Where are they now?

Where is the outrage?

Where is the indignation?

Where is the name calling?

How soon we forget.

Mr. Speaker, 13,000 children are being detained right now in far worse conditions and far more crowded than before.

Where are those colleagues of ours that were clanging gongs and sounding the alarm?

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY), my colleague, who represents the Seventh Congressional District.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, America's border is under siege, and it is a siege that this administration continues to encourage with each passing day.

They say it is not a crisis or an emergency, even as they have dispatched FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to help manage the disaster that they have created.

In February alone, the shortest month of the year, overwhelmed border patrol agents encountered more than 100,000 illegal aliens crossing our southern border, including 30,000 unaccompanied children and minors. And that does not include the countless illegal aliens that slipped through undetected.

Mr. Speaker, as many as 25 percent of the illegal aliens that the border patrol apprehends are testing positive for COVID—and not all are being tested.

Thanks to the administration's catch-and-release policies, many of these aliens immediately board buses and fan out across the country, making every State a border State. That includes my State in the far north, Wisconsin, because I hear it from sheriffs and law enforcement all over northern Wisconsin, especially the drugs that flow in, the fentanyl, the

methamphetamines, that flow into our communities killing our citizens.

Drug seizures were up more than 50 percent last month driven by huge spikes in meth and heroin, deadly poisons that ravage our families. In what is fast becoming a Washington tradition, the other side has tried to pass the buck and blame the border disorder on the last administration.

This is a tired talking point; one we will hear repeated over and over to explain away the policy failures of the one-party government they control. But facts are stubborn things.

This tidal wave of drug and human trafficking is a direct result of White House promises of amnesty, and the rollback of the commonsense border security safeguards put in place by President Trump. That is why it began at the end of January.

So what is their answer to this crisis? It is to pour gasoline on the fire by passing two amnesty bills that will give legal status to at least half of the estimated 11 million illegal aliens already in this country, including criminal aliens who have been convicted of multiple DUIs, drug and weapons violations, and even voter fraud.

One of the bills even includes an unbelievable provision allowing for the reimportation of foreigners who were deported as long as 4 years ago, bringing them back and giving them green cards. This is a slap in the face to the legal immigrants who have followed our laws. This is a slap in the face to American taxpayers, millions of unemployed Americans, and countless American families who have lost loved ones to the scourge of drugs like meth and fentanyl.

Even worse, it is a financial bonanza for the human traffickers and foreign drug cartels who prey on the vulnerable and profit from their misery.

So let's get this straight. The first act of this President was to open the borders and close our schools, or make sure that they stay closed. The first act of this President was to open the borders, the pipeline that brings the drugs and the human trafficking into America, but they closed the pipeline that gives us energy independence in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the administration to stop pretending that this crisis isn't happening, and to start defending the American people.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, listening to the gentleman, it is just hard to believe that in the greatest country on planet Earth, that this is what we are allowing to happen. Reimporting people who violated our laws, had due process, and we did what the law says, detain and deport.

Today, under Present Biden's deluge of executive orders, they are released and rewarded: free healthcare, compliments of the taxpayers of the United States; free education, compliments of the taxpayers of the United States. We spend \$12 billion in Texas alone on illegal immigration, and the price has just

climbed higher and higher under this President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP), my dear friend, representing the Ninth Congressional District.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend, Mr. ARRINGTON, for hosting this Special Order, it is an extraordinarily important topic.

Here is another angle on it. Tomorrow, on the floor of this House, Democrats will pass two mass amnesty bills, H.R. 6 and H.R. 1603. Consider that at the very time Democrats are bringing these amnesty bills to the floor, what promises to be the largest surge of illegal immigration on the southern border in at least 20 years, is building toward an unknown climax. The Biden administration has precipitated a humanitarian crisis so big that even they can no longer deny it.

Less than 2 months after terminating President Trump's declaration of an emergency on the border, Secretary Mayorkas of the Department of Homeland Security, has been constrained to send FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to facilitate the Nation's response to this crisis.

Today, in the Committee on Homeland Security, I asked Secretary Mayorkas about the deliberate and absurd rhetoric used by the administration: Come, but don't come now.

I was unable to secure from Secretary Mayorkas a straightforward acknowledgment that it is always wrong to incite migrants to enter the United States illegally.

And, amazingly, when I asked the Secretary whether he and the Biden administration had been expected or were surprised by the crisis that is now blooming on the southern border, he was caught off guard. He said he had no expectation whatsoever. I couldn't believe it, and I don't think the American people can believe it.

Just like the Biden administration's rhetoric, these bills signal economic migrants that if they make the dangerous trek through Central America and Mexico, they will be met with amnesty, taxpayer-funded healthcare, housing, and anything else you can think of.

Whether it is gutting the migrant protection protocols, otherwise known as "remain in Mexico," and stopping border wall construction, the administration's message to migrants is clear: Come. Take your lives in your hands, brave the gangs, the coyotes, the smugglers, take the risk of sexual abuse. Come.

Today, the Democrats are augmenting that clear-as-day message with more promises of amnesty, and that will be the bills tomorrow, which everyone here know will fuel more illegal migration.

Let's face it, Democrats are committed to a regime of open borders, where any person from anywhere in the world has a right to enter the U.S. for

any reason, even if that means migrants are assaulted or killed on their way to the border. And Democrats feel better about themselves. They assume a superior moral position by pursuing such a policy.

It is no wonder, but apparently no cause for reflection by the Biden administration, that the CBP very recently apprehended four individuals on the terrorist watch list crossing the southwest border. Secretary Mayorkas admitted that today, and then went on to say: Well, it is nothing unusual, more or less. Amazing.

I have heard some of my friends on the other side of the aisle complain that Republicans are not offering solutions.

Let me offer three: End all talk of amnesty. Reinstate the migrant protection protocols that provide more for their safety than the policy does now articulate. And finish building the wall. Let's resume a responsible border policy. Let's consider, for once, the interests of the American people.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would say that America is the most generous Nation, not only the most powerful, but the most generous. We represent 5 percent of the world population, and we represent 20 percent of the immigrant population. We welcome freedom-loving, law-abiding people who want to make America their home and make a better life for their family, but only if they respect our laws and our sovereignty and the safety of the American people.

Millions of people wait for years to have legal status in this country, and this President has just created lawlessness and chaos, just like that, with a pen and a cell phone. The unilateral actions have been reckless and endangered not only our citizens, but the poor people that are making this trek on account of his message: Don't come now, is what he says, but come now. Come one, come all. It is a free-for-all at the border, is what his policies say loudly and clearly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my dear friend from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), he represents Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican party has historically been, and I believe is still today, the voice for those who have no voice. We value life and believe all people should be treated with dignity.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas for leading this discussion tonight, for his compassion for people, and for his passion to serve Texas and America.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, I not only rise to address the growing crisis on our southern border, but to be a voice for the persecuted. In an interview aired this morning, President Biden told migrants not to come to the United States, but still refused to recognize the situation as a crisis. Actions speak

louder than words. It doesn't matter what you say when it doesn't match what you do.

Such a directive is pointless, considering there are no policy changes to demotivate the migrant surge, the likes of which the United States hasn't seen in 20 years. Our facilities and agencies are being overwhelmed by the surge.

President Biden offered an open invitation for parents to send their children across the border without fear of being turned away. The result is catastrophic. While there have been migrant surges in the past, there has never been such a prolific number of unaccompanied minors.

These policies are a driving incentive for parents to give their children to coyotes and traffickers who will abuse and use them, causing lifelong trauma. Over 500 children are crossing the border daily, including unaccompanied kids as young as 6 years old. These children are threatened and coerced by cartels to carry drugs over the border and exploited by sex traffickers.

One in three women—one in three women, Mr. Speaker, will be assaulted as they attempt to make the journey.

I just witnessed my colleagues from across the aisle spending an hour honoring women's history. What kind of history are the left's policies writing for these women? Young women, young women as young as 13 years old are being lured to Texas with the promise of a job in the service industry, and instead, are being sexually abused and trafficked.

□ 2115

What we are seeing now is but a fraction of what we could see in the coming months. This is the Biden administration's responsibility, and President Biden owes the American people answers.

But President Biden is not alone. The majority party is neglecting their oversight responsibilities and aiding and abetting these dangerous actions.

I am calling on President Biden and congressional Democrats—who I remind you are the majority in both Chambers—to take responsibility for the border crisis and work to fix it and to take responsibility for the trauma these children will endure on the journey across the border.

Customs and Border Protection has informed Congress that four people on the FBI's terrorist watch list were apprehended at the border. If four were caught, how many got through? What is their intent?

One day, Democrats are the arsonists, and the next week, the firefighters. They have pulled this trick on every issue, including energy, Medicare, and now our border. To bring partisan immigration bills to the floor without even an opportunity to amend the bills is bad governance anytime, but it is downright insensitive during this crisis.

We are a nation of immigrants, and I support all legal immigration. But

open border policies are a direct threat to our national security and have created a humanitarian crisis. We should secure our borders and work on bipartisan legislation to address immigration issues, but Democrats refuse to even enforce existing laws.

Mr. Speaker, what good is a new immigration law when there is no evidence that it will be enforced?

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his heartfelt comments.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as you have heard from my colleagues, there are many levels and dimensions to this crisis. It is a national security crisis, Mr. Speaker. It is a public health and safety crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis of epic proportions, and it is only going to get worse until this President embraces the reality, resists the left's influence, and steps up and becomes the leader that our country needs at a time like this.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for joining us in this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), who represents Wisconsin's Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have already talked tonight about the numbers which come from the crisis at the southern border.

During the Obama administration, Mr. Speaker, if you had 1,000 contacts a day with people trying to sneak in this country, that was a lot. We are now at around 3,000 a day. February of this year compared to February of last year is up 173 percent. That is shocking. It didn't have to be.

What incompetence did it take to get such a massive swing of people coming across our border?

President Trump had something called the migrant protection protocol. When people tried to sneak in here and claim asylum, they were sent back and held by the Mexican Government pending a hearing. This was a great victory for President Trump.

Maybe just because he is President Trump, it means you don't like him, Mr. Speaker, and you had to get rid of him like the protection protocol. So, we are back to the old days.

Rather than being held south of the border, waiting to see if you can come here, you are escorted into the United States, turned over to some nonprofit organization, and told to disappear somewhere in the United States to show up for a hearing which you don't show up for. And that is, more than any other reason, why we have this problem.

Another thing they have changed is that President Trump had worked on a deal with Central American countries so that people trying to come up here

from South America and other Central American countries were held south of the Mexican border. One more good policy, but let's throw it overboard and see what happens.

By doing this, not only do we let more people in the country, but we enrich and empower the drug cartels. The drug cartels are charging about \$3,000 for every Mexican they let in here, about \$5,000 for every Central American, \$8,000 to \$9,000 for every Brazilian, and up to \$20,000 for every Asian.

When you are making that kind of money, Mr. Speaker, you know very well the drug cartels will recruit as many people as they can to come into this country.

Of course, nowadays, it is unlike years ago when they used to find marijuana. Now when people come across the border, it is fentanyl, meth, and heroin. So, in addition to the huge amount of humanity moving across the border, we have that many more drugs to kill the people of our country. I am sure the American people already remember we are losing about 80,000 people every year to illegal drug use, so much of which comes across the southern border.

As has been mentioned by other speakers, there is an increase in sexual assaults as people try to come across the border and are escorted by the drug cartels.

I want to point out that the drug cartels control that southern border. If you try to come here without their approval, Mr. Speaker, you are in big trouble. I will give you an anecdote from the last time I was down there. Three people tried to escort other people over the border. Two of them were skinned alive and died. The other was partly skinned alive and told to go back south to Mexico and tell everyone what happens if you try to come across the border without going through the drug cartels.

Just as another indication of the huge problem we have at the border, last year, which was an unusually hot year, they found, in the Tucson sector alone, 100 bodies of people who dehydrated trying to come here.

Under President Trump, Mr. Speaker, you know how good it can be. They went from a point where they were letting 100,000 people across the border, which was about 2 years ago, back down to, around December, about 10,000 people crossing the border. They did that with the migrant protection protocol, with dealing with Central America, and by being concerned about COVID.

So, what to do now? I am sometimes asked how the United States got in this mess, and I am talking about a wide variety of issues. Where would the Founding Fathers say they screwed up?

Until this, I always felt that if I look at the three branches of government and say between the legislative, executive, and judiciary, our Founding Fathers would have never believed the judiciary could have such complete lack

of respect for the Constitution. But now, I have to answer something else.

The press sometimes considers themselves the fourth estate. There are rumors right now that the Department of Homeland Security has put a gag order on the Border Patrol agents who always have so many interesting stories down there. If I think of our Founding Fathers now who wanted a free press, as disappointed as they would be in our President, as disappointed as they would be in our Congress, and as super disappointed as our Founding Fathers would be in our judicial branch, I think the area they would be most disappointed is in the fourth estate. The bootlicking sycophants of the fourth estate are just horrible. These toadies are ruining the country.

Wake up. Insist on being able to talk to the Border Patrol. Get down to the Border Patrol and find out exactly what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, my final plea tonight is for the press corps to wake up, get to the southern border, and report what is really going on down there.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this administration and our current President, Joe Biden, would do well to take a page out of President Trump's playbook, and I mean this with all sincerity.

The reason people by the millions followed this unconventional, non-politician businessman and leader is because they were convinced he would fight for them. It is because they watched as he followed through on what he promised he would do for them. And lastly, Mr. Speaker, it is because he put America first.

Perfect he was not, but I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, with every fiber of his being and ounce of strength in every waking moment, he was vigilant in keeping those promises, and one of them was to secure the border and stop illegal immigration once and for all.

Politicians have come and gone. They have made the same promises but to no avail. President Trump reduced illegal crossings by 75 percent.

We know what to do in this Chamber. We know the policies that would work to protect our fellow Americans, secure our border, and stop this chaos and madness that has ensued as a result of these reckless, unilateral decisions that this President is making.

We know what to do, Mr. Speaker, but there is no political will to do it. The message, as we have said, is clear. It is demoralizing and insulting that the leadership of this administration and our Commander in Chief have prioritized illegal immigrants over our own citizens.

I am wearing a mask in the people's House. Most of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have been vaccinated or have had COVID. We have social distancing, and we are still wearing masks. What a pathetic posture as we just release hundreds every day, thousands upon

thousands—some say the infection rate is upward of 20 percent—into the interior of our country and into our communities while we the American people have spent trillions of dollars and made untold sacrifices to help our country get back to its feet. It is just unbelievable.

Those poor Border Patrol agents, who have had to hear that they too should be defunded, are hamstrung, at best. They see the revolving door.

How would you like to go to work every day, Mr. Speaker, with a clear mission, and a righteous and patriotic mission, to secure the border and protect your citizens and have a Commander in Chief who says come one, come all, and has such little regard for the rule of law and for those who risk their lives every day to enforce it?

These are just the cold, hard facts. It is the truth, I believe, and always have, in the American people's good judgment. While some folks may have had an aversion to the style and personality of the last President—I can appreciate that—they have to look back and say that he achieved unprecedented results that left this Nation safer, stronger, and more prosperous than we have been in recent history, if ever.

Mr. Speaker, I pray our country will return to that level of strength, and I pray this President will embrace the facts and reality. I hope he comes to visit border States like Texas and listens to the cries that have gone unheard from his administration, from the people of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, and throughout this land who need him to step up and be our Commander in Chief.

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

HONORING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for 16 minutes, half the time remaining until 10:00 p.m.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Sami Haiman-Marrero.

Sami Haiman-Marrero is the president and CEO of URBANDER, a firm that assists the corporate, nonprofit, and government sectors in overcoming diversity, equity, inclusion, and multicultural marketing challenges.

Under Sami's leadership, URBANDER received the Orlando Business Journal's 2020 Diversity in Business Helping Hand Award for their work impacting underrepresented and underserved communities.

Sami's career started in New York City over 25 years ago in public relations, marketing, and publishing. Her career highlights include handling the first-ever Spanish-language U.S. Presidential media campaign in 1996, which led to winning the highly coveted Hispanic vote, becoming the publisher of a

national Hispanic magazine, and being interviewed on the U.S. Latino experience by The Wall Street Journal, El Nuevo Dia, Huffington Post, MSNBC, Florida Trend, NBCNews.com, and Canada's CBC News.

Haiman-Marrero earned a master's in communications from the University of Puerto Rico and was recognized in 2016 as one of Vision Magazine's 25 Most Influential Hispanics in Central Florida. She has served on prestigious boards such as Visit Orlando, United Arts, Hispanic American Professional Business Women's Association, and Prospera's technical assistance committee.

In 2017, after Hurricane Maria devastated her beloved Puerto Rico, Sami launched a nonprofit called SOS by URBANDER. SOS creates and implements culturally competent social mobility programs such as Talleres de Bienvenida, The Azalea Project, and job readiness training.

□ 2130

SOS is also the Del Ambiente, and Gender Advancement Project's fiscal sponsor, which supports LGBTQ-plus people of color.

In 2019, Orange County Commissioner Maribel Gomez Cordero appointed Sami to the county's Arts and Culture Council, where she serves as chair of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee. She was also an official delegate of the Second Annual Latino Leadership Summit held at the United Nations by the We Are All Human organization.

For this and more, Ms. Maiman-Marrero, we honor you.

HONORING WENDY COSCHIGNANO FORD

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Wendy Coschignano Ford.

Wendy Coschignano Ford was appointed the chief executive officer for the Osceola Council on Aging in 2019. Wendy's career with the OCOA is expansive, spending the past 20 years in key positions within the council, including serving as the director housing and finance.

During the past two decades, Wendy's multidisciplinary approach led to her appointment to the agency's top position. She effectively managed six separate housing communities and successfully developed, negotiated, and managed many commercial contracts while leading the implementation of strategic planning and marketing strategies.

Since 2019, OCOA has seen exponential increases in sustainable operations, collaborations with the Osceola and central Florida community, and new initiatives, which have increased revenue, client satisfaction, profitability, and reimbursement growth.

The Osceola Council on Aging's mission is to provide services to enable independence and self-sufficiency with Osceola County seniors, disabled adults, disadvantaged individuals, and impoverished families.

Wendy's colleagues state she is always committed to "achieving the

highest standards of performance and leadership" while embodying the heart of the council's mission.

Wendy is a graduate of the University of Central Florida's business school, and will be completing her MBA degree in July of this year. Wendy holds Housing and Urban Development certifications with Assistant Housing Manager and Housing Credit Certified Professional designations.

She was recently awarded two Certificates of Achievement from HUD for Superior Real Estate Assessment Center Outcomes; recognized for implementing the 'Senior/Kid Companion' program at the State of Florida National Community Service Conference, a recognition designated by former Secretary of State Colin Powell.

Further, Wendy is a member of the Kissimmee Police Department's Crime Free initiative program, and a graduate of the University of Florida's LeadingAge Leadership Academy in 2009, along with Leadership Osceola 2019.

Wendy has been married to her husband, Chip, for 11 years. She has two children and two grandchildren.

For this and more, Wendy Coschignano Ford, we honor you.

HONORING VIANCA MCCLUSKEY

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Vianca McCluskey.

Vianca is the administrator at the Florida Department of Health in Osceola County. She spent more than 20 years of public health experience with 15 years dedicated to leading health departments and federally qualified health centers.

During her career, she has collaborated with county governments, governing boards, and community partners to address health issues and ensure the provision of programs and services for vulnerable populations.

Her public health career began in Tennessee, where she was the State's first African-American county health deputy director. She directed operations at one of the largest rural health departments, which received recognition for its diabetes and community-wide weight loss programs.

After accepting the executive director position with Primary Care Medical Services of Poinciana, a federally qualified health center operated by the health department, she relocated to Osceola County in 2008, with her husband, Dale, and son, Jackson. She oversaw the Federal Health Resources and Services Administration, HRSA, grant and the delivery of comprehensive culturally competent healthcare and dental healthcare services to the community.

In 2012, she accepted a leadership position with the Community Health Centers, Inc., to oversee multispecialty sites serving vulnerable and underserved populations.

In 2018, she returned to the Florida Department of Health in Osceola County as the administrator. She is currently leading the agency through an

unprecedented and extended response to the COVID-19 pandemic. She and her dedicated team at the health department have worked tirelessly to maintain essential public health services during a large-scale emergency response effort.

She continues to work closely with community partners to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 in Osceola County, Florida. She is a member of the National Association of County and City Health Officials, Florida Public Health Association, Health Leadership Council, AdventHealth Kissimmee Advisory Council, and Osceola County Council on Aging board.

For this and more, Ms. Vianca McCluskey, we honor you.

HONORING RHONDA WILSON

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Rhonda Wilson.

Ms. Rhonda Wilson, who has her MS, MBA, and MS, is a victims service administrator with over 32 years of professional nonprofit criminal justice and military experience. She has earned three graduate degrees: A master of human services with a criminal justice specialization, a master of business administration, and a master of administration in justice and security.

Since 2009, Rhonda has been a leader for the Victims Service Center of Central Florida, where she has worked as a victim advocate and crisis counselor, community education coordinator, and, most recently, as an advocacy services supervisor where she oversees 10 master's level crisis counselors and interns.

Prior to her work with the Victims Service Center, Ms. Wilson proudly served in the United States Navy for 20 years, specializing in military justice. She took that knowledge and experience and, upon retiring from the Navy, served as the director of an 88-bed residential reentry center helping Federal inmates transition back into the community.

Rhonda has extensive training related to sexual assault and assisting victims of crime. She is a member of the Sexual Assault Response Team and the Florida Crisis Response Team. She was one of the initial first responders in the aftermath of the Pulse mass shooting tragedy and is often called upon to provide emotional support to law enforcement professionals when impacted by violence.

Rhonda is a respected leader and professional in the field of victim services and was recognized as Victim Advocate of the Year in 2017 by Central Florida Victim Services Network.

For this and more, Ms. Rhonda Wilson, we honor you.

HONORING ESTHER SANCHEZ COLON

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Esther Sanchez Colon.

At the age of 17, Esther Sanchez Colon began her healthcare journey as a secretary for a medical services and transport company in Puerto Rico. Her

interest was sparked through each EMS call, which offered her a chance to help a person or family in need.

She eventually became a dispatcher and discovered her passion for caring for others was her calling, not just a career focus. The paramedics she worked with encouraged her to follow that passion, and, in 2000, she became a registered nurse.

Esther Sanchez Colon now lives in Florida and is a clinical coordinator in Poinciana's Medical Center's emergency department. She has been with the hospital for more than 7 years and demonstrates exceptional leadership, both with the Poinciana ER and the Poinciana area community.

Esther serves as a pastor in her church and is currently finishing her doctorate in ministry. Specializing in both nursing and ministry has helped her be an uplifting resource for patients and their families in their time of need.

Because of her immeasurable compassion and efforts to make a positive impact in the lives of others, she received The DAISY Award for Extraordinary Nurses in 2018. Today, her dedication to helping others is stronger than ever, and she feels blessed to be of service during difficult times.

From supporting her colleagues to caring for patients and their families, she continues to excel in her role and live out the HCA healthcare mission, "Above all else, we are committed to the care and improvement of human life."

For this and more, Ms. Esther Sanchez Colon, we honor you.

HONORING BELINDA JOHNSON-CORNETT

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Belinda Johnson-Cornett, who has her MS, RN-BC, and MBA.

Ms. Belinda Johnson-Cornett is a board-certified registered nurse with years of experience in the healthcare industry as a practitioner and healthcare executive.

She has earned a master of science and master of business administration degree. She is currently pursuing a doctoral degree in business.

During the 2008 through 2017 period, she served as the administrator and health officer and chief executive officer of the combined Florida Department of Health in Osceola County and Osceola Community Health Services. She remained as chief executive officer of Osceola Community Health Services as the agency transitioned in 2017 to a private, nonprofit federally qualified health center.

Ms. Johnson-Cornett is recognized as a dedicated health advocate, having led many initiatives to increase healthcare access for uninsured and underserved populations. She is a strong supporter of decreasing health disparities by improving social determinants of health for at-risk populations.

She has worked tirelessly to advance community partner engagement in collaborative strategies to improve

healthcare access and enhance community resources.

Her leadership was the key driver in 2010 in mobilizing community partners from health, business, government, elected officials, community organizations, faith-based and involved citizenry in an Osceola Health Summit, which continues as an annual event.

Ms. Johnson-Cornett has had numerous achievements and recognitions, some of which include the National Leadership Academy for Public Health's 2012 Inaugural Leadership Program; selection as Florida's Outstanding Women in Public Health in 2014; a 2019 inaugural graduate of the National Association of County and City Health Officials Survive and Thrive Fellowship; and Osceola County's Lieutenant Lloyd Burton, Jr., Service Award in 2020.

Ms. Johnson-Cornett's leadership has brought many tangible results into Osceola County, including \$8.3 million in Federal capital improvement funding in 2011, \$5.5 million in resources for the disadvantaged minority community of Marydia, and many millions in Federal and private grant funding.

For this and more, Ms. Belinda Johnson-Cornett, we honor you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Seeing no other Members seeking recognition, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) for the remainder of the half hour, 14 minutes.

HONORING ANN CLAUSSEN

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Ann Claussen.

Ann Claussen has served in various leadership positions for 29 years in Polk County, Florida. During her career with State Farm Insurance Company, she has held many different leadership positions in the life and health company, and served as the credit union manager for 9 years, overseeing a \$240 million credit union with 1,100 members throughout the State of Florida.

In January 2014, Ms. Claussen took a leap of faith to start her new career as the CEO of Central Florida Healthcare. Serving in this role has allowed her to follow her lifelong passion for making a difference in her community by providing a patient-centered medical home to over 56,000 patients.

With growth in 14 clinics and 500 employees, Ms. Claussen's passion for serving her community is demonstrated each day by her genuine compassion to be a servant leader. With an understanding of building relationships and partnering for a healthier community, she serves on the United Way board, Junior Diabetes Research Foundation, and other boards and committees to ensure that our communities are working together in providing quality healthcare for everyone, regardless of their ability to pay.

Ms. Claussen's goal is to continue to focus on expanding healthcare and creating a positive work environment surrounded by people who share her passion for making a difference in our community.

With her caring heart, she leads by example and has been instrumental in partnering with other community leaders who have the same passion to serve.

Ann is married to Jim and has two sons, Justin and Ryan.

For this and more, Ms. Ann Claussen, we honor you.

□ 2145

HONORING JENNIE CYRAN

Mr. SOTO. In honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Jennie Cyran.

Ms. Jennie Cyran, a resident of Haines City, currently serves as a 5th grade English language arts teacher in Polk County Public Schools. She transferred schools to help overcome turnaround status and provide a consistent, quality education to all students.

She is an accomplished visionary leader with 5 years of teaching experience in Polk County. She stops at nothing to advocate for what is best for her students and teachers all over the State of Florida.

Some of Ms. Cyran's most notable accomplishments in education include being named to NPR's Best Commencement Speeches Ever list in 2014 for her graduation speech from Niagara University; being nominated for the Touchdown for Teachers award in 2010, 2011, 2014 and 2016, given by the National Football League's Buffalo Bills for dedication to the community in which she lived; the 2018 Distinguished Alumni Award from Niagara University, New York; and the Polk County Teacher of the Year award for 2019.

Since moving to Florida, she became very involved in Polk County Special Olympics and has helped coach sports such as bowling, softball, swimming, and bocce. She plays unified sports with her brother, Philip, who has autism. Unified sports gives the opportunity to teach acceptance through competitive play while mentoring athletes who have a cognitive disability so that they can build relationships with others and be more successful in everyday life. In the summer of 2018, she was named Polk County's Most Inspirational Unified Partner of the Year.

Ms. Cyran is currently completing her doctorate in educational leadership from Florida Southern College and aspires to be a principal someday. She is a living example of Rita Pearson's quote: "Every child deserves a champion: an adult who will never give up on them, who understands the power of connection and insists that they become the best they can possibly be."

For this and more, Ms. Jennie Cyran, we honor you.

HONORING AMAYA BRANNON

Mr. SOTO. In honor of Women's History Month, I would like to recognize Amaya Brannon.

Amaya Brannon is a 10-year-old resident of Auburndale, Florida, and an active, energetic, and personable young woman in the community.

She lives with her aunt Michelle and uncle Brian, along with her sisters, Shianna and Jayla. She enjoys playing soccer, dancing with her sisters, practicing Brazilian jiu-jitsu with her uncle Brian, and being active outdoors.

As a straight-A student in Code Academy in Lakeland, she participates in multiple school activities, including the Fuel Up to Play 60 program.

Amaya has aspirations of a future career in public relations or reporting, all while honing her skills as an artist. She has a heart for giving and helping others in the world.

Most recently, Amaya represented her community as the NFL PLAY 60 Super Kid Ambassador and the Good Morning America Super Bowl Kid Correspondent. She received VIP access during Super Bowl week. Throughout the week, she interviewed players from both teams, hosted a virtual Kids Play Day, was interviewed live on the Taste of the NFL show, practiced with the Buccaneers cheerleaders, and was featured during the second half the Super Bowl. Amaya also reported multiple times throughout the week about her experience live on GMA.

In her heart for helping and leading others, Amaya has pledged to eat healthy and move 60 minutes each day. Despite the unique year and even bad weather, she has been able to remain active. Amaya believes: "If you are healthy and active, you can achieve great goals in life."

For this and more, Miss Amaya Brannon, we honor you.

HONORING FRANCISCO H. DE JESUS

Mr. SOTO. In honor of National Borinqueneers Day on April 13, I would like to recognize Francisco H. De Jesus.

Francisco H. De Jesus was born on March 9, 1924, in the small town of Penuelas, Puerto Rico. In 1950, he was one of the Borinqueneers that was deployed to the Korean war on the USNS *Marine Lynx*. Francisco served for 1 year in the Korean war and then transferred to Panama for a tour as a Military Police member.

Upon completing his active service, Francisco returned to Puerto Rico, rejoining his young family in San Juan. He was an entrepreneur, pursuing numerous business ventures before establishing a very well-known men's store called Heryck's Men's Store in Caparra Terrace.

In 1976, Francisco sold his beloved store and moved his family to Orlando, Florida. For 20 years, Francisco worked for the Orange County School Board as a community liaison in the immigration department. He played a pivotal role in registering migrant families and their children to enable attendance at local schools during the year.

Francisco is a beloved husband, father of seven children, grandfather of

14, and great-grandfather of 16. He is still an avid storyteller, loves listening to music, and is great dominoes player.

Francisco recently celebrated his 97th birthday in Orlando, Florida.

For this and more, Mr. Francisco H. De Jesus, we honor you.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER KEVIN VALENCIA

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Officer Kevin Valencia of the Orlando Police Department, who was a courageous and heroic officer, a loving husband, father, son, brother, and friend.

On June 11, 2018, Officer Kevin Valencia was shot and critically injured while responding to a domestic violence call where a deranged individual took his own life after killing four children and shooting Officer Valencia.

Officer Valencia risked his life for people he didn't even know, a risk that many in the law enforcement profession take every day without question. Since that tragic night, Officer Valencia has been fighting for his life with his family by his side.

Regretfully, Officer Valencia passed away this week on March 15, 2021, after succumbing to the injuries he sustained.

Officer Kevin Valencia will be remembered by his loved ones as a hero, who selflessly gave to others and always had the best humor.

He is survived by his wife, Meghan Valencia, and their two sons, Kaleb and Kolton.

Thank you, Kevin Valencia, officer of OPD, for your great sacrifices. We mourn your passing, and may you rest in peace.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 18, 2021, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-612. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Clearing and Risk, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Exemption from Derivatives Clearing Organization Registration (RIN: 3038-AE65) received February 24, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-613. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Clearing and Risk, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's joint final rule — Customer Margin Rules Relating to Security Futures [Release No.: 34-90244; File No.: S7-09-19] (RIN: 3235-AM55) received February 25,

2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-614. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Compliance Requirements for Commodity Pool Operators on Form CPO-PQR (RIN: 3038-AE98) received February 24, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-615. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Market Participants Division, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's interim final rule — Portfolio Reconciliation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants — Revision of "Material Terms" Definition (RIN: 3038-AF08) received February 24, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-616. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Department Defense, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act contained in Defense Contract Management Agency case number 20-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); Public Law 110-161, Sec. 1517(b); (121 Stat. 2285); to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-617. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter thanking The Honorable Nancy Pelosi for requesting Department of Defense Ceremonial and logistical support for the lying in honor of U.S. Capitol Police Officer Brian D. Sicknick; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-618. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Second Maintenance Plan for the Johnstown Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0355; FRL-10016-55-Region 3] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-619. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards Second Maintenance Plan for the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2020-0316; FRL-10018-14-Region 3] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-620. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; State of Maryland; Control of Emissions from Existing Sewage Sludge Incineration Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0527; FRL-10018-21-Region 3] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-621. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans; (Negative Declarations) for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Maine and Rhode Island [EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0593; FRL-10017-79-Region 1] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-622. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Benzovindiflupyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0066 and EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0586; FRL-10017-32] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-623. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethaboxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0230; FRL-10018-73] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-624. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions; (Multiple Chemicals) [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0568; FRL-10017-55] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-625. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Illinois: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R05-RCRA-2020-0275; FRL-10017-08-Region 5] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-626. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Dumping; Modification of an Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Offshore of Humboldt Bay, California [EPA-R09-OW-2020-0188; FRL-10016-87-Region 9] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-627. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Streptomycin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0067; FRL-10017-52] received February 25, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-628. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting the March 2021 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396(b)(1)(C); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XIX, Sec. 1900 (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2801(a)(1)(A)(iv)); (123 Stat. 91); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STEIL (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 1953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit incarcerated individuals from receiving 2021 recovery rebates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Ms. TLAB, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 1954. A bill to amend the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to clarify that during a lapse in appropriations certain services relating to the Harmful Algal Bloom Operational Forecasting System are excepted services under the Anti-Deficiency Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONALDS (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 1955. A bill to temporarily modify the application of the sequester under the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1956. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 1957. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide coverage for infertility treatment and standard fertility preservation services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 1958. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the expedited removal of unaccompanied alien children who are not victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and who do not have a fear of returning to their country of nationality or last habitual residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MOULTON, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 1959. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high-quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. GAETZ, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. MAST, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. GIMENEZ):

H.R. 1960. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic, located at 400 College Drive,

Middleburg, Florida, the "A.K. Baker VA Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRENSHAW (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1961. A bill to provide procedures for appealing certain Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives rulings or determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1962. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a new employment, training, and supportive services program for unemployed and underemployed individuals, including individuals with barriers to employment and those who are unemployed or underemployed as a result of COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH (for herself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 1963. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to modify certain State uses of funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 1964. A bill to assess the State by State impact of Federal taxation and spending; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 1965. A bill to award three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protect the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 1966. A bill to require executive agencies to reduce cost-sharing requirements for certain grants with certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to grant Puerto Rico eligibility to issue commercial driver's licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the foreign insurer excise tax certain insurance policies issued by United States territory and possession insurers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1969. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to address disparity in Medicare Advantage benchmark rates for regions with low Medicare fee-for-service penetration; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions

as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 1970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of certain contributions received by charitable organizations from foreign governments and foreign political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 1971. A bill to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the local coordinating entity for the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area under subtitle B of Public Law 109-338; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARDER of California (for himself and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam to include hypertension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. NORMAN, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 1973. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Resources to submit to the Congress a report on State child care regulations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the energy investment tax credit for electrochromic glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 1975. A bill to take certain land located in San Diego County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRUJALVA, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAHELE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE,

Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1976. A bill to establish an improved Medicare for All national health insurance program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Rules, Oversight and Reform, Armed Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. FEENSTRA):

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Mr. BUCHSON):

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide information regarding vaccines for seniors as part of the Medicare & You handbook and to ensure that the treatment of cost sharing for vaccines under Medicare part D is consistent with the treatment of vaccines under Medicare part B, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BUSH, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRUJALVA):

H.R. 1979. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a corporate tax rate increase on companies whose ratio of compensation of the CEO or other highest paid employee to median worker compensation is more than 50 to 1, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois (for herself, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BARR, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H.R. 1980. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 1981. A bill to require the Comptroller General to submit a report on the transfer of student debt functions from the Department

of Education to the Department of the Treasury, including costs of such a transfer and the mitigation of the duplication of duties by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to provide grants to carry out activities to benefit pollinators on roadsides and highway rights-of-way, including the planting and seeding of native, locally-appropriate grasses and wildflowers, including milkweed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. GRJALVA, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1983. A bill to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other stakeholders to conserve and sustain the western population of monarch butterflies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1984. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for owning certain disaster resilient property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 1985. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to modernize Federal nursing home protections and to enhance care quality and transparency for nursing home residents and their families; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 1986. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate practices and strategies to reduce bird fatality resulting from collisions with certain public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 1987. 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; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself and Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1988. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to direct the President to issue an annual proclamation establishing Women's Military History Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 1989. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the time limitation for the use of entitlement by certain veterans under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 1990. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect beneficiaries with limb loss and other orthopedic conditions by providing access to appropriate, safe, effective, patient-centered orthotic and prosthetic care, to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse with respect to orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 1991. A bill to direct the Attorney General to conduct studies on child custody and divorce in domestic violence cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. SEWELL, and Ms. CHENEY):

H.R. 1992. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish programs for carbon dioxide capture, transport, utilization, and storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1993. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to provide grants for energy improvements to certain public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LONG, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. SIREs):

H.R. 1994. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review laws relating to the illegal passing of schoolbuses, execute a public safety messaging campaign related to illegal passing of schoolbuses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself and Mr. BROOKS):

H.R. 1995. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 243. A resolution removing a certain Member from a certain committee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 244. A resolution electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SIREs, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BERA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H. Res. 245. A resolution calling for renewed, decisive, and robust international collaboration and coordination to fight COVID-19 across Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 246. A resolution recognizing the 200th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. FALLON, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ROY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas):

H. Res. 247. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Congressman Ronald Wright and commending him for his devotion to the Nation and its ideals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H. Res. 248. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of March 28, 2021, through April 3, 2021, as "National Cleaning Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STEEL, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H. Res. 249. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should not impose a financial transaction tax on individuals or market intermediaries in connection with trades executed on the National Market System or alternative trading systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself and Mr. LOUDERMILK):

H. Res. 250. A resolution requiring each Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives to complete a program of emergency preparedness training during

each Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-2. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Legislative Resolution 1, expressing enthusiastic support for the United States Air Force to reestablish the United States Space Command headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base near Omaha, Nebraska; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ML-3. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, urging Congress to enact The Sunshine Protection Act of 2019, which would permanently extend daylight saving time; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. STEIL:

H.R. 1953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "To lay, and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. DONALDS:

H.R. 1954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DONALDS:

H.R. 1955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

H.R. 1956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 1957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 1958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 1960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 1961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH:

H.R. 1963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 1965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1967 .

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 1969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas:

H.R. 1970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 A

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 1971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 provides Congress with the power to "dispose of and make all needful rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. HARDER of California:

H.R. 1972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, sec. 8

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 1973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution; and

(2) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 1976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 1978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Ms. LEE of California:
H.R. 1979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. MILLER of Illinois:
H.R. 1980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:
H.R. 1981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PANETTA:
H.R. 1982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PANETTA:
H.R. 1983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 1984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:
H.R. 1985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:
H.R. 1986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:
H.R. 1987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 1988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. STEUBE:
H.R. 1989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to

Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 1990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mrs. TORRES of California:
H.R. 1991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VEASEY:
H.R. 1992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to interstate commerce)

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 1993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mrs. WALORSKI:
H.R. 1994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ZELDIN:
H.R. 1995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 18: Mr. REED.

H.R. 37: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 43: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 235: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 239: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 245: Mr. KEATING, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 333: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 340: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 350: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DAVID

SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VELA, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. PAPPAS, and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 366: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 384: Ms. BUSH.
H.R. 431: Mr. García of Illinois, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 432: Mr. SOTO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 461: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 477: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 501: Ms. BUSH.

H.R. 508: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 534: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 541: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 543: Mr. MANN.

H.R. 568: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 707: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 712: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 746: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 809: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 825: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 846: Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 852: Mr. TURNER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. RYAN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 911: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 914: Mrs. DINGELL and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 941: Mr. JONES and Mr. SWALWELL.
H.R. 1035: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1085: Mr. BABIN and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1140: Mr. KHANNA and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1145: Mr. KIND, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 1184: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1202: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 1207: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1208: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1246: Mr. GALLAGHER and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1282: Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 1289: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1328: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1332: Ms. MENG, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1344: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MENG, and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 1346: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 1352: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1362: Mr. KELLER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BOST, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1366: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 1378: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1384: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1417: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1448: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BOST, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HERN,

Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DEAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. WILD, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BENTZ, and Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 1456: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1466: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1470: Mr. CASTEN.

H.R. 1511: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1521: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 1534: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1551: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1554: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1577: Ms. WILD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms.

VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 1585: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1593: Mr. BACON and Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 1594: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1620: Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. MCBATH, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1623: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1624: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1626: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 1646: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1655: Ms. ESCOBAR and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1676: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. HAYES, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 1680: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1699: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1716: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1722: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1729: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1735: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1758: Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 1761: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1770: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1793: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1801: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1808: Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 1814: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WILD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 1819: Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1827: Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 1830: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1843: Ms. OMAR, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. CORREA, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1861: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1868: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1888: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1892: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MANN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1893: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 1895: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KATKO, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 1901: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1905: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1934: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1935: Mr. ROY and Mr. BABIN.

H.J. Res. 17: Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 118: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. PALMER, Mr. STEIL, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DONALDS.

H. Res. 119: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. DEAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 127: Mr. BENTZ and Ms. VAN DUYN.

H. Res. 139: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 151: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H. Res. 153: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.

H. Res. 171: Ms. PINGREE.

H. Res. 205: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H. Res. 216: Ms. HERRELL.

H. Res. 241: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

PT-3. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Redlands, CA, relative to Resolution No. 8159, urging the United States Congress to enact the Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act (H.R. 763); which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 2021

No. 50

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 16, 2021)

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable MARTIN HEINRICH, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Father in Heaven, bless our Senators. May they strive to act with integrity. Guide them to listen to the voice of conscience, seeking to please You with their motives as well as their actions. Lord, give them such ethical congruence that their words will be validated by laudable actions. Test their hearts with Your unfailing love, empowering them to become instruments of Your peace. Mighty God, keep their feet on solid ground.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARTIN HEINRICH, a

Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

PPP EXTENSION ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a second, I will move the PPP bill to the floor. I hope—and I ask our Republican colleagues to cooperate—that we can move this bipartisan PPP proposal without delay. It passed the House overwhelmingly. A vast majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for it. I hope we can move it quickly here in the Senate as it expires on March 31, and there are some changes that were made in the ARP that people need time to adapt to and implement. To allow a lapse would not be the right thing to do for so many of our small business people across the country. So I am hoping that our Republican colleagues will move the bill with the same alacrity with which it passed in the House with an overwhelmingly bipartisan majority. I think there were fewer than 10 votes against it.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1799

Mr. SCHUMER. With that, Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill

at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1799) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

GEORGIA SHOOTINGS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now let me proceed to my remarks.

First, on the terrible tragedy in Georgia, the people of Atlanta, GA, and the surrounding communities were just shocked last night by a series of shootings that left eight people dead, six of whom were of Asian descent.

The motivations behind this devastating tragedy are still unknown, but there is a legitimate concern that these killings may have been racially motivated. Over the past year, the Asian-American community has faced a rising tide of abuse and violence in the wake of COVID-19, driven by ignorance, by misinformation, and by age-old prejudices against the Asian-American community. Tragically, hate crimes against Asian Americans have skyrocketed.

There is bigotry in the land and far too much of it. These dark forces have always existed in America, but, recently, they seem to have been unleashed. The sort of superego that puts

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1577

these things down seems to have weakened, and the id seems to have strengthened.

We cannot lose for a moment our vigilance against these forces of hate, intolerance, bigotry, and discrimination.

I love the Asian American community. They have done so much for America. I see it in my borough of Brooklyn, in my city and State of New York, and throughout the country—hard-working people, people who do so much for our country at every level. They are welcome here. That is America. Yet, bigots have increased hate crimes and maybe even possibly led to the deaths of these people.

So I hope that all Americans first will realize that there is too much hate in the land, that hate against one group is hate against any group, and we should all, Americans of every background and race and creed, color, and religion, gender, and sexual orientation, band together against the haters. It is so un-American.

E pluribus unum—out of many, one. That is what America has always been. That is what America must continue to be, and our voices must speak out.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Second, on nominations, the Senate is once again making excellent progress this week confirming President Biden's nominees. We began the week by confirming a history-making Cabinet member, Interior Secretary Haaland. Yesterday, we confirmed Isabel Guzman as the SBA Administrator. Today, we will confirm another consequential administrative appointment, the U.S. Trade Representative.

