United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 2021 *No. 65*

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CRAIG).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 15, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGIE CRAIG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Blessed are we who trust in the Lord. But O God, trust is so hard for us to master. We trust that You have called us here—but do we? For if we did, we would be as content as a tree planted by water. And yet, we find that when the heat comes—the heat of our moments, the heat of our anger—inwardly we find ourselves thirsty for respite, fearful for ourselves and our survival.

May we, in these moments, lean not on our own understanding—our own perceptions of progress, purpose, and success—but may we submit ourselves, our whole being over to You that You would make straight the paths we should take.

Lift up our eyes that we would see and take the opportunity to appreciate those who travel with us on this path called life. May we trust You enough to trust them—even when they seem geared up for a different journey, with different challenges. Nonetheless, You, in Your providence, have directed that our paths be joined.

Help us to trust that our fellow sojourners are companions You have provided to cajole and comfort, to spar with and support along the way, but always partners in service to You.

Grant that we would find ways to trust and love each other, that together we will unite our resources until You bring us, when our work is done, together in Your loving embrace.

In Your sovereign name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

The gentleman will put his mask back on.

HONORING SHAWN FRIEDKIN

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Shawn Friedkin, a passionate advocate for people with disabilities, whose life was cut short after a courageous battle with cancer. John Friedkin was my friend, and we were kindred spirits.

At the age of 27, Shawn was in a car accident that left him paralyzed. Instead of allowing that experience to defeat him, he used it to help others overcome their own obstacles and reach their full potential.

In 1997, he founded Stand Among Friends, a nonprofit dedicated to improving the quality of life for people with spinal cord injuries, and more broadly, improving employment outcomes so that people with disabilities can live ''life without limits.'' That was Shawn's philosophy, ''a life without limits,'' and he applied it to everything he did.

Whether providing assistance through Stand Among Friends, establishing a disability resource center at Florida Atlantic University, or advocating for legislation in Congress, Shawn demonstrated his unwavering commitment to improving the quality of life for individuals with disabilities everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to call Shawn a friend. Although his life was cut far too short, his legacy will live on through his work and his loving family.

BRIGADE 2506

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

Ms. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs invasion; specifically, to honor the men of Assault Brigade 2506.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. Speaker, over 1,400 selfless men—many of which were only teenagers at the time—volunteered to save the island of Cuba on April 17, 1961 from communism.

Mr. Speaker, 114 brigaders and 4 American soldiers were killed in action by the brutal Castro regime; while thousands of others waiting on the island for these freedom fighters were arrested, killed by a firing squad, or sent into exile, including my grandmother.

For my Miami exile community that I represent, these are our moral points of reference, our heroes, and are reminders of how the Cuban people continue to suffer under a ruthless communist dictatorship led by the Castro brothers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART in introducing a bipartisan resolution honoring the brigaders. I urge my colleagues in Congress to cosponsor our resolution to join us in our fight for freedom, democracy, and human rights in the only communist bastion in the Western Hemisphere, the island of Cuba.

AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN

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

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Nevadans who are still struggling to put food on the table.

I rise for those who can't bear to look their children in the eye when they are asked, ''What's for dinner.''

Right now, in my home State of Nevada, where our economy has been devastated by this pandemic, 304,000 adults say that they don't have enough food to eat. Of that, 132,000 say that their children don't have enough to eat. This is entirely unacceptable. There is no excuse for a child to go hungry in our country.

But I am glad to say that help is here.

The American Rescue Plan will cut child poverty in half through payments, bolster child tax credits, and the expansion of food assistance programs. For the first time in a long time, millions of children across this country will be lifted out of poverty and allowed a stable and secure childhood.

We all know that our children are our future, and the smartest investment we can make is in them, which is just one of the many reasons I am proud to support the American Rescue Plan.

BORDER WEEK

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the southern border. President Biden's policies paved the way for this full-scale crisis. He promised outright citizenship to more than 11 million illegal immigrants, placed a moratorium on deportations, and halted border wall construction.

I went to the southern border to witness firsthand this crisis last week:

I saw scared children. Under the Biden administration, Mexican cartels are the winners, and innocent children are the losers. Cartels are making hundreds of millions of dollars exploiting children as the daily average of unaccompanied minors crossing the border has nearly doubled.

I saw overcrowded facilities and overwhelmed Customs and Border Patrol agents. Texas migrant facilities are well over 700 percent capacity, and 40 percent of our agents are being pulled away from border control to process unaccompanied children.

I watched agents place $8 million worth of methamphetamine, cartel-smuggled drugs, on a table, and I learned that the cartel would throw migrant children in the Rio Grande as a distraction to avoid being apprehended.

We must end these disastrous, no-consequence policies, secure our border through a physical barrier, enhanced technology, and patrol agents, and adhere to and modernize our country's immigration system.

RELIEF FOR ADULT-DISABLED DEPENDENTS

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

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, last year, the CARES Act delivered relief checks to millions, but families were disappointed to learn that their dependent adult children weren't eligible to receive support, including the Harris family in Eagan, Minnesota.

Debbie and Victor Harris are proud parents to their wonderful son, Josh, who has complex medical needs. Expenses are constant for the Harris family. Home-care nurses and their two grown sons provide 24-hour care for Josh. Despite that, as an adult-disabled dependent, Josh didn't qualify for relief.

It was because of stories like these that I introduced the All Dependent Children Count Act and pushed to ensure that Josh and millions of other dependent adult children could receive the relief they deserve.

I am so proud we were finally able to get this in the American Rescue Plan and give families like the Harrises an additional $1,400, allowing them the freedom and support to enjoy some well-deserved time in Minnesota's great outdoors.

REMEMBERING JAMES R. CASH

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, as a young farmer, I knew of James R. Cash at an early age. He was a legend in the agriculture community and a household name in west Kentucky. His farm auctions were always the highest grossing sales anywhere and regularly attended by farmers from six States.

As an aspiring politician, James R., Cindy, and Caroline took me in and were instrumental in the development of my organization in west Kentucky. James R. always put my campaign signs up all over my very large Congressional district—especially en route to Fancy Farm. He hosted events, donated money, offered advice, and always allowed me to stay in his guest house.

James R. Cash was extremely successful in business and life. His great legacy will live on in his three children. I am extremely pleased to work in Washington with Caroline, who definitely inherited her father's intelligence, patience, and management skills. West Kentucky has lost a great entrepreneur, father, husband, and role model.

James R. Cash will be deeply missed by everyone who ever knew him.

MEDFIELD MODEL

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

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Medfield Model as a national exemplar for returning kids to full, in-person learning.

By following the latest public health guidance, drawing on the best science and technology, and building trust across students, teachers, administrators, parents, and nurses, the Medfield Public Schools are returning to full, in-person learning safely. At a recent visit, I watched nurses test and screen students with minimal disruption and felt firsthand the palpable relief among the students and teachers to be back in the classroom.

For their academic and socioemotional growth, our students deserve an education off Zoom and in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, the Medfield Model shows that we can keep students physically and mentally healthy. I am pleased to see schools in my district leading the way.

BIDEN'S BORDER CRISIS

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, 30 days ago, I invited Mr. Biden to Yuma County in my district to view firsthand the crisis his open border policies have created.

My invitation was as urgent as it was sincere.

The crisis all along the southern border has only gotten substantially worse. Illegal alien crossings are at a

15-year high; border facilities are 1,700 percent over capacity; 5,000 illegal aliens crossing the border have prior criminal records.

Mr. Biden recently named KAMALA HARRIS as a crisis manager for the border crisis he created.

Under her watch, the problem has gotten dramatically worse. Over 172,000 illegal-alien apprehensions have occurred, including 20,000 unaccompanied minors taken into custody in March—the highest monthly total in the history of the United States, and it is much greater.

The situation is charitably called a disaster. This needs to stop. We need order restored to the border and we need faithful execution of existing Federal laws.

To date, Mr. Biden has not responded to my invitation. Therefore, I stand on the House floor today to re-invite Mr. Biden and Ms. HARRIS to visit Yuma to see what my constituents are experiencing from this historical surge of illegal-alien border crossings.

□ 1215

RECOGNIZING BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH WEEK

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the fourth annual Black Maternal Health Week.

As the founder and co-chair of the Black Maternal Health Caucus, I want to take this time to speak briefly about the Black maternal health crisis in America, where Black mamas are disproportionately and needlessly dying.

Across the country, Black women from all walks of life are dying from preventable pregnancy-related complications at three and four times the rate of non-Hispanic, White women. However, 60 percent of Black maternal deaths are preventable.

Research suggests that the cumulative stress of racism and sexism undermines Black women's health, making them more vulnerable to complications that endanger their lives and the lives of their infants. Unfortunately, current healthcare practices are inadequate in addressing the health consequences of living with stress.

The Black Maternal Omnibus Act of 2021, a package of 12 bills, will comprehensively address every dimension of the maternal health crisis in America to save lives and end racial and ethnic disparities in maternal health outcomes.

This crisis demands urgent attention and serious action to save the lives of Black mothers, women of color, and other marginalized women across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and this Congress to stand together with me to ensure that our mothers and babies have the resources they need not only to survive but to thrive. Black mamas can't wait, and neither will we.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ZIGGY WILINSKI

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Ziggy Wilinski, who recently lost his battle with pancreatic cancer.

A Vietnam War veteran and USPS postmaster and general manager, Ziggy loved our country and community more than anything. Ziggy was an icon in the town of Riverhead, which boasts a large Polish-American population.

You could often find Ziggy planning and organizing events at the Riverhead Polish Hall, which was used to gather the community for parties, performances, and other gatherings. He was also instrumental in planning and organizing the iconic annual Riverhead Polish Town Festival. Speaking from experience, it is a fantastic event that draws thousands of people every year.

Thank you to Ziggy, his wife, Wanda, and his entire family for their service to our community. Ziggy was a great guy. He will be greatly missed, but I have no doubt his legacy will live on for generations to come.

SUPPORTING PEOPLE AFFECTED BY LA SOUFRIERE VOLCANO

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, La Soufriere volcano on the Caribbean Island of St. Vincent began a series of explosive eruptions. The volcano has erupted several times since that date.

The eruptions have blanketed the island nation with clouds of volcanic ash and hot gas and are so large that they have reached the neighboring island of Barbados, 110 miles away. The eruption has resulted in the evacuation of tens of thousands of people.

Electric outages, destroyed crops and forests, wildlife killed, and water shortages are some of the immediate issues. The 16,000 evacuated residents present dire health issues as people are moved to congregant areas in a community that has had very little vaccination to date.

This natural disaster, along with other struggles brought on by COVID, will cause St. Vincent and the Grenadines to struggle for the next few years. It presents an opportunity for American action with humanitarian disaster relief, support for COVID vaccinations, and future technical assistance.

I am asking this body to use its influence and legislative actions to support St. Vincent, to keep out China and its influence, along with Venezuela, in support of our brothers and sisters.

CONGRATULATING COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON CHEERLEADING TEAM

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

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege to present congratulatory remarks to the College of Charleston cheerleading team on their historic weekend, winning their first national championship.

For the first time in school and program history, the College of Charleston cheerleaders won first place, under the direction of their head coach, Samantha Pairet, who stands as an exemplary leader of young athletes in South Carolina and around the country.

The team traveled to Daytona April 7 through 10 to compete in the Intermediate Small Coed Division I performance division, where they received a score of 94.23 and were crowned the Intermediate Small Coed Division I national champions. Way to go, Cougars.

MAKING EQUAL PAY A REALITY

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

This morning, women across America drove to jobs where they will be paid lower salaries for equal work. Today, Black women make 63 cents and Hispanic women make 55 cents for every dollar earned by a White man. Over a lifetime, that gap grows to $400,000, enough to pay off the mortgage and put two kids through college.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will not fix the systemic racism and sexism that are embedded in our Nation's treatment of women, but it will take us a step closer to making equal pay a reality.

I am proud to be voting, once again, to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act. I am calling on all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me and pass this long-overdue bill into law.

SECURING OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the current crisis at our southern border.

In March, unlawful border crossings reached their highest level in 15 years. This includes nearly 19,000 unaccompanied minors, which represents a 99

percent increase from February and the highest figure ever recorded.

This is a dangerous humanitarian, health, and security crisis that warrants immediate action.

I am particularly concerned about these children, Mr. Speaker. As the President of Mexico recently confirmed, this administration's policies and speeches on this subject have convinced families that they can send their children to the United States in search of a better life.

Yet, we know that the situation is often dire for these children. Human traffickers made an estimated $14 million per day along the border in the month of February alone.

Shortly, I will be joining my colleagues to visit the border and speak directly to our Border Patrol agents firsthand about their experiences.

I look forward to sharing that insight with my constituents. However, we already know that there is unprecedented disorder at the border, and immediate action is needed. We must secure our border immediately.

TAKING ACTION TO CLOSE PAY GAP

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

On average, women are paid just 82 cents for every dollar paid to men. The gap is even larger, almost double, for women of color. Compounded over a lifetime, the pay gap becomes a wealth tax, costing women thousands and thousands of dollars in lost wages.

Longstanding workplace discrimination sets women back in pay, benefits, hiring, and promotions. Closing the pay gap will provide more financial stability for women, especially those who are hardest hit by the pandemic.

At a recent Oversight and Reform Committee hearing on Equal Pay Day, soccer superstar Megan Rapinoe testified: ''One cannot simply outperform inequality.''

Combating pay discrimination requires deliberate action, and that is what the Paycheck Fairness bill does. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this important bill.

REMEMBERING U.S. CAPITOL POLICE OFFICER WILLIAM EVANS

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of U.S. Capitol Police Officer William Evans.

This week, we pay our respects to Officer Evans' life of service as he was remembered with a congressional tribute and lying in honor in the United States Capitol rotunda.

Officer Evans was a beloved father, husband, brother, son, and friend.

He was a dedicated officer, joining the U.S. Capitol Police on March 7, 2003, and servicing for 18 years. In addition to patrolling the north barricade, Officer Evans was a member of the Capitol Division's First Responder's Unit.

Officer Evans was a member of our Capitol family, and I want to send my heartfelt condolences to the Evans family for their loss.

Mr. Speaker, let's take this time to remember Officer Evans and to thank each and every member of U.S. Capitol Police and National Guard members here on the Capitol Grounds for their continued service to keep us safe.

SUPPORTING WOMEN WITH EQUAL PAY

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

Mr. KAHELE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of all women across the Nation, to ensure they will be paid fairly based on their work performance, not their gender.

Mr. Speaker, I am blessed with three young daughters. My oldest daughter, 'Ale'aokalani, who, as we speak, is studying at Juan Diego High School in Draper, Utah, is preparing to embark on her own journey as a grown woman. She is smart, talented, and, most of all, a hard worker.

But right now, in our country, she and my two younger daughters are faced with insurmountable odds that no amount of hard work or diligence can overcome. As Native Hawaiian women, they are estimated to only make 63 cents to every dollar that their White male peers would make working the exact same job.

The Paycheck Fairness Act guarantees they will no longer have to fight for the same rights and paychecks as men.

Mr. Speaker, equal pay for equal work, it is as simple as that.

RECOGNIZING HEROIC ACTIONS OF U.S. MARSHALS SERVICE

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic actions of the U.S. Marshals Service.

Last month, the U.S. Marshals Service issued this press release: In an ongoing joint operation known as Operation Homecoming, the U.S. Marshals, in coordination with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and other Iowa agencies, have located 21 missing Iowa children between the ages of 4 and 17 since October 2020.

As a mother, I cannot begin to imagine the heartache the families of these children have endured, but thanks to the U.S. Marshals Service and other agencies tasked with finding missing and exploited children, these 21 children have finally been brought home.

I would like to thank Deputy Marshal Christopher Siemens, U.S. Marshal Doug Strike, and the more than 50 local task forces that are working to return Iowa children home to their families.

Speaking of missing and exploited children, it cannot go without saying that, for missing and exploited children, know what is happening at our border is a travesty. I want to thank Customs and Border Protection agents for all they are doing to try to reunite these children and get them safely to their end result. But it should not continue as the U.S. Federal Government, under this administration, is engaged in a human smuggling operation.

BLOCKING PROPERTY WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIED HARMFUL FOREIGN ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117–29)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation.

I have determined that specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation—in particular, efforts to undermine the conduct of free and fair democratic elections and democratic institutions in the United States and its allies and partners; to engage in and facilitate malicious cyber-enabled activities against the United States and its allies and partners; to foster and use transnational corruption to influence foreign governments; to pursue extraterritorial activities targeting dissidents or journalists; to undermine security in countries and regions important to United States national security; and to violate well-established principles of international law, including respect for the territorial integrity of states—constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 15, 2021.*

□ 1230

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2021.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 15, 2021, at 11:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 400.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 303, I call up the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, 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 303, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117–15, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 7

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 ''Paycheck Fairness Act''.

SEC. 2. ENHANCED ENFORCEMENT OF EQUAL PAY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) 'Sex' includes—

''(1) pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition;

''(2) sexual orientation or gender identity; and

''(3) sex characteristics, including intersex traits.

''(aa) 'Sexual orientation' includes homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality.

''(bb) 'Gender identity' means the gender-related identity, appearance, mannerisms, or other gender-related characteristics of an individual, regardless of the individual's designated sex at birth.''.

(b) BONA FIDE FACTOR DEFENSE AND MODIFICATION OF SAME ESTABLISHMENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 6(d)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''No employer having'' and inserting ''(A) No employer having'';

(2) by striking ''the opposite'' and inserting ''another'';

(3) by striking ''any other factor other than sex'' and inserting ''a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience''; and

(4) by inserting at the end the following:

''(B) The bona fide factor defense described in subparagraph (A)(iv) shall apply only if the employer demonstrates that such factor (i) is not based upon or derived from a sex-based differential in compensation; (ii) is job-related with respect to the position in question; (iii) is consistent with business necessity; and (iv) accounts for the entire differential in compensation at issue. Such defense shall not apply where the employee demonstrates that an alternative employment practice exists that would serve the same business purpose without producing such differential and that the employer has refused to adopt such alternative practice.

''(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), employees shall be deemed to work in the same establishment if the employees work for the same employer at workplaces located in the same county or similar political subdivision of a State. The preceding sentence shall not be construed as limiting broader applications of the term 'establishment' consistent with rules prescribed or guidance issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.''.

(c) NONRETALIATION PROVISION.—Section 15 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 215) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''employee has filed'' and all that follows and inserting ''employee—

''(A) has made a charge or filed any complaint or instituted or caused to be instituted any investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under or related to this Act, including an investigation conducted by the employer, or has testified or is planning to testify or has assisted or participated in any manner in any such investigation, proceeding, hearing or action, or has served or is planning to serve on an industry committee;

''(B) has opposed any practice made unlawful by this Act; or

''(C) has inquired about, discussed, or disclosed the wages of the employee or another employee (such as by inquiring or discussing with the employer why the wages of the employee are set at a certain rate or salary);'';

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) to require an employee to sign a contract or waiver that would prohibit the employee from disclosing information about the employee's wages.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) Subsection (a)(3)(C) shall not apply to instances in which an employee who has access to the wage information of other employees as a part of such employee's essential job functions discloses the wages of such other employees to individuals who do not otherwise have access to such information, unless such disclosure is in response to a complaint or charge or in furtherance of an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action under section 6(d), including an investigation conducted by the employer. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the rights of an employee provided under any other provision of law.''.