President Biden has named Katherine Tai, the daughter of proud immigrants from Taiwan, a veteran of the Office of the Trade Representative under President Obama, and one of our country's most seasoned experts in international trade. That—Ms. Tai—is what America is all about.

We welcome her. We give her a great position of authority because of her expertise. And maybe—you know, I will leave it at that. It is a great contrast to the tragedy I was talking about a few minutes ago and the ascension of another proud American of Asian ancestry here.

As U.S. Trade Representative, Ms. Tai will play a crucial role in enforcing existing trade deals and making sure that American workers, businesses, and researchers can compete on a level playing field. She will be an essential player in restoring America's credibility with our trading partners and promoting international cooperation to tackle some of the world's biggest problems, from the global pandemic to climate change.

I have not a single doubt that Ms. Tai is the right person for the job, and I look forward to the Senate giving her a well-deserved promotion later today.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Now on S. 1, democracy reform, today Senate Democrats are introducing the No. 1 bill of the 117th Congress, S. 1, to stand up to voter suppression, end dark money in politics, and reinvigorate American democracy in the 21st century.

Make no mistake, democracy reform must be a top priority of this Congress, and I will put S. 1, the For the People Act, on the floor of the Senate.

For too long, we have let really important parts of our democracy wither. Unlimited dark money flows into campaigns. Special interests have way too much influence in Washington. And worst of all, there is a concerted, nationwide effort to limit the right of American citizens, particularly people of color, to vote.

Throughout America's history, we have seen a continuous cycle of expansions in our democracy being met all too often by vehement backlash from those who wish to maintain an exclusionary status quo.

Earlier this year, we witnessed only the latest example in the form of a violent insurrection right here in this Chamber, right here in this Capitol, an attack fueled by the insidious lies of the former President aimed at overturning the results of a free and fair election.

In the wake of the November election, one of the safest and most secure in American history, dozens of Republican-led State legislatures have seized on the former President's big lie and introduced hundreds of bills aimed at tightening voting rules under the nasty guise—the nasty, malicious, and false guise—of election integrity. These bills, sadly, are aimed at Americans of color—Black Americans, Latinos, Native Americans.

Despicable efforts to target these historically disenfranchised communities have become a central component of the electoral strategy of one of America's major political parties. Shame on them. Shame. It is infuriating. Infuriating. When you lose an election, you are supposed to win over the people you lost, not stop them from voting. That is un-American, autocratic, and against the fundamentals of our democracy, but this is happening in States all across the country—all across the country.

Maybe the most reprehensible effort is underway in Georgia, where State Republicans are trying to limit absentee and mail-in voting, make it harder to post a ballot by drop box, and disallowing early voting on Sunday, a day when many churchgoing African Americans participate in voter drives. Does anyone on the other side of the aisle think taking away Sunday voting in Georgia is not bigoted? What is the rationale? Stop it, if you want to stand for equality and justice.

Our country has supposedly come a long way since African Americans in the South were forced to guess the number of jellybeans in a jar in order

to vote. But some of these voter suppression laws in Georgia and other Republican States smack of Jim Crow in the 21st century rearing its ugly head once again.

These laws and their various cousins in Republican State legislatures across the country are collectively one of the greatest threats to modern American democracy. According to a recent report in the Washington Post, these laws could strain every available method of voting for tens of millions of Americans, potentially amounting to the most sweeping contraction of ballot access in the United States since the end of Reconstruction, when Southern States curtailed the voting rights of formerly enslaved Black men.

If one party believes "heads we win; tails you cheated"; if one political party believes that when you lose an election, the answer isn't to win more votes but, rather, to prevent the other side from voting, then we have serious and existential threats to our democracy on our hands.

This is no political dispute. It goes way beyond that to the core—the core—of what America is all about. That is why we need S. 1 so badly, a bill that would combat all of these voter suppression efforts by restoring critical parts of the Voting Rights Act; a bill that would make it easier, not harder, to vote by automatically registering American voters when they get a driver's license; a bill that would limit dark money and corruption in our politics and much more.

There are a lot of problems in our country—healthcare and climate change and income inequality—but we designed a democracy that would allow competing interests in our country to come together and agree on solutions. If our democracy doesn't work, we have no hope of solving any of our other problems.

S. 1 is going to be a top priority this Congress. We will fight and fight and fight to get this done legislatively. Failure is not an option. Too darn much is at stake.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Now on the American Rescue Plan, I would like to continue shining a spotlight on different aspects of ARP. The legislation helped so many people and so much of the country, it is easy to forget many crucial parts of the bill. So later today, I will be joining my dear friend Representative VELÁZQUEZ from New York to talk about how the American Rescue Plan helps Puerto Rico, which is too often an afterthought in Federal legislation.

The American Rescue Plan will do three historic things for the people of Puerto Rico, American citizens all.

First, it will deliver Federal dollars to the island's earned income tax credit for low-wage workers for the first time ever.

Second, it will expand eligibility for residents to claim the child tax credit. Prior to the ARP, only families with three or more children in Puerto Rico could claim the child tax credit. Why those American citizens were treated differently than all the others was beyond me and strikes me as nasty. But now every family can.

Third, the ARP bill will add \$1 billion—\$1 billion—in food assistance. Residents of American territories don't receive traditional food assistance programs like those in the United States, such as the SNAP program, but instead their governments receive block grants that have been capped by the Federal Government.

The American Rescue Plan makes sure that Puerto Rico, which suffers devastating rates of poverty, 43 percent, and especially childhood poverty—an unacceptable 57 percent of all the children in Puerto Rico live in poverty. So we want to make sure that Puerto Rico receives its fair share of Federal food assistance.

The American Rescue Plan may be the greatest anti-poverty effort in a generation, and we make sure that Puerto Rico is part of it.

Now let me turn my attention to schools. One of most enduring images of the COVID-19 pandemic will be the empty classroom. For 12 months, teachers have done their level best to keep their students engaged with remote learning, but there have been incredible difficulties. Too many students don't have reliable internet. Too many parents can't be there to help young kids log on and keep up with their work. Simply put, there is no replacement for having kids in the classroom. We need to get our schools to reopen as quickly and as safely as possible.

Now, my Republican colleagues have made a lot of noise about reopening our schools, but they don't want to dedicate any resources to actually getting it done. We need money to do this. There are many more expenses under COVID.

Through the American Rescue Plan, Senate Democrats delivered the single largest investment in American education ever. We are proud of that. Proud. Let me say it again. Through the American Rescue Plan, Senate Democrats delivered the single largest investment in American education ever—ever—\$170 billion to repair the damage caused by this pandemic, three-quarters of which will go directly to K-12 education, prioritizing school districts that need it the most. This will help schools update ventilation, hire more nurses and janitors, make classroom sizes smaller, and make getting kids to and from school safe.

In short, the American Rescue Plan will greatly accelerate the safe and effective reopening of schools. Once kids are back in the classroom, the American Rescue Plan will help make sure they can stay there and succeed. After what has been a lost year for too many

students, this bill provides significant support for learning recovery programs—afterschool programs, summer school programs, and other resources to help kids catch up and get back on track.

Through the American Rescue Plan, we have made a life-changing investment in our students. It is one of the many ways this bill will help us recover from the crisis and come back stronger than ever before.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Last week, our Democratic colleagues had to resort to a rare tactic to rescue the stalled nomination of Xavier Becerra to run the Department of Health and Human Services.

The distinguishing feature of this nominee's resume is not his expertise in health, medicine, or administration. That part of the resume is very brief. What stands out are Mr. Becerra's commitments to partisan warfare and his far-left ideology.

He has supported the sweeping government takeover of healthcare they call "Medicare for All," which would actually end Medicare as we know it and would rip away families' private insurance plans.

As the administration's policies continue to create a border crisis, Mr. Becerra is someone who believes we should not just have blanket amnesty, but that entering the country illegally should not even be a crime.

And even amid a global pandemic, the most significant health-related experience on the nominee's record is his efforts to wield the legal system against religious Sisters to make them violate their faith and conscience.

Up to now, every person who has ever been confirmed as Secretary of Health and Human Services has either been favorably reported by the Finance Committee or discharged by unanimous consent. There is ample reason why this nominee would be a glaring exception.

I continue to urge a "no" vote.

NOMINATION OF KATHERINE C. TAI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, fortunately, the Senate will first be confirming a thoroughly qualified nominee to be the new administration's top trade official.

Katherine Tai is just the kind of qualified and mainstream person who is positioned to serve President Biden

and the country quite well. That is why she received broad bipartisan support from the Finance Committee and why the vote to advance her nomination yesterday was 98 to 0.

I look forward to working with Ms. Tai to embrace trade and push back on abusive practices from China and other anticompetitive countries.

Trade is a huge strength of America. It drives job creation and economic growth. Just look at my home State, for example. Exports support more than 140,000 jobs in Kentucky. Hard-working Kentuckians supply nearly 200 countries with everything from agricultural goods to medicines, to aerospace parts and motor vehicles.

In the last Congress, we modernized our trade with our neighbors to the north and south through the USMCA. We gave Kentucky farmers, workers, and consumers a long-awaited boost.

But our job creators still face unfair barriers, including those targeting American spirits. The Bluegrass is proud to craft 95 percent of the world's bourbon, but, currently, tariffs put Kentucky distillers at a disadvantage in their largest export markets.

Ms. Tai should address these unfair international headwinds facing Kentuckians. I would encourage her to focus on expanding markets and reducing barriers for products and services from all 50 States.

Americans would welcome the growth in opportunity and prosperity. And, if you ask me, the whole world could benefit from a little more Kentucky bourbon.

CHINA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, tomorrow, the Secretary of State and the President's National Security Advisor will have their first face-to-face meeting with Chinese officials. I am glad our officials met with regional allies like Japan and South Korea right beforehand and have been in touch with Australia and European allies as well. It is essential that we and our friends present a united front.

Now, the United States and the whole world need the President's team to deliver a strong message tomorrow.

During the campaign, President Biden spoke dismissively about the threat from China. But thus far, in office, his team has shown signs they understand that Communist China threatens America, our allies, and the prevailing international system.

The world spent years presuming that welcoming China into the international community would inevitably cause its rulers to play by the rules. Twenty years ago, President Clinton said: "[E]conomic innovation and political empowerment . . . will inevitably go hand in hand." But since then, rather than the rest of the world exporting liberty and transparency into China, Beijing has found more success exporting authoritarianism and corruption beyond its borders.

In Japan, on Tuesday, Secretary Blinken called out the “coercion and aggression” that China deploys at home and abroad. He said this administration will push back on Beijing. That clear-eyed talk is certainly welcome, but it is just the first step.

Walking the walk will mean actually responding in tough ways to espionage and cyber attacks, to violations of human rights, to military bullying, to stealing intellectual property and cheating on trade. If the administration is up to the task, they will find strong partners in this Republican conference.

Here is one big test: Are they willing to keep investing in our own defense?

Our financial commitment to defending America is our most important policy lever in this competition with China. Our allies and adversaries do not heed American Presidents because they are charming or good-looking. The world has respected America for our overwhelming military and economic superiority. When that edge erodes, we invite trouble.

As a share of our economy, American defense spending has fallen significantly, not just from Cold War-era heights but even just recently. Meanwhile, China used its growing prosperity to modernize its military, develop new and longer range weapons to hold U.S. forces at risk from further away, and turn a particular eye towards space and cyber space.

Defense spending is about protecting our homeland. It is about projecting power. It is about preserving global influence, supporting our allies. It is really a barometer of our national will.

It is also about innovation and the future. Many life-changing innovations throughout our economy were first rooted in military R&D.

Unfortunately, reports suggest the Biden administration may plan to freeze defense spending. Of course, that means a reduction, after inflation. Dozens of Democrats are pressuring the administration for even steeper cuts than that. If the administration is serious about competing with China, deterring Russia, and preserving American leadership, the most important test will be in the President’s budget submission.

Some of our Senate Democratic colleagues have expressed interest in crafting bipartisan legislation related to China. If any issue is ripe for a regular-order, bipartisan process, it would be that one.

Defense spending is the crucial first step, but there are a whole variety of subjects concerning our competition with China that could benefit from a serious look.

There is bipartisan support for improving security reviews of foreign investment and protecting against forced technology transfer, for cracking down on Chinese espionage and political influence campaigns, for supporting the people of Hong Kong, and human rights, and deterring aggression against Taiwan. There is bipartisan

support for fostering specific industries of national-security importance, such as semiconductors, and for broadly strengthening American R&D.

There is an opportunity for fruitful discussion here. Certainly, this is an area where bipartisanship will be especially crucial, so strategies don’t change schizophrenically with every election. As one of our Democratic colleagues said in a hearing yesterday, “the U.S. will not out-compete China . . . with short-term legislation and never-ending uncertainty.”

That is another great argument for not trashing the legislative filibuster. Imagine if every action the Senate takes with national security implications were constantly subject to being wiped clean. While China plans years and decades at a time, our Federal legislation would be reduced to a shelf life of a couple years.

These issues need to be addressed thoughtfully and deliberately. Identifying critical technologies and the best ways to promote and protect advancements needs to be a smart, fact-based process, not a political guessing game or throwing cash at industries with the right connections.

Our work on this front should strengthen our ties with our allies and partners, not try in vain to simply go it alone.

And the Democratic majority must resist the temptation to pile a long list of unrelated policy wishes into a big package and try to label it “China policy.” It would be quite a remarkable coincidence if our Democratic colleagues’ vision for a so-called China bill ends up being indistinguishable from a list of things that just happen to delight liberal interest groups.

Getting America on a stronger footing will not require some sweeping far-left transformation of our economy. It will mean continuing to complement the principles and ideas that are our greatest strengths, and it will mean working on these issues the right way, across the aisle.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

TRIBUTE TO ERIC FELDMAN

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to an extraordinary public servant and Michigander, Eric Feldman.

Since my first days serving in the U.S. House of Representatives more than 12 years ago, Eric has served as my chief of staff. I still vividly remember him coming to my home just a couple of weeks after my election to interview for the chief of staff position.

I was immediately impressed by his extensive knowledge of American politics and his passion to serve the people of the State of Michigan.

But to fully know Eric is to know his family’s story and how it shaped the man he is. All four of his grandparents survived the Holocaust. His maternal grandmother was imprisoned in Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen, among others. His maternal grandfather was in a forced labor camp in Plaszow. His grandparents met and married in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. They were liberated from there and remained after it was converted to a displaced persons camp following World War II. That camp is where Eric’s mother was born.

His grandparents and mother immigrated in 1949 to Detroit, where his grandfather worked as a janitor at Ford Motor Company during the day and worked as a tailor at night. His mother won a full scholarship to the University of Michigan from Ford Motor Company as part of a program for employees.

Eric’s paternal grandparents fled Poland on the eve of the Nazi German invasion. They survived the war as slave laborers in Siberia, where Eric’s father was born. Following the war, they immigrated to Israel before settling in Detroit. Eric’s father went to Wayne State University, thanks to the GI bill, after serving honorably in the U.S. Air Force.

After immigrating to Detroit, Eric’s family worked hard, and they were able to achieve the American dream. There is no question that their life experience and their journey instilled in Eric a sense of service and devotion to country.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I was fortunate to have Eric on my team. He brought with him extensive political and policy experience, having worked for Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, Leader NANCY PELOSI, and Rahm Emanuel. He built on that experience, leading our office with steady, unwavering leadership, brilliant vision, and wise counsel.

Through four reelections—including my election to the Senate and reelection last year—and many crises impacting Michigan and our country, I entrusted Eric to help ensure that we were able to come together, solve tough problems, and ultimately deliver results. He never flinched. I could always count on Eric to work with our team to develop creative ideas to tackle challenges or empower staff to make

sure that we were on the leading edge of issues critical to Michigan.

He has guided my office through countless high-profile events and crises: the great recession and auto crisis, the Flint water crisis, several government shutdowns, the COVID-19 pandemic, the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol, and two impeachment trials. Through it all, Eric has provided stability and focus—a focus on working in a bipartisan manner to pass important legislation and to make progress for Michigan and for our entire country.

Last week, I was humbled to be recognized by the Center for Effective Lawmaking as the most effective Senator in the 116th Congress. Recognition of this sort does not happen without having an incredible team. Eric played a critical role in helping me enact 10 bills into law—the most of any Senator from either party over the last 2 years.

And I know that Eric will tell you, without a doubt, that there is no “I” in team. As a leader, Eric has focused on hiring talented staff, both in DC and across Michigan, staff that humbly, selflessly, and effectively serve the people of Michigan each and every day. With Eric’s laser focus on what is best for Michigan, together with our team, we have secured record funding to protect the Great Lakes, worked to increase security at our Nation’s borders, expanded apprenticeships and skills training, saved taxpayer dollars, and made the Federal Government more efficient, all the while standing up for Michigan workers, including those working in our auto industry.

Eric is always on the leading edge, and he has distinguished himself through his work with Michigan’s auto manufacturers and automotive stakeholders. In particular, Eric has helped drive policy efforts focused on innovation and emerging technologies so that in the near future, self-driving vehicles will not only be safely deployed and save thousands of lives on our highways but also be developed and built in Michigan and in the United States, creating good-paying jobs for the next generation of workers.

At every step of the way, through all of his hard work, Eric has carried himself with his characteristic enthusiasm and passion. It is only fitting, as an alum of the University of Michigan and a fervent—very fervent—Wolverine fan, he has, and I quote, an “enthusiasm unknown to mankind.” Whether it is policy, politics, casework, or an issue important to constituents, there is no doubt that Eric approaches it with keen interest and with high energy and that he will think through every single possible angle.

But Eric has been much more than just a chief aide. Colleen and I feel incredibly fortunate not only for all that Eric has done to lead my office and deliver for the people of Michigan; we count on him as a confidant and a dear friend.

Eric, you will be missed dearly as you depart for your next endeavor in

the private sector. But I am grateful for what you have built, and I know that it will endure—a culture of teamwork, hard work, productivity, and a commitment to what is best for Michiganders.

Eric, Colleen and I know that you have devoted countless hours to a job that you love while balancing the two most important roles in your life: being a loving husband and a father. I have been proud to watch you celebrate many of life’s milestones over the years, including the birth of your two beloved sons, and I will certainly never forget your eldest son Avi’s birthday on November 4, 2014, the day Michiganders elected me to the U.S. Senate.

Eric, Colleen and I wish you much success, and we hope you enjoy this next chapter with Dena, Avi, and Ethan. Know that Colleen and I will always be thankful beyond measure for your service and for your leadership and that you will forever be part of Team PETERS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

(The remarks of Mr. THUNE pertaining to the introduction of S. 797 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote is called.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. And for the information of the Senators, I will speak for about 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thank you.

GEORGIA SHOOTING

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would like to start by taking a moment to address the awful violence we saw in Georgia yesterday.

Everyone, especially elected officials, needs to not just speak out but to act against this deadly display of hate.

To the victims and their families and to the Asian-American and Pacific-Islander community in Washington State and nationwide, my heart is with you not just today but going forward. I will continue sending a strong message that hate against you must stop, and I will keep working to ensure your safety in light of the terrible surge in hate crimes we have seen in our State and across the country.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Now, Madam President, I rise today to voice my strong support for Attorney General Becerra to serve as Secretary of Health and Human Services.

After 4 years of attacks on families’ healthcare from President Trump,

after a year of this pandemic ravaging our Nation, the challenges that lie ahead of us, especially when it comes to healthcare, are numerous; they are enormous; and they are absolutely urgent.

The uninsured rate, the drug prices, and healthcare costs have all skyrocketed. Confidence in our public health agencies have plummeted. Already painful health inequities have grown deeper. And this pandemic has absolutely devastated communities and pushed our healthcare system to the brink.

COVID-19 has killed over a half a million people, and that number continues to rise. When it comes to the hard work ahead to not only end this pandemic but rebuild a stronger and fairer country, it is clear we need an experienced leader at the Department of Health and Human Services. It is clear we don’t have a second to waste, and it is clear Attorney General Becerra is the right pick for this job.

His track record shows he has the convictions and the qualifications for the task at hand. As a Member of Congress for over two decades, he has proven himself a skilled legislator who understands healthcare policy. As attorney general of one of the Nation’s largest justice departments, he has proven himself as a leader capable of heading a complex Department like HHS. And throughout all of his work, he has proven himself as a champion for patients and public health.

In Congress, he worked to help more people get quality, affordable healthcare by passing the Children’s Health Insurance Program and the Affordable Care Act. In California, he has fought in court to defend the Affordable Care Act and time and time again has gone to court to fight for patients, like when he won a \$70 million settlement from pharmaceutical companies for blocking cheaper generic drugs from market, when he won a settlement from opioid manufacturers behind the addiction crisis and joined a bipartisan investigation into whether opioids were unlawfully marketed, when he sued e-cigarette companies from marketing tobacco products to children and led a bipartisan effort with the Republican attorney general of Nebraska to protect kids from tobacco imagery, or when he worked to investigate companies and hold them accountable for putting workers at risk by failing to follow COVID-19 safety measures.

Attorney General Becerra has also worked to acknowledge and address issues driving inequities in healthcare. As leader of California’s Department of Justice, he fought in court against the Trump administration rule that undermined care for the LGBTQ community, against the administration’s constant efforts to undermine reproductive healthcare and against its blatant disregard for the well-being of migrant children.

Attorney General Becerra also established a new Bureau of Disability

Rights at his department, as well as a new office focused on environmental justice, including how pollution and public health hazards disproportionately hurt communities of color.

Overall, his record tells a story that is clear, compelling, and persuasive. He has fought against pharmaceutical companies, opioid manufacturers, tobacco companies and polluters and for more affordable, quality healthcare for every patient.

I have no doubt as Secretary that he will put special interests on notice and put patients and public health first and put science, data, and experts back in the driver's seat. And he would also bring an important perspective to this role as a first-generation college student and the first Latino Secretary of Health and Human Services.

He is exactly the kind of leader we need to make sure we make good on the promise of the historic investments we made in the American Rescue Plan to end this pandemic—investments to rapidly scale up testing and tracing and sequencing so we can identify new strains of COVID and slow the spread; investments to quickly and equitably get vaccines into arms, an effort that requires not just making vaccines available but breaking down barriers to access, promoting vaccine confidence, fighting misinformation, and engaging community partners; investments to build our public health infrastructure and recruit and train 100,000 public healthcare workers.

He will also be a valuable partner to Congress as we work to address challenges that predate this pandemic but have been made all the more urgent, like rooting out systemic racism and addressing inequities in our healthcare system, which have made this pandemic so much more damaging and deadly for communities of color; like addressing the mental healthcare crisis, which the trauma of this pandemic has made so much worse; like fighting the opioid epidemic, a crisis which was deadlier than ever this past year; and like expanding access to quality affordable childcare, which has become more difficult for families to get during this pandemic.

When this pandemic is over, we will need a strong leader at the Department to deal with the aftermath and with so many other outstanding issues: bringing down prescription drugs prices; making sure healthcare in this country is truly a right, not a privilege; undoing 4 years of attacks on reproductive rights and ensuring every woman can get reproductive healthcare, regardless of their race or income or ZIP Code or disability; lowering our unconscionably high maternal mortality rate; reversing the alarming trend of rising youth tobacco use; and ensuring the Office of Refugee Resettlement is upholding its welfare mission by prioritizing the well-being of every child in its care, ensuring they are treated with decency and humanity and kindness; and working to place

children with suitable sponsors quickly and safely.

We have our work cut out for us, but in Attorney General Becerra, we have a Secretary of Health who is up to the job. He has the support not only of Democrats but of Republicans, as the Republican attorneys general of both Louisiana and Tennessee have spoken highly of their experiences working with him.

I urge every Senator who wants the Biden-Harris administration to succeed at ending this pandemic quickly, keeping our families safe, and ensuring everyone can get quality affordable healthcare to join me in voting to confirm him.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON TAI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tai nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. 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. KELLY assumed the Chair.)

(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hagerty	Portman
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warnock
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Hirono Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 37, Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Charles E. Schumer, Chris Van Hollen, Michael F. Bennet, Jack Reed, Tammy Duckworth, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Patrick J. Leahy, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Ron Wyden, Robert Menendez, Richard J. Durbin, Martin Heinrich, Maria Cantwell.

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 Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	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	

NAYS—49

Barrasso	Cotton	Hagerty
Blackburn	Cramer	Hawley
Blunt	Crapo	Hoeven
Boozman	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Braun	Daines	Inhofe
Burr	Ernst	Johnson
Capito	Fischer	Kennedy
Cassidy	Graham	Lankford
Cornyn	Grassley	Lee

Lummis	Romney	Thune
Marshall	Rounds	Tillis
McConnell	Rubio	Toomey
Moran	Sasse	Tuberville
Murkowski	Scott (FL)	Wicker
Paul	Scott (SC)	Young
Portman	Shelby	
Risch	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—1

Hirono

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 50, the nays 49.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, before I begin my formal remarks, I want to pause to condemn the hatred and violence that took eight precious lives last night in Metropolitan Atlanta.

I agree with Georgians, with Americans, with people of love all across the world. This unspeakable violence visited largely upon the Asian community is one that causes all of us to recommit ourselves to the way of peace, an active peace that prevents these kinds of tragedies from happening in the first place.

We pray for these families.

Mr. President, I rise here today, as a proud American and as one of the newest Members of the Senate, in awe of the journey that has brought me to these hallowed Halls and with an abiding sense of reverence and gratitude for the faith and sacrifices of ancestors who paved the way.

I am a proud son of the great State of Georgia, born and raised in Savannah, a coastal city known for its cobblestone streets and verdant town squares. Towering oak trees, centuries old and covered in gray Spanish moss, stretched from one side of the street to the other, bend and beckon the lover of history and horticulture to this city by the sea.

I was educated at Morehouse College, and I still serve in the pulpit of the Ebenezer Baptist Church, both in Atlanta, the cradle of the civil rights movement. And so like those oak trees in Savannah, my roots go down deep, and they stretch wide in the soil of Waycross, GA, and Burke County, and Screven County. In a word, I am Georgia, a living example and embodiment of its history and its hope, of its pain and promise, the brutality and possibility.

At the time of my birth, Georgia's two Senators were Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge, both arch segregationists and unabashed adversaries of the civil rights movement.

After the Supreme Court's landmark *Brown v. Board* ruling outlawing school segregation, Talmadge warned

that "blood will run in the streets of Atlanta."

Senator Talmadge's father, Eugene Talmadge, former Governor of our State, had famously declared: "The South loves the Negro in his place, but his place is at the back door."

When once asked how he and his supporters might keep Black people away from the polls, he picked up a scrap of paper and wrote a single word on it: "Pistols."

Yet there is something in the American covenant, in its charter documents and its Jeffersonian ideals, that bends toward freedom. And led by a preacher and a patriot named King, Americans of all races stood up. History vindicated the movement that sought to bring us closer to our ideals, to lengthen and strengthen the cords of our democracy, and I now hold the seat—the Senate seat—where Herman E. Talmadge sat.

That is why I love America. I love America because we always have a path to make it better, to build a more perfect Union. It is the place where a kid like me, who grew up in public housing, the first college graduate in my family, can now stand as a United States Senator.

I had an older father. He was born in 1917. Serving in the Army during World War II, he was once asked to give up his seat to a young teenager while wearing his soldier's uniform, as they said, "making the world safe for democracy." But he was never bitter. By the time I came along, he had already seen the arc of change in our country. He maintained his faith in God and in his family and in the American promise, and he passed that faith on to his children.

My mother grew up in Waycross, GA. Do you know where that is? It is way 'cross Georgia. Like a lot of Black teenagers in the 1950s, she spent her summers picking somebody else's tobacco and somebody else's cotton. But because this is America, the 82-year-old hands that used to pick somebody else's cotton went to the polls in January and picked her youngest son to be a United States Senator. Ours is a land where possibility is born of democracy: a vote, a voice, a chance to help determine the direction of the country and one's own destiny within it—possibility born of democracy.

That is why this past November and January, my mom and other citizens of Georgia grabbed hold of that possibility and turned out in record numbers, 5 million in November, 4.5 million in January—far more than ever in our State's history. Turnout for a typical runoff doubled, and the people of Georgia sent their first African-American Senator and first Jewish Senator, my brother JON OSSOFF, to these hallowed Halls.

But then, what happened? Some politicians did not approve of the choice made by the majority of voters in a hard-fought election in which each side got the chance to make its case to the

voters. And rather than adjusting their agenda, rather than changing their message, they are busy trying to change the rules. We are witnessing right now a massive and unabashed assault on voting rights, unlike anything we have ever seen since the Jim Crow era. This is Jim Crow with new clothes.

Since the January election, some 250 voter suppression bills have been introduced by State legislatures all across the country, from Georgia to Arizona, from New Hampshire to Florida, using the big lie of voter fraud as a pretext for voter suppression—the same big lie that led to a violent insurrection on this very Capitol the day after my election. Within 24 hours, we elected Georgia's first African-American and Jewish Senators, and hours later the Capitol was assaulted. You see in just a few precious hours the tension very much alive in the soul of America. The question before all of us at every moment is, What will we do to push us in the right direction?

So politicians, driven by that big lie, aim to severely limit and in some cases eliminate automatic and same-day voter registration, mail-in and absentee voting, and early voting and weekend voting. They want to make it easier to purge voters from the voting roll altogether. As a voting rights activist, I have seen up close just how draconian these measures can be. I hail from a State that purged 200,000 voters from the rolls one Saturday night in the middle of the night. We know what is happening here. Some people don't want some people to vote.

I was honored on a few occasions to stand with our hero and my parishioner, John Lewis. I was his pastor, but I am clear: He was my mentor. On more than one occasion, we boarded buses together after Sunday church services as part of our Souls to the Polls program, encouraging the Ebenezer Church family and other communities of faith to participate in the democratic process. Now, just a few months after Congressman Lewis's death, there are those in the Georgia legislature—some who even dared to praise his name—that are now trying to get rid of Sunday Souls to the Polls, making it a crime for people who pray together to get on a bus together in order to vote together. I think that is wrong. As a matter of fact, I think that a vote is a kind of prayer for the kind of world we desire for ourselves and for our children, and our prayers are stronger when we pray together.

To be sure, we have seen these kinds of voter suppression tactics before. They are part of a long and shameful history in Georgia and throughout our Nation. But refusing to be denied, Georgia citizens and citizens across our country braved the heat and the cold and the rain, some standing in line for 5 hours, 6 hours, 10 hours just to exercise their constitutional right to vote— young people, old people, sick people, working people already underpaid and forced to lose wages to pay a kind of

poll tax while standing in line to vote. And how do some politicians respond? Well, they are trying to make it a crime to give people water and a snack as they wait in lines that are obviously being made longer by their draconian actions.

Think about that. Think about that. They are the ones making the lines longer through these draconian actions. And then they want to make it a crime to bring grandma some water while she is waiting in a line that they are making longer. Make no mistake, this is democracy in reverse. Rather than voters being able to pick the politicians, the politicians are trying to cherry-pick their voters. I say this cannot stand.

And so I rise, Mr. President, because that sacred and noble idea—one person, one vote—is being threatened right now. Politicians in my home State and all across America, in their craven lust for power, have launched a full-fledged assault on voting rights. They are focused on winning at any cost, even the cost of democracy itself. I submit that it is the job of each citizen to stand up for the voting rights of every citizen. And it is the job of this body to do all that it can to defend the viability of our democracy.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the For the People Act, which we introduced today. The For the People Act is a major step in the march toward our Democratic ideals, making it easier, not harder, for eligible Americans to vote by instituting common-sense, pro-democracy reforms, like establishing national automatic voter registration for every eligible citizen and allowing all Americans to register to vote online and on election day; requiring States to offer at least 2 weeks of early voting, including weekends, in Federal elections, keeping Souls to the Polls programs alive; prohibiting States from restricting a person's ability to vote absentee or by mail; and preventing States from purging the voting rolls based solely on unreliable evidence like someone's voting history, something we have seen in Georgia and other States in recent years. And it would end the dominance of Big Money in our politics and ensure our public servants are there serving the public.

Amidst these voter suppression laws and tactics, including partisan and racial gerrymandering, and in a system awash in dark money and the dominance of corporate interests and politicians who do their bidding, the voices of the American people have been increasingly drowned out and crowded out and squeezed out of their own democracy. We must pass For the People so that the people might have a voice. Your vote is your voice, and your voice is your human dignity. But not only that, we must pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

You know, voting rights used to be a bipartisan issue. The last time the voting rights bill was reauthorized was 2006. George W. Bush was President,

and it passed this Chamber 98 to 0. But then, in its 2013 decision, the Supreme Court rejected the successful formula for supervision and preclearance contained in the 1965 Voting Rights Act. They asked Congress to fix it. That was nearly 8 years ago, and the American people are still waiting. Stripped of protections, voters in States with a long history of voter discrimination and voters in many other States have been thrown to the winds.

We Americans have noisy and spirited debates about many things, and we should. That is what it means to live in a free country. But access to the ballot ought to be nonpartisan. I submit that there should be 100 votes in this Chamber for policies that will make it easier for Americans to make their voices heard in our democracy. Surely, there ought to be at least 60 in this Chamber who believe, as I do, that the four most powerful words uttered in a democracy are "the people have spoken"; therefore, we must ensure that all of the people can speak.

But if not, we must still pass voting rights. The right to vote is preservative of all other rights. It is not just another issue alongside other issues. It is foundational. It is the reason why any of us have the privilege of standing here in the first place. It is about the covenant we have with one another as an American people: "e pluribus unum," out of many, one. It, above all else, must be protected.

So let's be clear. I am not here today to spiral into the procedural argument regarding whether the filibuster in general has merits or has outlived its usefulness. I am here to say that this issue is bigger than the filibuster. I stand before you saying that this issue—access to voting and preempting politicians' efforts to restrict voting—is so fundamental to our democracy that it is too important to be held hostage by a Senate rule, especially one historically used to restrict the expansion of voting rights. It is a contradiction to say we must protect minority rights in the Senate while refusing to protect minority rights in the society. Colleagues, no Senate rule should overrule the integrity of our democracy, and we must find a way to pass voting rights, whether we get rid of the filibuster or not.

So as I close—and nobody believes a preacher when he says "as I close"—let me say that I, as a man of faith, believe that democracy is the political enactment of a spiritual idea, the sacred worth of all human beings, the notion that we all have within us a spark of the divine, and a right to participate in the shaping of our destiny. Reinhold Niebuhr was right:

[Humanity's] capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but [humanity's] inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary.

John Lewis understood that and was beaten on a bridge defending it. Amelia Boynton, like so many women not mentioned nearly enough, was gassed on that same bridge. A White woman

named Viola Liuzzo was killed. Medgar Evers was murdered in his own driveway. Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman, two Jews and an African American, standing up for that sacred idea of democracy, also paid the ultimate price. And we in this body would be stopped and stymied by bipartisan politics? Short-term political gain? Senate procedure? I say let's get this done, no matter what.

I urge my colleagues to pass these two bills, strengthen and lengthen the course of our democracy, secure our credibility as the premier voice for freedom-loving people and democratic movements all over the world, and win the future for all of our children.

I yield the floor.

(Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AGENT ORANGE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, we can be proud of the bipartisan work the Senate has accomplished in recent years to expand veterans' benefits. Last Congress, we made significant progress with passage of legislation to enhance education, pensions, burial compensation, and landmark improvements to Department of Veterans Affairs care and services for women veterans, in addition to a groundbreaking initiative to prevent veteran suicides.

I am hopeful we can use this momentum to continue turning legislation into law to ensure we fill the promise our country made to the men and women who served in uniform, as well as their families. We know that too many veterans are being left behind because of current VA policies that prohibit them from accessing benefits and healthcare services they have earned.

Veterans like Bill Rhodes of Mena, AR, a marine who served in Thailand during the Vietnam war era, are pleading with Congress to help them get needed medical care and support. After developing illnesses linked to herbicide exposure, Mr. Rhodes turned to the VA for help. His claim was denied. He did his homework. He spent time looking for documentation to support his claim and realized this is a problem that needs a legislative fix because the Department's policies limit benefits for Vietnam war era for Thailand service.

I am proud to join with my colleague and chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Senator TESTER, to introduce legislation to help Mr. Rhodes and veterans like him who were exposed to Agent Orange and other herbicides while serving in Thailand during the Vietnam war.

The VA accepts that herbicides were used on fenced-in perimeters of military bases in Thailand, but its current policy is too restrictive. Among other things, it prohibits veterans who worked in security-related specialties. It is reasonable to believe that veterans on Thai bases were exposed to Agent Orange no matter what their jobs were or where their duty stations were.

In an article published in the Dayton Daily News, one veteran who served in Thailand said his barracks were along the perimeter, and at the time of the interview, he still hadn't received benefits for his VA claim.

The arbitrary limits on consideration of a veteran's claim to toxic exposure are simply wrong. These misguided technicalities and bureaucratic hurdles need to be addressed. Our bill would eliminate the unreasonable burden placed on veterans to prove toxic exposure.

No veteran should be denied benefits due to redtape. These Americans who served our country, and to this day are paying a high price as a result, have been carelessly hindered by the current limitations on the presumption of toxic exposure to Agent Orange, but they aren't forgotten. We have an obligation to ensure they get the benefits they are due, and I am committed to supporting their cause.

I appreciate the determination and tireless efforts of Mr. Rhodes. He said this legislation gives him some hope, but he won't be proud of his work until the bill is passed.

I encourage my colleagues to support our legislation. I look forward to working with members of the Senate VA Committee to eliminate the barriers that prevent veterans from getting the care and resources they have earned.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate will soon vote on the nomination of California Attorney General Xavier Becerra to lead the Department of Health and Human Services. Moving this nomination forward required an additional procedural step and more floor debate than others, so I will make just a few quick points this afternoon.

First, in our lifetime, America has never faced a greater public health challenge than the pandemic we face today. The Department of Health and Human Services is our point Agency, the leading Agency to coordinate the effort to end the pandemic as soon as possible. Right now, for example, it is coordinating the distribution of vaccines. It is working to get PPE, the critical protective equipment, into the hands of nurses and doctors and all those providers who desperately need more of it. The Department supports rural hospitals to keep them afloat so that rural patients have access to care.

The Department's work includes the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, the National Guard, all 50 States and the District of Columbia, as well as private healthcare systems, doctors, and many individuals across the country.

The American people, we all know, are ready for this pandemic to end. They certainly understand that having a person to coordinate the critical efforts of the Department of Health and

Human Services confirmed and on the job is part of that effort. There simply is no argument for delaying this confirmation any longer.

Attorney General Becerra has the right leadership experience and the right health policy experience to succeed in this critical job. He currently heads the Nation's second largest department of justice. He is in charge of a billion-dollar budget and more than 4,000 employees. He is the top law enforcement official in what would be the fifth largest economy in the world.

In terms of health policy, which is in the area I try to specialize in, I can tell Senators that Xavier Becerra has spent years and years on these issues at the Ways and Means Committee, the key committee in the other body with jurisdiction over healthcare. He has been through major policy debates, including the Affordable Care Act. As California's attorney general, he defended the act in court.

When the pandemic hit, he fought to protect the health and well-being of all Californians, particularly nurses and doctors and those workers who found themselves in harm's way.

Attorney General Becerra has the health policy savvy and the leadership savvy and the experience in both areas to run this Department, no question about it.

Attorney General Becerra made it clear to members of the Finance Committee that he will follow the law. Quaint idea. He said it again and again in response to a barrage of questions. He is going to be accessible to Senators. He is going to work to find common ground on key healthcare issues. I was glad he said it because that is heavy lifting. Most of the time, that is really all you can ask of nominees of the other party.

Healthcare is oftentimes a divisive subject. I think every Senator understands that. It is particularly true when it comes to women's healthcare. But it is clear to me that Attorney General Becerra wants to bring the two sides together. That is a great place to start after the last 4 years of knock-down, drag-out battles over healthcare issues that clearly took America in the wrong direction.

I am going to close with just one thought about why this position is so important. I don't know of any prospect more unifying among Americans than ending the pandemic and getting life back to normal as quickly as possible. Parents want their kids back in school. Grandparents want to hug their grandkids. Everybody wants to feel safe and get out in their communities.

Getting our country to that point is the essence of what this job is all about. Heading the Department of Health and Human Services focuses exactly on those things people want to have the country come together on. But we need to come together to beat the pandemic, and the Department needs its leader confirmed and on the job now.

I was pleased that there was bipartisan support for discharging Attorney General Becerra's nomination from the Finance Committee. I hope the Senate gives his nomination bipartisan support once again when it is time to vote on his confirmation.

I look forward to working with him in the months and years to come.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I oppose the confirmation of California Attorney General Becerra to be the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Our future HHS Secretary will be at the helm of rebuilding our country toward normalcy and preparing to address the weaknesses in our healthcare infrastructure, brought to light by the pandemic. It will be no small task, and its handling will have an impact on America for years to come. It will require a leader at HHS who has the trust of the public and the requisite healthcare experience. Unfortunately, those two factors are missing from the nomination of Attorney General Becerra.

In recovering from a once-in-a-century public health emergency, Americans need to have the confidence that our HHS Secretary understands the intricacies of healthcare policy and has an eye to the future as we improve upon our pre-pandemic vulnerabilities, protecting future generations from experiencing similar pandemic situations.

While Attorney General Becerra served on a healthcare-focused subcommittee as a U.S. Representative, he has no further experience in public health or medicine. He also lacks the executive experience that would be useful in running a complex executive branch Department like HHS, which is involved in the nationwide vaccine rollout and now the regulatory implementation of the recent \$1.9 trillion package.

The American people need to trust that their HHS Secretary will work for them, regardless of disagreements over ideology. Like a President, Cabinet officials work for the entire country, and broad public trust is essential. As Mr. Becerra was serving in his current role in California as attorney general, the Trump administration was making significant regulatory changes to protect the sanctity of life. Attorney General Becerra then spent much of his time attempting to overturn or ignore those changes.

Most recently, Attorney General Becerra actively defended a California law requiring abortion coverage in insurance plans offered by churches. The Office of Civil Rights at HHS ruled on January 24, 2020, that the State's abortion mandate violated Federal law, but Attorney General Becerra refused to comply.

Ideological or moral disagreements should not be met with legal challenges. Americans need to know that

their government is working to find a common ground that will protect all strongly held personal and religious beliefs, including the belief in the sanctity of life.

Thoughtful healthcare policy matters to Kansans and Americans now more than ever. We need a leader at HHS who is eager to serve all of the country, even in the face of disagreements—one who has the necessary healthcare expertise to be successful in this position and will be an asset to our country in this time of rebuilding.

I oppose this confirmation and urge my colleagues to join me.

EQUALITY ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today the Senate Judiciary Committee is considering a grave threat to the right of conscience. The House recently passed the Equality Act, which would demolish religious liberty protections, ironically making Americans of certain beliefs decidedly unequal under the law. In other words, for something called religious protections, the Equality Act would diminish the capability to be considered equal under the law.

It is not an accident of careless drafting that permits this outcome. The language is both so expansive and so explicit that it must be intentional and it must be intentionally hostile to people who hold such beliefs.

The language expands the definition of public accommodations to include prohibiting discrimination by “any establishment that provides a good, service, or program, including a . . . food bank, service or care center, [or] shelter,” and any organization receiving Federal funding. Religiously affiliated entities seeking to put their beliefs into action outside their church, mosque, or synagogue must comply.

The authors know such an expansive definition infringes on the constitutional rights of religious liberty. That is because this legislation would explicitly—explicitly—deny recourse to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA, a bill that was passed with overwhelmingly bipartisan majorities in both Chambers of Congress before being signed by President Bill Clinton in 1993.

This denial cuts off two legal paths for people of conscience. One, an individual or institution cannot sue the Federal Government to prevent enforcement of this act without statutory—explicit statutory—authority of RFRA. And, two, the individual institution that is sued for discrimination under this bill cannot rely on RFRA as a defense.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the five lines related to RFRA in this bill represent one of the most dramatic assaults against religious faith and conscience that I have seen in my time in Congress. The effects will be damaging to communities in Kansas and across the country.

If passed, people of faith must decide whether to adhere to their deeply held beliefs or to the law. This law effec-

tively says it is better to have fewer doctors in rural Kansas, which desperately needs them, than it is to have doctors of moral conviction; that it is better to shutter social services administered by faith-based groups that fill gaps in our safety net than to allow them to remain true to their mission; or that it is better to force the closure of religious schools in urban areas, which so often provide a path out of poverty, than to allow them to remain open and teach principles of faith.