(d) ENHANCED PENALTIES.—Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''Any employer who violates section 6(d), or who violates the provisions of section 15(a)(3) in relation to section 6(d), shall additionally be liable for such compensatory damages, or, where the employee demonstrates that the employer acted with malice or reckless indifference, punitive damages as may be appropriate, except that the United States shall not be liable for punitive damages.'';

(2) in the sentence beginning ''An action to'', by striking ''the preceding sentences'' and inserting ''any of the preceding sentences of this subsection'';

(3) in the sentence beginning ''No employees shall'', by striking ''No employees'' and inserting ''Except with respect to class actions brought to enforce section 6(d), no employee'';

(4) by inserting after the sentence referred to in paragraph (3), the following: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, any action brought to enforce section 6(d) may be maintained as a class action as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.''; and

(5) in the sentence beginning ''The court in''—

(A) by striking ''in such action'' and inserting ''in any action brought to recover the liability prescribed in any of the preceding sentences of this subsection''; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: '', including expert fees''.

(e) ACTION BY THE SECRETARY.—Section 16(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(c)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by inserting ''or, in the case of a violation of section 6(d), additional compensatory or punitive damages, as described in subsection (b),'' before ''and the agreement''; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: '', or such compensatory or punitive damages, as appropriate'';

(2) in the second sentence, by inserting before the period the following: ''and, in the case of a violation of section 6(d), additional compensatory or punitive damages, as described in subsection (b)''; and

(3) in the third sentence, by striking ''the first sentence'' and inserting ''the first or second sentence''.

(f) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Equal Opportunity Employment Commission shall carry out the functions and authorities described in section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1978 (92 Stat. 3781; 5 U.S.C. App.) to enforce and administer the provisions of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)), except that the Secretary of Labor, through the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, may also enforce this provision with respect to Federal contractors, Federal subcontractors, and federally-assisted construction contractors, within the jurisdiction of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs under Executive Order 11246 (42 U.S.C. 2000e note; relating to equal employment opportunity) or a successor Executive Order.

(2) COORDINATION.—The Equal Opportunity Employment Commission shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to explain and implement the standards of such section 6(d). The Secretary of Labor may issue regulations to govern procedures for enforcement of section 6(d) by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. The Secretary of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall establish other coordinating mechanisms as may be necessary.

SEC. 3. TRAINING.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, subject to the availability of funds appropriated under section 11, shall provide training to employees of the Commission and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs and to affected individuals and entities on matters involving discrimination in the payment of wages.

SEC. 4. NEGOTIATION SKILLS TRAINING.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Secretary of Education, is authorized to establish and carry out a grant program.

(2) GRANTS.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary of Labor may make grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out negotiation skills training programs for the purposes of addressing pay disparities, including through outreach to women and girls.

(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall be a public agency, such as a State, a local government in a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget), a State educational agency, or a local educational agency, a private nonprofit organization, or a community-based organization.

(4) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary of Labor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary of Labor may require.

(5) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity that receives a grant under this subsection shall use the funds made available through the grant to carry out an effective negotiation skills training program for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(b) INCORPORATING TRAINING INTO EXISTING PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall issue regulations or policy guidance that provides for integrating the negotiation skills training, to the extent practicable, into programs authorized under—

(1) in the case of the Secretary of Education, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), and other programs carried out by the Department of Education that the Secretary of Education determines to be appropriate; and

(2) in the case of the Secretary of Labor, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.), and other programs carried out by the Department of Labor that the Secretary of Labor determines to be appropriate.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall prepare and submit to Congress a report describing the activities conducted under this section and evaluating the effectiveness of such activities in achieving the purposes of this section.

SEC. 5. RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall conduct studies and provide information to employers, labor organizations, and the general public concerning the means available to eliminate pay disparities between men and women (including women who are Asian American, Black or African-American, Hispanic American or Latino, Native American or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and White American), including—

(1) conducting and promoting research to develop the means to correct expeditiously the conditions leading to the pay disparities, with specific attention paid to women and girls from historically underrepresented and minority groups;

(2) publishing and otherwise making available to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, educational institutions, the media, and the general public the findings resulting from studies and other materials, relating to eliminating the pay disparities;

(3) sponsoring and assisting State, local, and community informational and educational programs;

(4) providing information to employers, labor organizations, professional associations, and other interested persons on the means of eliminating the pay disparities; and

(5) recognizing and promoting the achievements of employers, labor organizations, and professional associations that have worked to eliminate the pay disparities.

(b) REPORT ON GENDER PAY GAP IN TEENAGE LABOR FORCE.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Director of the Women's Bureau and in coordination with the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, shall—

(A) submit to Congress a report on the gender pay gap in the teenage labor force; and

(B) make the report available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Labor.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(A) An examination of trends and potential solutions relating to the teenage gender pay gap.

(B) An examination of how the teenage gender pay gap potentially translates into greater wage gaps in the overall labor force.

(C) An examination of overall lifetime earnings and losses for informal and formal jobs for women, including women of color.

(D) An examination of the teenage gender pay gap, including a comparison of the average amount earned by males and females, respectively, in informal jobs, such as babysitting and other freelance jobs, as well as formal jobs, such as retail, restaurant, and customer service.

(E) A comparison of—

(i) the types of tasks typically performed by women from the teenage years through adulthood within certain informal jobs, such as babysitting and other freelance jobs, and formal jobs, such as retail, restaurant, and customer service; and

(ii) the types of tasks performed by younger males in such positions.

(F) Interviews and surveys with workers and employers relating to early gender-based pay discrepancies.

(G) Recommendations for—

(i) addressing pay inequality for women from the teenage years through adulthood, including such women of color;

(ii) addressing any disadvantages experienced by young women with respect to work experience and professional development;

(iii) the development of standards and best practices for workers and employees to ensure better pay for young women and the prevention of early inequalities in the workplace; and

(iv) expanding awareness for teenage girls on pay rates and employment rights in order to reduce greater inequalities in the overall labor force.

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL AWARD FOR PAY EQUITY IN THE WORKPLACE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established the National Award for Pay Equity in the Workplace, which shall be awarded by the Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, on an annual basis, to an employer to encourage proactive efforts to comply with section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)), as amended by this Act.

(b) CRITERIA FOR QUALIFICATION.—The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, shall—

(1) set criteria for receipt of the award, including a requirement that an employer has made substantial effort to eliminate pay disparities between men and women and deserves special recognition as a consequence of such effort; and

(2) establish procedures for the application and presentation of the award.

(c) BUSINESS.—In this section, the term ''employer'' includes—

(1)(A) a corporation, including a nonprofit corporation;

(B) a partnership;

(C) a professional association;

(D) a labor organization; and

(E) a business entity similar to an entity described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (D);

(2) an entity carrying out an education referral program, a training program, such as an apprenticeship or management training program, or a similar program; and

(3) an entity carrying out a joint program, formed by a combination of any entities described in paragraph (1) or (2).

SEC. 7. COLLECTION OF PAY INFORMATION BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION.

Section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–8) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1) Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall provide for the collection from employers of compensation data and other employment-related data (including hiring, termination, and promotion data) disaggregated by the sex, race, and national origin of employees.

''(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Commission shall have as its primary consideration the most effective and efficient means for enhancing the enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination. For this purpose, the Commission shall consider factors including the imposition of burdens on employers, the frequency of required reports (including the size of employers required to prepare reports), appropriate protections for maintaining data confidentiality, and the most effective format to report such data.

''(3)(A) For each 12-month reporting period for an employer, the compensation data collected under paragraph (1) shall include, for each range of taxable compensation described in subparagraph (B), disaggregated by the categories described in subparagraph (E)—

''(i) the number of employees of the employer who earn taxable compensation in an amount that falls within such taxable compensation range; and

''(ii) the total number of hours worked by such employees.

''(B) Subject to adjustment under subparagraph (C), the taxable compensation ranges described in this subparagraph are as follows:

''(i) Not more than $19,239.

''(ii) Not less than $19,240 and not more than $24,439.

''(iii) Not less than $24,440 and not more than $30,679.

''(iv) Not less than $30,680 and not more than $38,999.

''(v) Not less than $39,000 and not more than $49,919.

''(vi) Not less than $49,920 and not more than $62,919.

''(vii) Not less than $62,920 and not more than $80,079.

''(viii) Not less than $80,080 and not more than $101,919.

''(ix) Not less than $101,920 and not more than $128,959.

''(x) Not less than $128,960 and not more than $163,799.

''(xi) Not less than $163,800 and not more than $207,999.

''(xii) Not less than $208,000.

''(C) The Commission may adjust the taxable compensation ranges under subparagraph (B)—

''(i) if the Commission determines that such adjustment is necessary to enhance enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination; or

''(ii) for inflation, in consultation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

''(D) In collecting data described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the Commission shall provide that, with respect to an employee who the employer is not required to compensate for overtime employment under section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207), an employer may report—

''(i) in the case of a full-time employee, that such employee works 40 hours per week, and in the case of a part-time employee, that such employee works 20 hours per week; or

''(ii) the actual number of hours worked by such employee.

''(E) The categories described in this subparagraph shall be determined by the Commission and shall include—

''(i) race;

''(ii) national origin;

''(iii) sex; and

''(iv) job categories, including the job categories described in the instructions for the Equal Employment Opportunity Employer Information Report EEO–1, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(F) The Commission shall use the compensation data collected under paragraph (1)—

''(i) to enhance—

''(I) the investigation of charges filed under section 706 or section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)); and

''(II) the allocation of resources to investigate such charges; and

''(ii) for any other purpose that the Commission determines appropriate.

''(G) The Commission shall annually make publicly available aggregate compensation data collected under paragraph (1) for the categories described in subparagraph (E), disaggregated by industry, occupation, and core based statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget).

''(4) The compensation data under paragraph (1) shall be collected from each employer that—

''(A) is a private employer that has 100 or more employees, including such an employer that is a contractor with the Federal Government, or a subcontractor at any tier thereof; or

''(B) the Commission determines appropriate.''.

SEC. 8. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY EQUITY PROGRAMS AND PAY EQUITY DATA COLLECTION.

(a) BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS DATA COLLECTION.—The Commissioner of Labor Statistics shall continue to collect data on women workers in the Current Employment Statistics survey.

(b) OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS INITIATIVES.—The Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs shall collect compensation data and other employment-related data (including, hiring, termination, and promotion data) by demographics and designate not less than half of all nonconstruction contractors each year to prepare and file such data, and shall review and utilize the responses to such data to identify contractors for further evaluation and for other enforcement purposes as appropriate.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR DISTRIBUTION OF WAGE DISCRIMINATION INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Labor shall make readily available (in print, on the Department of Labor website, and through any other forum that the Department may use to distribute compensation discrimination information), accurate information on compensation discrimination, including statistics, explanations of employee rights, historical analyses of such discrimination, instructions for employers on compliance, and any other information that will assist the public in understanding and addressing such discrimination.

SEC. 9. PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES' SALARY AND BENEFIT HISTORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 7 the following new section:

''SEC. 8. REQUIREMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO WAGE, SALARY, AND BENEFIT HISTORY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be an unlawful practice for an employer to—

''(1) rely on the wage history of a prospective employee in considering the prospective employee for employment, including requiring that a prospective employee's prior wages satisfy minimum or maximum criteria as a condition of being considered for employment;

''(2) rely on the wage history of a prospective employee in determining the wages for such prospective employee, except that an employer may rely on wage history if it is voluntarily provided by a prospective employee, after the employer makes an offer of employment with an offer of compensation to the prospective employee, to support a wage higher than the wage offered by the employer;

''(3) seek from a prospective employee or any current or former employer the wage history of the prospective employee, except that an employer may seek to confirm prior wage information only after an offer of employment with compensation has been made to the prospective employee and the prospective employee responds to the offer by providing prior wage information to support a wage higher than that offered by the employer; or

''(4) discharge or in any other manner retaliate against any employee or prospective employee because the employee or prospective employee—

''(A) opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this section; or

''(B) took an action for which discrimination is forbidden under section 15(a)(3).

''(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'wage history' means the wages paid to the prospective employee by the prospective employee's current employer or previous employer.''.

(b) PENALTIES.—Section 16 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) Any person who violates the provisions of section 8 shall—

''(A) be subject to a civil penalty of $5,000 for a first offense, increased by an additional $1,000 for each subsequent offense, not to exceed $10,000; and

''(B) be liable to each employee or prospective employee who was the subject of the violation for special damages not to exceed $10,000 plus attorneys' fees, and shall be subject to such injunctive relief as may be appropriate.

''(2) An action to recover the liability described in paragraph (1)(B) may be maintained against any employer (including a public agency) in any Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees or prospective employees for and on behalf of—

''(A) the employees or prospective employees; and

''(B) other employees or prospective employees similarly situated.''.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for purposes of the grant program in section 5 of this Act may be used for a congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 11. SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MATERIALS.—The Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall jointly develop technical assistance material to assist small enterprises in complying with the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) SMALL BUSINESSES.—A small enterprise shall be exempt from the provisions of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, to the same extent that such enterprise is exempt from the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) pursuant to clauses (i) and (ii) of section 3(s)(1)(A) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 203(s)(1)(A)).

SEC. 12. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or in any amendments made by this Act, shall affect the obligation of employers and employees to fully comply with all applicable immigration laws, including being subject to any penalties, fines, or other sanctions.

SEC. 13. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of that provision or amendment to particular persons or circumstances is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

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 Education and Labor.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act in 1963, our country codified the basic idea that all workers should earn equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex. Regrettably, more than five decades later and after the passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, that promise remains unfulfilled.

Today, women continue to be paid, on average, 82 cents on the dollar compared to men. This wage disparity is far worse for women of color, who make less than White men and White women. It exists across every sector, regardless of education, experience, occupation, industry or job title. A recent Census Bureau study found that 38 to 70 percent of the gender wage gap is unexplained and likely due to discrimination.

Drawn out over a lifetime, the persistent wage gap could cost a woman anywhere from $400,000 to $2 million. This impacts both workers and their families, often meaning the difference between financial stability and perpetual hardship.

The Paycheck Fairness Act offers an opportunity to finally secure equal pay for equal work. The bill strengthens the Equal Pay Act by bolstering workers' rights to discuss their wages with coworkers and making it easier for workers to join class action lawsuits; enhancing the enforcement tools available to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Labor Department; and, more importantly, by

closing loopholes for employer defenses and requiring employers to prove pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons.

The Biden administration has issued a Statement of Administration Policy in support of this bill. It states: ''Ensuring equal pay is essential to advancing American values of fairness and equity.''

Then it adds: ''The Paycheck Fairness Act is commonsense legislation that would strengthen the Equal Pay Act and give workers more tools to fight sex-based pay discrimination.''

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy of H.R. 7.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 7—PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT—REP. DELAURO, D–CT, AND 225 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. Ensuring equal pay is essential to advancing American values of fairness and equity. Women lose thousands of dollars each year, and hundreds of thousands over a lifetime, because of the gender and racial wage gap. Women working full-time, year-round in 2019 earned 82 cents for every dollar earned by men working full-time; year-round, and these disparities are greater for women of color. Pay inequity also impacts individuals who face intersecting forms of discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, including LGBTQ+ individuals.

Due to the COVID–19 pandemic, millions of women have dropped out of the labor force, partly reflecting the increased domestic labor demands on women. Caregiving demands often fall disproportionately on women, which leads to many women having to reduce their hours, resulting in lower earnings. As more and more American families rely on women's income, the pay gap hurts not only women, but also the families who depend on them. The cumulative impact of wage gaps adds up to financial insecurity over the course of a career for women and their families and for generations who follow.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is commonsense legislation that would strengthen the Equal Pay Act and give workers more tools to fight sex-based pay discrimination. It would also take major steps toward increasing pay transparency, an essential provision to advance equality in the workplace, by explicitly protecting workers from retaliation for simply discussing their compensation with their colleagues. The bill would also expand opportunities for workers to receive training on effective negotiation skills. The bill would also limit an employer's ability to rely on salary history during the hiring process to set pay, or when determining wages for a promotion. H.R. 7 would hold employers accountable by closing judicially created loopholes for employer defenses and by adding a class action option under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The bill would require the collection of pay data to enable better enforcement of laws prohibiting pay discrimination.

The Administration looks forward to continuing to work with the Congress to address pay equity and urges quick action on this landmark bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7, the Democrats' conveniently titled, but painfully misguided, Paycheck Fairness Act, which should be called the paychecks for trial lawyers act.

We all agree on the fundamental principle of this bill: women should not be paid less than men for the same work.

That is not up for debate; and, for me, it has never been up for debate; and, for our country, it hasn't been since 1963, when the Equal Pay Act amended the Fair Labor Standards Act, making equal pay the law of the land.

Moreover, in 1964, title VII of the Civil Rights Act codified non-discrimination rules for employment, making it illegal to discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, and sex.

The question before us today is whether the Democrats' Paycheck Fairness Act provides any additional protections to women in the workplace. The answer is a resounding no.

The United States has some of the most varied and complex workplaces in the world. Before the onslaught of COVID–19, women were earning merited paychecks in record numbers. According to a Harvard University analysis and numerous other studies, the difference in earning between men and women comes down to choices made regarding careers and parenting. Many working women take advantage of flexible work schedules to meet their diverse needs. A survey by Pew found 70 percent of working mothers say that a flexible schedule is extremely important.

Democrats aren't giving the full story when they talk about pay differences. Women are making career choices that are best for themselves and their families. Limiting their freedom to do so is wrong. Congress has no place in telling women their career choices are wrong, yet Democrats are hellbent on telling all Americans how to live their lives, how to spend their money, and now how to make career decisions.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is not a win for women in the slightest. It is a false promise that creates opportunities and advantages only for trial lawyers looking for easy payouts while causing irreparable harm to employers. By making it much easier to bring lawsuits of questionable validity against employers, trial lawyers will be able to force employers into settlements or try for unlimited paydays from jury awards, lining their own pockets and dragging women through tedious, never-ending legal proceedings.

In the United States, we believe in innocence until proven guilty, but this bill assumes otherwise. Under current law, business owners can defend themselves from a claim of pay discrimination by proving that a pay differential is based on legitimate, business-related factors other than sex.

H.R. 7 would radically alter this law, requiring a business owner to convince a judge or jury that the pay differential was required by ''business necessity.'' This is a nearly impossible burden of proof to meet that will lead to unfair judgments against business owners because the plain meaning of the term ''business necessity'' is that the pay differential must be absolutely essential to the business.

H.R. 7 would also result in a flood of litigation in front of judges and juries, who will delve into employer compensation decisions even when the employer can demonstrate that those decisions are based on legitimate, business-related reasons having nothing to do with the sex of the employee.

Fearing Big Government and liability risks that could leave them bankrupt, many business owners will likely implement rigid pay bands—a model used by government and unionized businesses. This means workers will not be compensated on the basis of merit.

This is the opposite of the American Dream. As one columnist wrote: ''equality of opportunity—not outcomes—is the American ideal.''

On top of the legal jeopardy this bill creates for employers, H.R. 7 also mandates that business owners submit mountains of worker pay data to the Federal Government. This will pose significant threats to the confidentiality and privacy of workers' pay data, create a data stash that would be impossible to protect or interpret, and cost business owners more than $600 million annually.

This bill purports to champion equality for women, yet it disregards the 40 percent of small businesses owned by women that will be forced to implement pay policies found in government-run workplaces and be stuck paying through the nose in compliance costs if this bill passes.

Even worse, H.R. 7 will severely limit workplace flexibility for women. Many working women take advantage of flexible work schedules to meet their diverse needs, yet this harmful legislation completely ignores this reality and threatens to take away the choices and freedom necessary for them to retain employment.

We know employees prefer workable and flexible schedules, and now is not the time to limit these options for women who have been hit particularly hard by the COVID–19 pandemic.

Should my Democrat colleagues wish to discuss additional policies which will foster the advancement of women in the workplace, we can consider legislation that safely reopens our schools and businesses, provides the flexibility and support to expand work-based learning programs and create viable pathways that enable more individuals to reskill and build fulfilling careers on their own terms, and promotes career and technical education, to name a few.

Unfortunately, my Democrat colleagues would rather impose radical

and unworkable policy under the guise of progress than find bipartisan solutions which foster environments where individuals are empowered to succeed and make the decisions that are best for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 7, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is the Assistant Speaker of the House.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in December, American women lost 156,000 jobs, accounting for 100 percent of jobs lost; and since the start of this pandemic, nearly 3 million women have been pushed out of the workforce.

Women have borne the brunt of the economic crisis brought on by this pandemic, and gender pay inequality is at the root of the problem. More than five decades after the passage of the Equal Pay Act, women still only make 82 cents for every dollar earned by men, and that gap is even wider for women of color.

By passing the Paycheck Fairness Act today, we are correcting this injustice and ensuring that all people receive equal pay for equal work.

Let's be clear: this isn't a women's issue. Pay inequity hurts children, families, and our entire economy. It is fundamental to our recovery and our ability to not just rebuild to status quo, but to rebuild a just and inclusive America for all.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member FOXX for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, everyone supports equal pay for equal performance, and everyone is against gender-based wage discrimination. This has been the law for nearly 60 years.

When I entered the workforce 30 years ago after college, wage discrimination was basically nonexistent, thanks to the law and a simple recognition of the value of a diverse workforce. Companies then, as now, simply assigned a starting salary based upon the position, and paid that wage to everyone they hired; thereafter providing merit increases based upon performance, unlike what happens in union shops and with government positions.

But do my Democrat friends across the aisle base their staff salaries on gender? Or do they pay women less than men? Or do they set salaries based on market conditions, qualifications, and experience?

□ 1245

Why do they assume less of private employers?

We already have laws and protections that ensure fair pay, and companies must maintain documentation demonstrating nondiscrimination in wages, performance evaluations, and merit increases.

In fact, we are in a much stronger position today than we were 30, let alone 60 years ago.

This legislation from the Democrat Party is just another attempt to insert themselves further into the workplace with a purported cure for a disease that doesn't exist. Democrats are dependent upon the perception of discrimination and victimhood to expand their base of power as they continue to divide us as a Nation.

Democrats also view employers, businesses, and job creators with disdain, believing that, left to their own devices, they would seek to harm and exploit their employees. Not to worry, Big Government to the rescue; or, more accurately, big Democrat government laying on more control, more regulations, more mandates, all designed to enrich their trial lawyer friends and increase liability for employers.

The Democrats will disingenuously cite statistics that indicate that there are discrepancies in income based on gender, but they won't specify discrepancies in pay for the same positions in the same industries because they don't exist.

This bill adds more layers of burdensome and costly reporting requirements for businesses, estimated to cost about $600 million a year, costs which will be passed on to consumers in higher prices with no real benefit.

The bill doesn't do anything to help women in the workplace, but it hurts employers, exposing them to greater liability, and enriches the trial lawyer donors to the Democrat Party. It allows the lawyers to litigate every decision an employer makes, and to bankrupt small businesses by seeking unlimited monetary damages.

It makes it impossible for employers to defend charges of gender-based discrimination when experience, qualifications, or performance warrants higher pay. They would now need to prove that the determination is a business necessity.

Leave it to politicians in Washington to think that they have the right to determine for employers what is a business necessity.

Left to themselves, businesses and employers tend to get it right. But Big Government almost never gets it right, and this bill is no exception. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the sponsor of the bill, a champion for equal pay, and the chair of the House Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Paycheck Fairness Act, legislation that I have introduced in every Congress since 1997.

Since then, we have pushed and battled to strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963. We launched, side by side, into the fray to elevate pay discrimination, to emphasize how central its impact is to working families.

I cannot tell you how difficult it has been to break through on something so simple; so simple. Men and women in the same job deserve the same pay. It is a principle that we adhere to in this Congress, and I don't believe anyone would challenge it. The same is true of the U.S. military.

Last month, we recognized Equal Pay Day on March 24, which is the day into the current year that women must work to meet the wages earned by men in the previous year.

The National Committee on Pay Equity tells us, at its lowest point in 1973, full-time, working women earned a median of 56.6 cents to every dollar that full-time working men earned. Today, women who work full-time, year-round are paid, on average, only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men.

The gap exists in every State, regardless of geography, occupation, education, or work patterns. And it is worse for women of color. Latinas are typically paid 55 cents; Native American women 60 cents; Black women 63 cents; Asian American and Pacific Islander women are paid as little as 52 cents.

This wage disparity costs the average American woman and her family an estimated $400,000 to $2 million, impacting Social Security benefits and pensions.

Today, the issue and the environment have collided. This pandemic has brought out the depth of our problem, exposed existing inequalities, and threatened women's economic security at a disproportionate rate. Women have lost more than five million jobs; and as we seek to rebuild our economy, let us remember that the pay gap hurts not only women, but also the families who depend on them.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is a bipartisan piece of legislation, which has the support of every member of the Democratic Caucus, as well as three Republicans. It would toughen the remedies in the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to give America's working women the opportunity to fight wage discrimination and receive the paycheck they have rightfully earned.

It would require employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons; ban retaliation against workers who discuss their wages; it facilitates a wronged worker's participation in a class action suit; and it prohibits employers from seeking the salary history of prospective employees.

And by now, we are all familiar with the case of Lilly Ledbetter. Her bosses said: ''Their plant did not need women; that women did not help, and, in fact, they caused problems.''

Well, a jury found that, yes, Lilly Ledbetter had been discriminated against, and awarded her $3.8 million in back pay and damages, which the Supreme Court eliminated. She received nothing, as it closed the courtroom door to all women.

We, the Congress, reopened that door with the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. It reversed the Supreme Court's decision. It was a court access case, but it

did not address the underlying issue of pay discrimination.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956, in his State of the Union address, said: ''Legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice. I earnestly urge the Congress to move swiftly to implement these needed labor measures.''

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law nearly 58 years ago, he said: ''It is a first step. It affirms our determination that when women enter the labor force, they will find equality in their pay envelopes.''

The Paycheck Fairness Act is the next step. It simply brings the Equal Pay Act into line with the remedies already available for those who are subject to other forms of employment discrimination. That is it, pure and simple.

We have passed paycheck fairness through this House in 2008, 2009, 2019. But, now, in the 117th Congress in which we welcomed the most women in our history, we must get it into law. We have the opportunity to make good on that promise that Presidents of both parties have made. We need to seize that moment.

It is time for us to say that the work that women do in our society today is valued and respected, and the contribution that we make, if it is good enough for the women in the House of Representatives, then it is good enough for women all over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter supporting the Paycheck Fairness Act by a broad coalition of organizations that promote economic opportunity for women.

FEBRUARY 3, 2021.

CO-SPONSOR AND SUPPORT SWIFT PASSAGE OF THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As members of a broad coalition of organizations that promote economic opportunity for women and vigorous enforcement of antidiscrimination laws, we strongly urge you to co-sponsor and push for swift passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act as a top priority of the 117th Congress. Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist, and earnings lost to these gaps are exacerbating the financial effects of COVID–19, falling particularly heavily on women of color and the families who depend on their income. This legislation offers a much needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

The COVID–19 pandemic and systemic racism have exposed how the work performed primarily by women, and particularly Black and brown women, has long been and continues to be undervalued and underpaid, even as the rest of the country is newly recognizing the essential nature of this work. Black women, Latinas, and other women of color are especially likely to be on the front lines of the crisis, risking their lives in jobs in health care, child care, and grocery stores; they are also being paid less than their male counterparts. At the same time, women in this country lost more than 5 million jobs in 2020; indeed, women accounted for 100% of the jobs lost in December 2020. The unemployment rate for Black women and Latinas remains exceptionally high. These high jobless numbers threaten to exacerbate gender wage gaps when women regain employment. We cannot build back an economy that works for everyone without ensuring that all women can work with equality, safety, and dignity, starting with pay equity.

There is no more fitting way to begin this session than by making real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive fair pay. The Paycheck Fairness Act updates and strengthens the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides robust protection against sex-based pay discrimination. Among other provisions, this comprehensive bill bars retaliation against workers who voluntarily discuss or disclose their wages. It closes loopholes that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any important business justification related to the job. It ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity. It prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that pay discrimination does not follow women from job to job. And it also provides much needed training and technical assistance, as well as data collection and research.

Women are increasingly the primary or co-breadwinner in their families and cannot afford to be shortchanged any longer. Women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men. But for every dollar paid to their white, non-Hispanic male counterparts, Black women only make 63 cents, Native women only 60 cents, and Latinas only 55 cents. While Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) women make 87 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men, women in many AAPI communities experience drastically wider pay gaps. Furthermore, moms are paid less than dads. And even when controlling for factors, such as education and experience, the pay gaps persist and start early in women's careers and contribute to a wealth gap that follows them throughout their lifetimes. These pay gaps can be addressed only if workers have the legal tools necessary to challenge discrimination and employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law.

We recently commemorated the twelfth anniversary of the enactment of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. That vital law rectified the Supreme Court's harmful decision in Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company. The law helps to ensure that individuals subjected to unlawful compensation discrimination are able to have their day in court and effectively assert their rights under federal antidiscrimination laws. But the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, critical as it is, is only one step on the path to ensuring women receive equal pay for equal work. It's time to take the next step toward achieving equal pay. We urge you to prioritize the Paycheck Fairness Act in the 117th Congress by co-sponsoring and urging swift passage of this legislation, taking up the cause of Lilly Ledbetter and all those who have fought for equal pay.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Kate Nielson, Director of Public Policy & Legal Advocacy at the American Association of University Women or Emily Martin, Vice President for Education & Workplace Justice at the National Women's Law Center.

Sincerely,

9to5; A Better Balance; AFCPE (Association for Financial Counseling & Planning Education); All-Options; American Association of University Women (AAUW): AAUW of Alabama, AAUW of Alaska (AAUW Fairbanks (AK) Branch), AAUW of Arizona, AAUW of Arkansas, AAUW of California, AAUW of Colorado, AAUW of Connecticut, AAUW of Delaware, AAUW of District of Columbia (AAUW Washington (DC) Branch, AAUW Capitol Hill (DC) Branch), AAUW of Florida, AAUW of Georgia, AAUW of Hawaii, AAUW of Idaho, AAUW of Illinois, AAUW of Indiana, AAUW of Iowa, AAUW of Kansas, AAUW of Kentucky, AAUW of Louisiana, AAUW of Maine, AAUW of Maryland, AAUW of Massachusetts, AAUW of Michigan, AAUW of Minnesota, AAUW of Mississippi, AAUW of Missouri, AAUW of Montana, AAUW of Nebraska, AAUW of Nevada, AAUW of New Hampshire, AAUW of New Jersey, AAUW of New Mexico, AAUW of New York, AAUW of North Carolina, AAUW of North Dakota, AAUW of Ohio, AAUW of Oklahoma, AAUW of Oregon, AAUW of Pennsylvania, AAUW of Puerto Rico, AAUW of Rhode Island, AAUW of South Carolina, AAUW of South Dakota, AAUW of Tennessee, AAUW of Texas, AAUW of Utah, AAUW of Vermont, AAUW of Virginia, AAUW of Washington, AAUW of West Virginia, AAUW of Wisconsin, AAUW of Wyoming.

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Unions (AFL-CIO); American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; American Federation of Teachers; AnitaB.org; Association of Flight Attendants-CWA; Bend the Arc Jewish Action; California Women's Law Center; Catalyst; Center for American Progress; Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Center for LGBTQ Economic Advancement & Research; Clearinghouse on Women's Issues; Coalition of Labor Union Women: Philadelphia Coalition of Labor Union Women; Community Health Councils; Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces; Connecticut Women's Education and Legal Fund (CWEALF); Disciples Center for Public Witness.

Equal Pay Today; Equal Rights Advocates; Every Texan; Family Forward Oregon; Family Values@ Work; Feminist Majority Foundation; Futures Without Violence; Gender Justice; Holy Spirit Missionary Sisters, USA-JPIC; In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; Indiana Institute for Working Families; Institute for Women's Policy Research; Justice for Migrant Women; KWH Law Center for Social Justice and Change; Labor Council for Latin American Advancement; Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; League of Women Voters of the United States; Legal Aid at Work; Legal Momentum, The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund; Legal Voice; MANA, A National Latina Organization; Methodist Federation for Social Action; Mi Familila Vota.

Michigan League for Public Policy; MomsRising; NAACP; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF); National Association of Social Workers; National Center for Law and Economic Justice; National Committee on Pay Equity; National Council of Jewish Women; National Domestic Violence Hotline; National Education Association; National Employment Law Project: National Employment Lawyers Association National Employment Lawyers Association—Eastern Pennsylvania, National Employment Lawyers Association—Georgia; National Network to End Domestic Violence; National Organization for Women: Florida NOW, Illinois NOW, Indiana NOW, Jacksonville NOW, Kanawha Valley NOW, Maryland NOW, Monroe County NOW, Montana NOW, Northwest Indiana NOW, South Jersey NOW-Alice Paul chapter.

National Partnership for Women & Families; National WIC Association; National

Women's Law Center; National Women's Political Caucus; Native Women Lead; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; New Jersey Citizen Action; NewsGuild-CWA; New York Women's Foundation; North Carolina Justice Center; People For the American Way; PowHer New York; Prosperity Now; Reinventure Capital; Restaurant Opportunities Centers (ROC) United; Service Employees International Union; Shriver Center on Poverty Law; TIME'S UP Now; U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce; Union for Reform Judaism; United State of Women; WNY Women's Foundation; Women and Girls Foundation of Southwest Pennsylvania; Women Employed; Women of Reform Judaism; Women's Fund of Rhode Island; Women's Fund of the Greater Cincinnati Foundation.

Women's Law Project; Women's Media Center; Women's Rights and Empowerment Network; YWCA USA: YWCA Allentown, YWCA Arizona Metropolitan Phoenix, YWCA Billings, YWCA Butler, YWCA Central Alabama, YWCA Central Indiana, YWCA Central Maine, YWCA Central Virginia, YWCA Dayton, YWCA Duluth, YWCA Elgin, YWCA Genesee County, YWCA Greater Austin, YWCA Greater Baton Rouge, YWCA Greater Cincinnati, YWCA Greater Cleveland, YWCA Greater Portland, YWCA Greenwich, YWCA Hartford Region, YWCA Kalamazoo, YWCA Kauai, YWCA Kitsap County, YWCA Knoxville and the Tennessee Valley, YWCA Lower Cape Fear, YWCA McLean County, YWCA Metro Detroit—Interim House, YWCA National Capital Area, YWCA New Hampshire, YWCA North Central Indiana, YWCA Northern New Jersey, YWCA Oahu, YWCA Pierce County, YWCA Princeton, YWCA QUINCY, YWCA Sauk Valley, YWCA Seattle king Snohomish, YWCA South Hampton Roads, YWCA Southeastern Massachusetts, YWCA Southern Arizona, YWCA University of Illinois, YWCA Utah, YWCA Western New York, YWCA Wheeling, YWCA Yakima; Zonta USA Caucus.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MCCLAIN).

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

We don't need the government telling business how much they can pay their employees. Let's not forget that it is business that has lifted us out of poverty, not the government.

As a former businesswoman who has actually signed the front of paychecks, not just the backs, what you do as an employee and what you produce as an employee matters, and what you produce should be reflected in your outcome, not your gender.

Do not—please, do not insult me as a woman by lowering the bar for me. And please, do not insult me as a business owner for forcing me to lower the bar for my employees. Outcomes and hard work are what leads to success, not your gender.

Gender discrimination is already against the law thanks to the Equal Pay Act.

At a time when businesses are shutting their doors due to the pandemic, we should be creating jobs and incentivizing people to work.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), chair of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for his support, and for his leadership on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I have done for my entire career, from the North Carolina House to the U.S. House, in support of equal pay for equal work.

It is 2021, and women are still subject to unequal, unfair compensation in the workplace. This truth, this wage gap is at its worst for women of color. Black women, for example, earn an average of 63 cents on the dollar compared to men.

This issue persists in nearly every line of work, regardless of education, experience, occupation, industry, or job title. And if you don't believe that data, take it from me. I have lived it.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is an opportunity for Congress to strengthen the Equal Pay Act, to bolster the rights of working women, and to put an end to the gender-based wage disparity once and for all.

We cannot continue to rob nearly half of our Nation's workforce of the wages they deserve, nor can we continue to force women to work far more just to be paid fairly.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Partnership for Women and Families in support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FOR
WOMEN & FAMILIES,
April 13, 2021.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Partnership for Women & Families is a nonprofit, non-partisan advocacy organization committed to improving the lives of women and families by achieving equity for all women. Since our creation as the Women's Legal Defense Fund in 1971, we have fought for every significant federal advance for equal opportunity in the workplace, including the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009. We write in strong support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, and urge you to vote for passage while opposing any harmful amendments. This critical bill will help our nation build back an economy that works for everyone by ensuring that all women can work with equality and dignity.

As the Paycheck Fairness Act recognizes, women and workers from communities of color continue to face significant pay disparities in the United States. On average, women working full time and year-round are paid only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men, and the wage gap is widest for women of color. Among women who hold full-time, year-round jobs in the United States, Black women are typically paid 63 cents, Native American women 60 cents and Latinas just 55 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men. White, non-Hispanic women are paid 79 cents. Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) women who work full time, year-round are paid as little as 52 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men, as Burmese women are. Asian American women overall are paid just 87 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men. The wage gap persists across different industries, occupations and education levels and exists in nearly every congressional district.

These troubling statistics underscore the need to update our nation's equal pay laws. The Paycheck Fairness Act would make it safe for workers to discuss their wages with each other. Employers can currently mask compensation discrimination with pay secrecy policies that forbid employees from discussing pay and benefits. Secrecy and the threat of retaliation leave workers unable to learn about and challenge pay disparities. In a survey of private-sector workers, over 62 percent of women and 60 percent of men reported that their employers discourage or prohibit discussing wage and salary information. The Paycheck Fairness Act would make pay secrecy policies illegal.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would also prohibit employers from screening job applicants based on their salary history or requiring salary history during the interview process. Women are typically paid lower wages than men even in their first jobs. Salary disparities that begin early in a woman's career can follow her from job to job when employers are permitted to base a new hire's salary on her prior earnings. People should be paid fairly for the job they are being hired to do.

The bill would also make it more difficult for employers to justify pay discrimination. Workers in the same company who do the same job and have the same amount of experience, education and training should be paid the same. Currently, however, employers are able to explain away differences in pay too easily by relying on a catch-all defense in the Equal Pay Act. The Paycheck Fairness Act would close that loophole and require employers to prove that any differences in pay are not sex-based, are job-related concerning the position in question, and are consistent with business necessity and account for the entire difference in compensation. Employees claiming pay discrimination would also have new opportunities to prove that the employer's defense is the pretext.