In response to the Obama contraception mandate a decade ago, I warned: “If the government can compel an individual or group to violate one’s conscience, then there is no limit to government power.” That remains true now, nearly 10 years later, and remains true into the future.

I will oppose the use of such government power to infringe on matters of religious belief and conscience, and I stand in opposition to the Equality Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FILIBUSTER

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it appears that our friends across the aisle are experiencing an existential crisis when it comes to deciding how to manage their newfound powers in the majority. We are just 2½ months into this new Congress, and already we are hearing the majority leader and many on the other side of the aisle threatening to blow up the rules of the Senate. After decades as a Senator, President Biden even yesterday relented and threw his support behind the plan.

The filibuster has been called into question a number of times over the past few years. That is to be expected, but it is just that our Democratic friends used to be on the other side of the argument. They took one position when they were in the minority, where the filibuster protected their rights. And now when they are in the majority, many of them are looking to eliminate any minority rights and to fundamentally change the Senate.

In 2018, our Democratic colleagues were afraid the Republican Senate majority would blow up the filibuster. I am not really sure why they were concerned. After all, Senator MCCONNELL and Republican Senators have consistently defended the rights of the minority by use of the legislative filibuster, even when President Trump called for it to be eliminated.

But our Democratic friends keep piling on. Senator DURBIN, the Senator from Illinois, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was asked about President Trump’s call to end the fili-

buster—that was when President Trump called to end the filibuster—and he said: “That would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding Fathers.” That would be on the right-hand side of this chart. Just to repeat, he said: “That would be the end of the Senate as it was originally devised and created going back to the Founding Fathers.”

I agree with Senator DURBIN. I agreed then, and I agree now.

The Senate filibuster was designed to ensure that the two political parties would actually have to work together, which I think the American people believe is a good thing. And it should be hard to do the work of building consensus in a country as big and diverse as the United States.

But the filibuster was designed to make sure that the majority just couldn’t jam things through and deny the rights of the minority to be heard. But when you get 60 Senators to agree on something, it becomes all but impossible for ultrapartisan proposals to become law. That is the nature of the consensus-building process, and that is a good thing for the country.

Imagine the instability and unpredictability that would occur if laws changed as quickly as Presidents and Senate majorities do. Just 4 years ago, Republicans controlled both Chambers of Congress and held the White House. Twelve years ago, our Democratic colleagues controlled all three. The filibuster was designed to encourage, again, consensus building on a bipartisan basis and to provide some stability between those transitory majorities and changing Presidents. And that is a good thing, like I said, in a country where the political party in control is constantly changing, and it ensures that a minority viewpoint cannot be steamrolled.

Our Senate Democratic friends have certainly benefited from the protections of the filibuster over the last 6 years. They filibustered countless bills on everything from pandemic relief to police reform.

But now it appears that our Democratic colleagues—at least their leadership—have flip-flopped. The political tides have shifted, and since the radical left wants to get rid of the filibuster, so do they.

In a floor speech earlier this week, this same Senator, Senator DURBIN, our friend from Illinois, said the filibuster is “not the guarantor of democracy. It has become the death grip of democracy”—a pretty dramatic conversion from 2018 to 2021.

What has changed? Well, the majority has changed. Republicans controlled the majority when he thought the filibuster was a good thing. Now, when Democrats control the majority, he thinks it is a bad thing.

Apparently, the countless filibusters of our Democratic colleagues were not a mockery of democracy. They certainly wouldn’t be guilty of that. But

now that the shoe is on the other foot, Democrats are ready to hit the big red button and go nuclear. And, I must say, once you go nuclear around here, you certainly don't go back.

But Senator DURBIN's views aren't the only ones that have changed on this matter. As I mentioned, former Senator and now President Joe Biden finally changed his views as well. For decades, he was a staunch defender of the institution. When he was asked about removing the filibuster, going nuclear, he said:

This nuclear option is ultimately an example of the arrogance of power. It is a fundamental power-grab by the majority party.

Well, that is certainly not mincing your words. And this isn't some long ago abandoned view of his. In January of this year, President Biden was asked if he could move his agenda with the filibuster rules intact, and he answered yes and explained the opportunities to work together on shared priorities, as he did throughout his career as a U.S. Senator.

He went on to add:

I think we can reach consensus on that and get it passed without changing the filibuster rule.

But now the pressure has been put on both President Biden and the Democratic leadership in the Senate to endorse a rules change, not by the ordinary course of rule changes but by the nuclear option. We know that there are unpredictable consequences of changing the rules in a place where your power, where your majority, is never guaranteed. Chipping away at the rights of the minority may help you today, but you will live to regret it when the shoe is on the other foot.

But it won't take a shift in the majority for our Democratic colleagues to see the disastrous consequences of going nuclear on the filibuster rule because, if anybody needed a reminder, we have a 50-50 Senate: 50 Democrats and 50 Republicans.

Yesterday, Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, somebody who has been around this institution a long time and understands it better than almost anybody I know, reminded our colleagues that "[t]his is an institution that requires unanimous consent to turn the lights on before noon."

Unanimous consent is literally the grease that helps the machine run. In order to accomplish even the most mundane tasks in the Senate, you need an agreement. Most of the time it is easy because it is not controversial; it is not partisan; it is the right, practical thing to do. But you need compromise, and you need a quorum.

This rules change being floated wouldn't clear a path for productivity in the Senate. It is an invitation to futility. If our Democratic colleagues take the unprecedented step of blowing up the filibuster, they can expect to be met with an unprecedented response.

Republicans will not sit idly by while Democrats take an axe to the rules in order to advance a partisan agenda. If

Democrats go down this road, they will have no one to blame but themselves for the consequences of a horrible miscalculation.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. President, on another matter, as we know, it has been more than a year since the term "COVID-19" became a part of our daily vocabulary. Over this last year, families have lost loved ones, millions of workers have lost their jobs, Main Street businesses have shuttered, and our healthcare workers have endured unimaginable stress and heart-break.

One year ago, the majority of Americans were hunkered down at home in order to stop the spread of this deadly virus, and today, while we continue to follow the commonsense public health guidelines to stop the spread of the virus, we are finally experiencing some hope. With three successful vaccines now being administered throughout the country, the light at the end of the tunnel gets bigger and brighter every day. I know we are all grateful for that.

More than 27 percent of Americans 18 and up have received at least one dose of the vaccine. That includes nearly two-thirds of people over the age of 65, one of the most vulnerable cohorts. We have every reason to be optimistic that brighter days are ahead, but we are not out of the dark yet.

In the coming months, we need sound leadership from public health officials who have the experience and the expertise to guide us through these final, critical months. Unfortunately, President Biden has nominated someone who is unprepared to lead that charge.

The President has chosen Xavier Becerra to be his Secretary of Health and Human Services. As we know, the Secretary of Health and Human Services is one of the top generals in the war against COVID-19. The Department coordinates the healthcare providers, State and local officials, researchers, and the American public to respond to a crisis like this. For everything from COVID-19 testing to treatment and therapeutics, to vaccinations, HHS is actually in charge.

The Department disburses funding. It determines how many vaccines go to each State. It leads efforts to boost public confidence in the vaccine and so much more, but that is not even including the long list of nonpandemic responsibilities for the Department, including everything from overseeing Medicare and Medicaid to regulating prescription drugs.

So what life experience does Mr. Becerra have that makes him qualified to lead these efforts? Well, he is not a doctor. He is not a public health expert. He has never even worked in a role that is remotely related to healthcare. In fact, his only semirelevant experience is the range of lawsuits he has filed as attorney general of his home State of California.

Mr. Becerra led a group of attorneys general in opposing the Texas lawsuit

Texas v. Azar. The case attempted to reinstate the individual mandate penalty which was removed by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. He also led a case attempting to overturn protections for religious groups, such as the Little Sisters of the Poor, that don't offer coverage for contraceptives in their group health insurance plans. He sued them. Well—no surprise—the Supreme Court ultimately ruled 7 to 2 in favor of the Little Sisters of the Poor.

And, as we know, Mr. Becerra's radical policy objectives date long before his time as attorney general. As a Member of the House, he took extreme views on abortion. He opposed legislation that would ensure that babies who were born after a botched abortion would receive medical treatment, just like any other patient.

He opposed a bill to prevent taxpayer dollars from being used for abortions, the Hyde amendment, which has been bipartisan consensus for at least since the late seventies. He even opposed legislation to make it a crime to harm or kill an unborn child during the commission of a violent crime. In 38 States, including his State of California, they already have similar protections, but he opposed legislation to do it.

Unlike the majority of President Biden's nominees who received bipartisan support by both the committees of jurisdiction and the full Senate, there is no bipartisan chorus singing the praises of Mr. Becerra. Put simply, he is a partisan warrior who lacks the experience to lead HHS during normal times, let alone during a pandemic.

We are at the 10-yard line in the pandemic. Now is not the time to give the punter a chance to try out his quarterback just because he happens to be friends with the coach.

I would oppose the nomination of Mr. Becerra and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do so as well. The American people deserve an experienced Health and Human Services Secretary, and this nominee does not fit the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

SUNSHINE WEEK

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, it has been a year now since the outbreak of a novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. It put the world into an unprecedented global lockdown, and we are still in the dark about how the pandemic even began.

Folks, this isn't entirely an accident. The virus emerged in one of the world's most closed societies, ruled by a ruthless authoritarian regime with no tolerance for truth or transparency. And, even today, after 2½ million people around the world have died, the Communist Party of China refuses to fully cooperate with efforts to learn how COVID-19 made the cross-species jump from bats to humans. Finding the source isn't about assigning blame; it is about understanding the cause and preventing a similar occurrence from happening again.

Here is what we do know: COVID appeared in the vicinity of the Wuhan Institute of Virology, a laboratory where studies were being conducted on bat coronaviruses. After the outbreak began, Chinese officials ordered the destruction of coronavirus samples. In the months just prior to the first case of the new pathogen being publicly identified, researchers at this state-run lab reportedly became sick with COVID-like symptoms.

Years ago, U.S. officials who visited the institute sent warnings back to the State Department that studies were being conducted on dangerous coronaviruses from bats that could be transmitted to humans in a lab which had “serious” safety problems.

Some of that research was even being subsidized by U.S. taxpayer dollars, including a study published less than 2 years before the pandemic that found the first evidence that humans could be infected with coronaviruses from bats. You heard that correctly, folks. Your tax dollars were paying for dangerous studies on coronaviruses in a lab in China that our own government officials had warned was unsafe.

This all raises many questions, the first being, How much were we actually paying for this endeavor? And that should be relatively easy for anyone to discover since a law renewed by Congress every single year requires all projects supported by the Department of Health and Human Services to include a pricetag disclosing the cost paid by taxpayers. But noticeably absent on the study from the Wuhan Institute: the cost.

A review of numerous other projects supported by HHS found that cost information was missing from all of them—all of them. Covering up information that the public has a right to know about might be how things work in Communist China, but it isn't how it should work here in America.

This isn't China, folks. Our laws aren't optional, especially for those who are supposed to be enforcing them.

Maybe we can't force China to be forthcoming, but we should be able to expect our own government to be open and transparent. That is why I am asking the HHS Office of Inspector General to launch an investigation to compel the Department to comply with the law.

I am also introducing legislation to require every project funded with your taxpayer dollars to disclose the cost paid by you. This is just one of the bright ideas to shine some light on how your money is being spent that I will be unveiling this week to commemorate Sunshine Week, the annual celebration of open government.

A transparent government is one of the most fundamental principles that make our government—of the people, by the people, for the people—work. Decisions are made every day in Washington that impact families and communities in Iowa and across the country.

We all benefit when we bring this information to light, especially when it involves how our tax dollars are being spent. That is why I am also working to create an alert system to notify the public whenever a project goes \$1 billion or more over budget or falls 5 years behind schedule.

Some good news: My bipartisan bill was just reported out of committee this morning, so boondoggles, you better beware.

Another bill I will be supporting will require hospitals and insurers to reveal rates to patients before they receive their medical care. This commonsense effort would allow patients to know the costs associated with their healthcare in advance so that they can make informed decisions for themselves and their families.

Finally, I am calling for more transparency from the Department of Education when it comes to COVID spending. Taxpayers should be able to see clearly how well States and school districts are doing at spending tax dollars provided to help schools safely reopen.

Knowledge is the power that allows every citizen to hold those entrusted to make our decisions accountable. After all, the only reason to keep taxpayers in the dark about any of these decisions is because they can't withstand the scrutiny that results when all of the facts come to light.

With the Sun now setting an hour later as a result of daylight saving time, we are all reminded just how much a difference can be made with a little extra sunlight. After all, sunshine is the best disinfectant because to stop waste, we first need to be able to spot it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Indiana.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I have come to the floor several times in the little over 2 years I have been here, and a common theme—and I think we all know it as Senators—is that our healthcare system is broken. It is driven by misaligned industry incentives that promote opaque, behind-the-scenes pricing maneuvers at the expense of patients and healthcare consumers.

Increased transparency is the key to fixing our broken healthcare system. It will allow Americans to have skin in the game and deal directly with their healthcare providers to make informed decisions. They cannot do that very well currently.

Pulling the curtain back on a healthcare system to restore market forces, which aren't really there now, to increase innovation and competition, particularly in regard to price, quality, and service—you do that with anything else. A consumer is engaged, they are informed, and you have many competitors competing for their business.

In order for Americans to regain their sovereignty in a healthcare sys-

tem, you need the ability to be able to navigate accordingly. Congress must act to provide Americans with these tools before we try to throw more government at a broken healthcare system.

Government pays for a portion of healthcare; more is paid through the private sector. If we reform it, it makes it less expensive for both payers. To give you an example, sometimes what you hear here sounds like it is theoretical, hypothetical. I took on the cause roughly 12, 13 years ago in my Main Street enterprise that was just starting to grow, doing the things it was supposed to do, and that is transportation distribution. Then all of a sudden, healthcare becomes a subset of your business, and about the only solution you would get each year is, well, you are lucky it is not going up more than 5 or 10 percent.

I heard that too many years in a row. I was sick and tired of that being what I would have to live with as a CEO who had a healthy, successful business other than the healthcare component. What did I do? Healthcare plans are basically made up of three or four features.

You have your deductible. Ours had risen more than I was willing to take it up any higher. The only way you could buy premiums down would be to do that or change underwriters every 2 or 3 years. That gets to be a hassle as you become a larger company, and the profits were so great then for people who did it, you could end up bringing your cost down. Well, then you were right back in the old groove of, you are lucky it is only going up 5 to 10 percent the next year on renewal.

You also have coinsurance. Most people don't worry about that until they get significantly ill or have a bad accident. That is the percentage you have to pay once you exceed your deductible.

When you have those variables, you have one other item that almost everyone loves in their plan, and that is a low copayment. Those copayments are paid for in the high premiums, but it is because they constitute nearly 25 percent of most healthcare plans, and that is to keep skin out of the game for the people who use the system.

Well, I was going to do something different and decided to limit that expense when you really get sick or have a bad accident, covered coinsurance through the company, and asked my employees to engage from dollar one in shopping around and see if that would work.

Lo and behold, it has now been 13 years, and we have been able to keep a good plan in place, lower family healthcare premium contributions, and have not had a premium increase. What is it based upon? It is finding the meager transparency that was out there 12, 13 years ago and enhancing it over time. To give an example, if you pick up the phone, you get on the web, you will find anywhere from 30, 50, 60, 70

percent savings. Procedures like MRIs, CAT scans, colonoscopies can run anywhere from 700 to 3,000 bucks. Your insurance companies seem to always shove you to the most expensive one. They give you these huge discounts, take their margin out of it, and it still costs you a bundle.

When the consumer gets engaged, you will see prices start to come down. LASIK surgery is the best example, where you have no insurance involved. Ten, fifteen years ago, that could be up to \$2,000 an eye. Now, it is advertised heavily, providers go after their customers, and you can probably get it done for as little as \$250 to \$500 an eye, with better quality. That sounds like a lot of other areas of our economy that actually work.

Last Congress, I put healthcare transparency at the forefront of my agenda and have definitely been the most outspoken Senator that we have a broken system; put almost all the blame on the industry itself because it does not give us transparency. It does not want to compete. The healthcare customer is somewhat to blame because they don't want to pay for anything. And I don't think the answer is bringing more government into it until you reform the system.

We need to shine light on the dark corners and the misaligned incentives embedded in the current system. Among the bills I will reintroduce this Congress is the Healthcare PRICE Transparency Act. Every Senator should want to be on that bill to hold the industry accountable. This will empower patients through transparency. It will drive competition among hospitals and insurers by requiring them to publicly disclose their prices so patients can compare between providers and insurers.

Last Congress, a number of my colleagues joined in my effort to bring more transparency and affordability to healthcare consumers. I am excited to reintroduce the Healthcare PRICE Transparency Act soon and hope all of my colleagues will join in so that we can collectively lower healthcare costs before we try to get more government involved.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

SUNSHINE WEEK

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I am proud to join my colleagues in celebration of Sunshine Week and promote the importance of government openness and transparency. Transparency isn't something you see too much up here in Washington. Being accountable to the American people should be a basic function of government.

In Florida, we have sunshine laws to promote openness and build our citizens' trust in government. When I came to Washington, I made it my mission to bring the success and transparency we had in Florida to the Federal Government and make this dys-

functional place work for the American people.

Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues have blocked nearly every single one of my efforts for transparency and requests for information to help Congress make the best decisions for American families.

Last month, I wrote to President Biden's Acting Director for the Office of Management and Budget requesting any documents related to enacted but currently unspent COVID-19 stimulus funding. The response? None. Total silence.

This month, as we considered the Democrats' wasteful and partisan \$1.9 trillion COVID spending package, I introduced a resolution calling on President Biden to inform the Senate and the American people of how much unspent funds are left over from the previous COVID spending bills, but Democrats blocked it.

When my colleague Senator JOHNSON called for their massive, 600-page bill to be read on the floor so the American people could know exactly what was in the bill, Democrats complained and called it a waste of time.

Let me be clear. Being transparent, open, and accountable to the American people is actually never a waste of time; it is our job. That is why I have been working on several measures to bring sunshine transparency to Washington, including my bill to make sure Members of Congress work for the American people and actually read bills before casting their votes and my STOP COVID-19 Act to set vaccine distribution reporting and transparency standards for States and create a program for cities and counties to increase funding, testing, contact tracing, and transparency efforts in order to reduce the spread of COVID.

I will never stop fighting to bring sunshine to Washington and working to make sure our government and the Biden administration are transparent, open, and accountable to the American people who elected us to serve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I want to start by thanking Senator ERNST for once again setting up the Government Sunshine Week event and for her commitment, as was just discussed by my colleague from Florida, to ensuring taxpayers know where their money is going. This includes the \$150 billion that the U.S. Government distributes every year in taxpayer funds for research grants. More transparency will help ensure that research isn't stolen by China and other countries.

In 2019, as the then-chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, or PSI, I led a bipartisan investigation with then-ranking-member Senator TOM CARPER into China's theft of U.S. intellectual property and U.S. research at our research institutions and college campuses.

As many of you know, China has made no secret of its goal to surpass the United States as the world leader in scientific research. This has become even clearer, by the way, during the COVID-19 pandemic, as China has attempted to get information in the United States to help produce their own vaccines to rival ours. But what most don't know is that China has been using our taxpayer-funded research enterprise here in the United States to accomplish this long-term goal. China uses talent recruitment programs—most notably its Thousand Talents Plan—to recruit researchers at American universities and research institutions using taxpayer-funded grants to do the same research at shadow labs in China or transfer taxpayer-funded research back to China—research that has been used over the past two decades to strengthen China's military and its own economic rise.

Along the way, they have been aided by a lack of transparency in our Federal grant-making process that has allowed researchers to receive taxpayer funding without disclosing their ties to foreign governments. What is worse, Federal law enforcement officials at the FBI knew about this for years and admitted at our PSI hearing last Congress: "We wish we had taken more rapid and comprehensive action in the past." I wish they had.

I am pleased the Trump administration chose to follow through on their promise to do better in this regard. Since our report, prosecutors have charged at least 13 researchers here in the United States for failing to disclose their ties to the Chinese Government and Chinese Communist Party—researchers at prestigious institutions like Harvard and the Ohio State University. Many of our colleges and universities around the country have been part of this.

The Biden administration must stand by the promises made on the campaign trail to keep the pressure on China, and that includes on this issue. We can also help here in Congress by shining a light on the grant-making process and passing laws to help us keep track and protect these important investments in our research.

In the coming weeks, I will be reintroducing bipartisan legislation called the Safeguarding American Innovation Act, which uses the key findings from our bipartisan PSI investigation and report to protect the research enterprise—in part, through more transparency.

First, our bill creates a cross-governmental council at the Office of Management and Budget to coordinate and streamline unauthorized access and grant-making processes between Federal Agencies so that there is greater transparency in where the money is going and how it is being used.

Second, the Safeguarding American Innovation Act makes it illegal to lie on a grant application about ties to

foreign governments like China. Transparency here will make it clear that researchers are liable for attempting to mislead the government when trying to receive taxpayer funds.

Third, our legislation closes loopholes exploited by China and other foreign actors and empowers the State Department to deny visas to foreign researchers aiming to steal U.S. intellectual property and research.

Fourth, the Safeguarding American Innovation Act requires research institutions and universities to safeguard against unauthorized access to sensitive technology and to be transparent with the State Department about what technologies a foreign researcher will have access to on campus.

Finally, the act requires transparency from our colleges and universities as to what money they are getting from foreign sources. They will have to report any foreign gift of \$50,000 or more, and it empowers the Department of Education to fine universities that repeatedly fail to disclose these gifts. Current law requires reporting, but at \$250,000. We found that nearly 70 percent of U.S. universities consistently failed to do even that. Lowering the threshold increases transparency, and adding the penalty ensures the schools will report.

The American Council on Education has supported our PSI report's recommendation that research institutions should establish a "know your collaborator" culture.

Greater transparency in our Federal grant-making process, great transparency from our research institutions and universities—these are the steps we need to take to ensure that there is proper accountability in place for the \$150 billion that taxpayers entrust with the government for federally funded research every year, while still keeping our fundamental research open and collaborative.

The Safeguarding American Innovation Act will shine a light on the Federal grant-making processes and allow us to maintain our world-class lead in innovations, while protecting our investments from foreign theft.

Again, I want to thank my colleague Senator ERNST, in particular, for this event today to talk about transparency, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation that will provide long overdue transparency in our federally funded research enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, about 4 weeks ago, it got cold in Oklahoma—really cold. My house was at negative 14 degrees. Now, Senator STEVE DAINES from Montana is used to that, but in Oklahoma we are not used to negative 14 degrees. It was overcast, snowy, cold. Then, the sun broke through, and we had a day when it got up to 30 degrees. It was like everyone was going to the park. It felt so nice because the sun was out, even though it was cold.

Sunshine has a great way of making everyone lift and look around and say: Where has that been?

I think that happens in the Federal Government as well.

I thank Senator JONI ERNST for hosting what she is calling Sunshine Week to be able to say: What are we doing to put a little light into the Federal process to be able to make sure people can see into some of these programs? Because all the time I hear from people, and when something comes on the news, they will say: Where did that come from?

I will say: That was poked in some bill that probably no one read.

I will give you an example of it. Two weeks ago, when the "COVID" bill passed with almost \$2 trillion in spending, I already had folks come back to me saying: I am grateful for that \$70 million for the Small Business Administration to increase some of the loans by \$70 million.

I said: Great. Do you know how much the administrative cost was on that \$70 million program?

The answer is \$390 million in administrative costs, \$70 million in loans. That is in the bill.

Everyone looks at me and says: Oh, I didn't know that.

In lots of States around America right now, their legislatures are meeting, including mine in Oklahoma. They are suddenly finding out that that bill that was for "COVID-related" mandated that no State in America could reduce taxes on anyone. Lots of States are saying: Wait a minute; we were planning on reducing taxes on working families in certain targeted areas.

They are finding out that you can't do that, and they will say things like: I didn't know that was in the bill because there wasn't any sunshine on that bill.

I worked for years to pass a bill called the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act. It is a commonsense bill. It asks a simple question: What programs do we do in the Federal Government? This body has heard about me talk about it year after year after year. Contrary to popular belief, it is not easy to actually move a bill in this place. Some things that are very commonsense take forever.

This was my simple bill. In the Federal Government, every Agency has to list every program that they do, how many employees they hire to do that program, what is the cost of the program, and is the program evaluated? If it is, just put the evaluation numbers with the program.

Why would I say that? Because I talk to Agency heads that start a new program and they get 2 years down the road from starting a new program and they find out a different Agency has already done that for 5 years. Then we get together and find out a third Agency started that 10 years ago. None of them knew about the other program.

Before you think that doesn't happen, oh, yes, it does. It happens all the

time. Not only that, but I want to ask a simple question to say: How many options do we have for whatever it may be? How many programs do we have for STEM education, for instance? How many different incentives have we put out there, and how many Agencies are helping to provide greater STEM education? The Agencies can't tell me. They could eventually tell me what is in their Agency, but they don't know what other Agencies are doing.

And when I go to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, and ask them, their answer is: I will get you an answer back in about 18 months—months—18 months before they can tell me how many STEM programs we have in the Federal Government. I should be able to do an internet search and get that in 18 seconds, not 18 months.

The Taxpayers Right-To-Know bill requires the Office of Management and Budget to actually work with every Agency to get a master list of every program across the Federal Government—how many employees they have, if it is evaluated, and what it does.

It is pretty simple. It is basic transparency, but it allows any American and all Members of Congress to be able to see what we do and if we have duplication in government.

Again, you may think that is simple and straightforward. It is, but it took years to actually pass. We finally got that passed and signed into law last December.

I met with Gene Dodaro, who heads up GAO, and asked him about it because he has also been an advocate of that for years. He said: We need an "unequivocal commitment from the Office of Management and Budget to implement it properly" because we have to actually get this done.

Sunshine helps. We can see how money is spent. We can see how duplication actually functions. We can't reform what we can't see. The American people perpetually get frustrated with what they didn't know was in a bill and find out later, and they don't like it.

In the days ahead, I will release my annual "Federal Fumbles" book, as we do every year. In that "Federal Fumbles" book, this year, we are going to outline where our debt comes from because I run into so many people who say: We have debt. Who is our debt? Is it all China?

I will say: Well, actually, \$1.6 trillion of it is from China, and we are paying them interest every single year on that debt. But it is in a lot of other places.

A lot of people misunderstand what government debt really is. This needs some sunshine because if we are going to solve this, the American people have to be able to see it and so do we.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I rise to share my objections to the nomination of Xavier Becerra to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

With \$1.3 trillion of spending in Health and Human Services, that Department has the largest budget of the entire executive branch. In fact, if we were to compare the budget—the budget of HHS to other nation's GDPs—HHS, in fact, would rank among the top 10 in the world. The size of this Department is significant, and the responsibility is even greater.

Whoever oversees this Department has a big impact on our country, our economy, and the lives of all Americans, including those of the unborn. This is exactly why I am deeply concerned with President Biden's pick of Attorney General Xavier Becerra to lead HHS. Mr. Becerra has spent his career propagating far-left ideology and supporting divisive policies that don't resonate with the majority of Americans.

The Secretary of HHS has massive authority to steer the future of healthcare in our country, and someone who has made a career out of defending the abortion industry and promoting other liberal policies, like free healthcare for illegal immigrants, should not be at the helm of this Department.

I am concerned that Attorney General Becerra will use the power of this Agency to overstep and impose his radical liberal agenda on millions of Americans. This administration decidedly, intentionally, chose a nominee who has repeatedly attacked the religious freedoms of so many Americans, a nominee who has aggressively pushed a very pro-abortion agenda, a nominee who supports a complete takeover by the government of our healthcare, a nominee who advocates for illegal immigrants to receive taxpayer-funded healthcare.

How do these qualities make Attorney General Becerra the right person to head Health and Human Services? It just doesn't make sense to so many in our country. It is just another sign that this, unfortunately, is a far-left administration that is outside the mainstream.

Especially now, during a pandemic, it is critical that all Americans can trust whoever holds this position. It is critical that the leader of this massive Department will operate as a good steward of Federal health programs and not use his post to impose a government takeover of healthcare and to eradicate job-based coverage for millions of Americans.

Xavier Becerra is, unfortunately, not that person. He has built his career defending some of the very most extreme stances in our society, and we can expect that he will only take things further at HHS.

When it comes to abortion, Attorney General Becerra doesn't believe there should be any restrictions—not one. In fact, I had the chance to ask Mr. Becerra some questions a couple of weeks ago at a hearing. I asked if he would support a ban on the lethal discrimination of babies diagnosed with

Down syndrome, or, perhaps, what about banning sex-selective abortions, or, at least, a ban on partial birth abortions. His refusal to answer spoke volumes. His inability to name even one restriction that he might think about putting on abortion is chilling.

Mr. Becerra's views on abortion even go a step further. He has repeatedly bullied and harassed Americans who respect the sanctity of life, like the Little Sisters of the Poor. This order of nuns has dedicated their lives to serving the less fortunate, and under their Catholic faith, they do not believe in providing abortions or contraceptives.

Attorney General Becerra litigated against these nuns in court and attempted to revoke an exemption that protects religious groups from providing contraceptives, and that goes against their religious beliefs. He has literally sued to impose crippling fines on Catholic nuns for remaining true to their religious beliefs—crippling fines on nuns—a horrendous attack on Americans' constitutional right to religious freedom.

He has stated that crossing the border illegally should be decriminalized. Let me say that again. He has stated that crossing the border illegally should be decriminalized. No wonder we are seeing a crisis on our southern border. He has repeatedly pushed for illegal immigrants to receive health benefits on the taxpayers' dime.

As we are seeing Biden's border crisis play out, it is even more alarming that one of his nominees would seek to incentivize illegal border crossings even more. I guess you could say this is all part of Biden's "America Last" agenda, but as Secretary of Health and Human Services, Xavier Becerra would have the massive ability to impose a pro-abortion, anti-religious freedom, socialist healthcare agenda. His nomination highlights just how extreme—sadly, how extreme—the Biden administration really is. These views fail to represent the majority of Americans and have no place at the head of the largest Department of our executive branch.

I urge my colleagues to consider the impact that Mr. Becerra would have as the head of Health and Human Services and to vote against his confirmation. Rather, we must stand up for life, for religious freedom, an "America First" agenda and against Mr. Becerra's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the stated mission of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is "to enhance the health and well-being of all Americans." It is a laudable goal. The HHS Secretary is, thus, charged with overseeing all government healthcare and social services and protecting the health and the rights of the American people, a worthy goal, important job. Unfortunately, the history of the nominee before us, Mr. Xavier Becerra,

poses grave concerns to our ability to carry out this goal and to our ability to oversee an Agency with such vast, far-reaching responsibilities.

First, Mr. Becerra has repeatedly been on the record for wanting to eliminate private health insurance for millions of Americans even at a time when families need affordable, effective, and flexible healthcare and when healthcare workers need jobs perhaps now more than ever. What is more concerning, however, is that, while in public office, Mr. Becerra has repeatedly, deliberately undermined Americans' constitutional rights and waged political warfare on those who happen to disagree with his views.

Take, for example, his views on abortion. Instead of supporting laws that protect and sustain the life and health of American women and unborn children, Mr. Becerra has supported laws that violently hurt them in his endorsing legal abortion up until and even during the moment of birth.

As Attorney General of the State of California, he brought 15 felony charges against a reporter for exposing Planned Parenthood's role in trafficking the body parts of aborted babies—a prosecution that even the Los Angeles Times described as "disturbing overreach."

He defended a California law that required pro-life pregnancy centers to advertise for State-funded abortion clinics, a law that so egregiously violated free speech that the Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional, which, of course, it was and is.

Not only that, but he has consistently and flagrantly taken hostile actions against the free exercise of religion. Perhaps the worst example of this can be found in his legal persecution of the Little Sisters of the Poor. Now, this is a religious order of Catholic nuns that cares for the elderly poor. Becerra waged a lengthy, difficult battle to force the sisters—again, this is an order of nuns—to pay for abortion drugs and contraception in their health insurance plan even though doing so violates their beliefs and even though they are nuns.

Even after the Supreme Court ruled for the Little Sisters of the Poor in 2016 under a separate case and after the Trump administration granted them full conscience protections in 2017, Mr. Becerra still sued the Trump administration in an attempt to pierce those protections. Again, he wasn't comfortable with letting those protections stand in place with respect to the Little Sisters of the Poor. No. He was determined, even still, to make sure that they couldn't live according to their own religious beliefs and their teachings.

During the pandemic, Becerra was the legal architect of some of the country's most strident, sweeping, and brazenly unconstitutional restrictions on church and on worship services, some of which were struck down by the Supreme Court last month, and he even

tried to prevent COVID relief funds from going to religious and other private schools.

Our Founders established the principle of religious liberty—the natural right of all human beings to freely hold and live out their religious beliefs—because they understood that man is not free unless his conscience is free. They thought that this principle was so important, so fundamental, that it was the first freedom articulated in the very First Amendment to the Constitution. In doing so, they sought to defend and preserve the space of our deepest convictions, a space upon which a State cannot and must never encroach.

In practice, that has meant that the government's job is not to tell people what to believe or how to discharge their religious duties but to protect the space for all people of all faiths—and of no faith at all for that matter—to seek truth and to order their lives accordingly.

The American people deserve a leader at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services who will uphold and strengthen this monumental tradition. They deserve a leader who will protect their fundamental rights, not trample them. Unfortunately, tragically, the record of this nominee demonstrates serious threats to the rights and the health and the well-being of the American people. They deserve better. In good conscience, I cannot support the nomination of Mr. Becerra.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, it appears that President Biden arrived at the White House prepared and willing to grant himself and his administration a mandate that American voters didn't agree to give him.

His party lost ground in the House, split the Senate, and maintained their trailing minority of governorships, but they seem to ignore that. In his first 50 days, he signed 34 Executive orders—more than anyone in history. He dismantled existing immigration controls, threatened protections for small businesses against the radical climate agenda, and destroyed thousands of jobs and the potential for greater energy security promised by the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

Meanwhile, my Democratic colleagues got busy laying the groundwork to transform not only the Senate into a majoritarian institution but also to radically transform the country. They used budget reconciliation to ram through a \$1.9 trillion bailout bill without a single Republican vote—the largest spending bill in our Nation's history—and now they are reversing their own positions on the filibuster to avoid debate on radical immigration reform, the Equality Act, and an already infamous bill that would federalize elections. They just don't want to talk about these things—just do it.

The more people learn about what the Biden White House is up to the

more questions they have for those of us who represent them.

Some of my Democratic friends in Tennessee say to me: I may have voted for Joe Biden, but I did not vote for this.

They do not want to radically change the country. They do not want to be tied to legislation that has a nice-sounding name but that does the exact opposite of what the Biden administration would have you believe that it would accomplish.

They have noticed that the President's Cabinet picks have come to their confirmation hearings ready and willing to move the goalposts away from the Constitution and the rule of law in order to accommodate their radical agenda.

Last week, this body voted to discharge from committee Xavier Becerra's nomination to the Health and Human Services Secretary position. I voted no, and I will vote no on his confirmation as well, not only because he is unqualified and has no experience in healthcare—Middle Tennessee has more than 100,000 individuals who are employed in the healthcare industry, and all, all are more qualified in healthcare than Xavier Becerra—and not only because his radical views shock just about everyone who speaks to me about him. Oh, yes, it was a topic of conversation at church on Sunday but also because, time and again, he has abused his power and weaponized the full force of the government against people whose deeply held, personal, political, and religious views don't align with his own: submit, conform, or else.

It is in the nature of our job as legislators to recognize that, yes, elections do have consequences and that, yes, the President has a right to assemble his own Cabinet, but we cannot be expected to green-light a nominee who has so little patience for diversity—diversity of thought, diversity of opinions—that his first and only instinct is to destroy the diversity: Barrel in. Burn it to the ground. Build it back in their own image. That is not what the American people want President Biden and his administration to do, but that is what they are getting with this nominee.

I strongly oppose Xavier Becerra's nomination, as I have from the start, and I would urge my colleagues to consider what you will be approving if you vote in favor of this confirmation: radically anti-life, radically anti-religion, radically anti-border security, radically anti-free speech, radically unqualified to lead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise to oppose the nomination of Xavier Becerra for Secretary of Health and Human Services.

There are, unfortunately, numerous nominees in the Biden administration who are either extreme or unqualified

for the positions for which they have been nominated, but of all of those nominees, I believe Mr. Becerra is the single worst Cabinet nominee put forward by Joe Biden to serve in the Cabinet.

President Biden has told this country repeatedly that his top priority is defeating the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department of Health and Human Services is on the frontline in fighting COVID-19. Mr. Becerra, by any measure, is woefully unqualified to lead that Department.

Mr. Becerra is not a doctor. Mr. Becerra is not a scientist. Mr. Becerra has no healthcare experience whatsoever. He has no medical experience whatsoever. He has no experience in virology. He has no experience with pharmaceuticals. He has no experience running a State or local healthcare agency. He has no experience in logistics. The Department of HHS is in the process of distributing and administering hundreds of millions of vaccines. Mr. Becerra has never so much as distributed french fries at a McDonald's.

Mr. Becerra's only qualification and, indeed, the qualification that earned him this nomination is he is a radical, leftwing trial attorney.

If a Republican President had nominated as the head of the Health and Human Services Agency someone with zero healthcare experience, zero medical experience, zero pharmaceutical experience in the midst of a global pandemic, that Republican President would have been laughed out of the room.

If a Republican President had done that, all of the Democrats would have been lined up here thundering: This is a President that doesn't care about science. We would have heard Democrats telling us: This is a President for whom defeating COVID-19 is not a priority, is not serious.

"This is a President," our Democratic colleagues would have told us, "who puts partisan priorities above defeating the public health menace of COVID-19. This is a President who is more concerned about appeasing his radical base than he is about protecting the public health and safety of Americans."

Had a Republican President nominated a nominee as unqualified as Mr. Becerra, I feel confident the Democrats would not have been alone. We would see multiple Republican Senators standing up, saying: No. We should actually have an HHS Secretary who knows something about science. We should have an HHS Secretary who knows something about medicine, something about pharmaceuticals.

I would note, by the way, President Trump nominated two HHS Secretaries. The first, Dr. Tom Price, was a medical doctor; the second, Alex Azar, was president of a major pharmaceutical company in the United States. Both had years and even decades of healthcare experience.

As best I can tell, Xavier Becerra's only experience with healthcare is

suing the Little Sisters of the Poor. Frankly, it should be a joke.

If a Republican President did this, a Republican Senate would discover the backbone to stand up and oppose it. And what I would say is sad is not a single Democrat is willing to stand up to Joe Biden and say: No. Try again. It is a pandemic. Over a half million Americans have died. How about putting someone at HHS that knows something about healthcare?

I will tell you right now, every Senator that supports this confirmation, when they go home, should be prepared to answer to their constituents—should be prepared to answer when their constituents say: Why did you vote to confirm a guy at HHS who doesn't know anything about science or healthcare or medicine? Why, in the middle of a pandemic, did you put in a radical, left-wing trial lawyer instead of someone that could help us beat this pandemic?

And for all the Democratic Senators who love to intone gravely "Listen to the science," that is actually—that sentiment is correct. We should listen to the science, which means we should have someone leading HHS who knows something about science.

My career, as a lawyer, has been litigating cases before the U.S. Supreme Court. If a President asked me to lead the Department of HHS in the midst of a pandemic, I would tell that President: With all due respect, I don't have the professional experience or expertise to do that job. There are other jobs for which I would be qualified, but in a pandemic, the Health and Human Services Department should have someone who knows a damn thing about healthcare.

Instead of knowing anything about science or medicine or viruses or virology or immunizations, what Mr. Becerra does know about is persecuting citizens who don't share his radical, leftwing ideology.

Mr. Becerra, as attorney general of California, has demonstrated a consistent pattern of contempt for privacy. While attorney general, he used his partisan power to overcome the individual privacy rights of California. As attorney general, he demanded that thousands of registered charities annually disclose to his offices the names and addresses of major donors, even though California law didn't require that. But he used government power to violate their right to privacy. Then what did he do? Did he keep it private for law enforcement purposes to examine irregularities? No. Instead, he published the information from nearly 2,000 organizations, subjecting donors and those nonprofits to harassment and abuse.

Healthcare issues are personal. They are sensitive. When you and I go to the doctor, we don't expect our doctor to share our personal healthcare details with the world. Joe Biden has said to the American people: We are going to put someone in charge of the Health and Human Services Department who

doesn't care about privacy and has a record of ignoring your right to privacy.

Later this year, the U.S. Supreme Court will decide whether Mr. Becerra's invasion of privacy violated the First Amendment to the Constitution. While his disregard for privacy is before the Supreme Court, what did Joe Biden do? He said: Let's put him in charge of healthcare in this country.

A third reason Mr. Becerra's nomination is so concerning concerns conscience protections.

The next HHS Secretary will be responsible for upholding the conscience protections that are written into Federal law to protect the rights of people of faith, whatever your faith—whether you are Christian or Jewish or Muslim or whatever your faith might be, the right of professionals, of citizens under the First Amendment to live according to their faith.

But Mr. Becerra, as attorney general, aggressively defended a California law that forced pro-life groups to advertise for abortion, a law that the Supreme Court deemed unconstitutional under the First Amendment.

Think about that for a second. He was so radical in going after and persecuting conscience rights, he wanted pro-life groups to advertise for abortion, and it took the U.S. Supreme Court to strike it down and say: That is unconstitutional. Joe Biden wants him to bring the same heavyhanded zealotry to the Health and Human Services Department.

And Mr. Becerra has not shown that it is just free speech that he has antagonism to, but it is religious liberty as well. Mr. Becerra has defended California's targeting of churches holding indoor services. The State of California concluded that if you go to an indoor service at a church and you pray or you sing or you worship, you are a public health menace. But if you go to a protest, if you go to other secular activities where the name of God is not invoked, then, magically, this virus is not contagious. It is ludicrous. It was facially absurd. It was driven by an unconstitutional animus toward people of faith, and it took the U.S. Supreme Court to strike it down and to say the policy that Mr. Becerra was defending is unconstitutional. Government cannot target people of faith.

So you have got a nominee with no healthcare experience, no medical experience, no scientific experience, but a record of being a radical, persecuting those with whom he disagrees, who has repeatedly gone before the U.S. Supreme Court and lost over and over again for violating the First Amendment, for violating free speech, for violating religious liberty. He is now currently before the Supreme Court for violating the privacy rights of Californians.

Do you want an HHS Secretary who doesn't respect your privacy, who doesn't respect your free speech or religious liberty? Do you want an HHS

Secretary who is not qualified to draw blood or give a shot, who doesn't know how to distribute vaccines, who has never distributed anything?

If nominations and confirmations were based on the merits, were based on qualification to serve, Mr. Becerra's nomination would be rejected by this Senate by a vote of 100 to nothing. The fact that that is unlikely to happen and that every Democrat will march lockstep with the Biden administration to confirm a nominee who has no healthcare experience whatsoever in the midst of a global pandemic show just how profoundly partisan and radicalized today's Democratic Party is.

I believe all of us should be united in demanding a Health and Human Services Secretary who is actually qualified to protect our health and defeat this pandemic.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to speak this afternoon in support of the nomination of Xavier Becerra to serve as the next Secretary of Health and Human Services.

President Biden nominated Mr. Becerra, who currently serves as the attorney general of the State of California. Prior to his service in State government for the people of California, he served in the House of Representatives, representing a district in Los Angeles for 12 terms. He is someone I got to know in those years, especially in the debates about healthcare, which I will speak about in a moment.

But when a person is nominated to be a member of any Cabinet, they bring with them not just their experience but their life story, and Attorney General Becerra's story is a great American story. His own story and that of his family is a great American story, a story of hard work and sacrifice, overcoming obstacles, achieving excellence, not only in his time in school and his academic record but also excellence in his public service as he discharges the duties of the offices that he has held.

I mentioned that I knew him in the years we were debating healthcare here in Washington when he was a Member of the House. But just since his nomination, I met with him and questioned him closely on matters that are important to me and the people of Pennsylvania. I also asked him questions in not one but two—two—hearings because he just happens to be nominated to a Cabinet position where the confirmation is considered by two Senate committees, the Finance Committee and the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, so I had the chance to question him in both hearings, both committees.

Through these conversations and based upon his long and distinguished record of public service, Attorney General Becerra has demonstrated that he

is the kind of leader our Nation needs at HHS during this challenging time.

He is a proven leader who spent his career fighting to expand healthcare—to expand it—protecting both patients and consumers and working to strengthen both Medicare and Medicaid.

As a Congressman, as I mentioned, he was instrumental in drafting and working to pass the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the so-called ACA. And as California's attorney general, he has led the fight to protect it.

Now, my view of the disagreement on the other side of the aisle is just that. This is someone who worked as a Member of Congress and then has worked as attorney general to pass and then uphold the ACA.

On the other side of the aisle, they don't like that because they have been committed as a party here in the Senate and in the House—both Republican caucuses have been committed to two things on healthcare: destroying the ACA, which means destroying all protections for preexisting conditions and—it is important to add this—they have been dedicated to ending—not limiting, not cutting back—ending Medicaid expansion, which, of course, accounted for most of the healthcare gains. Millions of Americans have healthcare today because of the expansion of Medicaid. It is the official position of the Republican Party to end that—to say to all those millions of Americans: You don't deserve healthcare coverage. That is their position based upon what they have supported in bill after bill that came before the Senate. We know that. That is a fact. And until they move away from that position, they will try to take down the nomination of or oppose anyone who wants to uphold the ACA, uphold all protections for preexisting conditions, uphold and support the expansion of Medicaid, one of the best expansions of healthcare in American history, not just recent history, in all of American history.

So I would support Attorney General Becerra just based upon what he has done on healthcare because it happens to be in the best interests of the American people to expand healthcare and the best interests of the people I represent.

I don't come across many people in Pennsylvania coming up to me, saying: I want you to lessen the number of people in the United States or in my State that have healthcare. I want you to cut that back. I want you to cut back on the Medicaid Program—which folks on the other side of the aisle want to do as well.

They not only want to end Medicaid expansion—end it completely—they want to cut the Medicaid Program by hundreds of billions of dollars over 10 years. That is their official position. It has been their position for years to cut the Medicaid Program and to end Medicaid expansion—cut the Medicaid Program by hundreds of billions of dollars.

So if you are against that, they are going to be opposing you, whether it is for confirmation or anything else, because they are the party that wants to cut Medicaid, not by \$100 billion over 10 years, not by \$200 billion or \$300 billion. Look at their budgets year after year. They want to cut it \$500 billion or \$700 billion. One year they even proposed—here in the debates about the budgets, one year they even proposed cutting the Medicaid Program by \$1 trillion. That was the official position of the Republican Party. So if you want to oppose them on that, then they will try to take you down.

The Medicaid Program, by the way, pays for half—almost half—of the births in America. Of the babies born in America, almost half of those births are paid for by Medicaid—the Medicaid Program—the program they want to cut by \$500 billion, at least, and sometimes a lot more than that.

So that is why they are against him, because they want to cut back on healthcare.

Now, his leadership of this Agency could not come at a more important time. Our Nation is facing the greatest public health crisis in more than a century, since the horror of 1918. Now we are facing a similar challenge.

We also have a jobs crisis. So the faster we put this pandemic behind us, the better it is for creating a lot more jobs and lifting our economy out of the ditch that it has been in the last year.

So we need a strong leader at HHS. We need someone who has the experience, the integrity, to lead us in that Agency to help guide us out of the crisis. I am confident—very confident—that Xavier Becerra is that leader, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, the first thing I would like to do is correct what my colleague from Pennsylvania said with regard to preexisting conditions.

I was here last year. I brought to the floor a bill that would say it didn't matter what the Supreme Court did; we would make sure that we could keep preexisting conditions if the Supreme Court declared that the Affordable Care Act was not constitutional. The Democrats blocked it.

I have been up here 2 years, and I have never seen once my Republican colleagues want to reduce spending for Medicaid.

What I do think is unfair is, in my State of Florida, what money we receive from the Federal Government is significantly less per person than what a State like New York has. So I would like changes to the Medicaid Program. I would like it to be a fair program in which States like Florida will get treated just as well as States like New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 798

Madam President, I rise today to discuss an insane issue in the Democrats' COVID spending bill that we need to fix.

Tucked into the Democratic bill is a provision to give \$1,400 stimulus checks to inmates. That is right. As our Nation faces a public health crisis and a crippling debt crisis, Democrats are handing out stimulus checks with your tax dollars to Federal inmates who don't pay income taxes, have all their needs—food and medical expenses included—paid for by taxpayers, and they do nothing to stimulate the economy. It simply doesn't make sense.

My friends and colleagues, Senators BILL CASSIDY, TOM COTTON, and TED CRUZ, tried to fix this by introducing an amendment to strip this out of the Democratic bill, but the Democrats wouldn't have it.

Senate Democrats voted unanimously to block the passage of that good amendment and chose instead to waste even more taxpayer dollars by sending \$1,400 checks to inmates.

Let's talk about what that means for American taxpayers. There are nearly 1.5 million State and Federal inmates incarcerated in Federal prisons across the United States. These are people convicted of committing serious crimes and victimizing their fellow Americans.

Under this bill the Democrats passed, American taxpayers are on the hook for \$1,400 checks to some of the most heinous people we have ever seen. I am talking about people like the racist Charleston Church shooter, Dylann Roof; serial rapist and predator, Larry Nassar; aspiring terrorist, Muhammad Dakhllalla, who tried to join ISIS and is now in prison in Georgia; convicted serial killer and rapist, Mark Goudeau, who is on death row in Arizona; convicted cop killer, Michael Addison, who is on death row in New Hampshire; and the monster who killed 17 innocent Floridians in Parkland at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018.

How could anyone—anyone—possibly justify sending checks to these people?

If we send \$1,400 checks to all State and Federal inmates, all 1.5 million, that is more than \$2 billion—\$2 billion in taxpayer money going to stimulus checks for inmates.

That is \$2 billion that could be used to help our small businesses recover; \$2 billion that could be used to enhance vaccine development and distribution so that more Americans can get the shots they need to move us forward and away from this virus; \$2 billion that could be used to pay down some of our massive debt. There are so many positive uses for these funds that provide a real return for American taxpayers, but sending them to inmates isn't one of them. It is an unjustifiable expense that does nothing to fight COVID-19.

Today, I ask for full support of this body to strip this bad policy from law. We cannot forget that America is in a

debt crisis. I have been talking about it for a while, and I won't stop talking about it because it is a crisis my Democratic colleagues still don't seem to understand.

Right now, our Nation is headed toward \$30 trillion in debt. Think about that—\$30 trillion. The U.S. debt will be equal to \$240,000 per taxpayer. That is insane. And what are the Democrats doing to rein in this unsustainable debt? Absolutely nothing.

In fact, the Democrats' wasteful and untargeted spending bill, which will raise the debt from \$28 trillion to \$30 trillion contains loads of handouts and provisions, just like this one, that recklessly spend on their priorities unrelated to COVID.

That is why I sent a letter to the Biden administration on Monday, urging him to rescind hundreds of billions in waste from this bill and create a targeted approach Americans truly need.

It is clear that Democrats are living in a fantasy land where debt doesn't matter, spending has no consequences, and inflation is impossible. Of course, reasonable Americans know that is not true.

The Biden administration needs to take immediate action to request the rescission of the non-COVID-related, liberal agenda-driven, and wasteful funding found throughout this bill.

So I will keep fighting to cut down on this liberal wish list. Today, we can start that important work and pass my bill to not only save \$2 billion from going to inmates who have no need for the money, but also show the American people that Congress is committed to remaining fully accountable to the American people for the proper stewardship of tax dollars.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 798, introduced earlier today. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, today the Republicans are showing some real chutzpa.

On this issue, Republicans were for it before they were against it. Today, they claim to want to target prisoners. The real harm they are doing is to innocent children and families.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, it is hard to imagine that my colleague just rose in opposition to this good bill.

Let's be clear. By objecting to this bill, Democrats are standing in full support of spending \$2 billion to send

\$1,400 checks to inmates. Democrats want to spend \$2 billion in taxpayer money to send checks to people in prison, convicted of committing serious crimes and victimizing their fellow Americans.

That means Democrats are saying that they want American taxpayers to be on the hook for \$1,400 checks to some of the most heinous criminals we have ever seen—people like Dylann Roof and the Parkland shooter.

How can anyone justify sending checks to these people? Let's remember, inmates don't pay income taxes. They have all their needs, food and medical expenses included, paid for by taxpayers. They don't do anything to stimulate our economy.

I do hope my colleague will reconsider his objection and stand with me in putting accountability to American taxpayers over this insane policy that does nothing but throw \$2 billion we don't have out the window.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I wish you and I wish everyone a happy St. Patrick's Day. It is a big day for celebration up in Boston and all of Massachusetts and all across the country and the world. On St. Patrick's Day, everyone is Irish. So I wish everyone a happy St. Patrick's Day today.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Madam President, right now on the floor of the U.S. Senate is a reason not to be so happy, and that is why I look forward to very soon casting my vote to confirm Xavier Becerra to lead the Department of Health and Human Services, one of the most qualified and forward-thinking minds that will have ever run the Department of Health and Human Services.

But today, Republicans are using this confirmation vote to continue their agenda of obstruction, deflecting attention away from the nominee who will be the head of the chief Federal Agency responding to the coronavirus crisis—all to revive an unnecessary, blatantly political debate on reproductive rights. This ridiculous delay tactic only highlights how out of step with the American people the Senate Republicans are.

Their anti-choice, anti-woman, and anti-health rhetoric is on full display here on the Senate floor, and, sadly, it is not new. They want to roll back Roe v. Wade. They want to criminalize abortion care. They want the government to control women and their bodies. They want to roll back title IX protections for women on university

campuses and completely gut the title X program to fund critical healthcare providers like Planned Parenthood.

Republicans have put in place an anti-choice majority on the U.S. Supreme Court by confirming Justices Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh and illegitimately filling Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's seat with Amy Coney Barrett. If there ever were a reason to abolish the filibuster, it is to ensure that we pass legislation to expand the Supreme Court so it cannot overturn Roe v. Wade and set us back decades in the fight for equal access to healthcare in our country.

But here today, the Republicans are attempting to disrupt the nomination of our Secretary of Health and Human Services with a craven political play to their base at the expense of the health of Americans. They would rather play politics than confirm President Biden's Cabinet nominees. They would rather remain beholden to the far-right's interest groups than do the work the American people sent us here to do.

For the past 4 years, the Trump administration emboldened these groups with dangerous rhetoric and far-right policies. But in November, how did the American people respond? They voted him out and gave the Democrats the Senate majority. Americans entrusted us to serve them, not fringe interest groups who want to turn back the clocks on healthcare and women's rights. That is why I stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate today to say abortion is healthcare.

We cannot stand for any more disparities, delays, or denials. More than ever in this country, we need to stand up and raise our voices against the Republican's work to restrict access to reproductive health services. We have a fight ahead of us—a fight to protect reproductive freedom, a fight to make sure that birth control is affordable and available, and a fight for title X to ensure that low-income patients receive quality family planning and reproductive health services.

Voters expect the Biden-Harris administration to take bold steps to protect and expand access to reproductive healthcare and freedoms, to ensure that every person has the fundamental right to make their own healthcare decisions, and they expect it because they want it.

Public support for Roe v. Wade is at a record high. Seventy-seven percent of Americans support that historic Supreme Court decision. That goes beyond a simple majority to an overwhelming consensus. A couple of years ago, one analysis of polling found that there is not a single State in the United States where a majority of voters support "making abortion illegal in all circumstances." The American people have moved past that debate that Republicans seem committed to resuscitating on the floor today. They are on the wrong side of history and the wrong side of the American people.

So as Republicans try to hijack this confirmation vote on Xavier Becerra,

all I can say is, enough. Enough with the era of extreme bodily discrimination. Enough with outside entities taking control over what a woman can and cannot do with her body. Enough with mounting barriers to reproductive services and birth control. Enough with criminalization of abortion care. Enough with creating roadblocks for poor women, immigrant women, and women of color to get equal access to healthcare. Enough with this offensive debate steeped in misogyny, partisanship, and tyranny.

It is time to guarantee quality, affordable healthcare regardless of race, status, or gender. It is time to rectify the healthcare and reproductive injustices that have cost too many lives for too long. We must move away from the antiquated and ideological debate over women's bodies and recognize the spaces in which our government can promote equity. We can reshape policy to reflect the constitutional rights of all people.

By delaying Xavier Becerra's nomination to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, Republicans seem more interested in denying the health rights of half of Americans than in protecting the health of all Americans.

Plain and simple, Xavier Becerra is exceedingly qualified to be our next Health and Human Services Secretary. He has proven that he prioritizes science and facts, believes in each person's right to make health and medical decisions about their own bodies, and is dedicated to fighting for those most vulnerable in our society. His record and support for reproductive freedom reflect the will of the vast majority of Americans who support legal access to abortion. He is committed to reproductive freedom and understands the importance of ensuring people have access to the accurate information they need to make the best decisions for their lives and for their families.

Xavier Becerra knows what is at stake, and I have the utmost confidence that he will lead with conviction, with compassion, and with care, and is ready to undo the damage that has been done by his predecessors.

As America continues to battle the coronavirus pandemic, his confirmation is long overdue. I am proud to support Xavier Becerra today as Secretary of Health and Human Services. He will be one of the greatest Secretaries our country has ever known.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New Jersey.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today to discuss yesterday's report from the Intelligence Committee, a public report, which confirmed what we all suspected last year: that the Russian Federation favored Donald Trump's reelection and sought to influence the outcome by amplifying attacks on Joe Biden and his family. While the scale of interference appears to be less than what we saw in 2016, the

receptiveness of Trump's inner circle appears to have been about the same. They were open for business.

I am not here to relitigate the 2016 or 2020 elections; I am here to raise my concern with the fact that, for two election cycles in a row now, the Republican Party's nominee for President sought to normalize foreign interference in our elections. And I want to be clear. It is wrong, it is hostile, it is undemocratic, and it must stop if you want the American people to have the confidence in the legitimacy and the credibility of our elections going forward.

This is not about party; this is about the durability of our democracy. Everyone in this body has an important role to play in rejecting foreign interference and restoring trust in our election process.

While the contents of the report came as no surprise, its findings were nonetheless breathtaking. Our intelligence community is highly confident—the highest assessment they have on any given issue—in its assessment that Vladimir Putin was involved in the operation whereby Andrii Derkach and Konstantin Kilimnik successfully manipulated President Trump's inner circle, including his personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani.

Thankfully, the American people had better sense than Mr. Giuliani and rejected the Kremlin-backed lies about Joe Biden and his family. That, however, does not diminish the fact that the Russian Government undertook this effort and the former President welcomed it. The Russian interference detailed in this report occurred at the very same time the Trump administration sought to publicly downplay the role played by Russia.

This report was mandated by Congress and for good reason. Americans deserve to know exactly who is interfering in our democracy and how. As I said before, everyone has a role to play, including the American people. We have to encourage Americans to practice better cyber security and to scrutinize the information they see on the web. Carefully examining social media posts before sharing them must become the new hallmark of a patriotic, active, and informed citizenry. And our social media companies must do a better job stopping the proliferation of foreign disinformation on their platforms.

The health of our democracy depends on this vigilance. The Kremlin will continue to attack our elections and seek to sow divisions among us. We have a responsibility to resist this interference and not make their job any easier.

We live in a media environment where Donald Trump and his Republican allies continue to this day to promote unhinged conspiracy theories that the election was stolen. The intelligence report confirms this is not true.

Some Republican officials have promoted wild conspiracy theories that China supported Democratic cam-

paigns. The intelligence report confirms this was not true.

Former President Trump and his allies still assert that Venezuela manipulated voting machines. A companion report by the Department of Justice and Homeland Security confirmed this is not true.

We must come to terms with the fact that while Russia has aggressively promoted disinformation in our country, the most pernicious engine of lies in the United States is cast by the former President himself.

Knowing the facts sets a foundation for action, and I look forward to engaging with this administration on measures to respond to our intelligence community's findings. There should be sanctions required in response to this interference, and the administration should move quickly to impose them.

I welcome the approach thus far by the Biden administration as it crafts a Russia policy that calls out Kremlin aggression when it happens and takes strong measures in response. The sanctions imposed in response to the Navalny assassination attempt demonstrate that such reckless and dangerous behavior will not be tolerated. And our efforts to hold the Kremlin accountable will include close coordination with our European allies.

The package of sanctions announced on March 2 shows how committed the Biden administration is to confronting Kremlin aggression. This type of rigor in the development of sanctions packages is a welcome reminder of how our government should work. The Navalny sanctions were a good first step, and I look forward to soon seeing the results of the administration's review of Russia policy. In my view, we need a strategy that accomplishes four main goals.

One, limiting the Kremlin's ability to interfere in our democracy as well as those of our allies and partners. This includes a comprehensive plan to counter Russian-generated propaganda and corruption around the world.

Two, standing up for our friends in Ukraine who are literally on the frontlines battling Kremlin aggression. They need our diplomatic support in Europe. They need our security assistance to defend themselves. They need our encouragement to reform democratic institutions. I hope that President Biden will soon speak with President Zelensky to send these important messages.

Three, we have a responsibility to engage with the Russian Government when it is in our national security interests. I supported the extension of the New START agreement and urge the administration to continue to advance arms control policies that advance stability and our national security.

Finally, our Russia policy must extend a hand to the Russian people, many of whom have courageously turned out by the thousands in opposition to Putin and his government. Their struggle for democracy is theirs,

not ours, but we must make clear that our disagreements are not with them but with Vladimir Putin and his corrupt, autocratic regime.

Defending our elections isn't just about strong cyber measures, protecting the ballot box, and promoting better practices on social media. It is about having a foreign policy that clearly communicates our values and interests, one that leaves no room for debate over the openness of any American President to foreign interference. It is about a foreign policy that recognizes how the Kremlin's efforts to weaken democracy in Ukraine or in other European countries ultimately threatens democracy here in the United States. It is about a foreign policy that works with allies and partners, not one that denigrates them at every turn.

The intelligence community is getting better at detecting and guarding against interference, but we must remain vigilant. Russia and other foreign actors will continue to attack our democratic process. Their tactics may evolve, but their intentions remain the same, and we need to stay one step ahead of them.

The Biden administration is off to a good start in defending our democracy. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I look forward to working together to advance policies that reflect America's time-honored democratic values both at home and abroad.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: Is there a time limit that we are in the midst of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in postclosure on the Becerra nomination. Each Senator has up to 1 hour.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Further parliamentary inquiry: Is there a limit on time divided by side or is the floor open regardless?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The floor is open to any Senator who seeks recognition.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Thank you.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Madam President, just switching very briefly, I want to urge my colleagues to join me in support of the nomination of Xavier Becerra to serve as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

I consider Mr. Becerra a friend. I had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives. In fact, we both came to Congress at the same time, a time, I might add, when there were far fewer Latinos elected to Federal office than we have today.

As a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, Mr. Becerra frequently spoke up for the many Americans left behind by our healthcare system: seniors facing sky-high prescription drug bills, patients with preexisting conditions, children, and the working poor.

Furthermore, he played an active role in the effort to pass the Affordable Care Act, a landmark law that since

2010 has changed the lives of millions of Americans in New Jersey and across the Nation for the better.

As California's attorney general, no one has fought harder to protect the Affordable Care Act than Xavier Becerra. And if confirmed to this position, no one will work harder to protect and improve access to healthcare than he will.

As the first Secretary of Health and Human Services of Latino descent, I know that Mr. Becerra will focus a great deal on addressing the health disparities that are harming so many lower income and minority communities nationwide, disparities we saw played out over the past year as COVID-19 claimed a disproportionate number of Black and Brown lives.

Mr. Becerra will also work to undo the damage wrought by the Trump administration to our healthcare system, from weakening nursing home standards that left seniors more vulnerable in this pandemic to allowing health insurers to, once again, sell shoddy, skimpy plans to consumers that failed to protect them from massive medical bills.

And, finally, I want to address some of the criticisms I have heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle regarding Mr. Becerra's qualifications. The notion that Mr. Becerra has no managerial experience is laughable, given that as California's attorney general, he has successfully led the second largest Justice Department in the Nation, second only to the U.S. Department of Justice.

And it is not lost on me that those questioning Mr. Becerra's credentials are the very same colleagues who claim that Congressman Tom Price's background as a doctor qualified him to lead an Agency that touches the lives of every single person in our great land. Well, he was a disaster and did not last a full year as Secretary of HHS. And the immediate past Secretary was a lawyer who did a good job in his pharmaceutical firm of dramatically pushing up insulin prices.

So I am confident that both Mr. Becerra's passion for healthcare issues, as demonstrated throughout his tenure in Congress, and his record as California's attorney general will serve him well as Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I urge my colleagues to support his nomination. He will lead this Agency with integrity and, most importantly, make the health of the American people his No. 1 priority.

With that, I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Ohio for indulging my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of Xavier Becerra, as Senator MENENDEZ just did.

Like Senator MENENDEZ, when Xavier and I came, we all were in the first class in 1992 together. I consider him a friend also and have admired the work

that he did as a Member of Congress, as attorney general, and the work that he will do at HHS.

In the middle of the worst health crisis of our lifetime, we need someone leading this Department who understands the importance of public health and who will work to build a stronger, more affordable healthcare system for the future. That is what Xavier Becerra will do.

He has the experience for this job. As Senator MENENDEZ pointed out, he ran the Nation's second largest law firm. He helped pass the Affordable Care Act, as a Member of the House, that expanded coverage to millions of Ohioans and tens of millions of Americans.

I think the Republican opposition, all partisan opposition, to Attorney General Becerra for Secretary of HHS, as Senator CASEY pointed out, is all about their opposition to the Affordable Care Act, their opposition to expansion of Medicaid. I heard one Senator after another say their State isn't treated right by Medicaid, but they didn't even expand Medicaid in many of those States.

As State attorney general, he took on tobacco companies, drug companies, opioid manufacturers, and polluters. That is another reason Republicans oppose him, because he took on their biggest contributors and their sponsors and the people they come to the Senate and fight for. That willingness to stand up to big drug companies is going to be more important than ever in the years ahead.

The cost of prescription drugs eats away at the budget of seniors and families in Cleveland and Akron and Mansfield and Youngstown and Dayton. I look forward to working with future Secretary Becerra to bring down those drug prices. I also hope we can work together to expand the Affordable Care Act and to make it work even better for the families.

We started this month, and the Presiding Officer from Wisconsin was a part of this, with the American Rescue Plan. People buying healthcare in the ACA exchanges are going to have lower premiums because of the rescue plan.

Mr. Becerra will work to undo the vast disparities in healthcare in our country. This pandemic has been the great revealer. It has shown how unequal access to care and pollution and biases in the system and so much else have hurt the health of Black and Brown Americans for generations.

We need to start with getting accurate data on how different communities have been hurt by this pandemic, something I have pushed for over the past year and something I know will be a priority to the new Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I urge my colleagues to join me in confirming him so he can work to help get every American vaccinated, to expand PPE and COVID testing supplies, and to build a stronger healthcare system for the future.

CONFIRMATION OF KATHERINE C. TAI

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, for decades, Ohio workers have watched the spread of a corporate business model where companies shut down production in Toledo or Dayton or Gallipolis or Youngstown. They collected a tax break to move jobs to Mexico or China where they can exploit workers only to sell their products back into the United States. Ohioans live with those consequences every day.

Last week, 81 workers in Bucyrus, OH, had their jobs outsourced to China, where GE-Savant moved production of its high-efficiency light bulbs overseas. Now, 81 union workers are facing tough conversations at the kitchen tables: How will their families survive; will they fall behind on their rent or their mortgage; do they move away with their kids; will their kids have to change schools—all those decisions that families have to make when workers or when plants shut down and move overseas.

The Presiding Officer from Wisconsin has been involved in this fight ever since her career began in the House 20-plus years ago, and I have worked alongside with her to make sure that we have a different trade policy. But when one production line closes, the ripple effect extends, as we know, to the whole community, to other workers and communities in the supply chain.

Yesterday, people in Northeast Ohio, in the Cleveland area, woke up to headlines about yet another American corporation deciding to build things in Mexico instead of Ohio with Ford breaking its promise to invest \$900 million in Avon Lake.

I got a call 2 days ago from a smalltown mayor, John Hunter, mayor of Sheffield Lake, OH, a longtime Ford—he was a Ford worker, retired, now mayor of Sheffield Village. He talked about how Ford had promised, at the bargaining table in 2019, that they would invest \$900 million in this Avon Lake plant. Ohioans are tired of watching corporation after corporation abandon the workers and communities that have made their businesses successful.

We are being told that production of cheap, simple products will be shipped overseas, while innovative, high-value products will be made in the United States by American workers. We see in Bucyrus, we see in Avon Lake that that is just not true, and we are sick of it. Our trade policy has to change.

That is why today was a good day for this country. Katherine Tai was confirmed by this body 98 to nothing. She understands trade policy. She is the right leader to take us in a new direction on trade with American workers at the center. She is a serious expert. She is respected on both sides of the aisle. We saw that in that vote today. She has a proven track record of making progress for workers.

Last year, I voted for a trade agreement for the first time ever in my ca-

reer because of our work with Senator WYDEN to fix the Trump administration's corporate trade agreement. He said it was a new NAFTA. It was really a tired, old, mostly the same NAFTA, rebranded as USMCA. We went to work. We secured groundbreaking new worker protections. Katherine Tai was one of the key policymakers who worked with us to make that happen. She was in the negotiations. She was in the discussions. She helped Senator WYDEN and I make this a much better bill that people, like a whole lot of us, as progressives, pro-worker Senators, could vote for.

Her work helped us make the first improvement to enforcing labor standards in our trade agreements enforceable, serious labor standards, since we have been negotiating them.

We know why companies close factories in Ohio and open them in Mexico. They can pay lower wages. They can take advantage of workers who don't have rights. American workers can't compete. We get a race to the bottom on wages and benefits.

The only way of stopping it is raising labor standards in every country we trade with and making sure those labor standards are enforced.

That is what Katherine Tai will do. She will enforce the laws we already have. She will stand up for American workers. She will fight for American businesses when countries cheat the rules. She will work with us to level the playing field so steelworkers and autoworkers and communication workers in Ohio and Wisconsin and all over the country can compete.

She won't allow corporate lobbyists to write trade agreements. We have seen it. Since I came to the Congress, we have seen it with NAFTA. We have seen it with CAFTA. We have seen it with PNTR. We have seen it with agreement after agreement after agreement: Corporate lobbyists write trade agreements. Workers are locked out of the room.

Now, with U.S. Trade Rep Tai's confirmation—the nominee, of course—I asked her what she will do to start to regain the trust of Americans in trade. She said:

You start by listening.

She then talked about the Mahoning Valley, Youngstown area in my State, listening to and understanding the concerns of communities that have gotten hurt over and over.

The administration's outline for its 2021 agenda, trade agenda, which Miss Tai will be charged with carrying out, says that "trade policy should respect the dignity of work."

Trade policy should respect the dignity of work and value Americans as workers and wage earners.

Imagine that; that our trade policy, never before have we seen this respecting the dignity of work and valuing Americans as workers and wage earners. That is the kind of thinking we need leading our trade policy.

As the first woman of color to ever serve as the President's chief trade ad-

viser, Katherine Tai knows how important it is for the people in the room making trade decisions to actually reflect, to actually reflect the diverse workforce that our trade policy affects.

We know one good appointment and one good provision won't stop outsourcing, but I am always going to be straight with American workers. We have come a long, long way, but we have a long, long way to go to undo the damage our trade policies have done over the past three decades.

As the Presiding Officer, I have stood up to Presidents of both parties on trade throughout my career. That is not going to change. One of my proudest votes was one of my first votes, and that was against the North American Free Trade Agreement.

I will continue to watch closely what this administration does. If they show any hint of reverting back to the old way of doing things, of letting corporations dictate trade policy at the expense of workers, they will hear about it from me. This is going to be a constant effort over many years.

As thrilled as I am with Katherine Tai, we know we still have a job to do to reorient trade agreements and trade laws that are a priority; that our emphasis no longer is corporations, but it is American workers. It has to be coupled with real investment in the communities that have been hollowed out because of Washington's and Wall Street's past mistakes. It has to be paired with an overhaul of our Tax Code to end, once and for all, the tax breaks paid for by Ohioans and others to send production overseas.

Trade doesn't happen in a vacuum. Our policies must work together to create a global market where workers are treated with dignity; they are safe on the job; they are paid fair wages; they are able to bargain collectively; they are able to bargain collectively for better pay and benefits.

When you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work. That is what Katherine Tai will do.

I thank my colleagues for the strong vote in support of her confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise today in strong support for the confirmation of California's attorney general, Xavier Becerra, to be the next Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I am absolutely confident that Mr. Becerra has the knowledge, the experience, the skills, and, just as importantly, the values and principles required of this job—a job that will play a key role in beating the coronavirus and tackling the urgent issues of equity and affordability now facing our healthcare system.

I am especially confident in my assessment of Xavier Becerra because I have known him personally for years, both as a former colleague and as a

friend. I first met then-Congressman Becerra in the House of Representatives, where he served for over two decades with myself and the Presiding Officer and others, and where he was a champion for the healthcare rights of the American people, working overtime to make sure that every American had access to quality, affordable healthcare.

We served together in the House Democratic leadership, and we served together on the House Ways and Means Committee. So I have had an opportunity to see his legislative talents up front and also to witness his love of service to our country.

We worked together to halt a number of proposals that maybe some of our Republican colleagues here in the Senate were pushing for, including the proposal that continuously appeared in the House Republican budget to voucherize the Medicare Program. One of the former Speakers of the House wanted to essentially provide seniors on Medicare with a voucher and send them out into more of a private marketplace. It would have ended up putting our seniors more at risk. So together we did battle that idea.

We served together on what was known as the Congressional Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction, also known as the "supercommittee," and known to some as the "not-so-super committee." I saw him work to try to achieve agreements on some of the biggest challenges facing our country, but, like him, we both agreed that we weren't going to do that at the expense of protecting Medicare for seniors, protecting Medicaid as an absolutely essential healthcare safety net for tens of millions of Americans, and we were not prepared to provide more tax cuts to the very wealthiest of Americans.

It is in that last effort where Xavier Becerra, I think, really distinguished himself in the House, when it came to the issue of equity and healthcare. I know the Presiding Officer knows well the battles we all went in together in the development and passage of the Affordable Care Act, and it was that that really defined Mr. Becerra's legacy in the House.

He championed the Affordable Care Act from the very start. He helped both to write and to pass this landmark law that now helps tens of millions of our fellow Americans, and after leaving the Congress, he led the charge to defend the Affordable Care Act against the Texas case before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now, I know a lot of our Republican colleagues have also spent years fighting the Affordable Care Act. We have seen that play out here in the U.S. Senate within the last couple years. But the reality is the Affordable Care Act is very important to the overwhelming majority of the American people who support it and is an essential lifeline to quality, affordable healthcare for tens of millions of Americans. And it is that

that Mr. Becerra fought to pass and which he has fought to defend against constant attacks in the courts.

There is no question that Xavier Becerra fights for what he believes is right, as he should, but that has never prevented him from working across the aisle to get things done. As the attorney general in the State of California, he has repeatedly partnered with Republicans to solve the pressing issues facing our fellow citizens.

He builds bridges every day and has worked across party lines to expand access to COVID-19 treatments, to confront the opioid crisis, and to address the dangers of vaping and smoking among our Nation's youth.

His record shows that Attorney General Becerra fights for what is important to the people he represents, not the party he belongs to, and he has demonstrated it by example time and time again with his ability to bridge deep divisions, even during this time of division. I know that he will fight hard for each and every one of our fellow citizens and will not look to see whether somebody is a Democrat or a Republican or from some other party. What he cares about is making sure he is looking out for the healthcare of every American.

And, at this moment, everyone in this country stands to benefit from an effective leader at the helm of the Department of Health and Human Services. Our most pressing task is to contain the spread of COVID-19 and to defeat COVID-19. That requires clear messaging on public health measures. That requires accelerating the distribution of vaccines and treatment and testing and making sure we do all of that in an equitable way. That means safely guiding the opening of our schools, and we all want our students to get back to school as quickly as possible and as safely as possible.

As the attorney general of California, he has led one of the largest departments of justice in the country, and, in that capacity, has stood up for strong consumer and worker protections throughout this pandemic and before, and I trust that he will continue to do so for all Americans as Secretary of HHS, if confirmed.

We know that this public emergency and health crisis has been a blow to our country. It has also laid bare the fault lines in our healthcare system in terms of racial inequities, inaccessibility for underserved communities, and underinvestment in our public health infrastructure. These issues, of course, predated COVID-19, but we must tackle them with renewed urgency as we emerge from this crisis.

Mr. Becerra is equipped to root out these disparities, both because of his knowledge and skill and expertise but also because of his lived experience. Xavier grew up in a working-class Latino family. He knows the communities that are hurting most because he has lived in those communities. He would bring to this important office

not only his expertise and skill but the empathy and the compassion needed to help those most in need.

Like most of us, Mr. Becerra is also guided and motivated by what makes him most proud: his family. At his confirmation hearing, he spoke movingly about his wife and his children, who are all a part of all that he does. And he spoke about his parents, who traveled to this country from Mexico seeking a better life, with nothing more than, in Xavier's words, "their health and their hope."

It is that health and that hope that propelled Mr. Becerra into a life of public service, and it is that health and that hope that will animate his leadership at the Department of Health and Human Services, should he be confirmed by this Senate.

He was brought up in a family that believed in and sought the American dream, and he has spent his life fighting to make that dream real for families across this Nation. He believes, as I believe, that that mission requires us to care for the health and safety of each and every one of our fellow citizens, and I have full confidence that he is up to the task.

Colleagues, I urge us to confirm the nomination of Xavier Becerra to be the next Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Indiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 730

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, this past year has been hard on Hoosiers and Americans across the country. When the economy was shut down, Congress got to work. Given my background as a business owner, I was involved in negotiating the Paycheck Protection Program, known as PPP, as part of the CARES Act, one of five bills that passed in 2020 with overwhelming support, I think 90-plus votes. We worked it out, Democrats and Republicans, together.

Those COVID-related packages totaled \$4 trillion, and we didn't have a penny saved up ahead of time to prepare for it. That is part of a deeper problem with this institution, is that we borrow anything that we spend money on, even 23 percent of our annual operating budget. To put that in perspective, imagine if you had a business doing \$100,000 in revenue, and you are losing \$23,000, and then you go to your banker and expect them to bail you out. It wouldn't make sense.

We came into 2021 with over \$1 trillion from those packages unspent, unobligated. Instead of working with us like before, Democrats did shut us out of the process. In fact, the Senate as a whole did not work the bill through committees. It was laid to us, on the Senate, by the House, all \$1.9 trillion of it.

Before this, some Republicans went to the White House to talk with the President about a bipartisan plan, knowing all the money would be borrowed again, but nothing came to fruition. Instead, we stayed up all night;

finished the bill at noon the next day, Saturday; spent 29 hours on the floor, and not a single Republican amendment was adopted in this massive spending bill.

Instead of focusing on the virus and getting our economy back on track, this became an exercise in ramming something through that was a liberal wish list. Only 1 percent of the bill—1 percent of the bill—went toward the vaccine. Less than 9 percent goes toward COVID-19 public health issues generally.

While the Congressional Budget Office projects the economy to return to prepandemic levels by midyear, only 5 percent of the \$130 billion for K-12 schools gets spent this year, and none of it is tied to reopening our schools, which many States had shut down early and opened up late.

Included in this package is a whopping \$350 billion for State and local governments. I had a conversation with our own Governor 2, 3 weeks ago. A place like Indiana, and I believe West Virginia as well, probably runs balanced budgets. We do it with the guardrail of a constitutional amendment. Many other States, if they don't have a constitutional amendment, they have a statute. In other words, you do what households do. You do what all businesses do. You live within your means. And here, when you run your State governments in a way that in good times, you can't make ends meet, and you look to the Federal Government to bail out your bad governance, it is a whole nother issue.

Even left-leaning economists and think tanks are worried about what this is going to do down the road because most of the time, you don't feel the repercussions until later. And, of course, that could show up in inflation. It could show up in a way similar to what we dealt with in the late seventies and the early eighties.

Forty-four States had surpluses last year, when you look at COVID funding. Many places, like California, had surpluses. Then they reconfigured how this was done not based on pro rata population but rewarded the States with the highest unemployment levels. It sounds bizarre to me.

Governor Holcomb in Indiana has done a great job balancing the economy with public safety, and that is why our unemployment rate is now close to a full employment rate. It was the lowest in the Midwest going into it because we have a good business climate, and we have a low cost of living. Things work there. Sadly, the Democrats' bill punishes States like Indiana for safely reopening. The higher a State's unemployment rate, again, the more bailout money you get proportionately.

But it goes one step further, and this is the part that caught my attention. I am interested in hearing the explanation for it. I think it was a sneaky maneuver when you put it in such a large bill that had other doozies like

stimulus checks for undocumented immigrants, for felons, all kinds of stuff that I think, when you look at it, shouldn't have been in there. But when it is that massive—it takes 10, 11 hours to read out loud—you are going to get some of that. What this does is say that if a State takes Federal money, they cannot lower their State taxes in any way through 2024.

First of all, I believe this is unconstitutional and coercive. Second, we should never punish States for putting taxpayers first. We serve the public and should be good stewards of their money, and especially a place like this that runs the way it does day in and day out should not be telling States that run their operations responsibly that they cannot do what they want with spending or taxation.

My bill strikes the provision that prohibits States' ability to change revenues as they see fit for their State's unique needs.

Second, my bill strips out the reporting requirement where States have to tell the Federal Government about every revenue source and amount of money they take in. This place ought to be doing that routinely to all the people who send it revenue.

This bill has the support of over 25 groups, including the American Legislative Exchange Council, Americans for Prosperity, Americans for Tax Reform, Citizens Against Government Waste, Club for Growth, FreedomWorks, Heritage Action for America, Independent Women's Forum, and the National Taxpayers Union, among others. We expect many more to join in coming days. I am sure many stakeholders in Indiana and in West Virginia not mentioned will throw in support as well.

Lastly, I would like to thank the Finance Committee ranking member, Senator CRAPO, for cosponsoring this legislation—and others, including Senators BLACKBURN, CAPITO, INHOFE, MARSHALL, RUBIO, RICK SCOTT, TILLIS, and Senator YOUNG from my home State.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 730 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANCHIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, my good friend the Senator from Indiana—I am hoping this is a misunderstanding, and I hope I can explain it because I was very much involved in this process.

First of all, as a former Governor, I know about the budget process. I know about balanced budgets. I used to meet

every Tuesday afternoon. As Governor, I would have my finance people come to my office, and we would sit down and look at the revenue estimates. We had to make adjustments because we had a balanced budget amendment. Isn't that a novelty, a balanced budget amendment? We had to live within our confines. That is something that no one who has ever been in State government or ever run a business understands. I understand that. But it is something that we did very religiously.

The language in this bill, Senator from Indiana, the only thing this bill does—or that language you were concerned about, the only thing it did—you can cut all you want to. You can manage all your money the way you want. You just can't take Federal money and use it if you cut your revenue intentionally. That is all. What we try to do is target where the money has gone.

So the Treasury, you have to go—as a State, you go to the Treasury, and you show the need that you have. You show the cost—what COVID has cost your revenue and you are able to have money to replace that because COVID caused you that problem.

You have also the ability to use this, in your State, for three things: water, sewer, and internet service. So you have infrastructure that can be done.

Also, what we did in this bill is we have it going out to 2024, so you are not going to overheat, if you will—overheat or overcharge the economy. They can spread that out. The State and local moneys go in two tranches: Half this year, half next year is what you can access. The money to every one of your communities—for the first time, 40 percent of that total money goes directly, so your large cities will get money directly from the Treasury. They have to show how they are using it for their backfill, not, basically, having anything to do with what their tax revenue is. They just can't use this money to backfill tax cuts if they want to do that. That is pretty simple because there is not a need for it. If you can reduce your taxes, then you don't need Federal dollars to backfill to show that you are in good shape. But if you need it for anything else, you can use it for that. You can use it for all these things.

I can tell you—I would assure you that every incorporated city in Indiana, every county in Indiana has to be thrilled. They have to be thrilled for the first time to have control of their destiny. That was our intention.

In the first CARES package, that never happened. The first CARES package went directly to the Governors, and if the Governors were very prudent in how they did it—set up a committee, worked through the legislature—some did, some didn't, and there is a lot of money that never got into the basic fibers of your State or my State. Now that is not going to be the problem.

Also, they have the ability, if they have a water project they have been

trying to do forever and never had the resources to do it, they can use their money for that.

If they have a sewer project—I have said this: How do we pick water, sewer, and internet? They are not the sexy things that, basically, Governors and politicians go out and cut ribbons for—a sewer line or a water line that is buried 50 feet down. That is not a sexy thing.

We knew the infrastructure was falling apart city by city and the ages of water lines are over 80 years in most of our cities. So we tried to do something.

They have until 2024, so they don't have to throw it out. It is not shovel-ready. It is a project you have been wanting to do but never could afford.

I assure you, we do not want to impede good fiscal management to make adjustments to do whatever they want to their tax codes. This does not prohibit that. It just prohibits using and going to the Federal Treasury and saying: I have a loss of revenue because I cut \$100 billion or I cut \$100 million or a billion dollars out of my State budget when I reduced taxes, and now I can't pay my bills.

Also, you can't use this money from the Federal Government for your pensions. That is a responsibility that we have. We call it OPEB, other postponed employment benefits. OPEB is other postponed employment benefits—pensions, healthcare, all the things that when a person retires from their State, these are things that the State has a contract and an obligation for them in their retirement. It is the responsibility of the States to manage that, and that, basically, keeps the State in a good financial position. It keeps your credit rating up or your credit rating low if you have managed yourself through it. This is only to help you with expenses and extraordinary expenses that you incurred during COVID. That is all, sir.

I don't want the State of Indiana or any State to think that they can't do whatever they want to with their taxes. They just can't use the Federal Treasury to backfill something done deliberately, basically, or self-inflicted—a loss of revenue. That is about it in a nutshell.

COVID-19 is the greatest challenge we have ever had. I know you mentioned a few things. I will tell you this because my dear friend from Maine is sitting here. We met quite a bit on the bill in a bipartisan way, even though a lot of it did not get in. The bill was bigger than what my friends—all of you, my friends on the Republican side—could basically vote for. I understand that.

But please understand there are an awful lot of things we talked about that I did everything in my power to make sure the tranches—spreading them out, not going it all at one time. There is the RESTAURANTS Act. Senator WICKER and Senator SINEMA were on the RESTAURANTS Act. There was, basically, the homeless children's

bill that Senator MURKOWSKI and myself put in there. There was bipartisanship in that.

There should have been a lot more; I agree. We both know the process sometimes doesn't work the way we want it to. But you make every effort you can to make it work. I did that. Whenever I talked, I said that this had bipartisan input. It didn't come out as a bipartisan vote, but there was bipartisan input into this piece of legislation, the best we possibly could.

I think it is a piece of legislation that we—if you have education, there is not a school in America today that should not be able to have a program where they can make their school the safest environment that a child should be in. Every parent should be safe in thinking their children are in a safe place because of heating, ventilation—things that we have in this bill that allow education to have the resources it needs and, also, your higher education too.

The money that is going out—you have money going to the stimulus payments, going to all of your citizens at \$75,000. We put a hard cap. We tried to put a hard cap at \$75,000 and \$150,000. We found out the first CARES package—I don't think that anyone on the Republican side or the Democrat side thought someone making \$200,000, \$300,000 would be getting money. They didn't need a check, but we found out it happened. We didn't intend for that to happen. That is the way the code read, and that is the way it kind of slipped into that. We stopped that from happening here.

So we tried to do everything—and that, again, came from our bipartisan group. If it wasn't for the bipartisan group talking and saying “This is something we can't do,” I would have had things I might have missed. I wouldn't have known some things that were of concern to all of us and some of the atrocities that happened that we didn't want to repeat. We did all the things we could to stop that.

I am very reluctant to object to any of my Senators, my fellow Senators, but on this one, sir—if I can work with you on this—I am objecting because I want to have a productive sit-down with you and we can work on something together.

Please tell your Governor that he can cut away if he wants to. He just can't go back to the Federal Government and say: OK, I made a mistake. Now I need your money.

That is about it in a nutshell. If Indiana can cut and it helps you and grows your economy, God bless you. If you have COVID expenses, we are going to help you. If you have projects—my goodness, just infrastructure projects—then there is no impediment there if you have internet services you need, if you have water services, and you have sewer services.

In West Virginia, what we are trying to do right now is put a team together that can basically work from this. The

State has money for those three tranches of infrastructure. The counties have it, and the municipalities have it. The unincorporated towns that aren't able to get money directly are going to count on the county and the State.

There is so much good to be done to make it work for you to make sure they understand. They are elated to now have a project they never could finish, like upgrade your services, finish your water line, have internet service you have never had before. These are all unbelievable opportunities that we have never had.