In addition to these critical provisions, the Paycheck Fairness Act would also allow workers alleging pay discrimination within the same company to file class-action suits; would change the remedies of the Equal Pay Act to treat gender-based pay discrimination claims the same as other civil rights violations that result in unfair pay; would recognize companies that want to do better; and would improve fair pay enforcement, data collection and disclosure.

Closing the gender and racial wage gap is a crucial measure to take in response to COVID–19. Throughout the pandemic, women and people of color have disproportionately experienced the adverse effects of the public health and economic crisis. Women and people of color have been on the front lines working in our most essential occupations, but forces like wage inequality have kept them underpaid and undervalued. The Paycheck Fairness Act would ensure that workers are given the support needed to ensure pay equity during this time of crisis.

Updating our nation's equal pay laws is also crucial to reducing negative impacts resulting from the mass exodus of women from the labor force during the pandemic. Women's labor force participation is at a 33-year record low, with nearly a million moms having left the workforce, largely due to the difficulties of balancing full-time work and care responsibilities. Increases in women's labor force participation rates drove the significant narrowing of the gender wage gap during the 1970s and 1980s, a narrowing which stagnated in the late 1990s, around the time women's labor force participation peaked. Without the Paycheck Fairness Act, progress on closing the gender wage gap could be set back decades, especially since women face financial penalties for taking time out of the workforce, with one study finding that women who took just one year out of the workforce had annual earnings 39 percent lower than women who did not.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would strengthen existing federal protections, ensure more equitable workplaces and allow women to remain in the workforce and maintain their economic stability at all phases of life. At the current rate of progress, projections are that the gender wage gap will close in 2041 for Asian women, 2069 for white women, 2369 for Black women, and 2451 for Latina women. Women cannot—and should not—wait that long for pay equity. It is time to clarify and strengthen existing federal protections for women in the workforce by passing the Paycheck Fairness Act. We urge you to vote in support and opposed harmful amendments.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 7.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem, and it does nothing to help employees. In reality, the bill would only boost paychecks for trial lawyers and not workers.

H.R. 7 places unworkable, burdensome restrictions on employers, and also poses a threat to worker privacy.

Even more, this bill would kill the Christmas bonus by effectively prohibiting employers from paying end-of-the-year bonuses to their employees. This hardly seems fair to an employee, despite the title of the bill.

Republicans tried to strengthen the bill during the committee markup. My colleague, Ms. STEFANIK, offered an amendment that would have made commonsense improvements to the text, but that amendment was rejected by the Democrats.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill. We should not allow trial lawyers and burdensome restrictions to kill the Christmas bonus under the false guise of fairness.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill will prohibit paying all the men a bonus and none of the women a bonus, although they have produced equally for the business.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I want to commend Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO for her extraordinary efforts and commend Chairman SCOTT for bringing this timely policy to fruition.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act. I think most of us can agree that every American should earn equal pay for equal work.

This legislation takes meaningful steps toward ensuring that every American, regardless of gender, receives fair compensation for their work.

We have seen over the course of the COVID–19 pandemic that essential workers are the lifeblood of our society. We have seen women on the frontlines in the hospital, in the classroom, and at our essential retail stores, and it is time that all of these ''sheroes'' are compensated at the same rate as their male counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters urging passage of this legislation and highlighting the persistent wage gaps between genders.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I urge you to support fundamental fairness by combating wage discrimination on the basis of sex by passing H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. I urge you to vote yes on H.R. 7 and to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without any weakening amendments.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would address the persistent wage gap based on sex by eliminating loopholes that hinder the effectiveness of the Equal Pay Act of 1963. H.R. 7 would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act in important ways. The bill closes loopholes that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any important business purpose related to the job. It would require employers to demonstrate that wage gaps are truly the result of factors other than gender. Importantly, it would prohibit retaliation against workers who share salary information or inquire about their employer's wage practices. H.R. 7 would also bring the remedies and procedures of the Equal Pay Act into conformance with those available for other civil rights claims. The Paycheck Fairness Act holds employers accountable for pay discrepancies between their male and female employees while strengthening incentives to prevent pay discrimination. And, it would preclude pay discrimination from following women from job to job.

While some progress has been made since the passage of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009, the wage gap still persists, and disparities are evident at every educational level. Nationally, women still earn only 82 cents for every dollar earned by their male colleagues. For women of color, the wage gaps are even larger.

Passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act will provide women and all other workers the tools necessary to challenge discrimination against them. It is an important step in making real progress in the fight to eliminate the gender wage gap and to provide economic, and retirement, security to women and their families.

It is well past the time to end pay discrimination in the workplace. The Teamsters Union urges you to reject weakening amendments and to vote yes on final passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, the gender gap is clear, and the Paycheck Fairness Act will address this disparity. Not only will this legislation help women in Georgia, but it will help families across the Nation.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, proponents of H.R. 7 claim that despite current prohibitions against pay discrimination, female workers are still paid, on average, considerably less than male workers and, as a result, a pernicious wage gap exists. However, many studies demonstrate that the gap is not necessarily the product of workplace discrimination.

In fact, this gap nearly disappears when factors such as hours worked per week, rate of leaving the workforce, and industry and occupation are considered.

A 2020 study by compensation software company PayScale found that when controlling for job title, years of experience, industry, location, and other compensable factors, women earned 98 percent as much as men.

A 2009 study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor found a gender wage gap of between 4.8 and 7.1 percent when controlling for economic variables between men and women.

A 2018 Harvard study found that the gap in pay between female and male bus and train operators working for the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, MBTA, can be explained by the workplace choices that women and men make rather than other factors, such as discrimination. The study found that the earnings gap for MBTA bus and train operators is explained by the fact that the male operators took 48 percent fewer unpaid hours off and worked 83 percent more overtime hours per year than the female operators.

I want to point out that I am giving you facts here, Mr. Speaker, facts.

These differences are not due to any different work options faced by female and male operators. Rather, the study found that the female operators had a greater demand for workplace flexibility and a lower demand for overtime work hours than the male operators.

Pay discrimination is wrong and already illegal. We probably cannot say that enough. Any new legislation to combat pay discrimination should be based on facts, not supposition, not projection. The facts seem to be sorely missing from this debate.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Equal Rights Advocates in support of H.R. 7.

EQUAL RIGHTS ADVOCATES,
April 14, 2021.

Re Pass the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and vote no on harmful amendments.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the House votes on the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7), Equal Rights Advocates strongly urges you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 7, without amendments that limit its scope or undermine its critical protections.

Equal Rights Advocates (ERA) is a national, non-profit legal organization based in San Francisco, California, whose mission is to protect and expand economic and educational access and opportunities for women and girls. We have a long history of working

to address pay discrimination and to close the gender wage gap. We have litigated numerous cases relating to pay discrimination and regularly provide information and resources to employees who contact our free legal information hotline regarding unlawful gender and race-based pay disparities.

We also advocate for various bills at the state-level to ensure economic and gender justice for women and families. Most recently, ERA has co-sponsored SB 973 (Jackson, 2020) which requires California employers with 100 employees or more to submit an annual pay data report to the Department of Industrial Relations outlining the compensation and hours worked of its employees by gender, race, ethnicity, and job category. This allows state agencies to more efficiently identify patterns of wage disparities and encourages employers to analyze their own pay practices to ensure they are fair and lawful. Additionally, ERA co-sponsored the California Fair Pay Act, SB 358, (Jackson, 2016) which amended and strengthened our state's Equal Pay Act to prohibit employer secrecy rules, clarify that workers must be paid equally to coworkers of another sex who perform substantially similar work, unless the employer proves that the disparity was due to a legitimate, job-related, bona fide factor not based on or derived from sex. We also cosponsored AB 168 (Eggman, 2017) which prohibits California employers from inquiring about prior salary and requires them to provide the pay Scale for a position in question upon reasonable request and AB 2282 (Eggman, 2018) which clarified that prior salary cannot be used on its own, or in combination with a lawful factor, to justify a wage differential under the California Equal Pay Act. Finally, ERA also chairs Equal Pay Today, a national collaboration of organizations working at the local, regional, and federal level to close the gender wage gap.

Today in the United States, despite the passage of previous equal pay legislation, including the critically important Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the gender pay gap remains pervasive. Women, even those who work full-time and year round, still only earn 80 cents to a man's dollar. This gives rise to a nationwide pay gap of $900 billion every year. For women of color, the pay gap is even larger. For every dollar earned by a non-Hispanic white man, Latina women earn only 53 cents, Native American women only 58 cents, and Black women only 61 cents. These large pay gaps, although of varying sizes across demographics of women, prove harmful to the economic security of women and families across the country. The negative economic consequences of these gender pay gaps are especially pronounced as ''mothers are primary or sole breadwinners in half of U.S. households with children.'' Of these female-headed households, one-quarter of them fall below the poverty line.

As it stands, the gender and race pay gaps are closing at a glacial pace. At current rates, the gender wage gap will not close until 2059. For women of color, the picture is even bleaker. It will not be until 2124 that Black women receive equal pay to white men and not until 2233 that Latinas receive the same. Now is the time for action.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is an important step in accelerating the closing of the gender pay gap. Among many provisions, the Paycheck Fairness Act would bar retaliation for discussing or disclosing wages. According to the Institute for Women's Policy Research, across the country, about half of workers were prohibited or strongly discouraged from disclosing their wages to other employees. Yet, when an individual is unable to discuss wages with other employees, it becomes exceedingly difficult to determine if one is making less than one's colleagues. By ending the practice of pay secrecy, the Paycheck Fairness Act would make it harder for employers to keep pervasive practices of pay discrimination hidden.

In addition, the Paycheck Fairness Act would also prohibit employers from relying on salary history when setting the wages of their employees. This provision is critical as the practice of relying on prior salary can lead to a single act of pay discrimination following a woman throughout her career. One year out of college, women are already earning 7 percent less than their male colleagues, even after controlling for factors such as college major, occupation, or hours worked. If a woman's prior salary is used by future employers, the gender pay gap will continue to persist as a depressed past salary continues to be used to determine future wages. Prohibiting employer reliance on salary history will help stop the perpetuation of unequal pay.

Another crucial provision in this version of the Paycheck Fairness Act is the commitment to pay data collection. As mentioned above, ERA fought for pay data collection at the California state-level and secured this via SB 973 (Jackson, 2020). The need to ensure equal pay is now more apparent than ever during the current COVID–19 health and economic crisis, which has exposed the lasting harm of unequal pay and other contributors to economic security on women, and in particular, women of color. Pay data collection helps uncover pay discrimination, which is a major contributor to the overall gender and race-based wage gaps.

Recognizing that pay discrimination is difficult to detect and address, the Obama Administration announced a proposed revision to the Employer Information Report (EEO–1) to include the reporting of pay data by gender, race and ethnicity beginning in 2018. For more than 50 years, large companies have been submitting these EEO–1 reports with demographic information to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). This data has helped the agency to identify patterns of occupational segregation and discrimination and enforce federal equal pay and anti-discrimination law. However, the Trump Administration put a halt to the implementation of this new rule, dealing a significant blow to the fight for equal pay.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would also close loopholes that allow employers to pay women less without a legitimate business justification and would provide the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination as race and ethnicity based discrimination. It would also require wage data collection and support salary negotiation skills training programs to give women the tools to advocate for higher wages. Salary negotiation workshops have been shown to be highly effective. For example, in a study conducted following the free salary negotiation workshops put on by the city of Boston, the Center for Women in Politics and Public Policy at the University of Massachusetts Boston found that nearly half of the women who were interviewed had either successfully negotiated a pay raise or starting salary that brought them either to or above the market rate following the training.

As the bill states, these continuing pay disparities have devastating impacts on women, especially women of color. Over the course of the COVID–19 pandemic, researchers have found this to be even more true. Since last February, 2.4 million women have exited the workforce, or, been pushed out of the workforce, highlighting a dramatic regress for gender equity. More and more women are forced to stay home in order to care for children and loved ones while men continue to work. Before the pandemic, ''women did, on average, three times more unpaid care work than men, and this responsibility has heightened since the pandemic given school and childcare closures, and increased care needs for elderly relatives.'' Women who are able to remain in the workforce, however, are still paid less than their male colleagues, especially Black women and women of color. COVID–19 has exacerbated these long-standing gender and racial inequities. Now, more than ever, elected officials must recognize these disparate impacts and deliver solutions to American women.

Without continued efforts to provide women with the tools to challenge and unearth pay discrimination and provisions to keep employers from perpetuating persistent inequalities, the gender pay gap will not close. The Paycheck Fairness Act is an important step on the path towards a future where women can stand on equal economic footing to their male counterparts.

For these reasons, we are proud to support the Paycheck Fairness Act and urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

JESSICA STENDER,
Senior Counsel,
Workplace Justice & Public Policy.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, it should offend every one of us that there remains a pay gap between men and women for the same work.

Women of color, in particular—African-American women, Latina women, Native American women, AAPI women—are making as low as 52 cents, Mr. Speaker, for every dollar for the same job and work by a man.

This is a travesty.

Let's make our communities stronger. Let's make our economy stronger.

In Harlem, East Harlem, northern Manhattan, and the northwest Bronx, women of color are the majority of workers. I can't go back home to my district and say that somehow they are working the same as men, or maybe more, in many cases, and are making less.

I support H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, because we need to bring fairness into the discussion. Let's make our communities stronger. Let's make our economy stronger.

Gender-based pay discrimination should not be something we are still discussing now in 2021.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will put everyone on the line to make sure that we are all doing our best to ensure fair and equitable pay.

Closing the pay gap will make women and families financially stronger.

Mr. Speaker, let's make our communities stronger. Let's make our economy stronger.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the co-chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter titled ''Support the Paycheck Fairness Act'' written by The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
April 14, 2021.

SUPPORT THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT, H.R. 7—VOTE NO ON HARMFUL AMENDMENTS

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human

Rights, a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 220 organizations to promote and protect the rights of all persons in the United States, we urge you to vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 7, without amendments that limit its scope or undermine its critical protections. The Paycheck Fairness Act is a priority of The Leadership Conference, and we will include your vote on final passage in our Voting Record for the 117th Congress.

Gender-based pay discrimination compromises the economic security of millions of women in the United States—and for women of color, the harm is exacerbated by their experience of both race- and gender-based wage disparities. Women working full-time, year-round in the United States are typically paid about 82 cents for every dollar paid to men, adding up to a loss of more than $400,000 over a lifetime. Black women are typically paid only 63 cents for every dollar paid to non-Hispanic white men, while Native American women are paid only 60 cents, Latinas are paid just 55 cents, and women in certain Asian American and Pacific Islander communities are paid as little as 52 cents. Research shows that the gender pay gap occurs across almost all occupations and industries, develops very early in women's careers, and grows over time.

Action to close the wage gap is long overdue, but in light of the current economic crisis, it is even more critical that Congress act now to strengthen protections against pay discrimination, both as a matter of economic security and fundamental fairness. The loss of income and savings from the wage gap has exacerbated the harmful effects of the COVID–19 pandemic for women of color and their families. Black and Brown women have been overrepresented in ''frontline'' jobs during the pandemic—many in low-paid jobs at high risk of exposure to COVID–19 and without benefits like paid leave and employer-sponsored health insurance—but they are paid less than non-Hispanic white men in the same jobs. Already struggling to make ends meet, women of color in low-pay jobs must also endure pay discrimination that artificially reduces their overall earnings, making it even less likely for women of color to amass the financial resources to withstand a health emergency and putting entire families at risk of economic insecurity. Almost 75 percent of Black mothers and more than 45 percent of Latina mothers were breadwinners in their families in 2018. At the same time, Black and Brown women have faced staggering job losses during the pandemic. The unemployment rate for Black women reached 17.4 percent in May 2020, for example, and Latinas experienced the highest unemployment rate of any group during the pandemic, at more than 20 percent in April of last year. The unemployment rate for Black women and Latinas remains exceptionally high.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to provide more effective protection against sex-based pay discrimination. The Paycheck Fairness Act would:

Prohibit retaliation against workers who discuss or disclose wages;

Prevent employers from relying on salary history to determine future pay so that pay discrimination does not extend from job to job;

Close loopholes in the Equal Pay Act that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any business necessity related to the job;

Ensure that women can obtain the same remedies for sex-based pay discrimination as those available to people subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity;

Provide for much-needed training and technical assistance and require wage data collection.

Women and their families can no longer be shortchanged. Given the importance of this bill, we urge representatives to pass H.R. 7 without amendments that limit the bill's scope or undermine its protections.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
Interim President and CEO.
LASHAWN WARREN,
Executive Vice President for Government Affairs.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, for a quarter of a century, Chairwoman DELAURO has been trying to get this bill passed. She is sick and tired, I am sick and tired, and American women are sick and tired of being treated like second-class citizens.

Imagine if the women here in Congress were being paid 60, 70, or 80 percent of what our male colleagues are making. Do you think we would put up with it? Of course not. Somehow, American women are expected to put up with that.

Do you want facts? Ask about Ms. Rexroat, from the State of Arizona, who was paid less than her colleague because they decided that they would base her salary on what she was making before, as opposed to the job at hand.

We have a problem, Mr. Speaker. This has been going on for way too long. It is time for us to fix it for all the women and children in this country who want to be paid equally for equal work so that they have money for childcare, rent, food, and education.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the previous head of the EEOC.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Bar Association supporting passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
April 13, 2021.

Re ABA Urges Passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Bar Association (ABA), the largest voluntary association of lawyers and legal professionals in the world. I am writing to urge you to vote for passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would update the Equal Pay Act of 1963 enacted by Congress almost 60 years ago to prohibit gender-based pay inequality. This legislation, which is expected to come to the floor this week, has the support of working men and women across the country who want this nation to live up to its expressed commitment to equal pay for equal work.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 prohibits an employer from paying unequal wages to male and female workers who perform jobs under similar work conditions that require substantially equal skill, effort, and responsibility unless there is a legitimate reason for a pay differential.

The Paycheck Fairness Act does not alter the basic scheme of this statute or impose unreasonable burdens on employers; indeed, the majority of its proposed changes are borrowed from other civil rights statutes that have proved more effective in eradicating workplace discrimination.

We would like to respond to some persistent misperceptions regarding this important legislation:

Enactment of this bill will not compel businesses to pay their female workforce substantially more money to eliminate the existing wage gap. The purpose of this bill is to update the Equal Pay Act, which only applies in situations where women or men are receiving unequal pay for equal work. It does not create a new mandate. Employers already have a legal obligation to pay men and women equal wages for equal work unless there is a legitimate reason for the differential.

Enactment of this bill will not interject the government into the pay decisions of businesses. The Paycheck Fairness Act does not tell employers what factors to use to set pay; it only requires that pay decisions are job- and business-related.

Enactment of this bill will not make employers liable for any and every wage differential. An employer will still have four affirmative defenses and will not be guilty of wage discrimination if a pay differential is based on (i) seniority, (ii) merit, (iii) a system that measures quantity or quality of production, or (iv) a ''factor other than sex.'' 29 U.S.C. 206(d)(1). The only difference is that Paycheck Fairness Act will resolve uncertainty in the law over how to apply the fourth defense by redefining it as ''a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience.''

Enactment of a provision to clarify the ''factor other than sex'' defense will not eviscerate legitimate use of the defense. It is intended to prevent employers from asserting that unequal pay was the result of market force-derived excuses such as prior salaries or negotiation outcomes. A bona fide factor other than sex must be job-related, consistent with business necessity, and account for the entire differential in compensation at issue. The only time this defense would not apply would be in situations where an alternative employment practice is available that would serve the same business purpose without producing the wage differential and the employer has refused to adopt it.