The bipartisan SMART Act that was filed in May 2020 included both of these guardrails, plus another one required maintenance of effort. We have that in there. Maintenance of effort—we put that back then.

The Bipartisan State and Local Support of Small Business Protections Act that was released last December had exactly the same language. This is not new language, sir. This is the same language that has been there.

They have never been able to backfill for, basically, discretionary cuts that they made themselves. It doesn't prohibit them, the same as it doesn't prohibit anybody in their State for having—and being a former Governor, I am very partial to the 10th Amendment to the Constitution, States rights. You have those rights. Now you have the assistance also with those rights.

I am hoping to improve everyone's situation. I know it does in West Virginia. I hope it does in Maine. I hope it does in Indiana, and I think it will.

It is all about making these emergency funds get to the right people. We are trying to target it. It is something we have to keep an eye on. I can tell if we do it and do it right and we are good stewards, this will get us through this COVID challenge that we have because we really don't know.

I am hoping we come out of this guns ablazing in July—we come out of this, and the economy takes off like a rocket. Sometimes when they take off, they tend to level off too.

We want to make sure we are still out there for 2022, 2023, out to 2024. And if they do it and do it right, they can. They can finish their projects and be able to have the moneys as needed for emergencies if it has a dip.

With that, we thought we had worked something, but the language is nothing new. It is not a surprise. It was not anything that was put in; it has been in there. Basically, it is language that spells out pretty directly how you can use your money and what money you can't acquire. That is the only thing we did.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes, there is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. My friend from West Virginia explained why this won't impact Governors and legislatures in terms of what they can do with their own fiscal policy. I would say my friend the Senator from West Virginia probably ought to check with Governor Justice and his legislature to see if they are on the same wavelength there.

When we got input in bringing this up as an issue and when you are talking about the American Legislative Exchange Council, Americans for Tax Reform, Citizens Against Government Waste—I won't repeat the rest of the list—I think it would get down to semantics in this sense: What do you do if you want to cut tax rates? Then, just like pre-COVID, we cut taxes, and revenues went up for 3 to 4 years.

How do you measure that complicated equation? In many cases, when you cut rates, you find a new sweet spot where you generate more tax revenue. How would you sort all of that out? Then, if it were not based upon penalizing States that are most apt to lower their tax rates because of how good their economies were pre-COVID, it would be a different issue as well.

So I am willing to listen in terms of how that does play out, but for now, I am going to view it as something, I think, that is not going to sit well with many States, their Governors, or their legislatures and that has a possibility of being taken to court as being something that might be unconstitutional. If I am off base, I am willing to listen, but I will probably have to bring some other parties in to make sure that this isn't a case of semantics and is real according to the way you explain it.

Mr. MANCHIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRAUN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. First of all, I did have a nice conversation with Governor Justice. He and I have disagreed on basic issues on Tax Code legislation, and we are trying to work through all of that. I explained it to him. I said that it doesn't do a thing in that it doesn't impede you at all. If you want to cut, go ahead and cut. He is still moving through with the legislation. He might succeed on that, and he might not.

With that, I will make it very clear that this is not new language. You cannot backfill. You cannot backfill. The only thing you can use your money for is for COVID expenses. Basically, if your revenues were down through no fault of your own, business dropped off, and your tax collections were down through no fault of your own, then that is what this is for. COVID caused you a problem. It caused you an imposition and put strain on the services that you are basically providing to the people of West Virginia and Indiana.

We want to make sure that your first responders are there and your education is there, that everything is still running the way it is supposed to. That is why we have passed five bills in trying to keep things afloat, and we think we have done that. So it does not im-

pede that whatsoever. We have also looked at it constitutionally, and we are solid on the Constitution.

All we are asking is, does the Federal Government have a responsibility to backfill with Treasury dollars a decision that could be self-inflicted? That is all. You should live with that or my State should live with it or reap the benefits. We are not penalized. Even if your revenues went up, you still had COVID expenses you could offset. Those were legitimate expenses that you incurred during the COVID-19 pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic is what we are talking about. So if your revenues went up after that, we are not penalizing you. If they went down, that is a whole other story because COVID caused that, but you just can't cause it yourself. I think this is it in a nutshell.

Mr. BRAUN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. BRAUN. I think it begs the question in that, by cutting taxes, you are going to lower gross tax revenues, and that has been a discussion we have all had for many years.

I know in places like Indiana—and we just had it occur here with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act at the Federal level—that the CBO—and I was working with it—was getting close to saying its original forecast of when you had a tax cut, which was \$1.5 trillion over 10 years, \$150 billion per year, wasn't working out that way because there is the phenomenon called: When you find the sweet spot of taxation, you can cut taxes and generate more revenue. Then you penalize a good fiscal move by the way you are interpreting your reading.

I am willing to get into the nuance to see if that would muster that particular case, but I don't think it would.

Mr. MANCHIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRAUN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator BRAUN has always been very kind and very reasonable, and I look forward to sitting down with him on this.

What he has said is absolutely correct in that we are not penalizing. We don't intend to penalize anybody who has made that decision, but the Senator is talking about a State that has a balanced budget amendment year in and year out. There is a time when a Governor has to make a decision and go to his legislature and say: Hey, we are going to be X amount of dollars short, so we need to cut. So they start cutting and cutting services. That is what happens in order to balance the budget usually—services are cut to the people.

We are just saying in our piece of legislation here that we have that we don't want that to happen because it is of no fault of your own, but if you cut your taxes and you are thinking, well, 5 years down the road, we are going to have more revenue, then that is fine. You just can't backfill for that short period of time and use it for something for which you have cut revenues, basically, in a self-inflicting way. It might

be a self-ingratiating way to where it will help you down the road, but you still can't backfill for that.

Now, for any COVID expenses you have, absolutely, you can fill that hole. Show that you have had COVID expenses. If you were to say, "OK. We filled all of our holes for COVID, and now we have water, sewer, and internet"—and trust me, there is not a place in Indiana or in West Virginia that doesn't need help there.

I thank the Senator. I appreciate it. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 804 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

PROTECT AND SERVE ACT

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the brave, hard-working men and women who serve as law enforcement officers in our communities across the Nation. Men and women in law enforcement risk life and limb every day to protect public safety and preserve the rule of law. They truly are American heroes.

In recognition of their remarkable service and sacrifice, I am reintroducing the Protect and Serve Act. I hope every Senator agrees we must do everything we can to support the men and women in blue. I also call on my colleagues to support this common-sense legislation. It is my hope that this legislation will unite us on a bipartisan basis to support those heroes who keep us safe.

I can think of no better example of why we need this legislation than the events of January 6, right here in this Chamber and across the Capitol. While a ruthless, anarchist mob sought to disrupt and destroy our democracy, Capitol Police officers bravely kept us safe from harm while they were being viciously attacked by the violent mob. Many of my colleagues saw this firsthand while they were getting us into a safe position as the events unfolded that day.

Because this attack occurred in DC, though, there are only limited laws in place to prosecute those who would assault a law enforcement officer. Under current law, a criminal who assaults a law enforcement officer with a deadly weapon or who inflicts bodily injury could receive anywhere from a fine to 20 years in prison. Under the Protect and Serve Act, these violent criminals will receive an additional 10 years in prison if they assault an officer, and if they murder or kidnap a law enforcement officer, they could be given life sentences.

This would apply not only to Federal law enforcement and Federal properties, but it could also be used to prosecute criminals at the State and local levels who target law enforcement officers. This Federal law would ensure

that prosecutors have every tool available to punish those who attack the men and women in blue.

Nationwide in 2020, 47 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty, and over 300 were shot. Three of those murdered officers were right in my home State of North Carolina. So far in 2021, 14 officers have been killed in the line of duty, and over 50 have been shot. Countless others have been assaulted.

The year 2020 saw the rise of radical ideas like abolishing the police, which fueled distrust and disdain for our brave men and women in blue. Even while Americans of all views are calling for transparency and accountability, the ideas of abolishing and defunding the police only serve to deepen the divide in our country and our communities.

It is sad that Congress even needs to consider a bill to protect law enforcement officers. The heated rhetoric and the violent attacks on officers are having real world impacts beyond just the safety of our law enforcement community. Across the country, recruitments are down and retirements are up. We have cities having to increase funding for recruiting and finding people that will replace those who have left the profession or retired early. This is sad, but it is not surprising. Law enforcement officers put their lives at risk every single day. They leave their spouses and families every morning, and they don't know if they are going to come back.

In 2018, before the antipolice rhetoric took hold, the House passed the legislation by an overwhelming vote of 382 to 35—the bill that I am reintroducing—including 220 Republicans and 162 Democrats. On the floor, every current Member of the House Democratic leadership voted in favor of this legislation, including Speaker PELOSI.

This has been bipartisan legislation, and it should be bipartisan legislation today, which is why I call on all of my colleagues—Members of the Republican caucus and the Democratic caucus—to join us in support of this commonsense and needed legislation.

Congress must pass the Protect and Serve Act right away and boldly say that there is no escape from justice for dangerous criminals who intentionally assault and kill our hard-working, dedicated law enforcement officers.

I urge the American people: Call your Senators. Ask them to support the measure. Tell them that you want this bill passed and our law enforcement officers protected. Don't be silent. Help me fight for the men and women in blue, because they are counting on us. And along the way, when you see a law enforcement officer, thank them for their service and let them know Members of Congress are fighting for them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last month, the American people cre-

ated 379,000 new jobs across our country. The unemployment rate fell to 6.2 percent. Our economy is recovering. We are actually on our way back to normal.

In early February, the Congressional Budget Office published a report on this. The report says that our economy will reach the same size that it was before the pandemic, and it will do it in just a few months. It says this summer our economy will be back to normal.

Now, the CBO made that projection weeks before the Democrats passed and the President signed into law a \$1.9 trillion wish list. In other words, our economy would be back to normal even had they never passed the bill. We would be back to normal without a dime of this incredible high amount of spending.

We didn't need the liberal wish list. The country doesn't need it. Yet it is obvious why Democrats rushed—rushed—their liberal wish list into law. They wanted to stamp their name on the recovery that was coming, no matter what. I have no doubt that that is the goal.

Yet the truth is clear: This is not President Biden's recovery. President Biden inherited three vaccines—successful vaccines, vaccines that work and are safe. President Biden inherited 2 million tests a day for coronavirus. President Biden inherited falling coronavirus numbers. He also inherited a recovering economy.

Last year, we saw the fastest economic recovery in American history. The unemployment rate fell by half in 6 months. The American people created more than 12 million jobs coming back from the pandemic. They did it in just 6 months. That is more jobs than were created in the 8 years of the Obama-Biden administration.

Now, this was in large part because of the foundation laid by Republicans before the pandemic, with President Trump's economic programs in the White House. Republicans cut taxes for the middle class, on job creators. We cut regulations, and we cut government redtape. We made a better trade deal with our neighbors. Our agenda worked.

Just before the pandemic hit, the unemployment rate was down to 3.6 percent. The American people created more than 7 million new jobs under President Trump. We saw record-low unemployment for Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, and African Americans. We reached the lowest unemployment rate for women in 60 years.

When America began to reopen, the success of that agenda helped us recover at a record pace. The economy is also recovering because we are making progress against the virus.

With Republicans in the White House and a Republican majority in the U.S. Senate, we passed more than \$4 trillion in coronavirus relief. Unlike the Democrats' relief wish list, all five of our bills were bipartisan. They each got 90 votes in the Senate or more.

Operation Warp Speed broke records for vaccine development. A new vaccine typically takes about 10 years from the lab to people's arms. The previous record for a vaccine was for mumps. It took 4 years. Last year, we achieved two coronavirus vaccines in 10 months. We broke records, and it wasn't even close. The Food and Drug Administration made dozens of cuts to regulations in order to make this happen.

The Biden administration has not played it straight with the American people about coronavirus. We remember when Vice President Harris said that there was "no national strategy or plan for vaccinations."

We were delivering millions of doses of vaccines in December. President Biden said: "We got into office and there was nothing in the refrigerator"—"nothing in the refrigerator."

The Biden campaign and now the Biden administration has repeatedly misled the American people on the coronavirus. They have repeatedly taken credit for things for which they deserve no credit.

Mark my words. This summer they are going to try to take credit for our recovery. If they do, they will be flat-out wrong.

Our recovery was booming under the Republican agenda, and it was an agenda of low taxes and fewer regulations. That is the agenda that the American people need to get our economy booming again.

DEMOCRATS' AGENDA

Madam President, on another matter, I also come to the floor to oppose what I see as a radical agenda of the Democrats in Congress.

It has not even been 2 months since the Democrats took over the Senate, and they have already rolled out one of the most leftwing agendas in American history. They have already spent \$1.9 trillion—trillion with a "t"—\$1.9 trillion of our tax dollars. Twenty-six Democrats have endorsed amnesty for illegal immigrants. Nearly every Democrat has endorsed giving statehood to Washington, DC, and now Senator SCHUMER has put gun control on the Senate's to-do list. Democrats have proposed a radical agenda that invades nearly every aspect of American life.

Yet the driving force behind this agenda is not the Senate. It is still the House. House Democrats have gone after our First Amendment right to freedom of religion. They have gone after our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. They have gone after our right to work. When Democrats are in charge, none of our rights are safe.

Neither are our most cherished institutions. House Democrats have gone after our police, gone after our elections. They lecture Republicans about accepting the results of elections. Yet they are trying to overturn an election in Iowa.

Now, the lawyer the Democrats have put in charge of that case was just

sanctioned in Federal court on ethics violations. Yet Speaker PELOSI has made it clear at her press conference on Friday that she supports the effort to overturn the election.

That is not all. Democrats aren't just trying to change one election. They are trying to change all of our elections. They have passed a bill to change just about every aspect of our elections forever.

A recent poll by Harvard shows that 71 percent of voters say they don't want future elections to be like they were in 2020. If Democrats get their way, every election will be a pandemic election.

To change our elections, Democrats still need 60 votes in the Senate. That is why over the weekend, Democrats' allies at the New York Times endorsed changing the rules of the Senate. The paper explicitly said that that was the reason. The paper attacked Members of this body—Senator MANCHIN and Senator SINEMA—who have had the courage to oppose changing the rules of the Senate. The editorial board said: "This is a singular moment for American democracy, if Democrats are willing to seize it."

It is dangerous. It is scary. Yet it is true. This is a singular moment. Once they rig the Senate, then they can rig our elections. Once they rig our elections, then there will be nothing to stop them. Then they can go after our religious freedoms. They can go after our rights to keep and bear arms. And they can spend as many of our hard-earned tax dollars as they want.

This certainly is a singular moment for our democracy. It is a moment for Senators on both sides of the aisle to stand up to this radical agenda.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

MARCH MADNESS

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, I rise today to speak about a subject that is a point of pride and a source of passion for my constituents.

Visit Indiana, and you are bound to see them: a backboard hammered to an old barn, rows of asphalt courts in city parks, a lone hoop in front of a cornfield or in a clearing, steel poles standing in driveways.

Though basketball wasn't technically invented in Indiana, Indiana is indeed its epicenter. Even the game's inventor, James Naismith, once said: "Basketball really had its origin in Indiana, which remains the center of the sport."

So it is appropriate that this year's NCAA tournament will be played in its entirety in our State.

Now this, of course, is in part because planning and hosting 68 teams in the middle of a global pandemic presents unprecedented challenges, challenges that Hoosiers in and around Indianapolis are going to be able to navigate. And they will be able to work their world-class college campuses in order to host teams from around the country. It is a great source of pride for us.

But it is also fitting because this sport is so important to our State. You see, it is March Madness meets Hoosier Hysteria. The gyms where we play basketball are historic sites. The men and women who have competed and coached back home are Indiana folk heroes. We know their names. They are part of our common language: The Big O, Catch, the General, Bird, Wooden.

Memorabilia, artifacts, and sites associated with them are preserved in museums and townhalls. They are in school gyms. They are marked by bronze plaques and other ways to memorialize those who have preceded us. Streets and roads are named in their honor. We can even identify legendary teams and major moments in our basketball history with just a few almost mythic words that are familiar to the ears of Hoosiers: "Franklin Wonder Five," "Plump's last shot," "8 points in 9 seconds," and, yes, the infamous "chair throw."

Even the color of the ball—orange, of course—can be traced back to a Hoosier, Tony Hinkle, who thought it was a good idea.

For Indiana, basketball is much more than just a pastime. It is a source of joy. It is a source of joy for our communities, and it brings the people in and across them together. After all, it takes little more than a basket and a ball to play.

That is why wherever you go in Indiana and no matter the neighborhood you might be visiting or passing by, be it affluent or hit by hard times, in the country or in the city, you are going to see basketball played. It almost doesn't matter what the time of year it is or what the weather is like, you are likely to see basketball if you hit the road for a few hours in Indiana at any given time of year. You are going to hear it discussed. The basketball court and the gymnasium bleachers are great levelers.

I am sharing this with you because there is a larger point at play. Today, it increasingly seems that Americans have less and less in common with one another; that we are defining ourselves not as a diverse nation united by a common set of values with a shared past and a shared future, but we are instead sorting ourselves into tribes based on geography or class or even political affiliation. This has been accompanied by the hollowing out of many of our communities and a loss of faith in the public spaces and access to these public spaces and institutions that shape our national identity and bind this vast, pluralistic, and beautiful country together.

Now, these are dangerous trends, this separation, this tribalism; ones that we are going to have to work hard to turn back. There is only so much this body can do—I am under no illusions—there is only so much government can do to make America whole again.

That is why we should cherish and celebrate the institutions that do have the power to unite us. And, as any Hoosier will tell you, basketball is one of them.

Even beyond this, as its history in Indiana shows, this shared ritual that brings us joy and brings us together also pushes us to be better individually and collectively.

I think of the persistence of a teenager by the name of Steve Alford, endlessly practicing free throws in his driveway in New Castle, even in the snow and rain; and the courage of Indiana University's Bill Garrett, who fought segregation and broke the Big Ten color barrier; and then the faith of Little Milan High, enrollment hardly 100, beating mighty Muncie Central, enrollment over 1,000, for the 1954 State high school championship; the grace of successive generations of graduates at Crispus Attucks. Now, this is a high school built to segregate Black students in Indianapolis, but it then grew into an academic and athletic powerhouse whose basketball program was a beacon in the civil rights movement and, to this day, remains a great source of pride not just for Black Hoosiers but for all Hoosiers. It was also the first African-American team to win a State championship in the Nation; the spirit of the tiny town of Medora, an underdog community featured in a recent documentary, who stood by their team while its players laced up work boots because they couldn't afford basketball shoes. Then they set out with grit and determination and resolve to end a season losing streak.

So these scenes from Indiana's history, up to the present day, like the game itself, unite people from different backgrounds, and they foster pride in our places, especially our struggling places. They teach us to draw a line between competition and contempt, to keep perspective and to have the humility to remember that defeat is never permanent and neither is victory. They help us see and treasure what we have in common. They show us the power of opportunity and empowerment.

Institutions like basketball can't be taken for granted. They bring meaning and purpose into the lives of people and places that we call home. They encourage our citizens to dream beyond limit, and I would say that they are what we need in this Nation right now.

So as the NCAA tournament tips off and the games begin across our stadiums, field houses, and arenas, Indiana's hardwood civic temples, as we like to think of them, I know will be a reflection for our love for basketball and an exhibition of our collaborative ability to host such a large event during such a difficult time.

But what will also be on display is the other reason it is right and proper that this event takes place in Indiana. We are devoted to this sport because it brings us hope, and it brings us together. It instills the virtues necessary to preserve many of the other features that make our country so special. It really can help make America whole again.

Now and then, we all need to be gently reminded, I think, of the importance of these very things, and I can think of no better time or place for that than March in Indiana.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me thank my colleague from Indiana. You can't do better than "Hoosiers." It is one of my favorite movies. It is the story of a small Indiana town beating the big city players, and, if I am not mistaken, my former colleague in the House, Lee Hamilton, might have been one of those players on the big city team. I think he told me at one point. It is a great story and all eyes are on Indianapolis and Indiana now with the NCAA tournament and your neighbors to the west, Illinois, headed across the border. It is going to make a good showing, I hope, for the Fighting Illini.

Thank you very much for reminding us of that great American tradition.

SENATE FILIBUSTER RULE

Madam President, earlier in the day, my friend and colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN, came to the floor and raised some questions about my commitment to the filibuster as a rule in the Senate. He quoted me several years ago as saying the filibuster is kind of an indication of what the Senate was all about, and I still stand by that.

The Senate, of course, with two Senators from each State, regardless of their population, is an opportunity for smaller States and minorities to be represented and to have a voice. And the filibuster, at least in some respects, was a procedural reflection of that same value.

But I would say to Senator CORNYN, I have been moved and changed my mind somewhat on filibuster because of nothing—nothing. That is what has been happening on the floor of the U.S. Senate, nothing. When Senator MCCONNELL, as the Republican leader, was in charge of the Senate over the last 2 years, we did little or nothing.

I didn't run for this office to represent the people of Illinois and to help our Nation to watch the ink dry on documents that are being pushed back and forth on desks here. We came here to do something.

Two years ago, because of the filibuster, 2 years ago, we considered 22 amendments in the course of 1 year on the floor of the Senate. That is not counting vote-aroma, that contraption of a procedure where we debate all of 2 minutes before we vote on something, but real debate and real amendments—22.

Well, the following year, 2020, dramatic increase. We went all the way up to 29 amendments in the course of a year.

You say: Well, give me some measurement in history. My wife said: What does that mean? In the first year of the Obama administration, we had 240 amendments in the first year. Now we are down to 22 and 29. Why? Because we reached a point now where everyone assumes that every issue is going to be filibustered, and therefore if you don't have 60 votes, forget it.

Well, it is rare that that kind of supermajority shows up on anything important.

That is what happens when you play out the filibuster tradition to an extreme. As one staffer said to me the other day, the Senate is in a death spiral. No one can bring anything to the floor that might be subject to a filibuster because you can't imagine where you are going to get 60 votes.

I hope he is wrong, but I can understand his analysis. The measures that we have considered so far this year in the U.S. Senate, after 2 months-plus—well, the impeachment trial—that didn't require any filibuster votes. The nominations that come before us every day are not subject to a filibuster. And, of course, there is the reconciliation bill—the American rescue program for President Biden—that was under a procedure where you couldn't use a filibuster.

So now things are quiet on the floor of the Senate again this week and next week because whatever you bring here is subject to a threat of a filibuster, and you need 60 votes. I have watched this play out on an issue near and dear to my heart. It is called the DREAM Act, which I introduced 20 years ago—20 years ago. It basically says that if you were brought to this country as an infant, toddler, or a child—your parents made the decision—you grow up here and you ought to have a fighting chance to earn your way to legal status and citizenship. That is it.

Overwhelming majorities of people in all political parties support it. They think it is a good idea. And you say: DURBIN, you came here to be a legislator, and, in 20 years, you can't pass one bill?

Well, I tried. Five times I brought the DREAM Act to the floor of the U.S. Senate, and it was stopped with a filibuster each and every time. I got a majority, and I still have a majority in support of it, but I can't get that 60 votes—that magic 60 votes that is needed under a filibuster.

Well, I am frustrated by that, and I hope my frustration is manifest by what I said on the floor. My challenge to the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle is very simply this: If you believe in the filibuster and if you believe in working, show me that you can pass an important bill subject to the filibuster. Do it next week or the week following. Bring something to the floor. Let's debate it, let's amend, and let's vote it. I don't think that is unreasonable to ask. In fact, I think that is the reason we were elected to come here.

So I would say to the defenders of the filibuster: Try to defend what has happened on the floor of the Senate the last 2 years—almost nothing. We can do better. The American people expect it of us.

GEORGIA SHOOTINGS

Madam President, last night, near Atlanta, GA, a gunman murdered eight people in what appears to be an act of

domestic terrorism. Six of the eight victims were women of Asian descent. We mourn the lives of those lost and pray for the families and loved ones.

While local and Federal authorities are still investigating the gunman's motives, we know that in the past year it has been a perilous time for Asian Americans and those from the Pacific Islands, especially women.

Since the pandemic began last March, nearly 3,800 hate incidents targeting these Americans have been reported. I expect the number of unreported incidents is much higher.

Asian-American women have had racist insults shouted at them from across streets. Grandparents have been assaulted and killed while running errands. Some Asian Americans have even begun carrying pepper spray, wearing body cameras, and walking in groups to protect themselves from wanton violence. Increasingly, AAPI Americans do not feel safe in their own neighborhoods.

This palpable fear is proof of how dangerous racist stereotypes and demagoguery can be. When former President Trump insists on calling the coronavirus the "China virus," as he did again last night on FOX News, he is not simply spouting hateful, childish rhetoric. He is granting people permission. Permission to target neighbors and fellow citizens. Permission to hate.

This kind of language divides and preys on fears. It offers the kind of answer to every problem that you might expect from these people. There is always somebody you could fear and someone you can hate. The sad reality is that racist fear-mongering has always been part of the American story.

Today, we know, by testimony from the FBI Director, that it is a growing danger to every American. Intelligence analysts warn us that White supremacists and other far-right extremists are the most significant domestic terrorism threat facing the United States. Of course, we look across the ocean to the threat of terrorism after 9/11. Sadly, now we have to look across the street.

For far too long the Federal Government has failed to adequately address this growing threat. We saw the lethal results of that inattention on January 6, right here in this Senate Chamber. Groups of far-right nationalists and neo-Nazis, provoked by former President Trump, stormed our Capitol in an attempted insurrection.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill in the Senate that would give law enforcement the resources to address this threat. It is called the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act. It would establish offices to combat domestic terrorism in the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Department of Homeland Security. Those offices would assess the domestic terrorism threat regularly so that law enforcement can focus their limited resources on the most significant threats, like those facing AAPI Americans today.

My bill would also provide training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement in addressing those threats. I am sure communities across this Nation could use that support.

And there is the issue of how these terrorist acts are committed. Last night's attack near Atlanta was a mass shooting, a uniquely American threat. Next week, the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, will hold a hearing on gun violence in America. Too many people get shot in America—not just near Atlanta but in the cities of Chicago and St. Louis and all across our country. How many times have we seen images in those communities like we did last night of another mass shooting? America is better than this.

We need to take action to reduce the number of gun deaths in this Nation. We are going to get to work in the Senate Judiciary Committee to try to find some common, bipartisan ground to address it. Maybe we will fail. I hope we succeed. We have to try.

It is time for the Senate to stop cowering before any special interest group and pass commonsense gun safety policy. To the people of Atlanta, to members of the AAPI community, and all across America, we are standing with you. We are grieving with you. We will do everything in our power to protect you.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Madam President, our Nation is at a critical moment in our fight against COVID-19. We have seen declining infections, declining hospitalizations and deaths. And thanks to three effective vaccines—and, perhaps, more on the way—and adherence to social distancing and mask wearing, this new administration has put together a comprehensive plan to address and defeat this virus, but we aren't out of the woods yet.

In the United States, we have less than 5 percent of the world's population and 20 percent of the COVID cases and deaths. We can continue to see 50,000 to 60,000 new COVID cases every day. We still have approximately 4,700 people hospitalized because of COVID in the United States. We still tragically lose 1,200 American lives each day.

While access is improving greatly, we still see too many people struggling to get a vaccine. If we are going to defeat this virus once and for all, we need our top public health officials in place on the job.

Yet our Republican colleagues continue to block the nomination of Xavier Becerra to head the Department of Health and Human Services, the chief Federal Agency responsible for our public health response to COVID. Their campaign to leave the top public health position in this Nation empty in the midst of a pandemic is unwise. It has to come to an end.

It has been 3 months—3 months—since President Biden announced that he would nominate Mr. Becerra to

serve as Secretary of Health and Human Services. A majority of Senators support his nomination. I do. He is a personal friend and someone I have known for years. He is extremely competent and ready for the job.

Yet Republican Senators continue to delay Xavier Becerra's nomination day after day after day. Their objections to him are all over the map. They say they oppose him because of his support for the Affordable Care Act. Remember that one—President Obama's Affordable Care Act, which took half of the people who were uninsured in America and gave them the protection of health insurance, maybe for the first time in their lives. It provided health coverage to more than 20 million Americans. It has been a lifeline to families nationwide.

Most people would say: Thank goodness Mr. Becerra supported it. For a man who wants to be Secretary of HHS, you would almost insist on that. And yet Republicans oppose his nomination because of that, and they also don't like the fact that he was the attorney general of California and he enforced the State's COVID-19 rules. How can defending public health rules disqualify a person who wants to be America's top public health official?

We are in the midst of a lethal pandemic that has claimed nearly 530,000 American lives. More people are infected and dying every day. Is this any time to play politics with the Department of Health and Human Services? I don't think so.

Xavier Becerra is an effective manager, a smart, thoughtful, passionate leader. He is the right person to lead the Department. He served in the U.S. House of Representatives for more than two decades. As California's top prosecutor in 2017, he took on the tobacco companies and the opioid manufacturers—three cheers for him in both instances—and he helped defend healthcare for families, women, and the LGBTQ community.

In his confirmation hearing, Mr. Becerra highlighted his commitment to serving all Americans by expanding access to health insurance, lowering prescription drug prices, improving rural healthcare, and addressing racial and ethnic disparities in care. Would you expect anything less from a man who wants to lead our public health effort?

When he is finally confirmed this week, after this unconscionable delay—and he will be confirmed—he will be the first Latino to serve as Secretary of HHS. His historic confirmation will be especially meaningful at this moment in time when Latinos are disproportionately affected by the medical and economic impact of COVID.

Delaying his confirmation only hurts our Nation—still struggling to beat this pandemic; still working to get everyone vaccinated, to get our schools open, and everybody back to work. Sadly, these Republican Senators who have led this charge against him are

demonstrating obstructionism at its worst and at the worst moment.

I look forward to confirming Xavier Becerra to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. While my colleague Senator DURBIN is here, there is a real irony here to say that our Republican friends are not going to support Xavier Becerra because of his support of the Affordable Care Act. One key ingredient of the Affordable Care Act is actually the exchanges to provide for those who don't have access to coverage from their employer or some other way to get in a group.

But that was an idea that was introduced in 1993 by 23 Republican Senators—23 Republican Senators—as an alternative to HillaryCare, and it never got anywhere. It never went anywhere until an enterprising Governor from Massachusetts—I heard about him—said: Here is a way one can enforce this and provide opportunities for the people to get healthcare coverage that otherwise wouldn't have it. He said this might work. And they introduced it as RomneyCare in the State of Massachusetts. And do you know what? It worked. It made healthcare coverage available to a lot of people, and it helped on the affordability side too.

For our Republican friends to say that is the reason why—his support for the ACA, a key ingredient of which is the exchange—is an irony here. So I hope it is not lost on our friends.

I thank Senator DURBIN for those comments.

Like my friend Senator DURBIN, I, too, rise in support of Attorney General Xavier Becerra, a longtime public servant and President Biden's nominee to be our next Secretary of Health and Human Service.

For a year now, I have been saying to anybody who would listen that the only way to really get our economy back on track, to put parents back to work, kids back in the classroom, and life back to normal in the United States of America is to do all that we can to put this devastating pandemic in our Nation's rearview mirror. That means vaccinating as many at-risk Americans as safely and as quickly as possible.

In fact, under the leadership of our new President, America is leading the way in the production and the distribution of vaccines. How about that—leading the world?

Each day we are breaking records on the number of new Americans who are being vaccinated. After going through one of the darkest periods in American history, we are finally beginning to see the light at the end of the tunnel. But as we ramp up for actual distribution throughout America and help make sure that all people—all people from rural communities to urban cities—have equitable access to lifesaving vaccines, we need to make sure that the

Department of Health and Human Services has the right leader at the helm going forward. And for my money and my judgment, that leader is Xavier Becerra. I believe he is the right person for this job at this point in our Nation's history.

As a key member of the Biden administration, he will work with the White House. He will work with us in the Congress to tackle the coronavirus pandemic and to coordinate our Nation's response to it.

Just as he has done throughout his career, he will fight to expand affordable healthcare, address persistent health disparities, and restore HHS's mission to protect the health and well-being of all Americans.

Madam President, I have heard several of my Republican colleagues calling into question Xavier Becerra's—Attorney General Becerra's qualifications to serve as HHS Secretary. Obviously they are free to express their concerns. As Senators, it is our duty to vet and evaluate Cabinet nominees and make sure that we believe they are going to be best able to serve the American people. I take the responsibility seriously. I know our Presiding Officer does as well. But let me set the record straight, if I could, on Xavier Becerra. I am confident that with his decades of experience working on healthcare issues in Congress and as California's attorney general, he will be an invaluable part of President Biden's administration as we work together to combat the pandemic nationally.

Some of the critics on the other side of the aisle say: What does he know about healthcare? Well, as it turns out, he served for I want to say two decades on the House Committee on Ways and Means. The last time I checked—you may want to double-check me on this—I think the primary responsibility of that committee is Medicare, and for somebody who served that long on that committee, I bet he knows a thing or two about Medicare. As it turns out, he does.

Throughout his career in public service, Xavier Becerra has shown an unwavering commitment to protecting and expanding healthcare availability for millions of American families and workers, especially those in vulnerable communities who remain underserved.

In the House of Representatives, he was a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, which helped to make the Affordable Care Act, which is based on a Republican idea, I think out of the Heritage Foundation in 1993 that, as I mentioned earlier, MITT ROMNEY helped make a household word in the State of Massachusetts when he was Governor there. And I think half of the people who had healthcare coverage—who didn't have it when we created the ACA have it. They have it today. We cut in half the number of people who don't have access to healthcare coverage.

In the State of Delaware, the cost of coverage is actually dropping in the ex-

changes. It has dropped by I think 19 percent over the last 2 years alone, as market forces are taking place and taking hold.

As attorney general of California, as has been mentioned, he led the charge for a coalition of States to defend the Affordable Care Act against multiple attempts by the Trump administration to dismantle this landmark legislation altogether.

I once asked somebody—I asked him. I said: What is it about your experience that would suggest you could run a big operation like the Department of Health and Human Services?

He said: Well, I have run the Department of Justice in California. It is the second largest Department of Justice in the country, second only to the Federal Department of Justice.

I forget how many thousands—maybe tens of thousands—of employees they have, but it is a huge operation in a huge State with a ton of people.

Xavier Becerra brought together attorneys general from both sides of the aisle to hold opioid manufacturers accountable for the addiction crisis that we are still struggling with.

When the pandemic hit, he went to bat for Californians on everything from protections for our workers from exposure to COVID-19, increasing transparency in nursing homes, to securing key safeguards for the rights of frontline healthcare personnel.

His past leadership is a major reason why President Biden is asking him today to accept the responsibilities of overseeing responses to many of our Nation's most urgent needs, including the distribution of COVID-19 vaccinations, restoring the public confidence in vital public health institutions, and boosting family health and financial security in the wake of the pandemic.

With so much of the COVID-19 response being executed at the State and local levels, we are fortunate that President Biden has chosen as his HHS Secretary Xavier Becerra, a leader with relevant, on-the-ground, State-based experience.

As a former State treasurer, former Governor, former chairman of the National Governors Association, to have somebody with this kind of State-based experience, what a blessing that would be.

As the head of the largest State department of justice in the Nation, overseeing thousands of employees, Attorney General Becerra has a proven track record and the management experience necessary to take on the massive operations at HHS. He will also make, as Senator DURBIN has mentioned, history as the first Latino American to take on this role, providing important perspective as Latinos and other minority communities continue to be disproportionately impacted by the pandemic.

As we try to make sure that about a third of the American people who are saying they are not going to take the vaccine—they don't care; they are going to take a chance—and a lot of

those people are Latino—wouldn't it be nice to have a Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services who could reach out to that community, literally reach out to them and touch them and convince them that, no, this is something they should do; they should take this chance and be glad they did.

Four years ago, this body confirmed President Trump's nominee for Health and Human Services within just 20 days—20 days from the start of his administration. We knew then that this role was important to fill. It took us 20 days.

Now, in the midst of a deadly pandemic, one that has taken the lives of over 530,000 Americans—a toll that exceeds the number of American deaths on the battlefields of World War I, World War II, and the Vietnam war, in which I served—we cannot afford to let another day go by without confirming Xavier Becerra.

With all of that, I just want to say, colleagues, it is time. It is over time, and we need to confirm Xavier. I think—in fact, I am convinced he will do a good job. He will make us proud. We need him. The President needs him. And with him on board as the leader of HHS, he can go to work on behalf of the American people and put this pandemic behind us for good, and we need that day to come soon.

I don't see anybody else waiting to speak. I think maybe I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NO HATE ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, we are working today in the shadow of a truly hideous, horrific series of murders that occurred yesterday in Atlanta, GA, and I want to start by expressing my sympathies to the families that are affected, families of innocent women who were gunned down heinously by a murderer there. Eight lives were taken by that gunman, six of them Asian women.

There is an active, ongoing investigation, and I have no intention of prejudging the outcome. Justice must be done, and I have confidence in the law enforcement authorities of Atlanta that they will assure that justice is done.

So we don't know for sure what the gunman's motivation was, but we know eight of the women were Asian, and we know for sure that this horrific shooting rampage is only the latest egregious incident in a sickening, despicable trend of anti-Asian-American, or AAPI, violence that has terrorized the Asian-American community over recent months.

And we know many of these incidents were, in fact, hate crimes motivated by

bias, bigotry, and prejudice. Now, hate-motivated violence, as Attorney Garland said at his confirmation hearing, “tear[s] at the fabric of our society . . . make[s] our citizens worried about walking [on] the streets and exercising even the most normal rights.”

And he is absolutely correct. It tears at our society. It degrades our trust in each other and in the fairness of America and the survivability of values and rights that are central to our democracy.

The increase in violence against Asian Americans must end, and we all know it. We all say it, but we must do it. In Congress, we must do everything in our power to provide law enforcement and prosecutors with the resources and the tools they need to overcome it, to successfully fight it, which they can do. And they need the will and determination to wield the tools and resources that we give them because they have to not only investigate, as they will this gunman, but also to effectively prosecute and assure just punishment.

We don’t know for sure the motivation. We have evidence. And we can’t say for sure how many hate crimes there have been against Asian Americans or others in our great country, but we have a pretty good idea where it all came from.

The rise in anti-Asian-American violence started with the previous administration, who failed to address and manage the COVID-19 pandemic, and rather than listen to the scientists and work to stop its spread, it sought to scapegoat a part of our country. It sought to scapegoat Asian Americans with xenophobic and hate-filled rhetoric.

Words have consequences. We all say it. We all know it. And we must denounce the words that spur and spew hatred and cause or contribute to hate crimes. Hate crimes are a growing scourge. The numbers are surging, whether it is against Asian Americans, Muslim Americans, Jewish Americans, Black Americans. When it is against Americans, it is against America. Words do have consequences.

Stop AAPI Hate, which tracks violence and harassment against the AAPI community, Asian Americans, received more than 1,100 reports of COVID-related harassment, discrimination, and assault in its first two operational weeks last March. And now it has recorded more than 3,800 incidents since the start of the pandemic—3,800 incidents of harassment, discrimination, and sometimes physical assault—spurred and encouraged and condoned by public officials who used that hate-filled rhetoric to cover their own failures in dealing with the pandemic.

As the investigators and prosecutors go forward, we will learn more, and we need to let them do their jobs. But that doesn’t mean we should remain silent, nor does it give us an excuse to be inert. We need to denounce that kind of rhetoric. We need to take action.

I have proposed a measure called the NO HATE Act, which would provide more training for investigators and more resources for hotlines because these hate crimes are typically and repeatedly unreported, and it would provide more incentives for reporting and new penalties—or encourage the imposition of penalties—that truly fit the crime.

Hate crimes are corrosive to our social fabric. They corrupt the pillars of our society, and their effect is unmistakable.

They traumatize and terrorize the communities that are their targets—in this case, Asian Americans, who have become more and more fearful as these incidents have multiplied. We all have a part to do in stopping this scourge. And we know that it is rampant, in part, because of the White supremacists and domestic terrorism and violent extremism that showed its ugly face in this Chamber earlier this year. It showed its brutal, cruel force in this building.

It is the same virus and cancer that is metastasizing in this country today. And its visible forms are the assaults, harassment, and discrimination that may well have been reflected in those murders yesterday.

I hope the NO HATE Act passes, but it won’t be for a while. I hope we can take other action, but it will take time. And in the meantime, we can all take it as a moral imperative as our duty to denounce—not condoned by our silence—these groups and their extremist ideologies in White supremacists that perpetuate and expand the virus and cancer of hate crimes and hatred. Hate speech—fighting words—incitement in our society.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Now, a bright spot for America today is the confirmation, which we hope will happen in the next 24 hours, of the first Latino Secretary of Health and Human Services in America, the first. He was the first in his working-class family to go to college. He broke barriers throughout his career.

Xavier Becerra, presently the attorney general of California, will be a leader of toughness, bravery, and vision at the Department of Health and Human Services.

I stand here as a former attorney general, actually, for 20 years. I know well how much of that job is spent on healthcare policy, and I know also the management skills it takes to achieve real concrete results.

Attorney General Becerra is deeply qualified because of his work as State attorney general, but he also enjoys a wealth of other experience, both personal and professional, that make him exactly the right person at this moment for that job. He knows the importance of healthcare—equitable healthcare, reducing the disparities in healthcare in our country that afflict us now.

We have been in a healthcare crisis for more than a year, the deepest, most

painful healthcare crisis in our lives and maybe for a full century, a time of heartbreak and hardship, when a deadly, insidious virus has threatened economic upheaval and disaster. It is a pandemic that has left no family untouched, as all of us in this Chamber know, and no community unscathed.

We have lost more than half a million of our fellow citizens and people to COVID-19, including 7,800-plus in Connecticut. While there is light at the end of the tunnel, each day brings a new loss. And we don’t know how long that tunnel may be.

The Biden administration has been laser-focused on ending this pandemic since day one. Every day, more and more Americans are receiving the vaccine. Every day, more and more Americans are beginning to see the big, bold benefits of the American Rescue Plan that President Biden signed last week, and every day we are seeing strong leadership from the Biden administration in addressing this deep crisis.

While there is hope at this moment, there are immense healthcare challenges still to be overcome, from increasing healthcare affordability and reducing the uninsured rate to lowering drug costs, to fighting back against healthcare disparities and protecting reproductive rights, and, I would repeat, lowering prescription drug costs. Job No. 1 for America, lowering prescription drug costs. Job No. 2, lowering prescription drug costs. We need to reduce the prices of medicine that Americans need every day, aside from the pandemic, every day. Prescription drug prices plague them, cause them worry, force them to make tough choices between eating and using the medicine, paying their rent, and buying the drugs they need to survive.

Attorney General Becerra served as deputy attorney general in California and later as a member of the State assembly before he went to the House of Representatives, here in the Capitol, for more than two decades. As a Congressman—and I think this point is really important—then-Representative Xavier Becerra fought to pass the Affordable Care Act, and then he fought to defend it against the Trump administration.

As California’s attorney general, he was a warrior in fighting to preserve the ACA, and he will continue to fight for the men and women who depend on the ACA. And more and more of them, fortunately, are taking advantage of it because of the American Rescue Plan.

He is also a leader in taking on Big Tobacco. I sued the tobacco companies, helped to lead a multi-State attorney general group, and I know it takes courage to stand up and speak out and act against Big Tobacco. And he has done more. He has taken that fight to a new frontier. He is committed to protecting our children from the scourge of flavored tobacco and the insidious products—often they are flavored too—that are sold by vaping giants, which now include some tobacco companies.

Attorney General Becerra is a leader in protecting reproductive rights. He is a leader in expanding mental healthcare services. He is a leader in the fight against the opioid epidemic. He is a leader for LGBTQ health and for ending the disparities.

We are in a racial justice movement now, a racial justice movement that is seeking to end those deep disparities, causing twice as many people in communities of color to die during the pandemic and only half as many now to have the vaccine so far because we have lived through 4 years of dishonesty and disregard for science and 4 years of attacks on our healthcare system, particularly for the underserved.

That is the challenge, among others, that Attorney General Becerra will confront. He will be vigorous, brave, and tough, and he will work to lower the cost of prescription drugs. He will take on those interests that may be against the healthcare goals and purposes of the American people. And we need him now more than ever in this critical position. I urge my colleagues to vote for him tomorrow when we have the chance to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from California.

GEORGIA SHOOTINGS

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I want to begin by joining with so many of our colleagues and leaders around the country expressing our condolences to the victims of the senseless shootings in Atlanta yesterday, in sharing our thoughts and prayers to their families and friends. Our heart goes out to the greater community, and, of course, we stand here to not only try to understand better what happened, how it happened, but do the work necessary to try to ensure that it doesn't happen again—not in Atlanta, not anywhere in the United States of America.

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the nomination of my friend California Attorney General Xavier Becerra to serve as Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

As we all know, as we all feel, our Nation is going through one of the toughest health crises in our history. The COVID-19 pandemic has taken an incredible toll on our country. Every State has been impacted. Every community has suffered, especially working-class communities and communities of color, like the very neighborhoods that Attorney General Becerra and I grew up in. These communities are hurting and people are dying at alarming rates, and they desperately need someone who knows these communities to their core.

Throughout his career, Xavier Becerra has always fought to improve the lives of his constituents. As the first Latino attorney general of California, he made it his mission to tackle the structural inequalities in our healthcare system. As has been ref-

erenced already, Attorney General Becerra was the leading force behind the lawsuit to protect the Affordable Care Act. Yes, he had the audacity to maintain protections for people with preexisting conditions and for those suffering from a mental illness. Over the course of this past year, he has also fought to protect frontline healthcare workers from further exposure to COVID-19.

Xavier Becerra's parents emigrated from Mexico, just like my parents did, with a dream of building a better life for themselves and their family. Just a few days ago, I spoke in this Chamber about my family's history and journey in this country. A hard-working short-order cook and housekeeper raised the son who now serves in the U.S. Senate. The same is true for Xavier Becerra's family. He, the son of a construction and clerical worker, is on the verge of becoming the most important health official in our Nation. That is the American dream.

But, unfortunately, tragically, over half a million Americans have had their dream cut short by COVID-19, over half a million lives lost and millions more lives upended by this pandemic. We need to act with urgency to end this crisis—urgency.

But as I rise today to address this Chamber, urgency is severely lacking. While millions of Americans continue to struggle, our Republican colleagues are dragging things out, playing politics with the confirmation of Attorney General Becerra, one of the most qualified nominees to lead the Department of Health and Human Services that this Chamber has ever considered. They have distorted his record.

Let me point out that many Members of this Senate have worked alongside Xavier Becerra here in Congress for decades. Republicans and Democrats know Xavier Becerra is both a thoughtful leader and someone who is always willing to listen to both sides of an argument. He built an outstanding reputation in the House, both as a legislator and as a colleague.

As attorney general of California, overseeing the largest department of justice in the Nation, second only to the U.S. Department of Justice, Xavier showed no fear in working across the aisle. In fact, he partnered with Republican attorneys general to increase access to lifesaving drugs to treat COVID-19. He worked across the aisle to protect drug discounts for health centers.

I can't help but point out the obvious. In fact, I am prepared to make this abundantly clear to the American people. The cynical delays and political games that we see being played are not actually about Mr. Becerra's qualifications. He is just as qualified as any of his predecessors. Sadly, Xavier Becerra is being held to a different standard—a different standard than other nominees this Chamber has supported and confirmed over the last 4 years, including our most recent Health and Human Services Secretary.

Let me also say this. As some of the first Latinos in our respective positions, both Xavier and I are not unfamiliar with being held to a different standard. It is a different standard today that is so stark that our colleagues are willing to delay his confirmation through the night. Yes, in the middle of a global health pandemic, Republicans are holding up the nominee for Secretary of Health and Human Services. They are holding up the first Latino nominee to head this critical agency during a pandemic that has disproportionately devastated the Latino community.

It is time to let Xavier Becerra get to work. I urge my colleagues to end the delay on Xavier Becerra's confirmation for Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Thank you, Mr. President.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for votes on March 17, 2021, so I could return to Hawaii to tend to a family matter.

On March 17, had I been present, I would have voted yea on confirmation: Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, Rollcall vote 123.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for votes on March 17, 2021, so I could return to Hawaii to tend to a family matter.

On March 17, had I been present, I would have voted yea on cloture motion: Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, Rollcall vote 124.●

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONFIRMATION OF KATHERINE C. TAI

● Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Katherine Tai to serve as the next United States Trade Representative. When confirmed, Ms. Tai will be the first woman of color and first Asian American to lead the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

Katherine Tai's story is America's story. Her parents came to the United

States as graduate students and remained here to make a better life for themselves and their family, her father as a researcher at the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center and her mother as a scientist for the National Institutes of Health.

Given her parents' background, Katherine is no stranger to public service, and through her parents' hard work and dedication to make a better life for their daughter, she was able to attend Yale University and Harvard Law, became a talented trade lawyer, and was nominated by President Biden to lead the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. I have a deep appreciation for the Tais, their work ethic and their commitment to family, representation matters, and Ms. Tai will be a representative for the United States in more ways than one.

Ms. Tai is a highly-qualified nominee with the experience to lead the U.S. trade policy at a critical time for our country, specifically as we continue to recover from the damage wrought by the coronavirus pandemic and rebuild our relationships with our allies abroad. She is a person who can help mend relationships and restore alliances.

Supporters have described her as a knowledgeable, tenacious trade expert who will work with a cross-section of advocates and stakeholders with the goal of bettering the lives of the American people and strengthening our economy at all levels. They have described her willingness to build coalitions across party lines, highlighting her broad support from both Democrats and Republicans, and from the labor, business, and environmental communities. They have referred to her time as a trade lawyer at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, where she worked to enforce trade agreements with China to hold that country accountable before the World Trade Organization. They have highlighted her time as a lawyer with the House Ways and Means Committee, where she built partnerships and crafted agreements that received broad bipartisan approval. These included the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement, which passed the Senate by an 89-10 vote and the House by a 385-41 vote. Ms. Tai played a key role in crafting the agreement, which speaks to her skills and experience.

Perhaps more importantly, however, Ms. Tai will prioritize trade policies that promote workers, families, the environment, and local communities. I met with Ms. Tai just after President Biden nominated her, and during our conversation, it was clear she understands that trade policies have real world implications for everyday people. She knows that if trade deals are not working for people, then they need to change. People need to come first as we develop trade deals. At a time when people are still working to recover from the coronavirus, Ms. Tai is the Trade Representative we need for the United States.

A family emergency has prevented me from being here for today's vote, but if I were present, I would have voted to confirm Katherine Tai as U.S. Trade Representative.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support her nomination.●

NOMINATION OF XAVIER BECERRA

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Xavier Becerra's nomination to be Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

I am proud to have known Xavier Becerra for many years as both a friend and colleague. He has spent decades serving California, including as the State's attorney general and as a 12-term Congressman from Los Angeles.

Mr. Becerra was the first in his family to receive a 4-year college degree, earning his bachelor of arts in economics from Stanford University and, later, his juris doctorate from Stanford Law School. As a member of the House of Representatives, he was a strong advocate for the healthcare of his constituents and fought to make the Affordable Care Act law. And as California attorney general he has been a staunch defender of the Affordable Care Act, leading 20 States and the District of Columbia in defense of the Affordable Care Act before the Supreme Court.

As part of his focus on protecting the health of Americans, Mr. Becerra has worked on a bipartisan basis with multistate coalitions of attorneys general on issues still affecting our country today. These include the need to reduce youth exposure to tobacco products like e-cigarettes, increasing access to COVID-19 treatments, as well as addressing the opioid epidemic and the considerable harm it has caused families.

As our State's attorney general, Mr. Becerra has led the Nation's second largest department of justice behind only the U.S. Department of Justice. His experience leading large and diverse organizations will position him to successfully lead the Department of Health and Human Services, which is the Nation's largest Federal agency by budget.

As Secretary, he will lead the Nation's top health agency charged with enhancing the health and well-being of all Americans. In this global pandemic, he will play a lead role in overseeing the implementation of President Biden's national strategy for COVID-19 response, which is vital to defeating the virus that has plagued our country for far too long. His history-making nomination as the first Latino to manage this Department comes at a time when this pandemic is affecting communities of color at much higher rates than white Americans. And those of us who know him personally know the level of his concern and the strength of his dedication to protect the health and safety of all hard-working Americans and their families.

In short, Xavier Becerra is the right candidate to lead the Department of Health and Human Services at this time, and I strongly urge the Senate to confirm his nomination. Thank you.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I rise to speak in support of Xavier Becerra's nomination to serve as Secretary of Health and Human Services, HHS.

Attorney General Becerra will bring a fresh perspective to HHS at a critical time during this pandemic. While there is light at the end of the tunnel with the distribution of the corona virus vaccines, there is still work to do to end this pandemic and put our country on a road to recovery, and that is where Attorney General Becerra's leadership will be crucial.

Attorney General Becerra's 12 terms in the U.S. House of Representatives gave him a solid foundation in knowing how to set agendas and achieve results, which we saw deployed in his work as a key leader on the Committee on Ways and Means ranking member of the Subcommittee on Social Security, and chair of the House Democratic caucus.

He helped to expand the Children's Health Insurance Program, modernize and strengthen Medicare, and helped pass the Affordable Care Act. His commitment to the letter and spirit of this law is something he carried into his role as California attorney general, fighting to maintain his State's ability to bring millions of previously uninsured residents under the Affordable Care Act's umbrella.

Last November, he led the defense of the Affordable Care Act in the U.S. Supreme Court on behalf of 20 States and the District of Columbia. His tweet after the oral arguments concisely sums up the national importance of his effort: "The ACA saves lives. It is the law of the land." He brings a strong commitment to using the law and regulatory tools to make access to health care and other vital services equitable—the very thing that makes our Nation strong.

I look forward to working with him on ensuring that everyone has access to quality and affordable healthcare, and I know he will be a partner in the fight against the corona virus and our goal of getting all eligible Americans vaccinated, even in hard-to-reach areas.

Last week, President Biden signed into law the American Rescue Plan Act, which included major funding to address the—Nation's worsening mental health and addiction crisis. This is a high priority of mine and an issue which Attorney General Becerra has firsthand experience. He started his career as a legal aid attorney in Massachusetts, supporting clients contending with mental health issues. I am eager to work with him on this issue.

Addressing the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs is another area where Attorney General Becerra has shown key leadership. He and I share a belief that fairer competition means

increased access to affordable prescription drugs and better public health. As California attorney general, he investigated and brought enforcement actions against drug manufacturers' anti-competitive business practices to help reduce drug prices and ensure that people have access to the drugs they need. In March 2020, he led a bipartisan group of 46 States attorneys general who successfully advocated before the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold the rights of States to regulate and address the rising cost of prescription drugs.

The United States must do more to ensure that new technologies have appropriate privacy and security protections for health data. At a September 2020 hearing on the need for Federal data privacy legislation, Attorney General Becerra told me and other members of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation that "every consumer should be able to own and control his or her data" and that "if we decide that we don't want anyone to use [our data], it's our choosing." His testimony was reassuring, and I look forward to working with him to ensure consumers can have a peace of mind when it comes to the security of their personal health data.

Given the pandemic's spotlight on the vulnerability of our Nation's seniors, I am eager to work with the Biden administration to improve the safety and well-being of older Americans. When my 92-year-old dad living in a memory care facility was diagnosed with COVID-19 last year, I was only able to visit him through a window. He recognized me, but he just didn't understand why we couldn't be in the same room together. Tens of thousands of families have been through these wrenching situations over the past year and want to see the Federal Government doing more. Attorney General Becerra recently moved to make the California Department of Justice Medicaid Fraud Control Unit a full-fledged division, underscoring his commitment to protecting seniors and people with disabilities. I know his leadership will place the needs of seniors front and center.

Attorney General Becerra has the expertise and experience and the enforcement and regulatory savvy to handle the job of protecting public health, strengthening our hospitals and healthcare system, making sure people have access to quality, affordable healthcare, and supporting our healthcare workers. And as the first Latino to lead the Department of Health and Human Services, he will bring a personal understanding of the immediate need for equitable access to care.

With that, I ask my colleagues to support the nomination of Xavier Becerra to be Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CONFIRMATION OF ISABELLA CASILLAS GUZMAN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to support the confirmation of Isabel Guzman, a dedicated public servant and successful small businesswoman, to lead the Small Business Administration.

Small businesses are a cornerstone of Maryland's economy, creating jobs, driving innovation, and anchoring communities. Isabel Guzman's extensive leadership experience serving at SBA under the Obama administration and running her own small businesses positions her well to support our small business communities as we finish the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic and address the unique challenges faced by women- and minority-owned small businesses across Maryland.

In her new role as SBA Administrator, she will inherit an economic crisis compounded by a mismanaged pandemic that has devastated the small business community from retail to restaurants and bars to sole-proprietorships. She will be charged not only with administering critical small business relief programs, including the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program and the Paycheck Protection Program, but also with building back better to shape the environment for a thriving small business community. I look forward to working closely with her to ensure that we build an inclusive economy that encourages and supports local entrepreneurs.

REMEMBERING LARRY "CLIZ" CLISBY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and recognize the distinguished legacy of Larry "Cliz" Clisby, who passed away on February 27, 2021, at the age of 74 after a valiant fight against cancer. Famously known across the State of Indiana as the legendary Voice of the Boilermakers, he will forever be remembered for his unmatched play-by-play commentary of Purdue basketball and his trademark "Bullseye!" calls during crunch time.

Born and raised in Ohio, Larry graduated from Warren Howland High School and Kent State University. Shortly after college and service in the U.S. Army, Larry started his broadcasting career in Paducah, KY. However, his time in Paducah was brief, as he moved to West Lafayette, IN, to work for WLF1-TV in the sports department in 1977. During his early career in the Lafayette area, Larry called high school basketball games and assisted during Purdue sports broadcasts. It wasn't until 1982 that Larry became the full-time radio announcer for the Boilermakers.

Over the course of nearly 40 years, Larry called a total of 1,890 Purdue men's basketball games, including dozens of high-profile Indiana vs. Purdue rivalry games. Since the 1980s, Larry was involved in many of Purdue's his-

toric moments, including one Big Ten Tournament title, nine Big Ten Championship Seasons, 28 NCAA Tournaments, and three Elite Eight appearances. In 2018, he was inducted into the Indiana Sportswriters and Sportscasters Hall of Fame, and he received one of Indiana's highest honors, the Sagamore of the Wabash, from Governor Eric Holcomb in 2020.

From the Purdue sports staff to the team players, everyone saw Larry as a true, dedicated Boilermaker and not just a typical play-by-play announcer. Throughout his career, Larry devoted his charisma, talents, and life to the Lafayette community, and I believe his work will serve as a benchmark for those who aspire to join the field of sports radio.

I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sympathies to Larry's wife, Michelle; his children, Chad and Carly; his sister, Carol; his stepchildren and grandchildren; and all of his family and friends as they mourn his loss. And to Larry's Purdue University family, I wish his beloved Boilermakers many, many "Bullseye!" moments in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET HUETTL

• Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, as we observe National Women's History Month throughout March, it gives me great pleasure to recognize one of North Dakota's own history makers. Margaret Huettl from Minot has become my State's first female Eagle Scout and is a member of the inaugural class of young women to receive this high honor across the United States.

Margaret is a member of Scout Troop 5401 of the Northern Lights Council. A recent graduate of Minot High School, Margaret is currently studying biology education at Minot State University. Despite the coronavirus pandemic, which limited many Scouting group activities over the past year, she continued pressing on toward her goal of completing the merit badges necessary to earn the award. For her Eagle Scout project, she spent 238 hours building a pit for gaga ball, which is a variation of dodgeball, for outdoor activities at her home church, Zion Lutheran.

She said earning the 21 merit badges, along with completing her project and the other requirements for the Eagle Scout Award, helped her further develop leadership, time management, and communication skills. She intends to continue her involvement with Troop 5401, transitioning to an adult leader this year.

I congratulate Margaret on achieving this award through hard work and persistence and a being a trailblazer for other young women who have an interest in the Scouting program. With only 6 percent of all scouts attaining the rank of Eagle Scout, she now will be recognized alongside the 2.5 million

others who have earned this prestigious award since it was created in 1911. She will learn, as have other Eagle Scouts, that throughout her life, this accomplishment will bring her recognition as being a person of the highest caliber and character. I fully expect to hear much more from Margaret in the future as she excels in academic, professional, and personal endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING BISSON'S SUGAR HOUSE

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize Bisson's Sugar House, a New Hampshire institution that is celebrating its 100th anniversary. March is Maple Month in New Hampshire, where maple producers across our State produce more than 90,000 gallons of maple syrup, and the Bisson family represents three generations of this great and tasty tradition.

Lazzare Bisson and his nephew Armand found Bisson's Sugar House in Berlin in 1921, and ran the business together successfully for 15 years. Lazzare then passed the business on to Armand and his wife, Juliette. In 1953, they constructed a new sugar house to support their growing business, and since then, they have welcomed families from New Hampshire and beyond to see their work each spring.

The Bisson family has prioritized preserving the traditional sugaring experience, while also modernizing their operations in order to provide high-quality, delicious maple products to their customers. Each year, the Bisson family taps more than 3,000 trees, and they still boil their sap on a wood-fired evaporator built by Armand and Juliette more than 50 years ago. During the height of the sugaring season in March and April, they make candy with the same evaporator they have used since the 1940s.

Since 1988, Bisson's Sugar House has been run by Armand and Juliette Bisson's niece Muriel and her husband Lucien Blais. For many families, an annual trip to Bisson's Sugar House marks the beginning of spring. As the sugar business has passed from generation to generation, the Bisson family's work has encouraged Granite Staters to treasure our past and embrace the future.

I hope you will join me in celebrating the 100th anniversary of Bisson's Sugar House and sending them best wishes for a successful harvest and many more years of sharing their traditions with the people of New Hampshire.●

TRIBUTE TO WALTER FRANK YORK

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, on Monday, March 15, the community of Ashland, KS, celebrated the career of someone who dedicated nearly 45 years to the Stockgrowers State Bank. Walter Frank York has called Ashland home since the day he was born. His parents, Russell and Marjorie, brought

him up in a modest home on a farmer's income during the 1950s and 1960s. Frank, as he came to be called by his family and friends, went on to study finance at Kansas State University, but the Vietnam war draft up-ended his plans before graduation.

Frank ultimately did not serve due to a back injury incurred while playing football for Ashland High, but the draft experience took him to Eagle County, CO, where he used his education to assist his sister with a new business that she was operating in Vail Village near the well-known ski resort. While taking on this challenge in Colorado, he finished his degree at CU Boulder, despite his long-lasting love for the K-State Wildcats. After earning his degree, his route led back home when he applied for a vacant position at a bank in Ashland. His first day at Stockgrowers State Bank was March 15, 1976.

Working as a loans officer, Frank added a sense of small-town care for each of his customers over the years. After all, he would frequently see his customers at church, at the grocery store, and at Friday night sporting events in Ashland and surrounding communities in southwest Kansas. In 2007, he earned the title of executive vice president after years of loyally helping customers. One recent highlight from his career was being awarded as a recipient of the Pioneer Award in early 2020, which is given annually by the Kansas Ag Bankers division of the Kansas Bankers Association. When he achieved the award, one customer of his remarked to the Kansas Ag Bankers: "Frank just makes it simple to do business and helps keep me connected to the Ashland community." In return, Frank likes to share that his clients and colleagues became "family" to him. Being surrounded by good people in an enjoyable community helped keep Frank at Stockgrowers for the entirety of his banking career.

I would be remiss if I did not speak of community involvement while sharing about Frank York. Whether it was being involved in his children's Boy Scouts troop, coaching local youth baseball programs in the summer, announcing football games for Ashland High, broadcasting SPIAA League high school basketball tournaments, or serving on the board of organizations near and far in Kansas, Frank has done it all. He currently serves on the board for KJIL Great Plains Christian Radio, in addition to the Kansas Leadership Center's board, and serves as president of the alumni board for his K-State chapter of Delta Upsilon fraternity.

I have had the joy of getting to know Frank on a more personal level in this past decade, as his son Tyler joined my staff after earning his degree at K-State. Frank lives in the same farmhouse that his grandfather built in 1912, just a few miles outside of Ashland. Farming and ranching has been a side passion and a hobby for him since he returned home for a career at

Stockgrowers. It is something that he intends to continue for years ahead, thanks to the local volunteer firefighters that spared the York farmstead from destruction in March 2017 as wildfires burned close to 80 percent of Clark County. He considers himself blessed to have been of the more fortunate residents of the area. While I have appreciated his friendship over the years, Frank was an invaluable resource to me in the aftermath of the Starbuck Fire. Along with many others from Clark County, he informed me on ways we could help direct the USDA and other governmental agencies to coordinate in providing assistance to those that were severely affected.

The announcement of retirement from Frank came in mid-2020. His emotional final day at Stockgrowers State Bank was on December 31, 2020. Due to the challenges that the pandemic brought to communities of all sizes, a celebration of his retirement, unfortunately, had to be postponed. However, I couldn't think of a better date to celebrate the career of Frank York than the 45th anniversary of his first day of employment at Stockgrowers State Bank. While the difficulties of the pandemic will still prevent many well-wishers from making it to Ashland to personally offer their congratulations, I know that the amount of lives that have been positively affected by Frank are plenty and stretch far beyond Ashland. His family—including wife, Sue, and children Joshua, Tyler, Emily, Adam, and Jennifer—should all be extremely proud of Frank's career. I offer my sincere congratulations to someone I am proud to call my friend, Frank York.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 485. An act to reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1799. An act to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the

covered period for the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. TRONE of Maryland, Mrs. BEATTY of Ohio, Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. LAHOOD of Illinois, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER of Washington, and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

At 6:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1085. An act to award three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 344. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retirement pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-637. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; California; South Coast Air Quality Management District; Ventura County Air Pollution Control District; Correction" (FRL No. 10021-07-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-638. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jefferson County Gasoline Loading Facilities at Existing Bulk Terminals and New Bulk Plants" (FRL No. 10021-39-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-639. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Jefferson County Existing and New VOC Storage Vessels Rule Changes" (FRL No. 10021-19-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-640. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of 40 CFR 63.6(f)(1) and 40 CFR 63(h)(1) to Reflect Court Vacatur of Exemption from Emission Standards During Periods of Startup, Shutdown, and Malfunction" (FRL No. 10019-05-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-641. A communication from the Endangered Species Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Bradshaw's Lomatium (*Lomatium bradshawii*) From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (RIN1018-BD59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 15, 2021; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-642. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "March 2021 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mrs. MURRAY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of four years.

*Rachel Leland Levine, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KING, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KAINE, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TESTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. OSSOFF):

S. 1. A bill to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of for-

tifying our democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 784. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a new employment, training, and supportive services program for unemployed and underemployed individuals, including individuals with barriers to employment and those who are unemployed or underemployed as a result of COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 785. A bill to withdraw normal trade relations treatment from, and apply certain provisions of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 to, products of the People's Republic of China, and to expand the eligibility requirements for products of the People's Republic of China to receive normal trade relations treatment in the future, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 786. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to review laws relating to the illegal passing of school buses and to execute a public safety messaging campaign relating to illegal passing of school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 787. A bill to amend the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the local coordinating entity for the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area under that Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a nonrefundable tax credit for the purchase of gun safes and gun safety courses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. LANKFORD, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 789. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 790. A bill to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 791. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate practices and strategies to reduce bird fatalities resulting from collisions with certain public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 792. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify certain agricultural exemptions for hours of service requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 793. A bill to require the Congressional Budget Office to make publicly available the fiscal and mathematical models, data, and other details of computations used in cost analysis and scoring; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a corporate tax rate increase on companies whose ratio of compensation of the CEO or other highest paid employee to median worker compensation is more than 50 to 1, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 795. A bill to establish the Emmett Till and Mamie Till-Mobley and Roberts Temple National Historic Site in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 796. A bill to codify maternity care coordination programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 797. A bill to require transparency, accountability, and protections for consumers online; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that the 2021 Recovery Rebates are not provided to prisoners; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. TESTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 799. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish programs for carbon dioxide capture, transport, utilization, and storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 800. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 801. A bill to identify and address barriers to coverage of remote physiologic devices under State Medicaid programs to improve maternal and child health outcomes for pregnant and postpartum women; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 802. A bill to modify the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove short-barreled rifles from the definition of firearms for purposes of the National Firearms Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the amount individuals filing jointly can deduct for certain State and local taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 805. A bill to repeal the wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 806. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to provide grants to carry out activities to benefit pollinators on roadsides and highway rights-of-way, including the planting and seeding of native, locally-appropriate grasses and wildflowers, including milkweed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 807. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 808. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 809. A bill to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other stakeholders to conserve and sustain the western population of monarch butterflies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 810. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam to include hypertension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COONS, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 811. A bill to establish the Taiwan Fellowship Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 812. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 813. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high-quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to

enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 814. A bill to promote security partnership with Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 815. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 816. A bill to amend the Diplomatic Security Act of 1986 to provide for improved serious security incident investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 119. A resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 120. A resolution recognizing the Ninth Summit of the Americas and reaffirming the commitment of the United States to a more prosperous, secure, and democratic Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 121. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Daniel Crowe; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to support library infrastructure.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on best practices to protect them from exposure to PFAS and to

limit and prevent the release of PFAS into the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 401

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 401, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit governmental discrimination against health care providers that do not participate in abortion.

S. 425

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to require States to establish complete streets programs, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to provide for congressional review of actions to terminate or waive sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor 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. 596

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 611, a bill to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 634

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to support and expand civic engagement and political leader-

ship of adolescent girls around the world, and other purposes.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualifying advanced coal project credit, and for other purposes.

S. 662

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to establish an interactive online dashboard to allow the public to review information for Federal grant funding related to mental health programs.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) 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. 723

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 723, a bill to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes.

S. 730

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 730, a bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to remove the prohibition on States and territories against lowering their taxes.

S. 748

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 748, a bill to provide for an extension of the temporary suspension of Medicare sequestration during the COVID-19 public health emergency.

S. 758

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to support financing of affordable and reliable energy projects by international financial institutions, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 105

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor 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. 117

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 117, a resolution expressing support for the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement, or the Belfast Agreement, and subsequent agreements and arrangements for implementation to support peace on the island of Ireland.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 797. A bill to require transparency, accountability, and protections for consumers online; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, social media platforms have become a pretty significant part of Americans' lives. We use them to stay up to date on news from friends and family—something that has become especially essential during the pandemic—to communicate with relatives and friends, for entertainment, and as a shopping resource. Social media sites provide ways to network, to connect with like-minded individuals from fellow theater lovers to fellow basketball fans, to advocate for causes that we believe in, to conduct business, even to date, and more and more we rely on social media sites as a primary source of news and information, from Presidential election news to updates on COVID vaccinations.

Social media offers a lot of benefits and opportunities, but the increasing dominance of social media, particularly in the news and information space, has also raised concerns. Consumers have become increasingly troubled about the way their information is used by social media platforms and how these sites decide what news and information we see. And there are increasing numbers of anecdotes to suggest that some social media platforms are moderating content in a biased or political way.

Currently, content moderation on social media platforms is governed by section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, which was enacted into law 25 years ago. Section 230 provides internet sites that host user-generated content—sites like YouTube or Twitter or Facebook—with immunity for the content that users post on their sites. So, for example, if somebody posts a video on YouTube that contains illegal content, YouTube isn't held legally responsible for that content.

Section 230 has been critical to the development of the internet as we know it today. Without section 230 protections, many of the sites we rely on for social connection or news or entertainment would never have come into being.

But as the internet and social media have grown and developed, it has also become clear that some changes need to be made. In particular, it has become increasingly clear that sites need to provide greater transparency when it comes to their content moderation practices and decisions. Social media sites are no longer just providing a platform for user-generated content as they did in their infancy. They are now making a lot of decisions about that content and carefully shaping our social media experience—what ads we see, what posts we see, what news stories we see.

Currently, Federal law does not require that social media sites be at all accountable to consumers for those content moderation decisions. That is why, today, I am introducing the Platform Accountability and Consumer Transparency Act, or the PACT Act, along with my colleague Senator SCHATZ. Our bill would preserve the benefits of section 230, like the internet growth and widespread dissemination of free speech it has enabled, while increasing accountability and consumer transparency around content moderation.

Now, content moderation is certainly not all bad. For example, most of us are happy to have YouTube or Instagram suggest additional content that matches the music that we like to listen to or the hobbies that we are interested in. The problem is that content moderation has been and largely continues to be a black box, with consumers having little or no idea how the information they see has been shaped by the sites that they are visiting.

The PACT Act would address this problem by increasing transparency around the content moderation process. Sites would be required to provide an easily digestible disclosure of their content moderation practices for users, and, importantly, they would be required to explain their decisions to remove material to consumers.

Until relatively recently, sites like Facebook and Twitter would remove a user's post without explanation and without an appeals process. And even as platforms start to shape up their act with regard to transparency and due process, it is still hard for users to get good information about how content is moderated.

Under the PACT Act, if a site chooses to remove your post, it has to tell you why it decided to remove your post and explain how your post violated the site's terms of use. The PACT Act would also require sites to have an appeals process. So if Facebook, for example, removes one of your posts, it would not only have to tell you why, but it would have to provide a way for you to appeal that decision.

We have seen increased concern lately about news articles being removed from social media sites. Under the PACT Act, a newspaper whose article was posted on Facebook or Twitter and then removed by one of those platforms

could challenge Facebook or Twitter, which would have to provide a reason for removing the article and allow the newspaper to appeal the decision.

The PACT Act would also help us develop the data necessary to demonstrate whether social media platforms are removing content in a biased or political fashion. As I said earlier, there has been increasing concern about biased content moderation on social media sites. The PACT Act requires detailed transparency reports every 6 months from large social media platforms, like Twitter and Facebook, which will provide the data it needed to determine whether and where biased moderation exists.

The PACT Act would also bolster efforts by State governments to hold social media platforms accountable. The bill would allow State attorneys general to bring civil lawsuits against social media platforms when these platforms have violated Federal civil laws.

The PACT Act would also require companies to remove material that has been adjudicated as illegal by a court. Internet platforms would be required to remove illegal content within 4 days. Failure to remove illegal material would result in the platform's losing its 230 protections for that content or activity, a provision that matches a recommendation made by the Trump Department of Justice for section 230 reform.

I am grateful to Senator SCHATZ for partnering with me on this legislation. Our bill is a serious, bipartisan approach to the issue of section 230 reform, and it would go a long way toward making social media platforms more accountable to consumers and increasing transparency around the content moderation process.

I invite our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in advancing this legislation.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the amount individuals filing jointly can deduct for certain State and local taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this is the time of year when people are calculating their taxes and filing their returns. There are inequities in our Tax Code, and the bill I am introducing today, the SALT Deduction Fairness Act, would help remedy one of these inequities. This bill would ensure that limits on State and local tax deductions, also known as SALT deductions, do not disproportionately and unfairly penalize married couples.

Currently, the amount in State and local taxes that both single and married filers may deduct from their annual income taxes is capped at \$10,000. Single filers and married filers are treated the same, and married people who file their taxes separately are limited to \$5,000 each. In other words, people would be better off not getting mar-

ried when it comes to the SALT deduction. My bill removes this penalty by simply doubling the deduction to \$20,000 for married filers.

This is the situation we have now: Two single people can both claim \$10,000 worth of State and local income taxes as a deduction on their Federal returns, but if they get married, they can claim only \$10,000 together. This is a classic example of a marriage tax penalty.

When the Senate considered the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in 2017, I worked to keep the SALT deduction in the Federal Tax Code because of the increased tax burden its elimination would have imposed on many Mainers who pay property taxes on their seasonal cottages as well as their homes, who remit annual excise taxes on their vehicles, and who are subject to State income taxes.

The SALT deduction has been in the Tax Code since 1913, when the Federal income tax was first established. It is intended to protect families from double taxation, from essentially paying a tax on a tax.

The Senate adopted my amendment, which paralleled that of the House, to retain the deduction for State and local taxes up to \$10,000. This deduction is especially important to families living in high-tax States, like Maine, which has one of our Nation's highest State taxes and where many residents own second homes, like camps on Maine's beautiful lakes. Last year, an analysis by WalletHub found that Maine had the fourth highest overall tax burden behind only New York, Hawaii, and Vermont. Yet Maine's median household income ranked only 35th in the Nation and was approximately \$6,800 below the U.S. median household income. So maintaining this deduction provides important tax relief for those Mainers who continue to itemize their deductions. Yet we can do better. We can make the SALT deduction fairer by eliminating the marriage penalty that limits a married couple to just \$10,000; whereas, if they were not married, they could each claim \$10,000.

According to the U.S. Census, there are more than 60 million married couples living in our Nation. Our Tax Code should be fair to them. We should not create a situation in which married couples would have been better off financially, in terms of taxes, had they not married. One way to accomplish this goal is to double their access to deductions for the State and local taxes they pay, including from properties they share, such as their homes. This legislation would remedy this double taxation problem and eliminate the marriage tax penalty when it comes to the SALT tax deduction.

It boils down to this: We simply should not be unfairly penalizing American taxpayers for being married.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill to fix this marriage tax penalty.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 807. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 807

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 “Cameras in the Courtroom Act”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“§ 678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings

“The Supreme Court shall permit television coverage of all open sessions of the Court unless the Court decides, by a vote of the majority of justices, that allowing such coverage in a particular case would constitute a violation of the due process rights of 1 or more of the parties before the Court.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings.”.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 808. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Cybersecurity Disclosure Act along with three members of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Chairman WARNER and Senators COLLINS and WYDEN, in addition to Senators CORTEZ MASTO and CRAMER, who serve with me on the Senate Banking Committee. In response to serious data breaches of various companies, our legislation asks each publicly traded company to include—in Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) disclosures to investors—information on whether any member of the Board of Directors is a cybersecurity expert, and if not, why having this expertise on the Board of Directors is not necessary because of other cybersecurity steps taken by the publicly traded company. To be clear, the legislation does not require companies to take any actions other than to provide this disclosure to its investors.

As EY, also known as Ernst & Young, noted in an August 2020 publication, “Public disclosures can help build trust by providing transparency and assurance around how boards are fulfilling their cybersecurity risk oversight responsibilities.” Investors and cus-

tomers deserve a clear understanding of whether publicly traded companies are prioritizing cybersecurity and have the capacity to protect investors and customers from cyber related attacks. Our legislation aims to provide a better understanding of these issues through improved SEC disclosures.

While this legislation is a matter for consideration by the Banking Committee, of which I am a member, this bill is also informed by my service on the Armed Services Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence. Through this Banking-Armed Services-Intelligence perspective, I see that our economic security is indeed a matter of our national security, and this is particularly the case as the pandemic has forced many of us to be ever more dependent on technology and the Internet.

Indeed, General Darren W. McDew, the former Commander of U.S. Transportation Command, which is charged with moving our military assets to meet our national security objectives in partnership with the private sector, offered several sobering assessments during an April 10, 2018 hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee. He stated that “cyber is the number one threat to U.S. Transportation Command, but I believe it is the number one threat to the Nation . . . in our headquarters, cyber is the commander’s business, but not everywhere across our Country is cyber a CEO’s business . . . in our cyber roundtables, which is one of the things we are doing to raise our level of awareness, some of the CEO’s chief security officers cannot even get to see the board, they cannot even . . . see the CEO. So that is a problem.”

With growing cyber threats that have resulted in serious breaches, we all need to be more proactive in ensuring our Nation’s cybersecurity. This legislation seeks to take one step towards that goal by encouraging publicly traded companies to be more transparent to their investors and customers on whether and how their Boards of Directors and senior management are prioritizing cybersecurity.

I thank the bill’s supporters, including the North American Securities Administrators Association, the Council of Institutional Investors, the National Association of State Treasurers, the California Public Employees’ Retirement System, the Bipartisan Policy Center, MIT Professor Simon Johnson, Columbia Law Professor Jack Coffee, the Consumer Federation of America, and Rhode Island General Treasurer Seth Magaziner, and I urge our colleagues to join in supporting this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 119—ESTABLISHING THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FAMILY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM FOR THE PLACEMENT IN OFFICES OF SENATORS OF CHILDREN, SPOUSES, AND SIBLINGS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE HOSTILE CASUALTIES OR WHO HAVE DIED FROM A TRAINING-RELATED INJURY

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 119

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “SFC Sean Cooley and SPC Christopher Horton Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program Resolution”.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “eligible individual” means an individual who is the child (including a step-child), spouse, or sibling of a member of the Armed Forces who is a hostile casualty or died from a training-related injury;

(2) the terms “hostile casualty” and “training-related injury” have the meanings given those terms in section 2402(b) of title 38, United States Code; and

(3) the term “Program” means the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program established under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Senate the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program, under which an eligible individual may serve a 12-month fellowship in the office of a Senator.

(c) DIRECTION OF PROGRAM.—The Program shall be carried out under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate.

(d) PLACEMENT IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICE OR A STATE OFFICE.—An individual may serve a fellowship under the Program at the office of a Senator in the District of Columbia or an office of the Senator in the State the Senator represents.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Program shall be carried out in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 120—RECOGNIZING THE NINTH SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS AND REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO A MORE PROSPEROUS, SECURE, AND DEMOCRATIC WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 120

Whereas the United States has pursued multiple collaborative initiatives to advance the region’s enduring and shared interest in a more secure, prosperous, and democratic Western Hemisphere;

Whereas the United States will host the Ninth Summit of the Americas for the first time since it hosted the inaugural Summit in Miami, Florida in 1994;

Whereas, since 1994, the Summit of the Americas is a valuable forum for democratically elected heads of state and governments of the Western Hemisphere to discuss common policy issues, affirm shared values, and commit to concerted actions at the national and regional level to address the novel and existing challenges facing the Americas;

Whereas the First and Second Summits of the Americas advanced commitments to lower trade barriers, improve transparency and market access, and facilitate economic integration, and, following those Summits, the United States has signed free trade agreements with 12 of the 35 countries in the region;

Whereas, since 2018, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, Suriname, and Uruguay have signed Memorandums of Understanding with the United States under the America Crece Program to leverage private investment in energy and infrastructure projects and advance economic prosperity, security, and good governance;

Whereas, during the 2018 Summit of the Americas, the United States announced additional humanitarian assistance for Venezuelans who have fled their country as a result of the political, economic, and security crises created by the regime of Nicolás Maduro, including support for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) response to assist Venezuelan refugees in Colombia and Brazil;

Whereas Transnational Criminal Organizations (TCOs) and their involvement in money laundering and the trafficking of people, narcotics, and weapons in the region pose complex transnational threats to United States public health and national security, as well as the stability of the Americas, by undermining citizen security, basic human rights, the rule of law, good governance, and economic development;

Whereas the United States has sought to improve regional security through friendly and sustained relationships that build interoperability, readiness, and capability with regional security partners, including through programs such as Plan Colombia, the Merida Initiative, the Central America Regional Security Initiative (CARSI), and the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI);

Whereas the pandemic caused by coronavirus disease 2019 (commonly referred to as “COVID-19”) has had devastating health and socioeconomic consequences for the states and peoples of the Americas that have—

- (1) overwhelmed health systems;
- (2) led to the worsening of economic conditions and contraction of gross domestic product per capita;
- (3) led to an increase in unemployment, especially for individuals working in small- and medium-size businesses and large informal sectors across the region, and a rise in the number of people living in poverty; and
- (4) created conditions that have strengthened the illicit activities of criminal organizations;

Whereas the United States Government remains deeply concerned about the negative, often predatory effects of China’s growing political, economic, military, and technological influence throughout the region, including significant illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing activities in the Southern Atlantic Ocean and Eastern Pacific Ocean and opaque infrastructure investments that impose unsustainable financial

burdens on recipient countries, enable corruption, and undermine good governance;

Whereas the United States Government is deeply concerned about the Government of the Russian Federation’s employment of a wide array of diplomatic, military, intelligence, cyber, misinformation, and commercial tools to undermine democratic systems in the region, including through its deepening political, economic, and security support for the Maduro regime in Venezuela;

Whereas the United States Government is deeply concerned about efforts by the Government of Iran to expand its political, economic, and security presence in the region, including through its deepening ties with the Maduro regime in Venezuela;

Whereas the regimes of Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela, Miguel Díaz-Canel in Cuba, and Daniel Ortega in Nicaragua, have systematically eroded democratic institutions, commit widespread human rights violations, draw lessons from one another to sharpen state-sponsored repression and internal control mechanisms, and receive the support of malign state and non-state actors, which pose a challenge to United States national security and national interests;

Whereas entrenched corruption, linkages between transnational criminal organizations and political actors, and the harassment and murder of journalists, human rights defenders, environmental activists, and civil society leaders in Latin America and the Caribbean weaken citizens’ confidence in democracy and negatively affect United States national interests; and

Whereas weak rule of law, elevated levels of criminal violence, and systemic corruption in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras fuel irregular migration that affects regional stability; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the occasion of the United States hosting the Ninth Summit of the Americas;

(2) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to promote economic prosperity, security, and democratic governance throughout the Americas; and

(3) calls on the President to lead a strong and coordinated diplomatic effort during the Summit process to ensure the Ninth Summit of the Americas—

(A) strengthens democratic governance by building on the 2018 Lima Commitment to—

(i) reduce bureaucracy;

(ii) strengthen the independence of judiciaries;

(iii) increase transparency through the use of new technologies;

(iv) encourage private sector participation in the formulation of public anti-corruption policies;

(v) protect whistleblowers, journalists, and law enforcement officials;

(vi) work towards preventing regional financial systems from being used to transfer and conceal illicit funds; and

(vii) identify resources to strengthen hemispheric anticorruption mechanisms;

(B) strengthens post-COVID-19 pandemic economic recovery efforts by outlining specific commitments to deepen trade and investment integration throughout the Americas and pursuing effective nearshoring and reshoring initiatives;

(C) builds upon United States efforts to enhance the institutional capacity and technical capabilities of partner countries to strengthen the rule of law, civilian security, respect of human rights, and government transparency;

(D) builds upon United States efforts to enhance regional cooperation to disrupt, degrade, and dismantle malign state and non-state influences, including transnational or-

ganized criminal networks, and terrorist organizations;

(E) reinforces the capacity of member states to—

(i) implement actions and initiatives in support of peaceful and democratic efforts of the people of Cuba, Nicaragua, and Venezuela, who desire to hold free and fair elections and restore democratic order and the rule of law in their respective countries; and

(ii) support the people of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras as they strive to address weak democratic governance and the elevated levels of corruption, violence, and criminality that drive irregular migration; and

(F) explores a comprehensive approach to forced displacement and migration challenges in the Western Hemisphere, takes stock of humanitarian crises and flashpoints in the region, and mobilizes member state commitments to advocate for and support multilateral humanitarian and development responses.