Enactment of this bill will not encourage more lawsuits and jeopardize post-pandemic economic recovery. The bill is designed resolve uncertainties in the law and increase employer compliance with the Equal Pay Act, not to encourage more lawsuits.

The bill's strengthened remedies, which align with those available in other employment discrimination statutes, will encourage employers to review their wage-setting practices and rectify those that are based on invalid justifications. Men and women who are paid fairly have no incentive to jeopardize their jobs and subject themselves to costly, time-consuming, and emotionally taxing lawsuits brought against their employers.

The bill's clarification of the ''factor other than sex'' defense will not spawn new litigation. Instead, it will provide guidance to the courts and resolve uncertainty in the law. The standard, which is adapted from Title VII discrimination cases and codified in the Civil Rights Act of 1991, is one with which courts already are familiar.

The bill will help strengthen the economy by improving the present and future economic welfare of working women, who comprise about one-half of the workforce and are the primary breadwinner in more than 12 million American families.

We urge you to demonstrate your commitment to equal pay for equal work by voting for the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA LEE REFO.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to strongly support H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, a critically important bill.

As the first woman to chair the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, I enforced the Equal Pay Act. I particularly appreciate that H.R. 7 would bring long-awaited strength to the EPA.

I especially appreciate that Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, a great champion for equal pay, has included my Pay Equity for All Act in H.R. 7, where I will focus today.

The Pay Equity for All Act would prohibit employers from asking job applicants their salary history. Even though many employers may not intentionally discriminate against applicants or employees based on gender, race, or ethnicity, setting wages based on salary history is routinely done in the workplace and can reinforce the wage gap. Evidence clearly shows that members of historically disadvantaged groups often start their careers with unfair and artificially low wages compared to their White male counterparts, and these disparities are compounded from job to job.

Job and salary offers should be based on an applicant's skill and merit, not on salary history. This bill addresses this problem by assessing penalties against employers who ask applicants for their salary history during the interview process.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7 requires that the employer defense must be consistent with ''business necessity,'' a broad and ill-defined term.

We don't know how the courts will interpret this sweeping requirement, but we do know the dictionary says it means ''absolutely essential'' or ''indispensable.''

How can an employer prove that any one factor determining employee pay could rise to the level to be necessary for the survival of the business?

Proponents of H.R. 7 will argue this phrase has been adopted from title VII, as amended by the 1991 Civil Rights Act, but the phrase has spawned endless litigation because of its lack of clarity. Anyone who thinks this concept is simple and can just be carried over from title VII is either naive or has been misled.

Further, the dubious concept of business necessity was developed under controversial so-called disparate impact analysis and cannot simply be slapped onto the Equal Pay Act, especially where, as mandated by H.R. 7, damages are unlimited. In contrast, under title VII, in disparate impact cases, damages are limited to backpay and benefits.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is really about mothers and daughters who earn about 82 cents on the dollar for every dollar a man earns. It is about mothers and daughters who lose about $1 trillion a year because of the wage gap.

For those men who don't have a really good reason to vote for it, it is about the fact that a woman gave birth to every man alive. So for all of the suffering, we ought to vote for this bill, because we are here as a result of some woman suffering for us.

At this time, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Committee on Pay Equity.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
ON PAY EQUITY,
April 14, 2021.

Re Pass the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and vote no on harmful amendments.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the House votes on the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7), the National Committee on Pay Equity (NCPE) strongly urges you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 7, without amendments that limit its scope or undermine its critical protections.

The National Committee on Pay Equity (NCPE), founded in 1979, is a coalition of women's and civil rights organizations; labor unions; religious, professional, and educational associations, commissions on women, state and local pay equity coalitions and individuals working to eliminate sex- and race-based wage discrimination and to achieve pay equity. These pay gaps can be addressed only if workers have the legal tools necessary to challenge discrimination and employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law. The Paycheck Fairness Act is one of these urgently required tools.

Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist, and earnings lost to these gaps are exacerbating the financial effects of COVID–19, falling particularly heavily on women of color and the families who depend on their income. The Paycheck Fairness Act, which has been passed three previous times by the House of Representatives, mostly recently in the 116th Congress, offers a much-needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

Women are increasingly the primary or co-breadwinner in their families and cannot afford to be shortchanged any longer. Women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men, adding up to a loss of more than $400,000 over a lifetime. This wage gap varies by race and is larger for many women of color: Black women working full time, year round typically make only 63 cents, Native American women only 60 cents, and Latinas only 55 cents, for every dollar paid to their white, non-Hispanic male counterparts. Latinas lose more than $1 million over a 40-year career due to the wage gap. While Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) women make 85 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men, many AAPI communities experience drastically wider pay gaps. And even when controlling for factors, such as education and experience, pay gaps persist and start early in women's careers and contribute to a wealth gap that follows them throughout their work lives and into retirement. Persistent pay discrimination, often cloaked by employer-imposed pay secrecy policies, is one factor driving these wage gaps.

The Paycheck Fairness Act updates and strengthens the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides robust protection against sex-based pay discrimination. Among other provisions, this comprehensive bill:

ends secrecy around pay by barring retaliation against workers who voluntarily discuss or disclose their wages, and requiring employers to report pay data to the EEOC

prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that pay discrimination does not follow women from job to job

closes loopholes that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any important business justification related to the job

ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity

provides much needed training and technical assistance, as well as data collection and research

The COVID–19 pandemic and systemic racism have exposed how the work performed primarily by women, and particularly Black and brown women, has long been and continues to be undervalued and underpaid, even as the rest of the country is newly recognizing the essential nature of this work. We cannot build back an economy that works for everyone without ensuring that all women can work with equality, safety, and dignity, starting with pay equity. Passing the Paycheck Fairness Act would mark a vitally important step toward ensuring this becomes reality.

We urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without harmful amendments that weaken its critical protections.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN YORK,
Secretary-Treasurer,
National Committee on Pay Equity.

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

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 58th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act. Despite the goal to ensure equality for women in the workplace, nearly 60 years later, the pay gap still exists.

Women today, on average, make 82 cents for every dollar earned by a man. For women of color, the disparity is worse, with Black women making 63 cents on the dollar, AAPI women making 60 cents, and Latinas making 55 cents.

This disparity is unacceptable, and it is unfair.

Let us come together right now to pass H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

When women get equal pay, our families and our entire economy will do better.

I include in the RECORD a letter from the United Church of Christ in favor of H.R. 7.

UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing to ask for your support in passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7), and to ensure that passage in the House is done without amendments that diminish the protections provided by the bill.

There is ample evidence to show that despite equal pay laws, the gender pay gap exists. These lost earnings add up to a loss of over $400,000 in a lifetime. The wage gap is even more significant for women of color

with Black women working full time making only 63 cents for every dollar paid to men, Native American women only 60 cents, and Latinas only 55 cents, for every dollar paid to their white, non-Hispanic male counterparts.

As people of faith, we believe that each person deserves to be treated with dignity and humanity. When women are paid less for the same work that is a concrete and explicit way of showing that their work and personhood are valued less. Passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act will strengthen and update the Equal Pay Act and provide women with the legal means to fight the gender pay gap and challenge gender pay discrimination.

The work done by women, and particularly Black and brown women, is undervalued and underpaid. Even though much of that labor is what keeps people fed, clothed, and cared for. The work of women, so important to how a society functions is always relegated to less pay and less value. This is a gross injustice—and part of the systemic racist structures that undergird the economic system in the United States. God's vision for our world is one where all are valued, no matter their gender, race, or credo.

We urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without harmful amendments that weaken its critical protections.

THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST
JUSTICE AND WITNESS MINISTRIES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, we all agree that every American should be compensated for the quality of their work and not face discrimination in the workplace based on race, color, national origin, religion, or sex.

That is why Congress passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963 and broader nondiscrimination laws under title VII of the Civil Rights Act the following year.

However, unlike those bills, H.R. 7 offers no new protections. It is simply a messaging bill to score political points.

What will the bill actually do? For job creators, they can expect more lawsuits and more regulatory burdens.

While limiting legal options for women by changing EPA class action lawsuits from an opt-in system to a mandatory opt-out system, H.R. 7 allows trial lawyers to pursue unlimited compensatory damages, making it nearly impossible for employers to defend against frivolous lawsuits.

Additionally, it requires employers to make intrusive data disclosures to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission regarding the sex, race, and national origin of employees and, for the first time, the hiring, termination, and promotion data of those employees, ultimately posing a threat to workers' privacy.

The compliance costs to satisfy these requirements can total more than $600 million a year. We have already seen a number of small businesses forced to close this year because of COVID lockdowns, and now my Democratic colleagues want to impose more regulatory burdens on businesses that were lucky enough to survive.

Thankfully, my colleague from New York, Congresswoman ELISE STEFANIK, has a solution that will actually address pay discrimination and support women in the workplace. The Wage Equity Act protects workers' privacy by encouraging voluntary pay analysis while bolstering women's employment through the creation of a grant program for women in college or career and technical programs to provide negotiation skills education.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 7 and work with Republicans on meaningful legislation to ensure all workers have the opportunity and wages they deserve.

□ 1315

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise us how much time is available on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 14¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

The Equal Pay Act has been the law for more than half a century, but, in 2021, equal pay for equal work is still not a reality for many women, especially women of color. This is an injustice to millions of working families. Closing the wage gap is an economic imperative.

Last month, I was honored to chair the hearing on persistent gender-based wage discrimination. We heard witnesses describe the barriers to detecting wage discrimination and holding employers accountable. Most importantly, we heard how the Paycheck Fairness Act can address the problematic loopholes in the current law, empower workers to better detect and combat wage discrimination, and create mechanisms for better pay data transparency.

By advancing the Paycheck Fairness Act, we can restore the original intent of the Equal Pay Act and finally make equal pay for equal work a reality. I thank Congresswoman DELAURO for her steadfast leadership. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act from the American Association of University Women.

AAUW,
April 14, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 170,000 members and supporters of the American Association of University Women (AAUW), I urge you to vote in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and to oppose harmful amendments when the bill comes to the House floor this week. Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist. The Paycheck Fairness Act offers a much needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle these pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

The dual crises of a global pandemic and systemic racism have laid bare the economic disparities in our country. While we all struggle to survive, we are relying heavily on the work performed by essential workers who are disproportionately Black and brown women. Yet their work has long been and continues to be undervalued and underpaid. At the same time, in 2020, American women lost more than 5 million jobs. Women accounted for 100% of the jobs lost last December—all 140,000 of them—and women of color made up an overwhelming share of those jobs. This massive job loss coupled with the consistent undervaluing of women's work compounds over time and results in significant lost earnings. As a result, women do not have a financial cushion to help weather the current economic crisis or the ability to build wealth, all of which contribute to racial and gender wealth gaps that create barriers to families' economic prosperity. We cannot build back our economy without immediately addressing these realities. And women and their families cannot afford to wait any longer for change.

To appropriately respond to the crises we are currently experiencing we must make real, concrete progress in ensuring all women receive fair pay. While the gap has narrowed since passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, progress has largely stalled in recent years. Data from the U.S. Census Bureau once again revealed that women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men. The pay gaps are even wider for women of color. Black women and Latinas make, respectively, 63 and 55 cents on the dollar as compared to non-Hispanic, white men. Action is required now: at the current rate, the overall pay gap between men's and women's earnings will not close until 2093 and it will take significantly longer for women of color to reach parity.

Research indicates that the gender pay gap develops very early in women's careers. Controlling for factors known to affect earnings, such as education and training, marital status, and hours worked, research finds that college-educated women still earn 7 percent less than men just one year out of college. Over time, the gap compounds and widens, impacting women's social security and retirement. Ensuring that women have equal pay would have a dramatic impact on families and the economy. According to a report from the Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR), the poverty rate for all working women would be cut in half, falling from 8.0 percent to 3.8 percent if women were paid the same as comparable men. The same study indicates that the U.S. economy would have produced an additional $512.6 billion in income if women had received equal pay for equal work. This is why I urge you to pass this important bill.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides effective protection against sex-based pay discrimination in today's workplace.

The bill takes several important steps, including:

Guaranteeing Non-Retaliation: The bill prohibits retaliation against workers for discussing or disclosing wages. Without the non-retaliation provisions of the Paycheck Fairness Act, many women will continue to be silenced in the workplace—that is, prohibited from talking about wages with coworkers without the fear of being fired. This is an issue that keeps women—like it kept Lilly Ledbetter—from learning of the pay discrimination against them.

Prohibiting Reliance on Prior Salary History: The bill prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that prior discrimination doesn't follow workers from job to job.

Requiring Job-Relatedness: The bill closes loopholes that allow employers to pay women less than men for the same work without a business necessity that is related to the job.

Equalizing Remedies: The bill ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity.

Providing Additional Assistance and Resources: The bill also provides technical assistance to businesses, requires wage data collection, and supports salary negotiation skills training programs to give women the tools to advocate for higher wages.

The pay gap is persistent and can only be addressed if women are armed with the tools necessary to challenge discrimination against them, and employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law. I urge you to take a critical step towards pay equity by voting in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and opposing harmful amendments when the bill comes to the House floor this week.

Cosponsorship and votes associated with this bill may be scored in the AAUW Action Fund Congressional Voting Record for the 117th Congress.

Sincerely,

KATE NIELSON,
Senior Director of Public Policy, Legal Advocacy & Research.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Another provision in H.R. 7 requires that, in addition to proving business necessity, an employer must prove the business necessity accounts for 100 percent of the differential in compensation at issue. This is impossible to do. How can an employer explain slight differences in compensation based on educational level, experience, or quality of work on the job?

This bill is going to make it impossible for employers to pay differentially on merit for anything. It is a bad bill, and we should not be passing it.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has made far too little progress in the fight for equal pay in the workplace. In 2021, women who work full time year round are paid, on average, only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men. This adds up to over $400,000 in lost wages over the course of a woman's career.

For women of color, the gender gap is a gender chasm, with Latinas earning 55 cents, Black women earning 63 cents, and Asian American and Pacific Islander women earning a mere 52 cents for every dollar paid to a White man for the same work.

The long overdue Paycheck Fairness Act would bring us closer to closing these gaps by ensuring equal pay for equal work. Notably, it would hold employers accountable for discriminatory practices, end pay secrecy, ease workers' ability to challenge pay discrimination, and strengthen the available remedies for wronged employees.

I thank Congresswoman DELAURO for her tireless advocacy on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the National Women's Law Center.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER,
April 14, 2021.

Re Pass the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and vote no on harmful amendments.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the House votes this week on the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7), we strongly urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without amendments that limit its scope or undermine its critical protections.

Despite federal and state equal pay laws, gender pay gaps persist, and earnings lost to these gaps are exacerbating the financial effects of COVID–19, falling particularly heavily on women of color and the families who depend on their income. The Paycheck Fairness Act, which has been passed three previous times by the House of Representatives, mostly recently in the 116th Congress, offers a much-needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

Women are increasingly the primary or co-breadwinner in their families and cannot afford to be shortchanged. Women working full-time, year-round are typically paid only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men, adding up to a loss of more than $400,000 over a lifetime. This wage gap varies by race and is larger for many women of color: Black women working full time, year round typically make only 63 cents, Native American women only 60 cents, and Latinas only 55 cents, for every dollar paid to their white, non-Hispanic male counterparts. Latinas lose more than $1 million over a 40-year career due to the wage gap. While Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) women make 85 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men, many AAPI communities experience drastically wider pay gaps. Mothers typically make only 75 cents for every dollar paid to fathers. And even when controlling for factors, such as education and experience, pay gaps persist and start early in women's careers and contribute to a wealth gap that follows them throughout their lifetimes. Persistent pay discrimination, often cloaked by employer-imposed pay secrecy policies, is one factor driving these wage gaps.

These pay gaps can be addressed only if workers have the legal tools necessary to challenge discrimination and employers are provided with effective incentives and technical assistance to comply with the law.

The Paycheck Fairness Act updates and strengthens the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides robust protection against sex-based pay discrimination. Among other provisions, this comprehensive bill:

ends secrecy around pay by barring retaliation against workers who voluntarily discuss or disclose their wages, and requiring employers to report pay data to the EEOC

prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that pay discrimination does not follow women from job to job

closes loopholes that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any important business justification related to the job

ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity

provides much needed training and technical assistance, as well as data collection and research

The COVID–19 pandemic and systemic racism have exposed how the work performed primarily by women, and particularly Black and brown women, has long been and continues to be undervalued and underpaid, even as the rest of the country is newly recognizing the essential nature of this work. We cannot build back an economy that works for everyone without ensuring that all women can work with equality, safety, and dignity, starting with pay equity. Passing the Paycheck Fairness Act would mark a vitally important step toward ensuring this becomes reality.

We urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without harmful amendments that weaken its critical protections.

Sincerely,

EMILY J. MARTIN,
Vice President for Education & Workplace Justice.
MAYA RAGHU,
Director of Workplace Equality & Senior Counsel.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to vote for this package and close the gender wage gap once and for all.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman DELAURO for her persistent leadership for so many years, as well as Chairman SCOTT and the Speaker.

We must put an end to the wage gap and pay discrimination. Let me tell you, as you have heard, the wage gap for women of color is so much worse.

I am reminded today of our heroine, Fannie Lou Hamer. She said, ''I am sick and tired of being sick and tired.''

Black women earn 63 cents, indigenous women earn 60 cents, Latinas earn 55 cents, White women earn 82 cents, and AAPI women are paid as little as 52 cents on every dollar paid to the White man. That is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Equal Pay Today! campaign urging Members to support the bill.

EQUAL PAY TODAY,
April 14, 2021.

Re Pass the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and vote no on harmful amendments.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE(S): As the House votes on the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7), we strongly urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 7, without amendments that would limit its scope or undermine its critical protections.

As members of the Equal Pay Today Campaign, we represent a broad coalition consisting of both national and state based organizations from all across the country, that are dedicated to challenging the legal, policy, and cultural barriers at the local, state, and national level that keep women from being paid equally. Launched on the 50th anniversary of the signing of the federal Equal Pay Act, we are committed to fighting and advocating for legislation that will ultimately close the gender wage gap.

With our nation now entering into year two of this global pandemic, we can no longer ignore the disparities that have existed long before our nation's shutdown, and

despite federal and state equal pay laws, the gender pay gap persists, and earnings lost to these gaps are widened due to the financial impacts of the pandemic, with a heavier burden bared by women of color and the families and communities who depend on them and their income.

Women are increasingly becoming the primary or co-breadwinner in their families, with Black mothers being far more likely than other mothers to be the primary or sole breadwinners for their families and more than half of Latina mothers being the breadwinner in families with children under 18. Women across this country, working full-time, year-round, are typically being paid only .82 cents for every dollar paid out to men, adding up to a loss of more than $400,000 dollars over a lifetime. And the wage gap gets even wider as race is factored in. Black women working full time, year round typically make only .63 cents, Native American women only .60 cents, and Latinas only .55 cents, for every dollar paid to their white, non-Hispanic male counterparts. Latinas stand to lose more than $1 million over a 40–year career due to the wage gap, and while Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) women make .85 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men, many AAPI communities experience drastically wider pay gaps. And even when controlling for factors, such as education and experience, the pay gaps still persist, start early in women's careers and contribute to a wealth gap that follows them throughout their lifetimes.

These pay gaps can be addressed and rectified through legislation that offers workers the legal tools and safeguards needed to challenge discrimination. The Paycheck Fairness Act, which has already been passed by the House of Representatives three times before and most recently by the 116th Congress, would offer the much needed updates to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by making these tools available while also providing new ones, that would help to combat and challenge discrimination and the pay gap.