SENATE RESOLUTION 121—HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE DANIEL CROWE

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 121

Whereas George Daniel Crowe (referred to in this preamble as “Mr. Crowe”)—

(1) was an extraordinary athlete;

(2) excelled at both basketball and baseball; and

(3) holds the rare status of having played both basketball and baseball at the professional level;

Whereas Mr. Crowe was born in Whiteland, Indiana, on March 22, 1921;

Whereas Mr. Crowe was raised in nearby Franklin, Indiana, where he was a standout on the football, baseball, and basketball teams;

Whereas Mr. Crowe led his basketball team to the 1939 Indiana State championship game, where, although his team lost to Frankfort High School, Mr. Crowe displayed his talents to a State-wide audience and became the first player to ever earn the prestigious distinction of Indiana Mr. Basketball;

Whereas Mr. Crowe earned an athletic scholarship to attend Indiana Central College, known today as the University of Indianapolis, where he played basketball, baseball, and ran track;

Whereas higher education was rare for an African American in the 1930s and 1940s, and Mr. Crowe took advantage of the opportunity to be a student athlete and graduated in 1943;

Whereas, after graduation, Mr. Crowe entered the Army during World War II and served the United States admirably until 1946;

Whereas, following his service to the United States in World War II, Mr. Crowe began playing professional basketball on a series of Negro League basketball teams between 1946 and 1953, including the Los Angeles Red Devils and the New York Renaissance (commonly known as the “Harlem Renaissance”);

Whereas, in 1947, Mr. Crowe joined the New York Black Yankees, which was a baseball team in the Negro Leagues;

Whereas, after joining the New York Black Yankees, Mr. Crowe played 2 professional sports simultaneously;

Whereas, in 1949, 2 years after Jackie Robinson integrated Major League baseball, Mr. Crowe was picked up by the Minor League Hartford Chiefs, where he won the batting title with a .353 average;

Whereas Mr. Crowe was called up by the Boston Braves in 1952 and played in the Major Leagues for 9 years on that team, the Cincinnati Redlegs, and the St. Louis Cardinals;

Whereas, during his Major League baseball career, Mr. Crowe played primarily as a first baseman and a pinch hitter;

Whereas, upon his retirement from Major League baseball, Mr. Crowe held the Major League record of 14 career pinch hit home runs and had a .990 fielding percentage;

Whereas the most successful period of Mr. Crowe's career in the Major Leagues was in 1957, when he hit 31 home runs, and 1958, when he was selected as a National League All Star;

Whereas Mr. Crowe also played winter baseball for the Santurce Crabbers in the Puerto Rico baseball league;

Whereas Mr. Crowe and his teammates on the Santurce Crabbers, who included Willie Mays and Roberto Clemente, won the Caribbean World Series;

Whereas Mr. Crowe was a pioneer in civil rights and quietly but firmly paved the way for wider opportunities in society in the United States by proving his ability as an athlete and student in college and as a professional athlete;

Whereas, in 1946, soon after his discharge from the Army, Mr. Crowe forced the integration of the movie theater in Franklin, Indiana, when he refused to leave his seat on the main floor and move to the designated Negro section in the back of the theater;

Whereas the prominence of Mr. Crowe in the Franklin, Indiana, community and his service in World War II, which was a war against fascism, led the movie theater to be permanently integrated 1 week after Mr. Crowe refused to leave his seat; and

Whereas, after his retirement from professional sports, Mr. Crowe began new careers as an insurance salesman and then a school teacher in New York: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) George Daniel Crowe—

(A) achieved a rarely matched record of athletic excellence at the high school, collegiate, and professional levels; and

(B) set an example for all Hoosiers and people of the United States—

(i) with his dogged determination and hard work;

(ii) by taking advantage of opportunities as they arose; and

(iii) by making the careers of countless people of the United States who followed him possible;

(2) the story of George Daniel Crowe is—

(A) the story of the United States in the 20th century;

(B) a story of overcoming oppression;

(C) a story of demanding what President Lincoln called the "Right to Rise";

(D) a story of developing talent and achieving greatness through hard work; and

(E) a story of trying to leave the world a better place than he found it; and

(3) on March 22, 2021, which is the 100th anniversary of his birth, the Senate recognizes George Daniel Crowe as—

(A) a great Hoosier;

(B) a man of respect and achievement; and

(C) a man whose example can help guide the people of the United States.

ment to the bill H.R. 1276, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID-19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1400. Mr. PADILLA (for Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1276, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID-19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening and Amplifying Vaccination Efforts to Locally Immunize All Veterans and Every Spouse Act" or the "SAVE LIVES Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO FURNISH COVID-19 VACCINE TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT ENROLLED IN PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may furnish a vaccine for COVID-19 to a covered individual during the COVID-19 public health emergency.

(b) PRIORITIZATION.—In furnishing vaccines for COVID-19 under the laws administered by the Secretary, the Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize the vaccination of veterans who are enrolled in the patient enrollment system, veterans who receive hospital care and medical services pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, and accompanying caregivers of such veterans before the vaccination of covered individuals not otherwise described in this paragraph; and

(2) only furnish vaccines for COVID-19 to covered individuals under this section to the extent that such vaccines are available.

(c) TIMING OF VACCINES PROVIDED TO SPOUSES OF VETERANS.—The Secretary may determine the timing for offering a vaccine for COVID-19 to the spouse of a veteran from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(d) VACCINE ALLOCATION.—It is the sense of Congress that, to the extent practicable based on the current national supply chain, the Secretary of Health and Human Services should adjust the allocation for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the vaccine for COVID-19 based on the additional eligibility of covered individuals under this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACCOMPANYING CAREGIVER.—The term "accompanying caregiver" means a caregiver described in subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of paragraph (2) who is accompanying a veteran who is receiving a vaccine for COVID-19 furnished by the Department.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term "covered individual" means any of the following individuals:

(A) A veteran who is not eligible to enroll in the patient enrollment system.

(B) A veteran who is eligible for care under section 1724 of title 38, United States Code.

(C) A beneficiary under section 1781 of such title.

(D) A family caregiver of a veteran participating in the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers under section 1720G(a) of such title.

(E) A caregiver of a veteran participating in the program of general caregiver support services under section 1720G(b) of such title.

(F) A caregiver of a veteran participating in the Medical Foster Home Program, Bowel and Bladder Program, Home Based Primary Care Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(G) A spouse of a veteran.

(3) COVERED PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.—The term "covered public health emergency" means an emergency with respect to COVID-19 declared by a Federal, State, or local authority.

(4) COVID-19.—The term "COVID-19" means the coronavirus disease 2019.

(5) PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM.—The term "patient enrollment system" means the system of annual patient enrollment of the Department of Veterans Affairs established and operated under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code.

(6) VETERAN.—The term "veteran" has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 10 a.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 Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 9:30 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 Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WATER, AND WILDLIFE

The Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife of the Committee

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1400. Mr. PADILLA (for Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN)) proposed an amend-

on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—S. 344

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 344 and it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE DANIEL CROWE

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 121, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 121) honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Daniel Crowe.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 121) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 17, 2021, (Legislative Day of March 16, 2021) under "Submitted Resolutions.")

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS' AND CAREGIVERS' COVID-19 IMMUNIZATIONS NOW EXPANDED ACT OF 2021

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1276, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1276) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID-19 vaccines to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PADILLA. I ask unanimous consent that the Tester-Moran substitute amendment be considered and agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1400), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening and Amplifying Vaccination Efforts to Locally Immunize All Veterans and Every Spouse Act" or the "SAVE LIVES Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO FURNISH COVID-19 VACCINE TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT ENROLLED IN PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may furnish a vaccine for COVID-19 to a covered individual during the COVID-19 public health emergency.

(b) PRIORITIZATION.—In furnishing vaccines for COVID-19 under the laws administered by the Secretary, the Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize the vaccination of veterans who are enrolled in the patient enrollment system, veterans who receive hospital care and medical services pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, and accompanying caregivers of such veterans before the vaccination of covered individuals not otherwise described in this paragraph; and

(2) only furnish vaccines for COVID-19 to covered individuals under this section to the extent that such vaccines are available.

(c) TIMING OF VACCINES PROVIDED TO SPOUSES OF VETERANS.—The Secretary may determine the timing for offering a vaccine for COVID-19 to the spouse of a veteran from the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(d) VACCINE ALLOCATION.—It is the sense of Congress that, to the extent practicable based on the current national supply chain, the Secretary of Health and Human Services should adjust the allocation for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the vaccine for COVID-19 based on the additional eligibility of covered individuals under this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACCOMPANYING CAREGIVER.—The term "accompanying caregiver" means a caregiver described in subparagraph (D), (E), or (F) of paragraph (2) who is accompanying a veteran who is receiving a vaccine for COVID-19 furnished by the Department.

(2) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term "covered individual" means any of the following individuals:

(A) A veteran who is not eligible to enroll in the patient enrollment system.

(B) A veteran who is eligible for care under section 1724 of title 38, United States Code.

(C) A beneficiary under section 1781 of such title.

(D) A family caregiver of a veteran participating in the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers under section 1720G(a) of such title.

(E) A caregiver of a veteran participating in the program of general caregiver support services under section 1720G(b) of such title.

(F) A caregiver of a veteran participating in the Medical Foster Home Program, Bowel and Bladder Program, Home Based Primary Care Program, or Veteran Directed Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(G) A spouse of a veteran.

(3) COVERED PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.—The term "covered public health emergency" means an emergency with respect to COVID-19 declared by a Federal, State, or local authority.

(4) COVID-19.—The term "COVID-19" means the coronavirus disease 2019.

(5) PATIENT ENROLLMENT SYSTEM.—The term "patient enrollment system" means

the system of annual patient enrollment of the Department of Veterans Affairs established and operated under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code.

(6) VETERAN.—The term "veteran" has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

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

Mr. PADILLA. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 1276), as amended, was passed.

Mr. PADILLA. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2021

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. Thursday, March 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Xavier Becerra to be Secretary for Health and Human Services; further, that the postcloture debate time on the Becerra nomination expire at 12 noon; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; finally, that upon disposition of the Becerra nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Martin Walsh to be Secretary of Labor and that the cloture motion with respect to the Walsh nomination ripen at 1:30 p.m.

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

Mr. PADILLA. Finally, for the information of Senators, we expect two roll-call votes during Thursday's session of the Senate in relation to the Becerra and Walsh nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:22 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 18, 2021, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

JOSE W. FERNANDEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS; UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE KEITH KRACH.

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

JOSE W. FERNANDEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, VICE KEITH KRACH.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOSE W. FERNANDEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY, AND THE ENVIRONMENT), VICE KEITH KRACH.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 17, 2021:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

KATHERINE C. TAI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING EAGLE SCOUT
ANGELINA HEMPHILL AS IOWAN
OF THE WEEK

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Angelina Hemphill, a newly minted Eagle Scout with Ankeny Troop 188, as our Iowan of the Week. Angelina is a member of the inaugural class of female Eagle Scouts nationwide and one of the first-ever from Iowa. She hopes to inspire others to work hard and never settle for less than what they deserve. Her goal is to help people believe in themselves even when they're faced with challenges and to help them look for the good in the world.

To rise to the rank of Eagle Scout, Angelina has invested a lot of time and energy in educating herself and in giving back to her community. She completed 21 merit badges for tasks such as climbing, tying knots and fishing. In all, Angelina completed nine more electives than she needed to earn the rank of Eagle Scout. Angelina also organized and led a conservation service project with a crew of volunteers who removed invasive species at Chichaqua Bottoms Greenbelt. Through her accomplishments, she has learned numerous first aid and outdoor skills and how to be a positive, contributing citizen. She has also learned valuable leadership skills that she will carry with her for the rest of her life.

As one of the first women elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the state of Iowa, I can attest that being the first at something is never easy. Angelina's bravery and determination, and her belief that young women should have an equal chance to learn about leadership and valuable life skills makes me so excited to see what the next generation can achieve. I am proud to represent constituents like Angelina who aren't afraid to stand up for themselves and take a chance at doing something new. During this first week of Women's History Month, I couldn't be happier to name trailblazing Angelina as Iowan of the Week.

IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICE
PAWS OF CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Service Paws of Central Pennsylvania for its service to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The volunteers at Service Paws of Central Pennsylvania have stepped up to alleviate

burdens for individuals and families in the process of purchasing a service dog. Service Paws helps to offset this expense, which can range from between \$4,000 to \$35,000.

Service Paws of Central Pennsylvania, which is operated entirely by volunteers, now serves Pennsylvanians in 14 counties.

The Service Paws of Central Pennsylvania volunteers are incredible community leaders in Blair County and across our Commonwealth. On behalf of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I thank them for their work to improve the lives of Pennsylvanians and wish them continued success in this mission.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 81.

RECOGNIZING THE FRONTLINE
HEALTHCARE WORKERS OF
SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize, celebrate, and honor the frontline healthcare workers of the great state of South Dakota.

Some of these South Dakota heroes are: Joseph Dolezal, Ashley Rose Doll, Kelly Allen Dollinger, Brianna Nicole Domeyer, Stuart William Donaldson, Erica Lynn Donovan, Ruth Douglas, Daniel Dean Doxon, Jared Drotzman, Russell Walter Dunlap, Eric Jon Duwenhoegger, Justin A. Dyer, Cory Jerome Eberle, Stephanie Rose Eggink, Robert M. Eisenbraun, Joshua Eldridge, Mark Eliason, Eric E. Emery, Danielle Renee Emmett, Matthew David Emrich, Kendra Enright, Kristie Lea Escott, Ethan Lester Esposti, Benjamin Cory Estes, Erik Jon Eversman, Mitchell Alan Evertse, Dustin J. Faber, Brandon James Fay, Peter M. Ferguson, Shawn M. Fischer, Chad W. Fischer, Sean Daniel Fitzgerald, Rachel Marie Flemmer, Kirk Lawrence Fochtman, Tracy Foltz, Chaz Raymond Fondren, Mark Dale Foss, Taylor Ray Freeman, Jamie Lynn Freeman, Ronald James Freemont Jr, Rhonda R. Fulkerson, Joseph Funke, Dakota Jon Gamber, Timothy Michael Gartner, Alex Christian Garvin, JD Geigle, Tanner Pike Geldert, Anthony Jerome Gengler, Kurtis Geres, Steven Alan Gilbert, Jeffrey Jon Gilchrist, Josef John Gislason, Branden Nickolas Glaser, Donovan Dexter Glerup, Douglas Glover, Roy Goban, Nikolas Edward Gonzales, Neill James Goodart, Tyler James Gorrell, Brian James

Gourdin, Rebecca Lynn Graf, Mary Grassrope, Mark Everett Green, David Brainerd Greene, Michael Clessan Greenman II, Shawn Greer, Melissa Marie Gross, Joshua Henry Grossman, Reed Theodore Groth, John Mitchell Gruber, Brandon Ali'i Gubach, Corey Erwin Gulke, Christina R. Guthmiller, Corey Richard Haefner, Drew Allen Haffner, Johnathan Daryl Hagen, James Lee Hale, Isaiah Tomas Hall, Gregory Hall, Emily Jo Halleen, Brian Hambek, Devon Veronica Hamlyn, Lance Hammrich, Kevin William Handke, Chase Stanley Hansen, Kelcey Katherine Hanson, Zachary Scott Hanson, Michael David Hanson, Marisa Michelle Hanson, Wesley Jack Hanson, Jessica Judith Hanssen, Tony Ray Hanssen, Keith Tobias Hapip Jr., Matthew R. Hardwick, Alexandra Marie Hardy, Jessica Marie Harms, Heath L. Harter, Steven Thomas Hartung, Brady Michael Hartung, Thomas James Harvey Jr., Jeffrey John Hauck, Cristy Jill Hawk, Steven W. Hawkins, Burton Paul Hayden, Tate Edward Hayford, Billy Joe Heap, Kellie Ann Hearnen, Philip Alvin Heier, Paula Le Heimgartner, Stephen Kieth Heimgartner, Adam R. Heinrich, Peter Heinrichs, Matthew Michael Helling, Nicholas Alexander Henchal, Clarence William Henderson, Adam Phillip Herther, Joy Jolene Hetle, Cody Mikal Heupel.

Eric J. Heupel, Dylan Charles Hinds, Charles Joseph Hinton, Rachel Renee Hobbs, Neal Robert Hofer, Abigail Marie Hofer, Carl Gayle Hoffman, Kyle Andrew Hollenbeck, Matthew Richard Hons, Nathan K. Hopper, Steven W. Housley, Eric Allen Hoy, Jonathan Chun Ming Huang, Kevin Lee Huber, Anthony Louis Hudson, Larry Huebner Jr, Joseph Nathan Huff, McKenzie Lynn Hulm, Christopher David Hunter, Theresa Marie Husman, Page Sonja Ideker, Jared William Ihnen, Paul Andrew Imhof, Jesse Matthew Ingebretson, Lance Truels Iversen, Loren Lydell Iversen, Gary Wayne Jackson, Chad Allen Jacobson, Daniel Janecek, Timothy John Jeffries, Stefanie Milea Jenks, Lorrane C. Johansen, Henry W. Johnson, Jason Jarred Johnson, Amy Joy Johnson, Brett M. Johnson, Scott Allen Johnson, Melissa Jane Johnson, Jordan Rolland Johnson, Benjamin Richard Johnson, Jill Anna Johnson, Kimberlee Ann Johnson, William Richard Johnstone, Christopher Jolley, Chad K. Jones, Cody Robert Jones, Kelcy Rose Jones, Scott Jongbloed, Jacob Jeffery Jorgenson, Scott Allan Jungck, Renae Dawn Kaiser, Matthew James Kann, Ashley Lynn Kann, Jeffrey Kaufman, Steven Philip Keller, Corey Alan Kempers, Robert Keys, Tyler Eric Kientopf, Benjamin Joseph Kilburn, Kirsten Laura Kirsch, Robert Joshua Kleinhans, Chris David Klucas, Anthony Kent Klunder, Kurtis Kent Klunder, Nicholas Lee Knotek-Wangberg, David S. Koch, Paul W. Kock, Robert Koistinen, Dustin George Kotzenmacher, Eric Richard Kovach, Cody Jacob Kraft, Meghan Danielle Krajewski, Anthony John Krajewski II, Kasia Anne Kramer, Joann Phyllis Kranz, Doug Kranz, Micah Douglas Kremer, Kandace K. Kritz, Katie L. Kruger, Brady Lee Kruger, Craig Kruse, Haley Helena Kuefler, Dustin Jacob Kuhn, Casey John Kulm, Tracy L.

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

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

Kurtz, Joshua Robert Kusser, Samuel Patrick Kuster, James Donald L'Esperance, Nicholas Andrew Lakey, Patrick Vincent Lalla-Kraemer, Duane L. Lamb, Austin Lee Lambing, Derek Jeffrey Landeen, Jeremy William Landhuis, Gary Langerock, Jamie Lee Langerock, Sydney Nicole Lanning, Tony Lawrence Lanoue, Trapper Lappe, Alyssa Lorraine Larive, Dustin James Larsen, Jason Alan Larson, Corolla J Lauck, Marius Laursen, Kimberly Ann Leibel, Nathan Richard Steckman Leonard, Jeffrey Walter Lesniak, Tyrel James Lewis Sr., Megan Catherine Lien, Sean P. Lien, Kyle Christopher Lineweber, Martin David Link, Mary Ann Lipscomb, Brandon Joseph Lliteras, Ronald L. Lockwood, Eliza Jayne Loeschke, Erik Jason Logan, Christopher Joseph Lohan, Brady John London, Colleen Sue Long, Brent Long, Wendy Kay Long, Matthew Russel Lordino.

Travis Alan Lovelace, Ann Michelle Lukesh, William Nicholas Lutz, Michael Anthony Mack, Cameron Arnold Mack, Chad Allan Madsen, Daryl Robert Madsen, Brandon Michael Manchester, Alexis Ladine Manolovits, Dan March, Ryan M. Marcks, Brandon S. Marienau, Amy Marsh, Eric A. Martens, Robert Joe Martian, Julie Ann Martin, Roger J. Martin, Adilene Martinez, Kenneth Wayne Maston, Jay Masur, Monte R. Mathews, Paul Mathiason, Ross Mattheis, Adam David Max, Colt Michael Mayfield, Steven Patrick McCollar, Brian Dudley McCoy, Tammy Sue McCoy, Tyler McElhany, Celeste Connolly McEwan, Nicholas Richard McGlothlen, Erica Leigh McIntosh, Benjamin Martin McKee, Justin Bruce McMahan, Monty McMurphy, Robert Eugene McNally, Matthew McQuisten, Corinna Mead, Troy Kirby Mead, Kyle G. Meininger, Suzette Meland, Joseph C. Meligan, Christopher James Merkwon, Monte Paul Mertes, Timothy Michael Meyer, Daryl Lloyd Michael, Branden Lee Miesemer, Richard Alan Migliorato, Leonardo Jose Mijares, Christopher Alan Mikkelsen, Adam Paul Miles, Dalton Jason Miller, Ross Michael Miller, Joshua Lynn Miller, Aaron Michael Mitchell, Steven Peter Mogard, Samuel Joseph Mogen-Frankfort, April Robin Mogen-Frankfort, Spencer Brian Monette, Michael Allen Monson, Tina Marie Monteith, Casey Lee Morgan, Wesley E. Morris, Kayla Sue Marie Mosaquites, Mariah Mougey, Jared Lee Mouw, Mary Christine Munch, Nathan Ray Murphy, Ty Alan Murray, Matthew H. Mydland, Dereck Scott Narvais, Austin Neil Nath, Thomas Allyn Neibauer Jr., Kurtis James Nelson, Hannah Leigh Nelson, Cory Edward Nelson, Terry Luke Nelson, Bonnie Nelson, Mark Aaron Nickles, Jarred Michael Nix, Christopher C. Noeldner, Brian Alan Nolde, Nicholas Bradley Nolen, Shellaine Novak, John Carl Noyes, Timothy Nugteren, Hapsie D. Nutley, Julie Lynn Nylund, Karen A. O'Brien, Steven William O'Leary, Joshua David Ochsner, Shannon Michael Odiet, Phillip Scott Oelschlager, Kevin Ray Oestman, Tyler Jamison Olson, Lauren Nicole Olson, Thomas Theodore Olson, Alan Thomas Omvig, Nathan Brian Opdahl, Zachary Francis Ordal, Sissy Dale Orel, Conley Orth, Bryan Cory Ott, Kristen Ann Otteson, Thomas Dean Papiernik, Rob D. Parker, Sean Bradley Patchett, Cassie Leigh Paulsen, Edward R Pavel, Joseph Edward Resch Pedersen, Richard Alden Pendleton, Ashly Perez-Franco, Alan Leonard Perry, Riki Renee Peterson, Michael Joseph Phelps, Justin Pietz, William Pollard, Joshua William Poppen, John Charles

Potter, Brian Povandra, Christopher J. Premus, Daniel Chapman Preadable, Robert Jay Price, Thomas E. Price.

David Vasilevich Prokulevich, Jaryd Ryan Pugh, Orion Edward Pullen, Angeline Estelle Quinn, John F. Quinn, James Clayton Rahm, Matthew Thomas Ramsey, Kristene Marie Rancour, Kirk Andrew Rangel, Alexander William Rasmussen, Matthew Clark Rector, Scott Redmond, Amanda Jean Reed, Michael Ivan Reis, Joseph Reiter, Jason J. Reitz, Robert Rendon, David Warren Reynolds, Robby Alan Rhembrandt, Ryan Keith Ricke, Justice James Ries, Matthew J. Rigo, Christy Michel Ritesman, Laura Lynne Roberts, Jeremy Robertson, Christopher J. Robinson, James Marshal Robinson, Katelynn Ann Roesler, Richard Drake Rogers, Nicole Ann Roggenbuck, David Thomas Rohlf, Jon Thorne Romans, Amy Lynn Roseland, Paul Jacob Rossum, Donovan L. Rowland, Jonathan David Ruby, Travis Sean Rup, Joshua Thomas Ryan, Connor Joseph Ryan, Jesse Rystrom, Holly Gee Sabers, Michael Lawrence Sackmann, Melissa Rae Sackreiter, Jason Sackreiter, Justin Ray Sadler, Shannon Mark Sandoval, Brian James Sanfilippo, Toby Scott Sanovia, Dominick Frank Santa Maria, Gregory S. Santa Maria, Michael Craig Sauser, Mark Saylor, Jennifer Lue Schaefer, Mandy Nicole Schaible, Kendra Susan Schamber, Elizabeth Diane Scharton, Matthew R. Schell, Jean Marie Scherschligt, Aden James Schillig, Carson Jack Schilt, Matthew Lee Schmidt, Austin David Schmidt, Jeremiah James Schneider, Lenae Marie Schneider, Joseph T. Schnell, Michael Peder Schoenemann, John E. Schoenfelder, Gabrielle Kirsten Schroeder, Adam E. Schroeder, Eric Paul Schueth, Eric Wendell Schuldt, Michael Steven Schultz, Halli Nikole Schulz, Todd Schulz, Heidi Lin Schulz, Karryn Colleen Schwab, Christian Daniel Scott, Andrew Ray Sebek, Rob Senger, Jeffrey Robert Severson, Andrew Shank, Keith Sharisky, Brian Randy Sharp, Eric Christopher Shattuck, Jama Lee Shaulis, Warren Eric Shaulis, Kayla Marie Shaw, Audriana Elizabeth Sherod, Tony Alva Shope, Susan Shumaker, Charles Lawrence Siferd, II, Megan Angela Sinner, Brenda Sinning, Ryan Sittig, Tanner Roman Sittig, Glenn Alan Skala II, Nicole Marie Skouge, Kim Lyle Smaaladen, Trevin Smeenk, James R. Smidt, Blair Smith, Cody T. Smith, William Brett Smith, Julie Kay Smithson, Samuel Guy Smolnisky, Joshua Dean Sneller, Kevin Eugene Sosa, Victor Joseph Spadaro II, Travis Spier, Daniel Louis Sponsler, Tamara Suzanne Stadel, Douglas Peter Stagnaro, Brendan Lee Stancer, Ian Jacob Stark, Brian John Staton, Brad William Staton, Frederick William Staudy, Scott Stauffenecker, Jacqueline Johanna Stegeman, Glenn William Stevens, Bradley Stiefvater, Shelly Marie Stockstad-Erickson, Kyle Lee Stoddard.

Shelley Anne Stortz, Willis Garberson Strawn IV, Hannah Mae Streff, Lucas Ludell Stroh, Darrell Curtis Strong, Travis Struss, Scott Stuefen, Nathan John Sturgeon, Dean Paul Sturzenbecher, Terry James Sudrta, Daniel Lee Suhr, Lydia Rose Surdez, Caleb Andrew Sutton, Derek David Swain, Kingsley Arden Swanson, Kathleen M. Sybrant, Andrea Lynn Syrstad, Eugene F. Taylor, Stephen Beau Teague, Nicholas Alan Tessman, Ethan Robert Dean Thaut, Steven Everett Thomas, Katy Joy Thompson, Matthew Thompson, Robert D. Thompson, Nicholas Lee Tieszen, Duane Vincent Tillman, Anthony Bryce Timm,

Cody Allen Tinklenberg, Joseph Tjaden, Robert Talmadge Todd, Gary Joseph Tommeraasen, Dylan David Traufler, Damien Jacob Trevino, Keith Trojanowski, Mathew Lee Truckenmiller, Loma Lee Tucker, Alecia Mae Turner, Tanner John Urbaniak, Shane Andrew Van Cleve, Eric D. Van Dusen, Joanna Rose Van Middendorp, Harlan Vandekieft, Benjamin Vanden Hoek, Gregory A VanDenBerg, Barry Vansickle, Drew Edward Vanvoorhis, Michael David Vargas, Roberto Ray Vargas-Cortes, Katie Marie Vedral, Tanner Lyle Venard, Elizabeth Marie Verhey, Brandon Tyler Villanueva, Hunter Jacob Vissia, Anthony M. Vopat, Jacob Matthew Vukovich, Rachel Renee Wager, Kymberli Anne Wagner, Donnie Glenn Walding Jr., Courtney Ann Walker, James Leslie Wallace, Jeffrey D. Wallenburg, James Ray Waller Jr., Beau Tyler Walsh, James Joseph Walton, Jamie Frank Walton, Tanner Ray Walz, Patricius Daniel Ward, Emily Jean Ward, Lesley Warren, Sapphire Marie Watchorn, Andrew Joseph Watne, Wade Thomas Waugh, Ryan P. Webb, Jerry Dee Webber, Joshua Mark Weber, Randy Webert, Michael Alan Weig, Alex Ruben Weil, Robert L. Weinert, Dody Weller, Christopher G Wells, Wade Wells, Lauri Ann Wempen, Ted Hartly Werre, Deeann Marie Werre, Tyra Moe Wheeler, Michael B. Whirlwind Soldier, Taylor Mark White, Terry Lee White, Aaron D. Wiechmann, Bryan Wientjes, Chuck Willard, Travis Jason Williams, Cully Clay Williams, Michael Nathaniel Wilson, Brant Robert Winter, Blake Mackinsey Wirtjes, Mitchell Walker Witt, Bruce Eugene Woods, McKenzy James Young, Ralph Franklin Young Jr., Jason Lane Zeigler, Nathan Daniel Ziegman, Aaron Zimmond, Robert Hardwick, Nellie Isaacs, Darcy Schock, Paul J. Schueth, Nancy Aadland, Kendra Lee Aasgaard, Kaili Ann Aberle, Alexis Hiller, Tami Hines, Tania Hinesh, Mackenzie Hinsley, Holly Hitland, Jeanette Hlaudy, Niki Hoaglan, Katie Hobson, Hallee Hodges, Lynn Hodny, Lori Hofer, Paula Hofer, Nicole Hofer, Monica Hofer, Lacy Hoff.

Ramona Hoff, Stephanie Hoff, Nancy Hoffman, Alexandra Hoffman, Tiffany Hoffman, Brett Hoffman, Kathy Hogg, Katie Hagie, Christine Hogle, Ruth Holcomb, Julie Holgate, Kari Holman, Alaina Holmes, Vanessa Holmes, Curtis Holscher, Natalie Holstein, Kelly Holt, Lacy Holte, LaNor Holweger, Candice Holzer, Ashley Hondel, Crystal Hom, Courtney Homer, Jammie Homer, Florence Horstman, Jody Horstman, Melissa Horvath, Amanda Hoseck, Kinsey Houlihan, Marcy Houseman, Deanna Houseman, Emily Houska, Kayla Houtsma, Sunshine Hovdesven, Gail Hovorka, Kelsey Hovorka, Kathy Howard, Jessica Howard, Danielle Howe, Wanda Howie, Jessica Hubbard, Stefanie Hubbard, Kiera Hubers, Lori Hubert, Amber Huckins, Danielle Hudec, Andrea Hudec, Miranda Hudelson, Cassie Huebert, Alicia Huebner, Kimbra Huenergardt, Delila Hughes, Doreen Hughes, Cynthia Hughes, Amber Hughes, Pamela Hughes, Charlee Hughes, Kala Hughes, Karen Huitema, Andrea Hunhoff, Sewhenu Hunjah, Trinity Hunter, Matthew Hurley-Jackson, Joy Huss, Samantha Hyatt, Taylor Hyatt, Emily Iatala, Alyssa Ideker, Galina Ignato, Demaree Iles, Tauna Ireland, Alyssa Irvine, Jennifer Isaacson, Lenn Island, Rachelle Island, Jenna Iverson, Peggy Iverson, Laura Iverson, Geriann Iverson, Emily Iverson, Betsy Jackson, Shanna Jackson, Ashley Jackson, Pamela Jacobsen, Joy

Jacobson, Renae Jager, Theresa James, Amy Jandreaux, Rachel Janes, Theresia Jangula, Heather Janis, Wendy Janke, Betty Janke, Robin Jankord, Robin Janousek, Rachel Janssen, Mary Janssen, Kristen Jaqua, Cynthia Jass, Lori Jaton, Angela Jeffers, Willow Jelsma, Megan Jenisch-Nagel, Allie Jenkins, Norma Jenks, Sonia Jenner, Penny Jensen, Ruth Jensen, Diana Jensen, Tanya Jensen, Debra Jensen, Candice Jensen, Tracy Jensen, Christina Jensen, Whitney Jensen, Veronica Johansen, Kristina Johns, Gael Johnsen, Nickole Johnson, LuAnn Johnson, Beth Johnson, Elizabeth Johnson, Lisa Johnson, Arlys Johnson, Molly Johnson, Annette Johnson, Claudia Johnson, Robin Johnson, Kelly Johnson, Lindsay Johnson, Laura Johnson, Byron Johnson, Briana Johnson, Tamara Johnson, Ryan Johnson, Brooke Johnson, Joni Johnson, Jill Johnson, Amy Johnson, Ashley Johnson, Kathy Johnson, Taylor Johnson, Hailey Johnson, Teresa Johnson, Traci Johnson, Katelyn Johnson, Monique Johnson, Jersee Johnson, Robin Johnson, Brooke Johnson, Michelle Johnson, Zakiyah Johnson, Catherine Johnson, Tember Johnson, Joshua Johnston.

Jonell Jones, Kathryn Jones, Hannah Jones, Shanna Jones, Robyn Jones, Jessica Jones, Katie Jongejeugd, Lara Joseph, Jahne Josephsen, Lori Josephsen, Holly Judd, Dawn Juel, Alysia Juhl, Shannon Juhnke, Sarah Jundt, Chelsey Jungemann, Casey Jungers, Rebecca Jurrens, Haley Jurrens, Jessica Just, Heidi Justison, Loretta Kading, Terra Kahler, Marilyn Kaiser, Danielle Kaiser, Rebecca Kaiser, Theresa Kallenberger, Chelsie Kallhoff, Vicki Kampa, Melissa Kane, Patricia Kangas, Dianne Kannas, Anita Kappenman, Lori Kappler, Sheila Kam, Amanda Kama, Shelbi Karr, Kaycee Karst, Danielle Kasuske, Kylie Kaven, Mary Kayser, Bikash KC, Mary Keegan, Amber Keiser, Eileen Keiser, Rhonda Keiser, Lindsey Kellar, Cynthia Kellen, Lyndsay Keller, Cheyenne Keller, Betty Kelley, Mary Kelly, Keegan Kelly, Audree Kempema, Vicki Kennedy, Terese Kenner, Andrea Kenrick, Katherine Kent, Brittany Kenyon, Beverly Keogh, Jessica Keogh, Kari Kem, Jennifer Kertscher, Christina Kettner, Gloria Kiefer, Taylor Kiefer, Julie Kierst, Rebecca Kiesz, Jaci Kihlstrom, Brianna Kilene, Ryan Killion, Phyllis Kilmer, Susan King, Denea King, Taylor King, Kimberly Kinner, Sarah Kinsella—Smith, Deborah Kirk, Stasha Kirk, Connie Kirschenman, Emily Kitterman, Morgan Klanchnik, Virginia Klatt, Kayla Klaw, Ronda Klein, Curt Klein, Melissa Klein, Kaia Kleinlein, Corliss Kleinsasser, Michelle Klemann, Cathy Klemme, Stephanie Kline, Emily Kling, Brittany Klinger, Erika Klinger, Malinda Klinghagen, Christina Klinghagen, Danyel Kloos, Melissa Kloos, Teresa Klug, Amber Klungseth, Teresa Knab, Katlyn Kniffen, Chandra Knock, Christina Knorr, Abby Knott, MiKayla Knudsen, Leann Knudson, Lee Knutson, Denise Kobold, Dawn Koch, Anna Koch, Ciara Koch, Lynette Koedam, Sharon Koenig, Linnea Koepke, Patricia Koopp, Ellie Koerner, Terri Kolb, Melissa Kolb, Chelsea Konda, Jennifer Konda, Melissa Konrad, Ashley Konradi, Tara Konda, Melissa Konz, Brigitte Kooima, Marcy Koontz, Macey Koopal, Julie Koopsma, Jason Korbel, Karah Kortlever, Diane Korus, Alisha Koski, Sr. Janet Kosman, Janelle Koster, Madisen Koster, Judy Koulavong, Kathy Kraemer, Margaret Kraft, Kay Kramer, Paige Kramer, Sarah Kraus, Jennifer Krause, April Krause, Jacqueline Kreber,

Amanda Kreger, Amy Krenn, Taylor Kreutz, Joan Krikac, Matthew Krogman, Kourtney Krohn, Nida Krokell, Kristen Kronbach, Amber Kruse, Jenna Kruse, Rebecca Kuehl, Dana Kuelbs, Ramona Kuhn, Kassie Kukal, Angela Kull, Jeanne Kunkel, Rosemary Kurtenbach, Tracy Kurtz, Carrie Kwasniewski, Deanna Kyne, Shara Labelle, Amber LaBelle, Lisa Laber, Leah Lachman.

Hanna LaCompte, Heather Lacroix, Mary Laffeur, Dominique Laki, Kirsten Lakner, Jennifer Lambert, Rebecca Lamptey, Erin Landegent, Nichole Landess, Cynthia Landis, Julie Lane, Amber Langbehn, Darla Langenhorst, Melissa Lantgen, Jennifer Larive, Kayla Larkins, Linda Laroche, Desiree Laroche, Janice Larsen, Janet Larsen, Stacy Larsen, Heather Larsen, Shandi Larsen, Teshia Larsen, Karla Larson, Peggy Larson, Shannon Larson, Kathryn Larson, Sean Larson, Faith Larson, Abigail Larson, Ariel LaRue, Peggy Lauck, Denise Laue, Laurie Lauing, Kagee Lauseng, Mackenzie Lawler, Ramona Lawrence, Carolyn Lawrence, Jimmi Lawrence, Tatiana Lazari, Lila Leader Charge, Debra Lechtenberg, Charlene LeClair, Cherie Leddy, Michelle Lee, April Lee, Tina Leebens, Nacole Lehman, Amie Lehman, Latrisha Lehto, Lori Leisinger, Kelli Lemke, Jamie Lemke, Manuel Lemos Jr, Bobbie Leneau, Linda Leonhard, Chelsie Lerdal, Robbi Letcher, Nancy Levanen, Danika Levanen, Patricia Levin, Shante Levy, Rosita Levy, Katie Lewedag, Theresa Lewis, Amanda Lewis, Sabrina Lickiss, Kyleen Liebig, Mollie Loeffort, Seanna Linafelter, Megan Lindblad, Matthew Linde, Pamela Lindell, Karen Linden Hansen, Jody Linke, Josephine Linn, Cynthia Lint, Haley Lippert, Jeanne Litka, Linda Ljunggren, Stacy Lloyd, Monica Loeschen, Kristina Lofswold, Brett Logue, Garrett Lohff, Heather Lohre, Amy Lokken, Lori Long Crow, Nicolette Longbrake, Taylor Longville, Maria Lonjers, Yazmin Lopez Jimenez, Angela Loppe, Mariah Lord, Tori Lowe, Missica Lowe, Hazel Lowery, Anna Lucas, Wendy Luce, Mary Ludwig, Stefanie Ludwig, Dana Luedeman, Crystal Lugo, Alexis Luke, Jessica Lund, Jodi Lundgaard, Rovilyn Lusk, Barbara Lynch, Heather Lynch-Devries, Cheryl Lyngen, Kassandra Lynn, Jayci Lyon, Alexandra Lyren, Elisabeth Maassen, Kourtney MacArthur, Melissa Machtemes, Lisa Maciejewski, Wanda Maciejewski, Shaina Mack, Michela MacRunnels, Karen Madison, Shawna Madison, Emily Madsen, Melanie Maher, Jacquelynn Mahlen, Peggy Mahon, Ryan Mahoney, Cheri Majeske, Nancy Major, Lilian Makori, Kaitlin Malsom, Debra Mammenga, Dawn Mandery, Laura Mann, Katie Manning, Madeline Manning, Tammy Manz, Shirley Margeson, Teresa Markwardt, Jessica Marlow, Michelle Marlow, Anna Marsden, Kennedy Marsh, Melissa Marshall, Jayne Marso, Dawn Martin, Laura Martin, Mackenzie Martin, Dennis Martin, Marlyn Martinez-Avila.

Amber Martinmaas, Caryn Marx, Candice Mason, Melanie Mason, Rebekah Matson, Carol Matt, Lisa Matthies, Debra Mattson, Rande Matz, Renae May, Timothy Mayes, Dustin McAdaragh, Kendra McAllister, Bobi McBride, Casie McCay, Kelly McClain, Gary McClure, Karen McCormick, Kiley McCoy, Kristal McDermott, Justice McDermott, Debora McDonald, Trisha McGill, Britney McGrath, Teresa McGreevy, Alexandria McIlvanna, John McInroy, Kaitlyn McKee, Jenny McKinstry, Susan McLaughlin, Carol McLendon, Kimberly

McMullen, Kelli McMurtrey, Peggy McNamara, Juanita McNaughton, Susan McNulty, Alysha McNulty, Kelli Mcpeek, Joanne McPherson, Taylor McQuiston, Peyton McWethy, Kim Meade, Riley Mears, Jamie Mechels-Rowe, Jaedyn Mehlberg, Linda Meissner, Amanda Mejia, Kimberlie Mendenhall, Carlie Merdanian, Ashley Merkel, Danielle Meyer, Tamera Meyerink, Christina Michael, Paul Michel, Michelle Micucci, Lori Middlemas, Juliet Mikeworth, Kristine Mikkelsen-Oliveron, Kaylee Milbrandt, Judy Miles, Marilyn Millage, Toni Millane, Marilyn Miller, Lonna Miller, Deborah Miller, Nancy Miller, Catherine Miller, Lana Miller, Rebecca Miller, Holly Miller, Sarah Miller, Paige Miller, Katie Miller, Charnette Mitchell, Kimberly Mitchell, Marvin Mitchell, Mary Mitzel, Erin Mitzel, Stefanie Moak, Sierra Moe, Sheila Moehring, Marion Moeller, Bridgette Moeller, Paige Moeller, Kendra Moen, Megan Mohr, Tamara Moller, Lindy Moninger, Stephanie Moninger, Taylor Monlux, Beverly Monson, Lisa Monson, Patricia Moore, Verna Moran, Jamie Moreno, Tina Morford, Andrea Morgan, Elizabeth Morin, Kathleen Mork, Megan Morris, Carrie Morrison, Lindsey Morrow, Tara Morse, Tasha Mortenson, Esther Moser, Teri Moser, Dori Moss, Jocelyn Moss, Kara Mostad, Mariah Mougey, Jessica Mound, Brenda Mower, Maxine Moyer, Eileen Muellenberg, Nichte Mueller, Carmen Muessigmann, Joan Muller, Joyce Mulloy, Nicole Mundekis.

Karissa Munger, Susanne Muntefering, Kortnei Murphy, Morgan Murray, Katherine Murtha, Hannah Murtha, Jessica Mutschelknaus, Delores Mutziger, Paula Myers, Crystal Myers, Jennifer Nagel, Michaela Namken, Sydney Nash-Fenner, Layne Neal, Heather Neff, Tracie Negus, Alicia Neis, Sandra Nelson, Lynette Nelson, Janet Nelson, Amy Nelson, Jordan Nelson, Amanda Nelson, Barbara Nelson, Brittany Nelson, Miranda Nelson, Mikayla Nelson, Ashley Nelson, Tearnee Nelson, Tanner Nelson, Amollie Nelson, Bernadette Nesheim, Susan Nesheim, Alison Nesheim, Deanne Ness, Deborah Neugebauer, Kimberly Neuhalfen, Sharon Neuharth, Joella Neumiller, Sheila Neuville, Christina Never Misses A Shot, Coryn Newcomb, Jane Newman, Erica Nichols, Raeann Nichols, Amber Nickeson, Ann Nielson, Jody Niewenhuis, Callie Night Pipe, Brandi Nilson, Madison Noeldner, Mindi Noisy Hawk, Jane Nordquist, Tina Norton, Traci Novotny, Nancy Noyes, Elisha Nyaboga, Heather Oaks, Nicole Obi, Karli O'Brien, Faye O'Bryan, Marie Ocegueda, Ashley Odegaard, Carla Oelke, Carole Oien, Pamela Oines, Mandy Old Lodge, Merry Olinger, Josselin Olivares, Jeanne Olivier, Paula Ollerich, Susan Olsen, Greg Olson, Arlene Olson, Vivian Olson, Karen Olson, Ronda Olson, Janelle Olson, Kailee Olson, Rebecca Olson, Paige Olson, Brinley Olson, Amber Olson, Michelle Olson, Emma Olson, Cody Olson, Lisa Ooton, Karrie Opsahl, Sissy Orel, Cecilia Ortiz, Anita Osmotherly, Jennifer Osowski, Claudette Ostby, Dawn Osterberg, Tacia Osterberg, Glenda Osterbur, Taylor Benson, and Saba Awan.

Over the past year they have faced challenges most of us cannot even imagine. They have shown incredible resolve in the face of adversity. They have shown us all how to seek positivity and hope in each day as we weather the storms that come our way.

I couldn't be more thankful to represent the incredible people across South Dakota and all

over the nation who work hard each day, not for fame, not for recognition or for money, but for the betterment of their communities. This is what makes America strong. I am grateful for the opportunity to recognize these hard-working individuals.

RECOGNIZING KACIE CORNETT ON BEING NAMED THE 2021 YOUTH FEMALE CITIZEN OF THE YEAR BY THE LAPEER AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mrs. McCLAIN. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Kacie Cornett on being named the 2021 Youth Female Citizen of the Year by the Lapeer Area Chamber of Commerce. Kacie has already logged 150 hours of volunteer work in this school year despite COVID restrictions. She is a volunteer at the Paradise Animal Rescue, works with middle school girls through the "Grow to Glow" program, participated in charity runs, and is a member of the National Honor Society, Key Club, Art Club, Photography Club, and the Dance Club. Through all of this, she has been able to maintain a 4.16 GPA, ranking her 9th in her class. I thank Kacie for her tireless dedication and selfless service to the Lapeer community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 80.

AWARDING THREE CONGRESSIONAL MEDALS TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE AND THOSE WHO PROTECTED THE U.S. CAPITOL ON JANUARY 6, 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1085, legislation awarding three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who on January 6, 2021 displayed selfless and heroic service in defense of American democracy in protecting the U.S. Capitol from the violent assault of domestic terrorists.

The United States Capitol Police dates back to 1800 when the Congress moved from Philadelphia to Washington, D.C. and a lone watchman was hired to protect the Capitol Building.

In 1827, President John Quincy Adams asked that a regular Capitol Police force be established and on May 2, 1828, Congress passed an Act that expanded the police regulations of the City of Washington to include the Capitol and Capitol Square.

The United States Capitol Police expanded its force after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and again following the historic merger with the Library of Congress Police in 2009.

In addition to the more than 2,000 sworn members of the force, the United States Capitol Police Department has over 350 civilian personnel who provide operational and administrative support and its diverse workforce is comprised of employees from nearly all 50 states and the U.S. territories.