The Paycheck Fairness Act updates and strengthens the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to ensure that it provides robust protection against sex-based pay discrimination. Among other provisions, this comprehensive bill:

ends secrecy around pay by barring retaliation against workers who voluntarily discuss or disclose their wages, and requiring employers to report pay data to the EEOC

prohibits employers from relying on salary history in determining future pay, so that pay discrimination does not follow women from job to job

closes loopholes that have allowed employers to pay women less than men for the same work without any important business justification related to the job

ensures women can receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination that are currently available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and ethnicity

provides much needed training and technical assistance, as well as data collection and research

This past year has undoubtedly been a challenging one. The pandemic has shone a light on how the work performed by women, specifically Black and brown women, has continuously been undervalued, underpaid, and gone unnoticed. We cannot continue to use the word ''essential'' to describe the nature of this work, if there is no commitment to ensuring that all women can work with safety and with dignity, and the first step to making this happen, starts with pay equity, and the catalyst for this would be the passing of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

We urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act without harmful amendments that weaken its critical protections.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

EQUAL PAY TODAY.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me finally say: Remember, because of this discrimination, women's Social Security benefits during their senior years are much lower than men. This injustice follows women throughout their lives. This issue impacts women, regardless of industry, education level or political party. It is past time—it is so past time for Congress to take action on this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7 would create impossible conditions in which to operate for businessowners large and small. It would result in endless litigation in front of judges and juries, who will delve into employer compensation decisions even when there has been a showing that those decisions are not based on sex.

Alternatively, businessowners will simply decide not to risk liability of unlimited damages, which could bankrupt them, and the end result will be the use of pay bands by employers, which imposes a government civil service model on the private sector that will result in everyone in the workplace being compensated equally without regard to merit.

This is a very broad goal of liberals in general: Pay everybody the same and stifle innovation, stifle initiative, stifle anybody being different.

This is the wrong thing for our country. That is not the way the United States of America operates. We value innovation, we value entrepreneurism, we value independent thinking. We don't want to crush everybody into thinking the same way. That is the way civil service works. That is the way the unions work. That is not the way it should be in private industry, which has made this country great.

This bill stalls upward mobility. It hurts all employees striving to succeed on the job, who want to be rewarded for their efforts.

For these reasons and others, H.R. 7's provisions are unworkable and will benefit only trial lawyers, not innovative, hardworking workers.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House.

This is about building back better with women, not stifling innovation and entrepreneurship, but reaping the benefits of all that women have to offer in our country.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 60 years ago, President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, lauding it as ''a measure that adds to our laws another structure basic to democracy.''

Today, I rise in support of a similarly momentous measure for our democracy, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which will strengthen that law and reaffirm this pledge: equal work deserves equal pay.

We all salute Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO, the guardian angel of this legislation, and so much of what Democrats' work on behalf of women and families. Chairwoman DELAURO is relentless, introducing this bill in each of the last 13 Congresses and securing bipartisan support and the support of the entire House Democratic Caucus. And now, because of her leadership, we have a chance for it to become law.

Many of us, with Chair DELAURO at the helm, have helped lead the charge for equal pay for many years now. Twelve years ago, House Democrats passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to protect women's right to challenge unfair pay in the courts. We are proud that President Obama made this bill the first bill he signed into law. You talked about it earlier, Mr. Chairman.

Exactly 10 years later, when Democrats retook the majority, we were honored to stand with Lilly Ledbetter, that courageous woman, as we took another step forward for pay equity by again introducing Congresswoman DELAURO's bill, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Today, a Democratic Congress led by over 120 women in the House; with an administration led by President Biden, a longtime champion of women; and the first woman Vice President, KAMALA HARRIS; and with a record number of women in the Cabinet, those are great advances for women.

We will pass this landmark bill once more, send it to the Senate, and then, hopefully, to President Biden to sign into law.

I am the mother of four daughters. I don't know anybody who has a daughter, a wife, a sister, a mother who can say to them, You are not worth it; your time is not worth the time of your brother, your father, your whoever else.

What father, brother or son would not want the women in their lives to have equal pay?

Sadly, equal pay is not yet a reality in America. Nearly six decades after the passage of the Equal Pay Act, women working full time year round are paid only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men.

And for women of color, the disparity is even greater. It is almost sinful. For Black women, it is 63 cents; Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, and Alaska Native women, 60 cents; and a Latina is making just 55 cents for every dollar for the same work as men.

Equal work, equal hours, equal efforts, but not equal pay. And this is not just about cents on a dollar. This pay

gap can add up to about $400,000 in lost wages over a career.

What does that mean to a woman's pension?

At the same time, the need for action has been accelerated by the pandemic, which has worsened economic disparities for women. Last year, women lost a net 5.4 million jobs during the recession, with losses disproportionately experienced by women of color.

This unjust, uneven toll on women is expected to widen the wage gap by up to 5 percentage points. Widen the gap by 5 percentage points, even as the economy recovers.

As the House passes this landmark legislation, let us stand proudly, unapologetically for what this does for the economy of our country. We continue to work to advance progress for women and families. With the strong support of President Biden, the House Democrats are proud to have passed and sent to the Senate our bipartisan VAWA reauthorization led by Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE; legislation to remove the arbitrary deadline for ERA ratification led by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER; and to have enacted the American Rescue Plan, which is helping many women to return to the workforce.

□ 1330

And we will continue this drumbeat of action ensuring that the Senate passes the Paycheck Fairness Act and advancing legislation to strengthen women's access to childcare, healthcare, workplace safety, and more.

And as we move forward to ''build back better,'' President Biden's alliterative phrase for how we have job creation in our country, we can only build back better if women are central to that effort. Advancing an economy in a country that works for all of the people in America is very important to America's families and America's children.

I urge a strong and, hopefully, bipartisan vote on H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. Fairness is an all-American quality. Fairness for women is essential because we know that when women succeed, America succeeds.

I thank Congresswoman DELAURO and Chairman SCOTT for their leadership.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. FOXX very much for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, Mr. Speaker.

All Americans, men and women, should be treated equally and receive equal pay for equal work. I happen to be the father of two daughters, and I will do everything in this House to ensure that that continues to be the case and is, in fact, the case.

If this truly were an Equal Pay Act, Mr. Speaker, I think we would have a bipartisan initiative here. We would have bipartisan agreement. The problem is this is not what it is, Mr. Speaker, it goes well beyond dealing with equal pay.

What it does is it provides equal pay for as many attorneys and trial lawyers as possible. And therein lies the problem. Once again, we have what looks like legitimate legislation that sounds good and feels good, Mr. Speaker, yet when you look at the details, it is far left extremism, which poisons the legislation and doesn't allow reasonable Members like myself to be supportive.

And this isn't the first time. This occurs very often, and it is the reason why we don't get things done, nor do we get bipartisan cooperation. Because cooperation is the way that we will achieve and complete bills of importance, particularly that are named equal pay for all, equality for all.

That is what our goal is. It would be great if a bill like this had the substance that provided the ingredients to provide for equal pay.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee for yielding, and I thank him for his untiring work.

''No employer . . . shall discriminate, within any establishment in which such employees are employed, between employees on the basis of sex, by paying wages to employees in such establishment at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to employees of the opposite sex.''

That was passed by the Congress of the United States, signed by the President of the United States in 1963. A half a century later, Mr. Speaker, the figures belie that promise. The figures are a shameful recognition of the emptiness of that promise.

Now, I know the gentlewoman from North Carolina, not well, but well enough. We have served here together for some period of time. I hope she will take this with a measure of positivity. She is a feisty lady. She stands up for what she believes. And she is tough. All those things are said lovingly. God help us if they paid her less than they paid every male Member of this House.

But we don't. We pay everybody the same, except, I will admit, the Speaker and myself, so perhaps I am not quite as detached. But everybody else gets the same. A person who comes in the first day gets paid as much as a person who has been here 40 years like me. Why? Because it is the responsibility and duties that we perform that are being compensated, not our gender.

Now, in this bill and every other bill that has dealt with equal pay—however, let there be no mistake, clearly, I pay people in my office who have been there for 10 years more than I pay people that have been there a year if they are doing the same thing. Period. Experience counts.

As a lawyer when I ran my law office, I paid people differently based upon their experience, their education, and other differentials, but not on the basis of gender. And like the gentleman who spoke before me, I have one more daughter than he has; he has two daughters, I have three daughters. Mr. Speaker, they would not be happy today if their dad came to this floor and voted against this bill, I will tell you that. I don't know about the gentleman's daughters, but I can tell you where my daughters would be.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring the Paycheck Fairness Act to the floor, as I did last Congress. The legislation is a critical part of Democrats' effort to close the gender pay gap and ensure that women earn equal pay for equal work. Lilly Ledbetter did not get equal pay for equal work. Period. Unfortunately, she was prevented by the Supreme Court from making her case. We corrected that.

The House passed a bill in 2019, but the Republican-controlled Senate failed to do the same, a bill just like this. That was very disappointing, not only to those of us who have been working hard to close the gender pay gap in Congress, but more so to the tens of millions of people in the workforce who deserve to take home pay they have earned. This is not a gift. This is compensation based upon ability and contribution, not on gender.

In America today, a woman still earns on average just 82 cents to every dollar earned by a man. Mr. Chairman, has that been disputed on this floor? From women of color it is even worse. African-American women earn on average only 63 cents to the dollar, while Latinas see 55 cents for the same work.

For women who work full time, yearround, the gender pay gap represents a loss of more than, as the Speaker just said, $400,000. That ought to be unacceptable to all of us if we believe in equality.

This disparity does not only hurt women, it disadvantages their entire families, with women's pay critical to household incomes.

Two-thirds of women are now either the primary breadwinner or co-breadwinner of their households, and women's earnings are the main source of income in more than 4 in 10 households, 40 percent.

Now, the gentlewoman from North Carolina knows full well that historically we have underpaid women because we thought men were the breadwinners. They were the people who earned the money. They were the people who needed money so they could support their families. That is not true today, if it was ever true. Those households ought not to be disadvantaged because women are paid less for the same work as their male counterparts.

I mentioned in 1963 the promise we made as a Nation. In 2009, when I was majority leader for the first time, I was proud to bring the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to the floor and get it passed.

I congratulate ROSA DELAURO who is on the floor today, Mr. Speaker. She has been indefatigable and focused and untiring—I suppose that is redundant—in her efforts to ensure that women were treated equally. And one of the best ways to treat people equally is pay them the same thing for the same job.

The Paycheck Fairness Act builds on its success by making it harder for businesses to hide the underpayment of women in their employ through nondisclosure contracts and imposing new civil penalties for those who violate equal pay rules, among other beneficial provisions.

Now, this has been in effect for half a century, and we haven't gotten there. Do we need some, yeah, let's get it done, this is what the law said in 1963? And we really meant it. So let's carry that out so when the bipartisan, nonpartisan reports are made as to who is making what for the same job, it will come back men and women are getting the same pay for the same job with the same skills and the same seniority.

I hope the Senate will take up this long overdue legislation and pass it so President Biden can sign it into law and at long last make good on the promise of the Equal Pay Act nearly six decades ago.

I thank my friend, as I just did, ROSA DELAURO for the work she has done. I thank Ms. DELAURO on behalf of Susan, on behalf of Stefany, on behalf of Anne, my daughters, on behalf of Judy and Ava and Brooklyn and Savannah, my three great granddaughters and my granddaughter. What she has done, what we can do will make a difference for them, their families, and our country.

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

I thank the majority leader for his compliments of me. When Howard Coble first introduced me to the Republican Conference here he said, I was ''a feisty mountain woman from the Blue Ridge, who goes bear hunting with a switch.'' And so I have cherished that description of me over the years. I am a feisty woman because I grew up extraordinarily poor.

And the majority leader is correct, I would not tolerate discrimination against me. I won't tolerate discrimination against anyone. I abhor discrimination. I am also an Italian American. I abhor that kind of discrimination and have fought against that. I fought against racial discrimination. I doubt there are many people in this body that fought more against discrimination against women than I have or mentored more women than I have.

However, the majority leader also said something that made me think of the phrase, ''all things being equal.'' Well, rarely are all things equal. Obviously, when all things are equal, we want no discrimination, everybody to be treated the same. That is what I want.

I have one child, a daughter. I have two grandchildren, a grandson and a granddaughter. I certainly don't want either one of them discriminated against on the basis of anything.

But, I say to Mr. HOYER, yes, 82 cents has been disputed. We hear the same old tired ''statistics.'' They are not accurate. So let's stop doing that. Let's deal with the facts.

H.R. 7 is not the answer to discrimination. It is going to make it more difficult for employers to create jobs and to pay women and everybody equally. We need alternatives and we have one.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCEACHIN). The gentleman from Virginia has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

□ 1345

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me that in 2021 we are still having this debate on whether men and women are paid equally. And I just want to say to my colleague on the other side, being a Black woman in America, I can tell you I do not feel that she has had the discrimination and the disrespect in the pay scale that women of color have experienced. And during the brunt of this pandemic where women are in the forefront, those who are frontline workers, the service industry—predominantly women. Paycheck fairness corrects this injustice by allowing women to challenge pay discrimination and hold employers accountable.

Many in this Chamber like to talk about leveling the playing field for all Americans. Then let's do it by passing this bill. And in America, when you walk in the room as a woman, you know you have overcome and you have work to do. And please don't continue to disrespect us by saying that everything is okay. In your world it may be, but today we can correct that.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have never said everything is perfectly okay. I said this bill is not the answer to what issues may still exist out there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), and applaud her for how she has handled herself in the past few months through all the turmoil and all of the challenges she has had.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Federation of Independent Businesses opposing H.R. 7.

NFIB,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2021.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT AND RANKING MEMBER FOXX: On behalf of NFIB, the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I write in opposition to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This legislation will add significant burdens to small businesses and potentially expose them to frivolous lawsuits.

NFIB and its members believe in equal pay for equal work. However, NFIB does not believe that this legislation is the solution. H.R. 7 will make legitimate business-related pay differences difficult to defend in court, invite frivolous lawsuits against small business owners by allowing unlimited compensatory and punitive damages in equal pay lawsuits, and significantly increase small business paperwork burdens.

This legislation would make it nearly impossible for a small employer to defend against claims where an ''alternative employment practice'' exists and could serve the same business purpose without producing a wage differential. Even if an employer were to demonstrate that a legitimate factor such as education, training, or experience accounted for a wage differential, an employee could claim that an ''alternative employment practice'' existed and that the employer refused to adopt such a practice. For example, an employee of a small, local hardware store would be able to sue an employer for refusing to adopt a business practice that a much larger company uses to address wage discrepancies. Forcing one-size-fits-all legislation on small, independent businesses puts them at a significant disadvantage relative to their larger competitors. A small business may have legitimate reasons for not adopting the practices of a large business. However, if an employee can prove that the independent business refused to adopt the ''alternative employment practice'' of a large competitor, the small business automatically loses the suit.

This legislation also prohibits an employer from asking a prospective employee about wage history and prohibits an employer from relying on wage history in determining wages. These prohibitions create a very difficult situation for small business owners. A person's written resume is only one aspect of the application process; a person's salary history is another essential part of gauging professional growth and development. If the needs of a prospective employee and the wants of a business do not match, the prospective employee and the business should be able to discern this sooner rather than later to avoid wasting each party's time and energy. By eliminating salary history, the hiring process becomes less precise and more difficult for small employers.

This bill also puts significant paperwork burdens on small business owners. It requires the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to issue regulations providing for the collection of employers' compensation data. Most small business owners do not have a human resources department or a full-time staff member in charge of reporting and compliance. NFIB members find unreasonable government regulations to be their sixth biggest problem and federal paperwork to be their 15th biggest problem when ranking their top 75 problems and priorities.

NFIB strongly opposes H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, urges the committee to oppose the legislation in its current form.

Sincerely,

KEVIN KUHLMAN,
Vice President,
Federal Government Relations.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to introduce this as a small business owner myself. The NFIB letter says: H.R. 7 will add significant burdens to small businesses and potentially expose them to frivolous lawsuits. In addition, the bill will make legitimate business-related pay differences difficult to defend in court, invite frivolous lawsuits against small business owners by allowing unlimited compensatory and punitive damages in equal pay lawsuits, and significantly increase small business paperwork burdens.

Moreover, the NFIB letter says that H.R. 7 will make it nearly impossible for a small employer to defend against claims where an alternative employment practice exists and could serve the same business purpose without producing the wage differential.

The letter also highlights the significant paperwork burdens H.R. 7 would place on small businesses who do not have a human resources department, a full-time staff member in charge, or attorneys for reporting and compliance.

Mr. Speaker, having been a small business owner and supported by the small business owners, and during the pandemic when it is so necessary for us to get our small businesses up and operating, I urge my colleagues to take these views of small business owners into consideration before they vote on H.R. 7.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS).

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not just about the past, it is about the future. Gender-based wage discrimination exists in every State and in many industries.

In the tech industry, which has a huge presence in my district in North Carolina's Research Triangle, women typically make thousands of dollars less than men in the same roles. Unsurprisingly, women in tech often leave the industry due to unfair compensation, much to that industry's detriment.

Pay inequity also follows women into retirement. Women have, on average, only 70 percent of the retirement income men have.

One of the best ways we can help close the wage gap is through salary negotiation training, which is one of the key provisions of this bill.

I am thankful to groups like Ladies Get Paid and countless others working to empower women to help them advocate for their work.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill for the sake of future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the National Council of Jewish Women.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our 180,000 members, advocates, and supporters, National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) urges you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) without amendments that limit its scope or undermine its critical protections.

NCJW is a grassroots organization of volunteers and advocates who turn progressive ideals into action. Inspired by Jewish values, NCJW strives for social justice by improving the quality of life for women, children, and families and by safeguarding individual rights and freedoms. The Torah compels us tzedek, tzedek tirdof—to pursue justice. To that end, we advocate for employment laws, policies, and practices that provide equal pay and benefits for work of comparable worth and equal opportunities for advancement.

Nearly 60 years after passage of the landmark Equal Pay Act, the gender way gap persists. Overall, women earn only 82 cents for every dollar earned by men, and the gap is much wider for women of color (Black women earn 63 cents, Indigenous women earn 60 cents, Latinas earn 55 cents, and some Asian American and Pacific Islander women earn only 52 cents). Earnings lost to these gaps are exacerbating the financial effects of COVID–19, falling particularly heavily on women of color and the families who depend on their income.

The Paycheck Fairness Act, which has been passed three previous times by the House of Representatives, mostly recently in the 116th Congress, offers a much needed update to the Equal Pay Act of 1963 by providing new tools to battle pervasive pay gaps and to challenge discrimination.

We cannot build back an economy that works for everyone without ensuring that all women can work with equality, safety, and dignity, starting with pay equity. Passing the Paycheck Fairness Act would mark a vitally important step toward ensuring this becomes reality. I ask you to vote YES on the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) without amendments that limit its scope or undermine its critical protections.

Sincerely,

JODY RABHAN,
Chief Policy Officer,
National Council of Jewish Women.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH).

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of YWCA USA, I include in the RECORD a letter of support for H.R. 7.

YWCA,
April 13, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: 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 the Representative to support the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and vote no on harmful amendments. As the economy continues to struggle under the weight of the COVID–19 pandemic disproportionately affecting women and marginalized communities, there is no better time to take action to improve the economic security of women and families and strengthen our economy. I urge you to pass this bill without amendments that limit its scope or undermines its critical protections.