The United States Capitol Police embodies the best in American policing and serves as a model in security, urban crime prevention, dignity protection, specialty response capabilities, and homeland security.

As ambassadors of the Congress, officers of the United States Capitol Police Department are often the first face that visitors and employees encounter, leaving a lasting impression that is reflective of the Legislative Branch and its role in America's democracy.

Officers of the United States Capitol Police Department each day proudly protect the legislative process, the symbol of the nation's democracy, the people who carry out the process, and the millions of visitors who travel here to see democracy in action.

No finer example of the selfless devotion to duty, love of country, and fidelity to their oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the officers of the United States Capitol Police Department's than their valiant, heroic, and courageous response to the January 6, 2021 assault on the Capitol Building by thousands of domestic terrorists, insurrectionists, and rioters sent there by the President of the United States to "fight like hell" to disrupt and derail the constitutionally required Joint Meeting of Congress to open, count, and publicly confirm the vote tally of the presidential electors and announce the persons who had been elected President and Vice-President of the United States.

District of Columbia Mayor Muriel Bowser and the Metropolitan Police Department have a distinguished record of protecting all groups, regardless of their beliefs, who come to the nation's capital to exercise their First Amendment rights peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

At the direction of Mayor Bowser, and in advance of the scheduled demonstrations, mutual aid was requested by the Metropolitan Police Department from several area police departments to be on standby in the District, including neighboring law enforcement departments, the Metropolitan Transit Police and non-law enforcement agencies such as the District's Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency and the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department.

The sustained assault on the Capitol precipitated an equally unprecedented response, necessitating the urgent request of the United States Capitol Police for the Metropolitan Police Department to come defend the Capitol to which the Metropolitan Police Department responded immediately with several Civil Disturbance Unit Platoons and proceeded to deploy to the west front of the Capitol and arrived within minutes.

The violent mob overran protective measures at the Capitol and by 1:50 p.m., Metropolitan Police Department had declared the assembly to be a riot and immediately began

working to achieve the objectives of stopping domestic terrorists from entering the Capitol building and removing those that were already inside, secure a perimeter so that the Capitol could be cleared for lawmakers to resume the Joint Meeting of Congress to demonstrate to the nation and the world the robustness and vitality of America's democracy, and making arrests of anyone violating the law.

During the height of the siege of the Capitol, approximately 850 Metropolitan Police Department members were at the Capitol, with another 250 in the area to directly support the response and aftermath.

Madam Speaker, people around the country and the world were shocked and moved by the video of a Metropolitan Police Department Officer being beaten by a crowd of insurgents, including one wielding an American flag, and of another in agony as he was crushed between a door and a riot shield but also awed by their bravery in the face of this unprovoked and vicious attack, bravery that was matched that day by countless other unheralded Metropolitan Police Department officers.

The January 6, 2021 siege of the Capitol assault resulted in one of the worst days of injuries for law enforcement in the United States since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

Madam Speaker, officers of the United States Capitol Police Department, the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C., and other uniformed law enforcement officers stood their ground in defense of American democracy while being attacked by the angry mob of domestic terrorists with metal pipes, discharged chemical irritants, and other weapons.

At least 138 officers, 73 from the United States Capitol Police Department and 65 from the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington, sustained injuries during the attack on the Capitol Building, several of which required hospitalization.

The injuries sustained ranged from bruises and lacerations to more serious damage such as concussions, rib fractures, burns and even a mild heart attack.

One United States Capitol Police Department officer died from injuries sustained while physically engaging with protesters and two officers involved in the response have died by suicide.

Dozens, if not hundreds, of officers whom law enforcement officials estimate will suffer in years to come with post-traumatic stress disorder and the dozens who contracted the coronavirus from the unmasked domestic terrorists and rioters who stormed the Capitol.

At least 38 Capitol Police officers have tested positive or were exposed to the coronavirus as well as nearly 200 National Guard personnel who were deployed to protect the Capitol.

Madam Speaker, the seven hours between the urgent call for help from the Capitol Police to Metropolitan Police Department and the resumption of work by both houses of Congress will be indelibly etched in the memories of every law enforcement officer who was on the scene, as it is in the minds of the Senators, Representatives, congressional and support staff, and members of the media corps who were forced to seek safety behind locked doors.

Despite being overwhelmed and outnumbered, the indomitable forces of American

democracy, symbolized by the resolve of the officers of the United States Capitol Police Department, prevailed and the seditious attack was quelled, the Capitol Building preserved, and the lives of United States Senators and Representatives protected, as well as those of congressional and support staff, and order was restored so that the Joint Meeting of Congress was resumed and completed its constitutionally required duty of counting and announcing the votes of the presidential electors, an essential step in the peaceful transfer of power that has been a hallmark of American democracy and the example to the world for more than two centuries.

Madam Speaker, the gold coin authorized to be minted by this legislation and displayed at the United States Capitol Police headquarters, to the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, D.C., and exhibited on display by the Smithsonian Institution conveys the thanks and appreciation of a grateful nation for the selfless and heroic service exhibited by these sentinels of the republic in defense of American democracy in responding to the January 6, 2021 assault on the U.S. Capitol by domestic terrorists.

This tribute is, as President Lincoln noted at Gettysburg, "altogether fitting and proper" for heroes of the republic.

The action we are taking today should encourage all educational and media institutions throughout the United States to teach and celebrate the story of the heroism of the officers of the United States Capitol Police Department, the Metropolitan Police Department, and all other law enforcement officers who, out of true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, selflessly risked their lives to protect the Capitol Building and its personnel, the Congress, and the spirit and fact of democracy in America.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Americans to read, celebrate, and reverse the Constitution of the United States, fidelity to which is the surest best means of forming a more perfect union, establishing justice, ensuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessing of liberty to them and their posterity.

COMMEMORATING THE SUCCESSFUL FEDERAL CAREER OF BRENDA B. SMITH

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, as the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I rise today along with Ranking Member KEVIN BRADY, to commemorate the successful federal career of Brenda Smith, Executive Assistant Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection's (CBP) Office of Trade. Ms. Smith is retiring after 33 years of government service, including 27 years with CBP and the legacy U.S. Customs Service.

Ms. Smith's leadership at CBP is marked by significant advancements in the agency's trade mission. She spearheaded unprecedented automation and modernization of the U.S. government's import/export system, a renewed focus on preventing duty evasion, intellectual

property rights infringement, and importation of goods derived from forced labor, as well as efforts to adapt the agency's trade and revenue workforce for the new pace and challenges of the 21st century trade environment. Ms. Smith also led the development of global e-commerce standards and focus on new technologies like blockchain and advanced analytics.

Under Ms. Smith's leadership, CBP modernized the international trade process, completing development and deployment of the U.S. Single Window and the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE)—the electronic portal for exporters and importers to clear shipments across the U.S. border. Ms. Smith took command of the Single Window project, organizing the efforts of 49 federal agencies and partnering with thousands of importers, exports, brokers, and technology developers to successfully deploy the modern, automated system. The Single Window is now a global model, and it has revolutionized the international trade process for U.S. businesses and consumers. In recognition of her leadership on this project, Ms. Smith was a 2017 finalist in the Samuel J. Heyman Service to America award for management excellence.

She also implemented key components of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act (TFTEA) of 2015, the first comprehensive authorization of CBP since the agency's creation in 2003. Ms. Smith led CBP's implementation of the Enforce and Protect Act of 2015, increasing the transparency and effectiveness of CBP's enforcement of antidumping/countervailing duty orders, and, following the repeal of a critical loophole, CBP's increased focus on enforcement of the import prohibition on goods produced using forced, prison, and forced child labor.

Ms. Smith also led U.S. delegations to several partner nations to strengthen relationships with customs and human rights officials, industry leaders, and non-governmental organizations and bolster international safeguards against forced labor. For this work and for her focus on strengthening CBP's trade enforcement mission, Ms. Smith was honored with a 2017 Distinguished Executive Presidential Rank Award, the highest award in civil service. In addition to leading a number of U.S. delegations, Ms. Smith represented the United States on the World Customs Organization Council in 2007 and 2017.

Ms. Smith also led CBP's implementation of the landmark U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), working with the United States Trade Representative (USTR) and other federal agencies, as well as the U.S. international trade community, to ensure effective and timely delivery of key customs provisions of the USMCA.

Throughout her tenure at CBP and its predecessor, Ms. Smith always took the time to be responsive to Member questions and concerns, making herself available for regular briefings.

Prior to joining Customs, Ms. Smith worked at the Department of the Treasury. She also served on the staff of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment and subsequently in the personal office of Congressman Bernard J. Dwyer of New Jersey. Over the course of her career, Ms. Smith received numerous accolades, including a National Performance Review "Hammer Award" and countless agency awards.

We wish to congratulate Ms. Smith on her retirement and express our sincere appreciation for the many years of service, leadership, and accomplishment she has devoted to the U.S. government and the American people. We wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors.

REMEMBERING JOAN F. ARP

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Joan F. Arp, of Liberty Township, Ohio, who passed away on Saturday, March 13, 2021 at the age of 78.

Joan was born on February 28, 1943 in Youngstown, Ohio, the daughter of Louis and Katherine (Popovich) Kunovich. Joan was a member of the First United Methodist Church in Girard and a member of the church's care team, bereavement committee, and taught Sunday School when her children were younger.

Mrs. Arp was a homemaker and stayed home to raise her children. She enjoyed playing bingo, needlepoint and was so proud of her collection of Santa Clauses. Joan loved to participate in the many fun activities and outings that were offered at Liberty Arms Assisted Living.

Joan will miss all of her cherished friendships, especially those she resided with. She leaves to cherish her memory, her children, Mark (Mary) Arp, of Hermitage, PA., and her daughter Kelly Hontula, of Liberty Township; sister Maureen Perrico, of Las Vegas, Nevada and grandson, Nicholas Arp. Besides her parents, Joan is preceded in death by her husband, Kenneth J. Arp, whom she married October 9, 1965 and died May 5, 2014, and her brother, James Kunovich.

I am proud to be friends with Joan's daughter, Kelly, and thank her for her long-standing support. My deepest condolences go out to Kelly, the entire family, and to all whose lives were touched by Joan.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF ROBERT HOYER

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of long-time community member Robert Hoyer as he celebrates his 100th birthday.

Bob grew up in Oakland and attended the University of Nevada, Reno. During World War II, Bob took a leave from his studies and served in the United States Army in the Philippines. When he returned home, Bob graduated from the University of Nevada with a degree in mining engineering. It was also in Reno that Bob met his wife, Eldora, who had served in the United States Navy WAVES during WWII teaching aircraft navigation.

Following college, Bob worked for the Natomas Mining Company in Nevada. When the mining industry declined after the end of

the war, Bob and Eldora moved back to the Bay Area where Bob worked for Dow Chemical in Pittsburg. He then went on to work for the East Bay Regional Parks District as a construction inspector.

In 1956, Bob and Eldora settled in Clayton where they advocated, along with other residents, for its incorporation. When the City of Clayton was incorporated in 1964, Bob became the first mayor and served on the City Council until 1980. One of the City Council's early accomplishments was the establishment of walking trails and preserved open space, which remain a highlight for the city today.

Bob and Eldora also contributed to the creation of the Clayton Historical Society, which was chartered in 1976. Bob served as the President, helped raise money for city monuments, and participated in the establishment of the Clayton Historical Society Museum. In 1976, two historic homes were moved to Main Street and joined together to create the Museum, which stands today as a testament to Clayton's dedicated citizens. Throughout his many years in Clayton, Bob continued to be an active member of the community. He served on The Grove Park Blue Ribbon Task Force and the Keller Ranch Master Plan committee and donated the flagpoles at City Hall, the Grove Park, and the Museum.

Bob is a regular in downtown Clayton and is known for his laughter and insightfulness. Please join me in congratulating Bob on his 100th birthday and his lifetime of service and leadership.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 81.

RECOGNIZING MS. NANCY DOLAN

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Nancy Dolan, a key member of the Senior Executive Service of the Department of the Air Force, upon her promotion and departure as the Deputy Director of the Secretary of the Air Force Legislative Liaison. As Deputy Director, Nancy is responsible for organizing, coordinating, and resourcing the Legislative Liaison Directorate. She develops and executes the Department of the Air Force's legislative program and ensures the Department of the Air Force provides a consistent and cohesive message through congressional engagements, inquiries, and correspondence. She works with Members of Congress, congressional staff, and senior Department of the Air Force leaders on legislative issues that affect Department programs, policies, and weapon systems. She will be deeply missed by all after three and a half years of exceptional service.

Nancy is a native of New York and is a graduate from Cornell University where she

earned a Bachelor of Science in Human Factors Engineering. Prior to her current assignment, Ms. Dolan served as the Deputy Director, Strategy, Concepts and Assessments, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Plans and Requirements. Ms. Dolan was responsible for developing and synchronizing Air Force strategy and strategic planning efforts and assessing alignment of planning products with strategic guidance. She supported the Chief of Staff of the Air Force with U.S. and Allied Strategic Studies Group, led Air Force transformation by developing, exploring, and advocating joint and combined force employment concepts, and executed the CSAF's Title 10 Futures Capabilities and unified engagement wargames.

Nancy also previously served as the Staff Director in the U.S. Congress for the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, where she was responsible for the operations of four subcommittees. She coordinated the work of the Full Committee minority to provide and update the legislative and fiscal authorizations for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Nation, we wish Ms. Dolan the best of luck in her new role as the Deputy Director of Staff, Secretary of the Air Force. I extend our deepest appreciation to Ms. Nancy Dolan for her dedicated service to the Department of the Air Force, the U.S. Congress, and to our Nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF BEDFORD COUNTY

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 250th anniversary of Bedford County, Pennsylvania on March 9, 2021. In 1771, the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed a law forming Bedford County. Since then, it has been an integral part of Pennsylvania.

The first settlement in the colony was established in 1758 around Fort Bedford, which was constructed during the French and Indian War. At the time of the County's formation, 221 families lived in the region. Over the course of 250 years, the County grown in both population and economic success. In addition to being a wonderful place to work and live, Bedford County is an important center of railroads and interstate highways, among other national priorities.

Bedford County is home to hardworking Pennsylvanians who build, sustain, and serve our commonwealth and our nation. It is an honor to recognize the Bedford County Sestercentennial and celebrate the County's remarkable history. I look forward to continued partnership with the people of Bedford County to continue this incredible legacy for the next 250 years and beyond.

IN MEMORY OF C.T. WRIGHT

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Dr. C.T. Wright,

a passionate, faithful, and devoted public servant and valued neighbor. C.T. will be remembered as a mentor and true leader throughout the education, criminal justice, and faith communities in Arizona. He devoted much of his life to civil rights and education, working for many of the country's historically black colleges and universities, where he then moved on to his passion to help with human rights. He founded the Light of Hope Institute, which promotes human rights around the world. He also served as a delegate for the Electoral College and met six Presidents. C.T. frequently led prayers at campaign rallies and promoted faith. He proudly served as the Chairman of the Board of Executive Clemency.

C.T. Wright had great passion for his family, education, faith, and freedom. Many will always remember and consider him as their brother. He leaves behind a great legacy that has reached out to communities across Arizona. He was a thoughtful, compassionate, and kind man who always cared for others while ensuring a good future for all.

C.T. Wright served countless communities unselfishly and served as a great leader. May we continue to honor his memory through our passion and service to our communities.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF MALCOLM HARDY DUDLEY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the very well-lived life of Malcolm Hardy Dudley who died on February 10, 2021 at home in Atherton, California, with his wife of 67 years, Cosette. He was born in Santa Cruz, California, to Allen Mason Dudley and Gladys Alda Hardy Dudley.

Malcolm Dudley was a graduate of the University of California, Davis, and studied at the London School of Economics. He served his country in the U.S. Navy for three years on active duty and for another three years as a communications officer for the U.S. Naval Command Europe. He retired from the Naval Reserves as a captain in 1982.

Malcolm Dudley's life was full and varied and he has been described as affable, cheerful, and relaxed, traits he combined with tremendous energy and efficiency. He began his career as a financial advisor in 1962 and retired in 2017, two weeks before his 85th birthday. He had a great interest in the environment and traffic congestion which led to his interest in local government. He served on the Atherton City Council for 24 years, six of them as Mayor. He was a champion of public transportation and he was known as the resident guru on regional transportation issues.

Malcolm had a passion for boating and water-skiing on Lake Tahoe, often sailing his 70-foot motor cruiser up the Pacific coast to Washington and Canada. He loved music and played jazz saxophone, and had a popular dance band in the 50's, and played with the Unicorns swing band until this year.

Malcolm leaves his wife Cosette and his daughters, Lynette Stebin and Virginia Rock, two grandchildren and countless friends, all of whom benefitted from his generosity and kindness. I consider myself privileged to have been among his wide group of friends.

Madam Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of Malcolm Dudley, a great and good man who was a true patriot, and in extending our condolences to his wife and his entire family. His was a life well-lived, one filled with generosity, public service and care for others. He bettered our community and strengthened our country.

HONORING OUR PRISONER OF
WAR/MISSING IN ACTION HEROES

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the sacrifices made by American men and women in uniform today and throughout our nation's history. We should each take a moment to recognize the enormous loss of Americans who leave their homes and families to serve their nation, and whose fates are unknown—some captured and listed as prisoners of war, while many others are listed as missing in action. Their families endure tremendous grief and pain, knowing that their loved one's story may never be revealed and that they may never be laid to rest.

Current estimates of American servicemembers who are unaccounted for number over 80,000. The vast majority of these are from conflicts decades ago, and answers continue to elude us. We must continue our efforts to make sure that all American servicemembers listed as POW or MIA are returned and that we continue to remember and venerate those who gave the ultimate sacrifice in war.

I want to commend the efforts of Gene Spanos, a constituent of the 9th Congressional District, who has spent a great deal of time and energy contributing to these efforts. His ongoing missions include, but are not limited to, pushing for recognition of American POWs who died in captivity during the Korean War, advocating for greater United Nations support of POW-MIA recognition efforts, ensuring that potential MIA servicemember gravesites are included in the Master Excavation listings country by country. The efforts of Mr. Spanos and so many dedicated individuals around the country are ensuring that we continue to move forward on this critical issue. Madam Speaker, I commend the work of my constituent Gene Spanos and his counterparts who are dedicating their time and passion to these efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes on March 16, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 78, NAY on Roll Call No. 79, YEA on Roll Call No. 80, and YEA on Roll Call No. 81.

VOCA FIX TO SUSTAIN THE CRIME
VICTIMS FUND ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1652, or the "VOCA Fix Act of 2021," a critical piece of legislation designed to curtail and prevent future cuts to an already diminished federal victim service grants program.

This legislation must pass, because VOCA grants provide compensation to victims of crime at critical moments of desperate need.

VOCA funds could help compensate the only surviving victim of Robert Lee Haskell who, driven by vengeance, fatally shot six members of his exwife's family in Texas, including four children.

The survivor of Haskell's rampage, a girl of only fifteen, was shot in the head and only survived by playing dead.

VOCA funds could help compensate the wife and two children of a man killed in a home intrusion in Harris County, Texas, after an intruder entered the family's home, ordered the wife and children to lock themselves into a room, and then proceeded to shoot their husband and father.

VOCA funds could help compensate a woman who was abducted in Houston and forced to drive to an ATM at gunpoint, where she withdrew cash to give to her abductors.

VOCA funds could help compensate innumerable victims and survivors of federal crimes, but only if we pass this legislation.

VOCA grants have been vital in their support of traditional victim service providers across the nation, particularly for those organizations serving victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking, and drunk driving.

VOCA grants also fund victim compensation, which helps survivors pay medical bills, missed wages, and in the most severe cases, funeral costs.

However, the "federal grants used to support victim services through VOCA have decreased significantly over the past several years.

Further drastic cuts to VOCA funding are expected, as the non-taxpayerfunded pool from which these grants originate, the Crime Victims Fund, is running dry.

The Crime Victims Fund serves as an example of true justice, because the money used to support victims comes not from taxpayer dollars but rather from the criminal fines and penalties paid by federally convicted offenders.

The Crime Victims Fund has shrunk rapidly in recent years and continues to decline, because rather than prosecuting cases, the Department of Justice increasingly settles cases through deferred prosecution and non-prosecution agreements, and the monetary penalties associated with these agreements are deposited into the Treasury rather than the Crime Victims Fund.

These agreements deny funding to victim services, which is contrary to the spirit of VOCA: monetary penalties from crimes should go to serve victims of crimes.

The crimes from which these penalties are derived are the same, whether they are pros-

ecuted or settled, and the funding should be going to serve victims.

The VOCA Fix Act of 2021 fixes this by ensuring that monetary penalties associated with deferred and non-prosecution agreements go into the Crime Victims Fund instead of into the Treasury.

This simple fix will prevent future funding cuts that jeopardize programs' abilities to serve their communities and will help address the many growing and unmet needs of victims and survivors, including survivors of domestic violence.

This legislation not only recognizes that it is the victims of crime that bear the brunt of the drastic cuts being made, but also that we must protect those victims that have the courage to come forward and work together with the authorities to bring justice to their offenders.

Victims who cooperate with authorities often fear for their own safety and face pain at revisited trauma, and this legislation recognizes that rather than putting victims in further danger, we create for them a safe environment—both physically and emotionally.

Victims may be intimidated by law enforcement or other government agencies, but if we want victims to fully and freely cooperate with the authorities, we must ensure that victims feel protected and that there is no risk of becoming retraumatized.

We must also make sure that if victims cooperate with authorities, then measures to ensure the safety of victims will be provided in our government agencies working in tandem with victim service providers.

Tomorrow, the House will vote on H.R. 1620, which will reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994.

We are doing so because we recognize the urgency and dire need faced by the victims and survivors throughout this country during a significant moment of ongoing domestic violence caused by this pandemic and experienced by both women and men.

Although local victim services agencies are there to help, they are facing record numbers of clients as well as the economic consequences of the pandemic.

Without the VOCA Fix Act of 2021, survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault will inevitably lose access to victim support services, leaving victims and survivors without options for safety and vulnerable to further victimization.

Madam Speaker, the time is now to deliver access to the services victims and survivors so desperately need during a critical moment when the need for victim assistance has skyrocketed and programs are being forced to cut lifesaving services for victims.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 18, 2021 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 22

6 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To receive a closed briefing on the policy and legal rationale of U.S. airstrikes in Syria.

SVC-217

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Admiral John C. Aquilino, USN, for reappointment to the grade of admiral and to be Commander, United States Indo-Pacific Command, Department of Defense.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine how U.S. international tax policy impacts American workers, jobs, and investment.

WEBEX

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

SD-106/VTC

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security

To hold hearings to examine why the U.S. pays the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine constitutional and common sense steps to reduce gun violence.

SH-216

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation

To hold hearings to examine bolstering democracy in Georgia.

SD-106/VTC

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the 2020 census and current activities of the Census Bureau.

SD-342

MARCH 24

9 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity

To receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations.

SVC-217

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the quarterly CARES Act report to Congress.

WEBEX

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation, and a routine list in the Coast Guard; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine rebuilding America's transportation infrastructure.

SH-216

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Cynthia Minette Marten, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Education.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight

To hold hearings to examine the National Response Enterprise, focusing on preparing for future crises.

SD-342/VTC

Committee on Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine S. 1, to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy.

SR-301

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Subcommittee on Water and Power

To hold hearings to examine the viability of incorporating natural infrastructure in western water management and policy to support economic development, protect watershed health, and build more resilient communities.

SD-366

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine water infrastructure needs for Native communities.

SD-628

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Small Business Administration's COVID-19 relief programs.

SD-215

3 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine veterans' mental health and implementation of the Hannon Act, focusing on coping during COVID.

SD-G50

MARCH 25

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Deanne Bennett Criswell, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

SD-342/VTC

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1577–S1621

Measures Introduced: Thirty-four bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1, 784–816, and S. Res. 119–121. **Pages S1613–14**

Measures Passed:

George Daniel Crowe: Senate agreed to S. Res. 121, honoring the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Daniel Crowe. **Page S1620**

SAVE LIVES Act: Senate passed H.R. 1276, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish COVID–19 vaccines to certain individuals, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S1620**

Padilla (for Tester/Moran) Amendment No. 1400, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1620**

Major Richard Star Act—Referral: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 344, to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retirement pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. **Page S1620**

Becerra Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services. **Pages S1582–S1609**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. EX. 124), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S1582–83**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, March 18, 2021; and that the post-cloture debate time on the nomination expire at 12 noon; provided further that following the disposition of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Martin Joseph Walsh, of Mas-

sachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor; and that the motion to invoke cloture with respect to the nomination of Martin Joseph Walsh ripen at 1:30 p.m., on Thursday, March 18, 2021. **Page S1620**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By a unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. EX. 123), Katherine C. Tai, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador. **Pages S1580–82, S1621**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years.

Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be United States Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Jose W. Fernandez, of New York, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment). **Page S1621**

Messages from the House: **Pages S1612–13**

Measures Referred: **Page S1620**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S1577**

Executive Communications: **Page S1613**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1613**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1614–15**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1615–19**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1611–12**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1619**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S1619–20**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—124) **Pages S1582–83**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:22 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday,

March 18, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1620.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

INCOME AND WEALTH INEQUALITY

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the income and wealth inequality crisis in America, after receiving testimony from Robert B. Reich, University of California Goldman School of Public Policy, Berkeley; Sarah Anderson, Institute for Policy Studies, John W. Lettieri, Economic Innovation Group, and Scott Winship, American Enterprise Institute, all of Washington, D.C.; and Jennifer Bates, Amazon BHM1, Bessemer, Alabama.

EXPANDING BROADBAND

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine recent Federal actions to expand broadband, after receiving testimony from Christopher Ali, University of Virginia Department of Media Studies, Charlottesville; Michael P. O'Rielly, former Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, Arlington, Virginia; Jon Wilkins, Quadra Partners, Washington, D.C.; and Justin Forde, Midcontinent Communications, West Fargo, North Dakota.

DRINKING WATER AND WASTE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water to examine the challenges facing drinking water and waste water infrastructure projects, after receiving testimony from Shellie R. Chard, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma City, on behalf of the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators; Kishia L. Powell, DC Water, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the National Association of Clean Water Agencies; Michael McNulty, Morgantown Utility Board, Morgantown, West Virginia; and Nathan Ohle, Rural Community Assistance Partnership, Falls Church, Virginia.

COVID-19 IN NURSING HOMES

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine COVID-19 in the Nation's nursing homes, including steps taken by the Department of Health and Human Services in response to pandemic, after receiving testimony from John E. Dicken, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; Adelina Ramos, SEIU District

1199 New England, Greenville, Rhode Island; Denise Bottcher, AARP Louisiana, Baton Rouge; R. Tamara Konetzka, University of Chicago Department of Public Health Sciences, Chicago, Illinois; Quiteka Moten, State of Tennessee Long Term Care Ombudsman, Nashville; and David R. Gifford, American Health Care Association/National Center for Assisted Living, Washington, D.C.

STRATEGIC COMPETITION WITH CHINA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine advancing effective U.S. policy for strategic competition with China in the twenty-first century, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth Economy, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York; and Thomas H. Shugart III, Center for New American Security, and Saif M. Khan, Georgetown University Center for Security and Emerging Technology, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 231, to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop guidance for firefighters and other emergency response personnel on best practices to protect them from exposure to PFAS and to limit and prevent the release of PFAS into the environment, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 272, to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, to require the budget justifications and appropriation requests of agencies be made publicly available, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 583, to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies;

S. 517, to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism;

S. 671, to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies;

S. 693, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses;

S. 658, to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with cybersecurity consortia for training;

S. 636, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report on projects that are over budget and behind schedule, with an amendment;

S. 688, to prohibit contracting with persons that have business operations with the Maduro regime;

S. 522, to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100 word plain language summary of the proposed rule;

S. 111, to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Best Practices;

S. 664, to require the Comptroller General of the United States to review certain legislation in order to identify potential risks of duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives;

S. 566, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 42 Main Street in Slatersville, Rhode Island, as the “Specialist Matthew R. Turcotte Post Office”;

H.R. 208, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Main Street, Suite 102 in Tupelo, Mississippi, as the “Colonel Carlyle ‘Smitty’ Harris Post Office”; and

H.R. 264, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1101 Charlotte Street in Georgetown, South Carolina, as the “Joseph Hayne Rainey Memorial Post Office Building”.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, and to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and Rachel Leland Levine, of

Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.

EQUALITY ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Equality Act, focusing on LGBTQ rights, after receiving testimony from Senators Merkley, Baldwin, Blackburn, Hyde-Smith, and Lankford; Representatives Cicilline, Newman, and Hartzler; Alphonso David, Human Rights Campaign, New York, New York; Edith Guffey, PFLAG National, Lawrence, Kansas; Mary Hasson, Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, D.C.; Stella Keating, Tacoma, Washington; and Abigail Shrier, Los Angeles, California.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Paycheck Protection Program, focusing on performance, impact, and next steps, including S. 723, to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to extend the covered period for the paycheck protection program, after receiving testimony from Lisa Mensah, Opportunity Finance Network, and Joel Griffith, The Heritage Foundation, both of Washington, D.C.; John K. Hoey, The Y in Central Maryland, Baltimore; and Brad Polumbo, Foundation for Economic Education, Arlington, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 43 public bills, H.R. 1953–1995; and 8 resolutions, H. Res. 243–250, were introduced. **Pages H1497–H1500**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1501–02**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment: The House passed H.J. Res. 17, removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 204 nays, Roll No. 82.

Pages H1419–32, H1475–76

H. Res. 233, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1620), (H.R. 6), (H.R. 1603), (H.R. 1868), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) was agreed to yesterday, March 16th.

Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2021: The House passed H.R. 1620, to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 172 nays, Roll No. 86. **Pages H1432–75, H1476–79**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–3, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–12, shall be considered as adopted. **Page H1432**

Agreed to:

Nadler en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–12: Burgess (No. 1) that requires the DOJ and HHS to issue guidance and best practices on strategies to improve coordination of sexual assault forensic examination training and program sustainability; Bush (No. 2) that ensures that survivors can access transitional housing and be protected from unfair evictions and denial of service; Bush (No. 3)

that requires the Attorney General shall make publicly available on the Department of Justice website reports involving police sexual misconduct; Case (No. 4) that ensures the inclusion of Native Indian, Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian groups; requires a review and subsequent Department of Justice report of Native Hawaiian interactions with the criminal justice system and related crime prevention programs to add to pre-existing data on Native Indians and Alaska Natives; Connolly (No. 5) that adds the right to be informed of the status and location of a sexual assault evidence collection kit to the rights of sexual assault survivors; Crist (No. 6) that clarifies that STOP grants can be used to cover the fees associated with replacing driver's licenses and birth certificates for survivors and their children; will provide survivors and their families with life-saving assistance as they take steps to build a safe and independent life; Rodney Davis (IL) (No. 7) that requires the Department of Health and Human Services to include in their Study and Report on Barriers to Survivors' Economic Security Access (Sec. 704), the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on such survivors as it relates to their ability to maintain economic security; Delgado (No. 8) that adds to the findings on Economic Security for Victims that individuals living in rural areas facing intimate partner violence often face barriers to accessing resources, ranging from health care to the criminal justice system; Delgado (No. 9) that requires an analysis of the unique barriers faced by survivors in rural communities in the study on barriers to survivors' economic security; Dingell (No. 10) that establishes pilot program grants (up to 10) through the Department of Justice to state and tribal courts, offering them the opportunity to explore the feasibility and effectiveness of serving protection orders electronically; Kaehle (No. 11) that ensures appropriate consultation and inclusion with indigenous groups to support the tailored needs of indigenous women; Lamb (No. 12) that adds training for sexual assault nurse examiners (SANE nurses) to VAWA's Rural Programs, to expand access to and retention of quality SANE nurses in rural areas; Lawrence (No. 13) that amends Section 102 (Grants Encouraging Improvements and Alternatives to the Criminal Justice Response), to authorize grants to also be used for the purpose of better identifying and responding to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking against individuals who have been arrested or have contact with the juvenile or adult criminal justice system, and for developing or strengthening diversion programs and to ensure they receive comprehensive victim services; Lawrence (No. 14) that incentivizes states to adopt laws prohibiting the prosecution of minors for prostitution; Leger

Fernandez (No. 15) that directs the Office on Violence Against Women to report on actions taken to prevent suicide amongst survivors and to consult with SAMHSA to establish best practices to prevent suicide amongst survivors; Leger Fernandez (No. 16) that requires that services provided pursuant to grants to support families in the justice system are provided in a culturally relevant manner and requires DOL's public outreach and education campaign to be conducted in a culturally relevant manner; Levin (MI) (No. 17) that amends Sec. 101 (STOP Grants) to add "implementing a vertical prosecution system" to the list of permissible uses for STOP grants; Meng (No. 18) that ensures family-focused programming for prisoners—from intake through reentry—to support the prisoners' familial needs, as well as provide appropriate training for correctional staff to engage with prisoners' families; Meng (No. 19) that ensures clear distribution and accessibility of sanitary products to prisoners and provides that no visitor is prohibited from visiting due to the visitor's use of sanitary products; Moore (No. 20) that authorizes a study on the intersection between domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking, and maternal mortality or morbidity; Moore (No. 21) that authorizes and expands programs offering sexual assault medical forensic exams and sexual assault victim services in tribal communities; Newman (No. 22) that requires grant applicants of the National Resource Center on Workplace Responses to include microbusiness in their outreach to qualify; Omar (No. 23) that includes credit history in the GAO economic barrier study; Omar (No. 24) that includes barriers of legal costs and jurisdictional challenges in the GAO economic study; Phillips (No. 25) that establishes a pilot program to identify and make immigration relief available to immigrants who are dependent upon their abusers for immigration status and have been subject to battering or extreme cruelty and have already been authorized for employment; Plaskett (No. 26) that establishes a civil cause of action against a person that discloses an intimate image of an individual without the depicted individual's consent, if the person disclosed the image with knowledge of or reckless disregard for such lack of consent; Pressley (No. 27) that establishes LGBTQ+ specific grants and services to LGBTQ+ victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking; Ross (No. 28) that revises the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act to allow grants to be used to for the development of statewide databases with information on where sexual assault nurse examiners (SANE nurses) are located; Ross (No. 29) that creates a statutory mandate that a victim's safety should be central to the housing and housing-related decisions that covered housing

providers make when implementing VAWA to not evict survivors, keep their information confidential, and do not deny assistance; Scanlon (No. 30) that provides legal representation to individuals for post conviction relief proceedings; Scanlon (No. 31) that creates a pathway for providing legal services through the Department of Veterans Affairs to address unmet needs such as elder law, child custody, and housing disputes; Speier (No. 32) that adds the Stopping Harmful Image Exploitation and Limiting Distribution Act (the “SHIELD Act”) to the bill, which addresses the malicious sharing of private, intimate images, known as “nonconsensual pornography” or “revenge porn”; Speier (No. 33) that directs the Secretary of Education to make available a climate survey for institutions of higher education to administer to students on their experiences with sexual assault, sexual harassment, domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence; Speier (No. 34) that establishes an Interagency Task Force on Sexual Violence in Education to provide pertinent information to the government, public, and educational institutions on campus sexual violence prevention and response, as well as how to better assist survivors; Speier (No. 35) that builds on the unanimous passage of the Survivors’ Bill of Rights Act establishing rights for survivors of federal sexual assault offenses by incentivizing states to ensure that survivors have, at a minimum, the rights guaranteed by the federal law; includes the right to be informed if the government intends to destroy or dispose of a sexual assault evidence collection kit, the right to be informed of any result of a kit, and the right to have a sexual assault evidence collection kit or its probative contents preserved without charge for the maximum applicable statute of limitations or 20 years, whichever is shorter; Torres (CA) (No. 37) that requires the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of HHS, to conduct a study investigating whether abused victims who raise evidence of domestic violence are more likely to lose primary custody of their children to an abusive partner or to the State, including reviewing and providing recommendations on restructuring relevant state laws, regulations, and practices; Torres (CA) (No. 38) that requires the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of HHS, to conduct a study on the direct and collateral economic costs and risks of divorce from an abusive partner to a victim of domestic violence, including payment of alimony, legal fees, spousal support, or the division of property; Torres (NY) (No. 39) that mandates state and local governments submit to the Attorney General a report on the number of sexual assault response teams at hospitals and their average victim response times to be eligible for certain federal funds; and Williams (No. 41) that ensures any

study conducted under this bill includes an assessment, to the extent practicable, of any disparate impacts of the matter studied, by race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity (by a yeand-nay vote of 228 yeas to 197 nays, Roll No. 83); and

Pages H1463–72, H1476–77

Wagner amendment (No. 40 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–12) that enhances VAWA’s transparency and accountability measures by making entities found by the Attorney General to have intentionally misused VAWA grant funds ineligible to apply for future grants for up to 5 years, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing (by a yeand-nay vote of 242 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 84).

Pages H1474–75, H1477–78

Rejected:

Stefanik amendment (No. 36 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–12) that sought to strike all and replace the text with the Violence Against Women Extension Act of 2021 (by a yeand-nay vote of 177 yeas to 249 nays, Roll No. 85). **Pages H1472–74, H1478**

H. Res. 233, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 1620), (H.R. 6), (H.R.1603), (H.R.1868), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 17) was agreed to yesterday, March 16th.

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Awarding three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021: H.R. 1085, amended, to award three congressional gold medals to the United States Capitol Police and those who protected the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeand-nay vote of 413 yeas to 12 nays, Roll No. 87;

Page H1480

COVID–19 Bankruptcy Relief Extension Act of 2021: H.R. 1651, amended, to amend the CARES Act to extend the sunset for the definition of a small business debtor, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeand-nay vote of 399 yeas to 14 nays, Roll No. 88; and

Pages H1480–81

VOCA Fix to Sustain the Crime Victims Fund Act of 2021: H.R. 1652, amended, to deposit certain funds into the Crime Victims Fund, to waive matching requirements, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeand-nay vote of 384 yeas to 38 nays, Roll No. 89.

Pages H1481–82

Clerk to Correct Engrossment: Agreed by unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 1620, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

Page H1482

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 244, electing a certain Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives.

Page H1482

Quorum Calls—Votes: Eight yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1475–76, H1476–77, H1477, H1478, H1479, H1480, H1480–81, and H1481–82.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CLIMATE CHANGE, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND THE ARCTIC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled “Climate Change, National Security, and the Arctic”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DHS MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing entitled “DHS Management Challenges”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING FOR A CLEAN ENERGY FUTURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Domestic Manufacturing for a Clean Energy Future”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RISING TO THE CHALLENGE: THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION POST COVID–19

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment held a hearing entitled “Rising to the Challenge: The Future of Higher Education Post COVID–19”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEADING THE WAY FORWARD: BIDEN ADMINISTRATION ACTIONS TO INCREASE COVID–19 VACCINATIONS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Leading the Way Forward: Biden Administration Actions to Increase COVID–19 Vaccinations”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Health and Human Services officials: Rochelle P. Walensky, M.D., Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Anthony S. Fauci, M.D., Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health; and Peter Marks, M.D., Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation

and Research, U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

AVERTING A CRISIS: PROTECTING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE IN THE U.S. TERRITORIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Averting a Crisis: Protecting Access to Health Care in the U.S. Territories”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Sablan, Radewagen, Plaskett, González-Colón, and San Nicolas; Anne Schwartz, Executive Director, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission; and Carolyn Yocom, Government Accountability Office.

GAME STOPPED? WHO WINS AND LOSES WHEN SHORT SELLERS, SOCIAL MEDIA, AND RETAIL INVESTORS COLLIDE, PART II

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Game Stopped? Who Wins and Loses When Short Sellers, Social Media, and Retail Investors Collide, Part II”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WOMEN LEADING THE WAY: THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT IN BELARUS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment, and Cyber held a hearing entitled “Women Leading the Way: The Democratic Movement in Belarus”. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

UPDATE ON COVID–19 IN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Global Human Rights held a hearing entitled “Update on COVID–19 in Africa”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE WAY FORWARD ON HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Way Forward on Homeland Security”. Testimony was heard from Alejandro Mayorkas, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

FROM RESCUE TO RECOVERY: BUILDING A THRIVING AND INCLUSIVE POST-PANDEMIC ECONOMY

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a hearing entitled “From Rescue to Recovery: Building a Thriving and Inclusive Post-Pandemic Economy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BRAIN DRAIN: REBUILDING THE FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC WORKFORCE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing entitled “Brain Drain: Rebuilding the Federal Scientific Workforce”. Testimony was heard from Candice Wright, Acting Director, Science, Technology Assessment, and Analytics, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

THE BUSINESS CASE FOR CLIMATE SOLUTIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Business Case for Climate Solutions”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held an organizational meeting. The Committee adopted its rules for the 117th Congress. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to receive a closed briefing on the planning, programming, budget, and execution process of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the 21st century economy, focusing on protecting the financial system from risks associated with climate change, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine fighting forced labor, focusing on closing loopholes and improving customs enforcement to mandate clean supply chains and protect workers, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the COVID–19 response, focusing on an update from Federal officials, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the SolarWinds supply chain attack, focusing on the Federal perspective, 10:15 a.m., SD–342/WEBEX.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 632, to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent inventors, S. 169, to amend title 17, United States Code, to require the Register of Copyrights to waive fees for filing an application for registration of a copyright claim in certain circumstances, and

the nominations of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General, and Vanita Gupta, of Virginia, to be Associate Attorney General, both of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to resume joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine COVID–19 one year later, focusing on addressing health care needs for at-risk Americans, 9:30 a.m., VTC.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, 10 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Efforts to Address Marine Plastic Pollution Through Recycling”, 11 a.m., Webex.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “COVID Outbreaks and Management Challenges: Evaluating the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Pandemic Response and the Way Forward”, 2 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing entitled “Unmanned Systems of the Department of the Navy”, 11 a.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services; and Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, joint hearing entitled “Fighting for Fairness: Examining Legislation to Confront Workplace Discrimination”, 10:15 a.m., Zoom.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, hearing entitled “The CLEAN Future Act: Industrial Climate Policies to Create Jobs and Support Working Communities”, 11 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion, hearing entitled “By the Numbers, How Diversity Data Can Measure Commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism, hearing entitled “Assessing the Human Rights Situation in Saudi Arabia”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Full Committee, hearing entitled “A Year Out: Addressing International Impacts of the COVID–19 Pandemic”, 2:30 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1833, the “DHS Industrial Control Systems Capabilities Enhancement Act of 2021”; H.R. 1850, the “Supporting Research and Development for First Responders Act”; H.R. 1870, the “Strengthening Local Transportation Security Capabilities Act of 2021”; H.R. 1871, the “Transportation Security Transparency Improvement Act”; H.R. 1877, the “Security Screening During COVID–19 Act”; H.R. 1893, the “Transportation Security Preparedness Act of 2021”; and legislation on the Transportation Security Public Health Threat Preparedness Act of 2021, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, hearing entitled “Discrimination and Violence Against Asian Americans”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn and Webex.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law, hearing entitled “Reviving Competition, Part 3: Strengthening the Laws to Address Monopoly Power”, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled “Restoring Abandoned Mine Lands, Local Economies, and the Environment”, 12 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Lessons Learned from the Texas Blackouts: Research Needs for a Secure and Resilient Grid”, 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Underserved, Agricultural, and Rural Business Development, hearing entitled “The Role of Community Navigators in Reaching Underserved Businesses”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled “Building Smarter: The Benefits of Investing in Resilience and Mitigation”, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Beyond Deborah Sampson: Improving Healthcare for America’s Women Veterans in the 117th Congress”, 2:30 p.m., Zoom.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled “Hearing with the IRS Commissioner on the 2021 Filing Season”, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth and Webex.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, to resume joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of veterans services organizations, 10 a.m., WEBEX.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, March 18

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Thursday, March 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, of California, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, and vote on confirmation thereon at 12 noon.

Following disposition of the nomination of Xavier Becerra, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Martin Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 1:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 6—American Dream and Promise Act of 2021. Consideration of H.R. 1603—Farm Workforce Modernization Act of 2021. Consideration of H.R. 1868—To prevent across-the-board direct spending cuts.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Axne, Cynthia, Iowa, E259
DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E263
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E264
Granger, Kay, Tex., E264

Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E262, E265
Johnson, Dusty, S. Dak., E259
Joyce, John, Pa., E259, E264
McClain, Lisa C., Mich., E262
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E263
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E263

Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E265
Schweikert, David, Ariz., E264
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E262
Wagner, Ann, Mo., E259, E264
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E265



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.