For over 160 years, YWCA has been on a mission to eliminate racism, empower women, and promote peace, justice, freedom, and dignity for all. From our earliest days providing skills and housing support to women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to civil rights, from affordable housing to pay equity, from violence prevention to health care reform. Today, we serve over 2 million women, girls and family members of all ages and backgrounds in more than 1,200 communities each year.

Informed by our extensive history, the expertise of our nationwide network, and our collective commitment to advocating for the equity of women and families, we believe that no one should have to choose between their livelihoods and their health, family, or safety. Yet far too women and families, including a disproportionate number of women and families of color, must make this choice every day. This has become more clear as the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic become more transparent. The impact of the pandemic has fallen heavily on women and women of color. Women are especially likely to be essential workers, but they are also bearing the brunt of job losses, while shouldering increased caregiving responsibilities that have pushed millions out of the workforce entirely, resulting in an economic ''Shesession''. Black women, Latinas, and other women of color are especially likely to be on the front lines of the crisis, risking their lives in jobs in health care, child care, and grocery stores, all while being paid less than their male counterparts.

The bipartisan Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) would help close longstanding gender and racial wage gaps by updating and strengthening the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and ensure robust protections against sex-based pay discrimination. Today, on average, women in the United States earn only 82 cents for every dollar paid to men, amounting to an annual gender wage gap of $10,157. Unfortunately, this gap is worse for women of color. Among women who hold full-time, year-round jobs in the United States, Black women are typically paid 63 cents, Native American women 60 cents and Latinas just 55 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men. White, non-Hispanic women are paid 79 cents and Asian American women 87 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men, and Asian American and Pacific Islander women of some ethnic and national backgrounds fare much worse. The COVID–19 global pandemic has exposed deepening economic disparities, further unveiling how the work performed primarily by women, and particularly women of color, has long been and continues to be undervalued and underpaid. It is time Congress addressed these deepening disparities and take steps towards real economic change for women by passing the Paycheck Fairness Act. We cannot afford to shortchange women as a result of persistent gender pay gaps and we urge the Representative to pass this bill without delay.

YWCA USA urges the Representative to protect women's economic security and pass the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) and take critical steps towards strengthening women's economic security, particularly at a time when the country begins to recover from the COVID–19 pandemic. At this pivotal moment, Congress must take aggressive action to address the economic disparities disproportionately affecting women and women of color. We urge you to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) without harmful amendments that weaken its critical protections.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

ELISHA RHODES,
Interim CEO & Chief Operating Officer.

Ms. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, St. Louis and I rise in full support of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

As a nurse, I earned around 60 percent of what my White male counterparts in the same position earned. I have often imagined how many people in my district experienced the same burdens, like how much overtime and missing wages we could have accrued every single month.

We have been chronically underpaid and chronically undervalued. I have stood up to fight for underpaid nurses before and I stand here today to fight for underpaid women, especially women of color everywhere.

Pay Black, pay Brown, pay indigenous, pay AAPI women what we're worth. Run us our money and run us our money now.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for leading and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

It has been more than five decades since the passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, yet a woman still earns only 82 cents on average for every dollar earned by her male counterpart. Women of color fare much worse. The Paycheck Fairness Act will ensure equal pay for equal work. It is just that simple and it is just that overdue. Gender and racial pay gaps persist, and earnings lost to these gaps are felt even more during the COVID–19 pandemic. This falls most heavily on women.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will update and strengthen the Equal Pay Act to help close this gap. Pay inequities not only affect women, it affects children and their families. Though we have made strides in the past, we know the issue of equal pay persists.

We must not pass this inequity on. I want my granddaughters, Aubrey and Ella, as well as my grandson, Sawyer, to live in a country where equal pay for equal work is the norm.

I thank chairwoman and champion ROSA DELAURO.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, did you know that over 40 percent of mothers are sole or primary breadwinners for their families? It has been over 50 years since the Equal Pay Act was signed into law, yet the problems that preceded that legislation remain today. So it is time for the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Mr. Speaker, across the country, women are paid 80 cents to the dollar that men are paid, and the number is significantly lower for women of color. Black women make roughly 60 percent to the dollar. Native-American women make about 57 cents. And Latina women make just over 50 to the dollar.

The discriminatory wage gap is costing women thousands of dollars a year for doing the exact same work as their male counterparts. And I see this right here in my community and my district where women are forced to work longer hours, harder, just to make ends meet and put food on the table for their families.

My community is one of the poorest in the Nation, and the wage gap is one of the biggest factors for families who are really trying to get out of the cycle of poverty and get the support for their children so they can thrive.

I am grateful to my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor for bringing this long overdue legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia and thank him for his leadership—also, the Speaker and the ranking member.

According to the National Women's Law Center, based on today's wage gap, a woman who works full-time year-round would typically lose $406,280 over her 40-year career. This means a woman making the median national salary for women would have to work almost 9 years longer than her male counterpart.

Mr. Speaker, 58 years after the enactment of the Equal Pay Act, full-time working women still earn 82 cents on average for every dollar a man earns, amounting to a yearly gap of almost $20,000. They, too, raise children. They, too, have overhead.

In this pandemic year, we have found that 2 million women have lost their jobs. We know that Hispanic women earn 55 cents, Native-American women 60 cents, and African-American women, on average, only 63 cents.

It is time now to put this paycheck fairness bill on the desk of the President of the United States. It modernizes and strengthens the Equal Pay Act, which is what the Lilly Ledbetter Act was, and brings the country one step closer to ensuring that women can receive equal pay for equal work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor, a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary, on Homeland Security, on the Budget, and a member of the Democratic Working Women's Task Force, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7, the landmark Paycheck Fairness Act, which strengthens and closes loopholes in the 1963 Equal Pay Act, including providing effective remedies for workers who are not being paid equal pay for equal work.

I thank my colleague, the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations, Congresswoman DELAURO, for introducing the Paycheck Fairness Act in every Congress since 1997, which enabled me join her as an original cosponsor all during those years as we fought shoulder to shoulder for women's equality and empowerment.

Mr. Speaker, in January 2009, the Democratic-led 111th Congress sent to the President's desk the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the first bill signed into law by President Obama, which restored the critical rights of workers to challenge unfair pay in court.

Now, a Democratic-led House will push for enactment of another critical fair pay bill—the Paycheck Fairness Act that strengthens current law.

When House has been controlled by a Democratic majority, the Paycheck Fairness Act has passed several times—including in the 110th Congress, the 111th Congress, and the 116th Congress, when it passed by a bipartisan vote of 242 to 187 on March 27, 2019, before dying in then-Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL'S legislative graveyard.

This is the year to finish the job and send this critical legislation all the to President Biden's desk for signature.

Mr. Speaker, as every woman Member of Congress knows, as our mother, sisters, daughters, and sorors in the workplace know all too well, the impact of the wage gap grows throughout a woman's career.

According to the National Women's Law Center, based on today's wage gap, a woman who worked full-time, year-round would typically lose $406,280 over a 40-year career.

This means a woman making the median national salary for women would have to work almost nine years longer than her male counterpart to make up this lifetime wage gap.

Mr. Speaker, 58 years after the enactment of the Equal Pay Act, full-time working women still earn just 82 cents, on average, for every dollar a man earns, amounting to a yearly gap of $10,157 between full-time working men and women.

The wage gap is also even larger for women of color.

Hispanic women on average earn only 55 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men.

Native American women on average earn only 60 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men.

African American women on average earn only 63 cents for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men.

The National Partnership for Women and Families has calculated that $10,157 for a median family in America means more than 9 additional months of rent or 13 additional months of childcare.

Indeed, if women were paid the same as men, the poverty rate for all working women would be cut in half and the poverty rate for working single mothers would be cut by nearly half.

Because of loopholes in the law and weak sanctions for violations, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 has not provided the tools to truly combat unequal pay.

The Paycheck Fairness Act modernizes and strengthens the Equal Pay Act and brings the country one step closer to ensuring that women receive equal pay for equal work in the following ways:

1. Requires employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons and puts the burden on employers to show the disparity is not sex-based, but job-related and necessary;

2. Bans retaliation against workers who voluntarily discuss or disclose their wages;

3. Ensures women receive the same robust remedies for sex-based pay discrimination available to those subjected to discrimination based on race and national origin;

4. Removes obstacles in the Equal Pay Act to facilitate a wronged worker's participation in class action lawsuits that challenge systemic pay discrimination;

5. Makes improvements in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC's) and the Department of Labor's tools for enforcing the Equal Pay Act;

6. Provides assistance to all businesses to help them with their equal pay practices, recognizes excellence in pay practices by businesses, and empowers women and girls by creating a negotiation skills training program; and

7. Prohibits employers from seeking salary history in determining future pay, so that pay discrimination does not follow women from job to job.

Finally, equal pay is not simply a women's issue, but a family issue.

Two-thirds of mothers are either the sole breadwinner or a co-breadwinner in the household, so their earnings are vital to their families.

When women bring home less money each day, it means they have less for the everyday needs of their families—groceries, rent, childcare, and doctors' visits.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is strongly endorsed by a coalition of more than 200 organizations, including AAUW, National Women's Law Center, National Partnership for Women and Families, National Organization for Women, National Committee on Pay Equity, MomsRising, UltraViolet, Center for Law and Social Policy, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, NAACP, League of Women Voters, U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, AFL–CIO, SEIU, United Steelworkers, AFSCME, American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, American Psychological Association, Anti-Defamation League, and many more.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act of 2021, to ensure effective remedies for workers who are not being paid equal pay for equal work.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. Women, in terms of employment and pay, have made great strides in this country. When I was graduating from high school, basically there were three open professions for women: nursing, teaching, and being a secretary. We have come a long way. We have also come a long way in terms of wages.

Do we have ways to go in this country in terms of the way everybody thinks about people who are different from them? We certainly do. Republicans and Democrats both agree that pay discrimination is repugnant and illegal. I will say it again and again. It is repugnant and illegal.

Despite misguided claims from the other side, this underlying principle is not up for debate. Women should not be paid less than men for equal work.

However, Republicans are not in the business of passing radical and prescriptive bills just to get flashy headlines and score cheap political points.

We are equally committed to promoting both fairness and strong policymaking, and when judged by these standards, today's bill falls woefully short. Pay discrimination is illegal.

You know, we have really heard nothing about the inadequacies of the current law or the current processes. What we have heard is that we need new legislation. Republicans disagree with that. Again, we want pay discrimination to be illegal and we want any such cases to be treated seriously and to be looked at. This bill offers no new protection against pay discrimination in the workplace, however. And that is sorely lacking in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7 is nothing more than a trial lawyer payout at the expense of hardworking women. I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time to secure equal pay for equal work. Over the past year, the COVID–19 pandemic has driven over 2 million women out of the workforce. As women return to the workplace, failure to strengthen the equal pay protections will exacerbate and entrench the gender wage gap for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that discrimination exists. The Paycheck Fairness Act will allow victims the tools they need to combat and also close loopholes that allows employers to escape liability for discriminatory pay differences.

Today, we are talking about financial security for millions of families. Sixty-four percent of mothers are either the sole family breadwinner or co-breadwinner. We cannot continue to allow gender-based pay inequity to rob half of all workers and their families the wages they deserve.

The Paycheck Fairness Act is our chance to finally help close the gender wage gap by reinforcing the Equal Pay Act and strengthening protections for working women. The bill would ensure that gender equality on the job is not an aspiration but a reality.

Madam Speaker, I ask our colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I have strongly supported the Paycheck Fairness Act and have done so for over two decades.

When the legislation finally got a vote in the House in 2008, I voted ''yes'' I voted ''yes'' again in 2009 and 2019. I have cosponsored the Paycheck Fairness Act since 2015.

In January, I again enthusiastically cosponsored H.R. 7—the Paycheck Fairness Act.

In late March, however, H.R. 7 was radically altered during markup in the Education and Labor Committee with a new definition of ''sex'' that according to serious legal analysis will compel employers to subsidize abortion on demand.

Because I respect the inherent dignity and value of unborn baby girls and boys who will be put at grave risk of death by dismemberment abortion and chemical poisoning if H.R 7 is enacted in its current form, I will vote ''no'' today.

In a letter dated April 14, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops said: ''H.R. 7 would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). The FLSA, among other things, prohibits unequal wages between men and women performing equal work. 29 U.S.C. § 206(d)(l). Wages include all forms of remuneration, including ''frinqe benefits'' such as ''medical, hospital, [and] accident . . . insurance,'' ''life insurance,'' ''retirement benefits,'' and ''leave.'' 29 C.F.R. 1620.10, 1620.11.

''Strengthening federal law to ensure equal compensation for equal work as between men and women is a laudable legislative goal, and we heartily endorse that goal . . . Unfortunately, H.R. 7 has moved in a different direction . . . We believe that if the bill were to pass, the Fair Labor Standards Act could be construed to require employers, including even religious organizations, to cover and pay for abortions . . . we urge members to oppose the redefinition of sex in H.R. 7 and instead revert to the version of the bill that passed the House in the 116th Congress.''

The National Right to Life Committee opposed the redefinition of ''sex'' and opposes the bill. They said in a letter: ''H.R. 7 makes definitional changes to sex to include pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition. It is well established that abortion will be regarded as a ''related medical condition.'' See 29C.F.R.pt.1604 App.(1986) and Doe v. CARS Protection Plus, Inc., 527F.3d 358 (3dCir.2008).

''Historically, when Congress has addressed discrimination based on sex, rules of construction have been added to prevent requiring funding of abortion. Since there is no rule of construction that would make this legislation abortion-neutral, it is likely that H.R. 7 could be used to sue employers for a lack of elective abortion coverage.''

In like manner, the Susan B. Anthony List opposes the bill noting that H.R. 7 amends the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 by adding ''pregnancy childbirth, or a related medical condition'' to the definition of ''sex,'' which courts have interpreted broadly to include abortion.''

Other pro-life organizations urged a ''no'' vote including March for Life Action.

Madam Speaker, underscoring my commitment to the legislation without the redefinition of the term ''sex'', yesterday I introduced H.R 2490—the Paycheck Fairness Act with the identical H.R. 7 language from January.

H.R. 2490 is needed to ensure that the noble goals embedded in the landmark law, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, are achieved.

Among its provisions H.R. 2490:

Prohibits employers from seeking the salary history of prospective employees. By banning reliance on salary history in determining future pay, the bill ensures that prior pay discrimination doesn't follow workers from job to job.

Bans retaliation against workers who discuss their wages.

Improves research on the gender pay gap. The bill instructs DOL to conduct studies and review available research and data to provide information on how to identify, correct, and eliminate illegal wage disparities.

Requires the collection of wage data from federal contractors and directs the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to

conduct a survey of available wage information and create a system of wage data in order to help the Department of Labor uncover wage discrimination.

Provides a small business exception. The Equal Pay Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act have an exemption for small businesses that generate less than $500,000 in annual revenues a year, and the Paycheck Fairness Act would keep that exemption intact.

Supports small businesses with technical assistance.

Provides assistance to all businesses to help them with their equal pay practices, recognize excellence in pay practices by businesses, and empower workers by creating a negotiation skills training program.

I include in the RECORD the following letters of opposition.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE
OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write to raise pro-life and other concerns about the Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 7.

H.R. 7 would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. The FLSA, among other things, prohibits unequal wages between men and women performing equal work. 29 U.S.C. §206(d)(1). Wages include all forms of remuneration, including ''fringe benefits'' such as ''medical, hospital, [and] accident . . . insurance,'' ''life insurance,'' ''retirement benefits,'' and ''leave.'' 29 C.F.R. §§1620.10, 1620.11.

Strengthening federal law to ensure equal compensation for equal work as between men and women is a laudable legislative goal, and we heartily endorse that goal. See Economic Justice for All, no. 167 (1986), (''Particular attention is needed to achieve pay equity between men and women''); Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church, no. 295 (2004) (''An urgent need to recognize effectively the rights of women in the workplace is seen especially under the aspects of pay, insurance and social security.''); Pope Francis, Audience with Delegates from the Confederation of Trade Unions in Italy (June 28, 2017) (''And what I am about to say may seem obvious, but in the world of work women are still in second class. You might say, 'No, but there is that businesswoman, that other one . . .'; yes, but if women earn less, are more easily exploited . . . do something.''). Indeed, Congress could do more in this area.

Unfortunately, H.R. 7 has moved in a different direction. On March 24, the House Committee on Education and Labor marked up the bill to redefine the term .. ''sex'' to include such items as ''sex stereotypes,'' ''pregnancy, child birth, or a related medical condition,'' ''sexual orientation.'' ''gender identity,'' and ''sex characteristics. including intersex traits.''

H.R. 7's redefinition of sex in the FLSA is seriously problematic. We believe that if the bill were to pass, the FLSA could be construed to require employers, including even religious organizations, to (a) cover and pay for abortions, contraceptives, and gender transition procedures in their health plans (b) treat same-sex civil marriages as equivalent to traditional marriages in the provision of spousal benefits, and (c) facilitate abortions and gender transition procedures by providing paid leave for that purpose as part of existing paid leave programs. In this way, the bill would require many religious organizations to be involved in and to approve things they sincerely believe are wrong.

Some may argue that Title VII already imposes all or some of these requirements. That argument—in addition to rendering the redefinition of ''sex'' in this bill seemingly redundant in whole or in part—overlooks the fact that Title VII has religious exemptions and abortion-neutral language that are not found in the FLSA. The Supreme Court has put off to another day the resolution of the question of exactly how the sex discrimination provisions of Title VII intersect with the religious convictions of employers. Bostock v. Clayton County. 140 S. Ct. 1731, 1753–54 (2020). H.R. 7 would raise a similar question but in a different statutory setting, one in which the critical religious exemptions and abortion-neutral language of Title VII are entirely missing.

For these reasons, we urge members to oppose the redefinition of sex in H.R. 7 and instead revert to the version of the bill that passed the House in the 116th Congress.

Sincerely.

HIS EMINENCE TIMOTHY CARDINAL DOLAN,
Archbishop of New York, Chairman, Committee for Religious Liberty.

MOST REVEREND PAUL S. COAKLEY,
Archbishop of Oklahoma City, Chairman, Committee on Domestic Justice And Human Development.

MOST REVEREND JOSEPH F. NAUMANN,
Archbishop of Kansas City in Kansas, Chairman, Committee on Pro-Life Activities.

MOST REV. DAVID A. KONDERLA,
Bishop of Tulsa, Chairman, Subcommittee for the Promotion, and Defense of Marriage.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO
LIFE COMMITTEE, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, April 13, 2021.

Re In Opposition to the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7).

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This week, the House will consider the Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7). While the legislation is meant to address potential discrimination regarding the gender pay gap, the legislation was amended to contain language that could be construed to require employers to cover elective abortion in their healthcare benefits.

Because of this change, National Right to Life urges you to oppose the bill and reserves the right to include a House roll call on this measure in our scorecard of key pro-life votes of the 117th Congress.

H.R. 7 states that it constitutes discrimination to provide disparate wages based on sex, and the legislation creates more opportunities to seek remedies for those challenging compensation. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has defined equal pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to include all forms of compensation, including healthcare benefits.

H.R. 7 makes definitional changes to ''sex'' to include ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.'' It is well established that abortion will be regarded as a ''related medical condition.'' See 29 C.F.R. pt. 1604 App. (1986) and Doe v. CARS Protection Plus, Inc., 527 F.3d 358 (3d Cir. 2008).

Historically, when Congress has addressed discrimination based on sex, rules of construction have been added to prevent requiring funding of abortion. Since there is no rule of construction that would make this legislation abortion-neutral, it is likely that H.R. 7 could be used to sue employers for a lack of elective abortion coverage.

Under H.R. 7, a person could make a claim that an employer's failure to provide health coverage for abortion is discriminatory if an employer provides health coverage for male-specific items.

For the reasons above, National Right to Life opposes the current version of H.R. 7 and reserves the right to include a House roll call on this measure in our scorecard of key pro-life votes of the 117th Congress.

Should you have any questions, please contact us.

Thank you for your consideration of NRLC's position on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

CAROL TOBIAS,
President.
DAVID N. O'STEEN, Ph.D.,
Executive Director.
JENNIFER POPIK, J.D.,
Legislative Director.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY LIST,
April 13, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write to advise you that Susan B. Anthony List, on behalf of our more than 900,000 members, opposes H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which was amended at the last minute to add a definition of sex that could force employers to cover elective abortion through employee benefits under the guise of fairness.

H.R. 7 amends the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 by adding ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition'' to the definition of ''sex,'' which courts have interpreted broadly to include abortion.

The abortion implications are buried in layers of court interpretations and regulations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The Fair Labor Standards Act (FSLA) prohibits sex discrimination in the area of employee wages. And while the FSLA does not explicitly include benefits like health coverage in its definition of wages, the EEOC has interpreted wages to include benefits. The EEOC states that the Equal Pay Act, part of the FSLA, ''requires that men and women in the same workplace be given equal pay for equal work.'' The Department of Labor and the EEOC further stipulate that equal pay includes benefits, and the EEOC allows a person to go straight to court with claims this provision has been violated. There is nothing preventing a person from claiming sex discrimination if an employer provides health coverage for all of men's health services but does not pay for coverage for abortion services for women.

When the terms ''pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical condition'' were used in the Pregnancy Discrimination Act four decades ago, the terms were accompanied by language stating that employers could not be forced to cover abortion in health insurance benefits except to save the life of the mother. While H.R. 7 does not override that limited safeguard, it does fail to extend equivalent safeguards to address its much broader, more sweeping reach. Without abortion neutral language in H.R. 7, this legislation opens the door for employers to be sued for sex discrimination by simply refraining from funding abortion on demand in employee health plans.

Susan B. Anthony List opposes and will score against H.R. 7.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE DANNENFELSER,
President.

MARCH FOR LIFE ACTION,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2021.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of March for Life Action and the millions of pro-life Americans who march to end abortion, I am writing to voice our opposition to H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. While March for Life Action has no position on the original bill, inexplicably the bill language was changed this Congress to include troubling language that seems to have the singular purpose of promoting abortion.

The definition included in Section 2 includes ''pregnancy or related medical condition,'' which amends the Equal Pay Act portion of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This law states that it constitutes discrimination to provide different wages to individuals based on sex. The EEOC defines equal pay under the FLSA/Equal Pay Act to mean all forms of compensation, including benefits.

By stating that ''sex'' includes ''pregnancy or related medical condition,'' the bill establishes the expectation that women will be given ''equal benefits'' related to pregnancy and abortion. The legislation gives power to the Federal government to use its full force to attack health care providers, including businesses, which do not include full abortion coverage in their plans, and be subject to the enhanced penalties laid out in the bill.

Clearly this legislation is not about fairness, however it is pushing a radical abortion scheme that is opposed by most Americans. For these reasons, March for Life Action will score against H.R. 7 in our annual scorecard for the 117th Congress.

Sincerely,

THOMAS MCCLUSKY,
President, March for Life Action.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the passage of H.R. 7, the Paycheck Fairness Act. This landmark legislation, of which I am a proud cosponsor, will close loopholes in the Equal Pay Act to better protect and promote effective remedies for workers still subject to inequitable and insufficient pay.

Signed into law by President John F. Kennedy in 1963, the Equal Pay Act was the first anti-discrimination law addressing wage differences at the federal level. Now, half a century after its enactment, women and minorities still face significant wage disparities despite making great strides in the workforce. According to a study conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, the median earnings for women in Texas is $36k, compared to the median earnings of $46k for men. Across the Nation, women are only earning on average 82 cents for every dollar a man makes in similar, full-time positions. The differences are only exacerbated when you take into consideration that Black women make 63 cents, Native American women 60 cents, and Hispanic women 55 cents.

As the first Black woman elected in Dallas and someone who has worked in fields dominated by men, I have witnessed and experienced firsthand the biases and hardships that women and minorities face in our workforce. That is why I am proud to announce that the advances made in this legislation are wide-ranging and significant. The Paycheck Fairness Act will protect working women against retaliation for discussing salaries, prohibit employers from screening job applicants based on their salary history, and finally require employers to prove that pay disparities exist for legitimate, job-related reasons. Additionally, this effort will make improvements to the tools available to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Department of Labor to enforce the Equal Pay Act.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the Democratic Women's Caucus, I am committed to advancing the professional development and financial security of women and minorities in our workforce. That is why I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the Paycheck Fairness Act, a bill I'm proud to have voted for in the previous Congress.

Today, women make up the majority of the college-educated workforce, yet only earn approximately 82 percent of what men earn. For women of color, the pay gap is even worse.

This legislation is critical because it makes significant progress in eliminating pay discrimination against women by providing them the necessary protections and tools to combat sex-based pay discrimination.

Simply put, ensuring that one half of the workforce is paid as much for the same job as the other half is a matter of basic rights and fairness. Women deserve better, and I look forward to voting for this bill once again.

□ 1400

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

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–15 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 303, 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 Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 117–15, 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 Education and Labor 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. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 303, I rise to 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, 5, and 6, printed in part B of House Report 117–15, offered by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER OF VIRGINIA

In subsection (f) as added to section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the amendment made by section 7 of the bill, strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall provide for the annual collection from employers of compensation data disaggregated by the sex, race, and national origin of employees. The Commission may also require employers to submit other employment-related data (including hiring, termination, and promotion data) so disaggregated.

At the end of subparagraph (2) of subsection (f) as added to section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the amendment made by section 7 of the bill, strike the last sentence and insert the following:

The Commission shall also consider factors including the imposition of burdens on employers, the frequency of required reports (including the size of employers required to prepare reports), appropriate protections for maintaining data confidentiality, and the most effective format to report such data.

In paragraph (3) of subsection (f) as added to section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the amendment made by section 7 of the bill, strike ''(3)'' and all that follows through subparagraph (C), and insert the following:

''(3)(A) For each 12-month reporting period for an employer, the data collected under paragraph (1) shall include compensation data disaggregated by the categories described in subparagraph (E).

''(B) For the purposes of collecting the disaggregated compensation data described in subparagraph (A), the Commission may use compensation ranges reporting—

''(i) the number of employees of the employer who earn compensation in an amount that falls within such compensation range; and

''(ii) the total number of hours worked by such employees.

''(C) If the Commission uses compensation ranges to collect the pay data described in subparagraph (A), the Commission may adjust such compensation ranges—

''(i) if the Commission determines that such adjustment is necessary to enhance enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting pay discrimination; or

''(ii) for inflation, in consultation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.''.

In subparagraph (D) of subsection (f)(3) as added to section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the amendment made by section 7 of the bill, strike ''shall'' and insert ''may''.

In subparagraph (G) of subsection (f)(3) as added to section 709 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the amendment made by section 7 of the bill, strike ''annually'' and insert ''at 18-month intervals''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. NEWMAN OF ILLINOIS

Page 28, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 12. NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each employer shall post and keep posted, in conspicuous places on the premises of the employer where notices to employees are customarily posted, a notice, to be prepared or approved by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Secretary of Labor, of the requirements described in this Act (or the amendments made by such Act).

(b) RELATION TO EXISTING NOTICES.—The notice under subsection (a) may be incorporated into notices required of the employer as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) DIGITAL NOTICE.—With respect to the notice under subsection (a), each employer shall—

(1) post electronic copies of the notice on an internal website to which employees have access; and

(2) notify employees on such internal website of the location of the place on the premises where the notice is posted.

Page 28, beginning on line 18, redesignate sections 12 and 13 as sections 13 and 14, respectively.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ OF NEW YORK

On page 12, after line 15, insert the following:

(a) NEGOTIATION BIAS TRAINING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish a program to award contracts and grants for the purpose of training employers about the role that salary negotiation and other inconsistent wage setting practices can have on allowing bias to enter compensation.

(2) TRAINING TOPICS.—Each training program established using funds under section (a) shall include an overview of how structural issues may cause inequitable earning and advancement opportunities for women and people of color and assist employers in examining the impact of a range of practices on such opportunities, including—

(A) self-auditing to identify structural issues that allow bias and inequity to enter compensation;

(B) recruitment of candidates to ensure diverse pools of applicants;

(C) salary negotiations that result in similarly qualified workers entering at different rates of pay;

(D) internal equity among workers with similar skills, effort, responsibility and working conditions;

(E) consistent use of market rates and incentives driven by industry competitiveness;

(F) evaluation of the rate of employee progress and advancement to higher paid positions;

(G) work assignments that result in greater opportunity for advancement;

(H) training, development and promotion opportunities;

(I) impact of mid-level or senior level hiring in comparison to wage rates of incumbent workers;

(J) opportunities to win commissions and bonuses;

(K) performance reviews and raises;

(L) processes for adjusting pay to address inconsistency and inequity in compensation; and

(M) other topics that research identifies as a common area for assumptions, bias and inequity to impact compensation.

On page 12, line 16, strike ''(a)'' and insert ''(b)''.

On page 13, line 19, strike ''(b)'' and insert ''(c)''.

On page 14, line 12, strike ''(c)'' and insert ''(d)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF NEW YORK

Page 16, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 18, line 6, and insert the following:

(b) RESEARCH ON GENDER PAY GAP IN TEENAGE LABOR FORCE.—

(1) RESEARCH REVIEW.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Director of the Women's Bureau, shall conduct a review and develop a synthesis of research on the gender wage gap among younger workers existing as of the date of enactment of this Act, and shall make such review and synthesis available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Labor.

(2) AUTHORITY TO COMMISSION STUDIES.—Not later than 36 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Director of the Women's Bureau, shall request proposals and commission studies that can advance knowledge on the gender wage gap among younger workers, and shall make such studies available on a publicly accessible website of the Department of Labor.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. WILLIAMS OF GEORGIA

Page 27, after line 16, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 10. NATIONAL EQUAL PAY ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established the National Equal Pay Enforcement Task Force, consisting of representatives from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, and the Office of Personnel Management.

(b) MISSION.—In order to improve compliance, public education, and enforcement of equal pay laws, the National Equal Pay Enforcement Task Force will ensure that the agencies in subsection (a) are coordinating efforts and limiting potential gaps in enforcement.

(c) DUTIES.—The National Equal Pay Enforcement Task Force shall investigate challenges related to pay inequity pursuant to its mission in subsection (b), advance recommendations to address those challenges, and create action plans to implement the recommendations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, these amendments will: require the EEOC to provide for the collection of annual compensation data for employees disaggregated by race, sex, and national origin; add a requirement that employers post notices and distribute information electronically informing employees of their rights under this act; direct the Department of Labor establish a program to award grants to employers to engage in training and conduct self-audits to identify and reduce bias in pay practices; direct the Secretary of Labor to conduct a study and a research literature review of gender wage gap in the teenage workforce; and reestablish the National Equal Pay Equity Task Force that had been set up under the Obama administration to coordinate efforts between the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, and the Office of Personnel Management.

These amendments will make meaningful improvements to the bill, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on the en bloc amendments. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the en bloc amendments.

Madam Speaker, in America, discriminating in pay based on sex is illegal, as codified in the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act.

Democrats claim H.R. 7 will improve upon these bipartisan laws to create new opportunities for women to fight pay discrimination. What H.R. 7 actually does is create new opportunities for trial lawyers to earn higher paychecks while offering no new protections for pay discrimination in the workplace.

Unfortunately, I cannot support any of the Democrat amendments to H.R. 7 because none of them addresses the numerous unworkable and onerous provisions in the bill.

I appreciate that Representative BEYER's amendment recognizes the very serious problems with H.R. 7 by attempting to place a fig leaf on the expansive government data collection mandate in the bill. However, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEOC, is still required to implement the draconian data collection scheme in the underlying bill, which is still extremely misguided, expensive, and unnecessary.

H.R. 7 requires business owners to submit reams of pay data to the EEOC disaggregated by job category, race, sex, and ethnicity. Moreover, the collection mandate also includes other employment-related data, including hiring, termination, and promotion data, which even the discredited 2016 Obama administration pay data collection scheme did not include.

The data collection mandate in H.R. 7 raises several concerns.

First, it puts at risk volumes of highly confidential pay data involving millions of individual workers. We all know of the widespread data breaches the Federal Government has suffered.

Second, EEOC will not be able to manage or properly use this data. It has never been explained what exactly the EEOC will do with this data. Madam Speaker, data is not the same as information.

Third, this mandate is overly burdensome. Under the Obama administration scheme, the data cells required from business owners when they file an Employer Information Report, EEO–1, with EEOC expanded 180 cells to 3,660. Let me say that again: from 180 cells to 3,660. H.R. 7's scheme will add on hundreds, if not thousands, of more data cells.

EEOC has estimated that with the new reams of pay data added, the collection will cost business owners more than $600 million annually. I doubt that is going to help one single woman in this country.

Although this amendment purports to give EEOC more discretion to implement the pay data collection, this data collection mandate should simply be removed from the bill.

In any event, discretion cuts both ways, and the Democrat-controlled EEOC may choose to implement a data collection scheme even more expansive.

Let me be clear that the Beyer amendment does not improve the draconian pay data collection mandate in

the underlying bill or the other serious flaws in other sections of H.R. 7 we have talked about today.

Representative NEWMAN's amendment takes a longstanding reasonable requirement and makes it disruptive and unworkable.

First, the amendment requires a workplace notice posting of a partisan special-interest bill which fails to address pay discrimination in the workplace.

Second, under current law, covered employers must post a notice of the equal employment opportunity rights in a conspicuous place at the workplace. Employees who telecommute or otherwise do not have access to the physical notice must be provided an electronic version. Under Representative NEWMAN's amendment, the employer must post electronic copies of a new notice on an internal website to which employees have access. This is unrealistic. H.R. 7 applies to millions of small businesses that do not have websites, much less internal websites for their employees.

In keep with the other impractical provisions in H.R. 7, the amendment adds another onerous requirement on small businesses that will be stuck with the bill.

Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ' amendment would create a new program for the Department of Labor to—I hate to say this word—''train'' employers regarding bias in negotiation and other wage-setting practices. The amendment includes a non-exhaustive list of 13 wage-setting practices on which employers allegedly need education. Employers may understandably review this list as 13 new ways for trial lawyers to allege violations of the Equal Pay Act.

I will compliment one aspect of Representative OCASIO-CORTEZ' amendment. It mentions compensation self-audits. Republicans agree that self-audits can be a useful tool in combating pay discrimination, and we urge support for the Republican substitute amendment which encourages employers to conduct self-evaluations to identify potentially unlawful pay differences and to take steps to rectify any unlawful pay practices. Unfortunately, H.R. 7 does not encourage these self-evaluations.

Representative WILLIAMS' amendment reestablishes the Obama-era National Equal Pay Enforcement Task Force. This amendment would establish another politically biased government bureaucracy that includes agencies such as the EEOC and the Department of Labor already tasked with enforcing laws against pay discrimination and ensuring compliance with those laws.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 7.

I was privileged to serve on the Science Committee and study physics as an undergraduate, and I have always been impressed with the Heisenberg uncertainty principle. It says you can't measure something without changing it.

As a longtime businessman, we always wanted to be driven by data because you can't manage what you don't measure.

Receiving equal pay should not have to depend on an anonymous note writer letting you know that you are being underpaid. Guaranteeing that women and men receive equal pay for equal work is a principle rooted in our Nation's commitment to equality and fairness.

My amendment would require employers to report pay data by race, national origin, and gender to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and for that data to be shared with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs.

It would lengthen the timeframe for inception of the pay data collection from 18 to 24 months, providing the EEOC with more time to develop and execute an effective pay data collection.

I believe it is plausible, Madam Speaker, to say that more than 90 percent of paychecks are prepared by software, either internal or external. I remember preparing paychecks by hand, but it is a very small business that does that anymore. That software will evolve overnight, probably through the course of this debate, and the burden is likely to be small.

The amendment also permits, but doesn't require, the use of pay bands or hours-worked data and provides the EEOC with flexibility in what type of compensation data to use. Importantly, it also gives the EEOC the discretion to collect additional employment-related data but also to consider employer burden, data format, and confidentiality.

Pay data reporting by employers promises to shine light on race and gender pay disparities, increase the likelihood of employer self-analysis and self-correction, and identify the areas of concern for further investigation by enforcement agencies.

Reporting this data will also allow the EEOC to see which employers have racial or gender pay gaps that differ significantly from the pay patterns from other employers in their industry and region.

I can also say, after almost 50 years of adapting to Federal regulations, almost every business can find a way to profit from it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I have two additional speakers.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. NEWMAN).

Ms. NEWMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Ms. FOXX for her comments, and I will share a tip because I am a former small business owner. So, there is this great thing called communication. You can chat with one another and talk about some of their rights, so I recommend it for all that ask.

Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the millions of women in the workforce that to this day are still only making 82 cents on every dollar. My amazing colleagues have identified lots of stats that are very, very convincing with strong data.

I ask today that everyone consider the 15 to 20 percent of the female workforce who have either paused or stopped their careers—or ruined their careers, which many would say—because of the pandemic. It has been devastating, as we all know.

The Paycheck Fairness Act builds on the Equal Pay Act and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act by making it harder for employers to pay women less than men for the same work.

When woman return to the workforce, and I pray that they do, we must ensure that they are aware of their rights under legislation—verbally, electronically, by any means; it all works—which is why I have introduced an amendment that requires employers to display a poster in their workplace or their employment worksite, or by email, or whatever they can do, so workers clearly understand that they have rights under this act.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment and this legislation so we can ensure equal work means equal pay.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILLIAMS).

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act and my amendment to this bill.

On average, full-time working women need to work well into the next year to catch up to the salary our male counterparts earned the previous year. March 24 marked the day that women's salaries, on average, caught up to the salaries of our male counterparts in 2020. For several subgroups of women, this date won't come until later this year. For example, as a Black woman, it will take until August—an additional 8 months—to make the same salary of our male counterparts as they did in 2020.

The American people look to Congress to be a force for economic justice and create policies that are fair and just. It is simply wrong that in the 21st century women still face pay inequity. That is why I am proud to support the Paycheck Fairness Act, which will strengthen existing laws to ensure that women are getting the pay that they deserve.

My amendment will build on this crucial legislation by reestablishing the Equal Pay Enforcement Task Force. This task force, which previously existed during the Obama-Biden administration, will ensure Federal agencies are working together to limit any potential gaps in enforcement of equal pay laws. Putting this task force back in place will bring us one step closer to ensuring that women finally receive equal pay for equal work.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the bill before us today to ensure that women are paid fairly.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I hope we would adopt these three good amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I support equal pay for equal work. I don't know how many times Republicans have to say that, but we will keep saying it if necessary because equal pay for equal work is the right thing to do, but it is also required under two Federal statutes, and in most cases it is being adhered to.

Congress should focus on policies that will continue to increase economic opportunity and expand options for all workers. That is what we should be doing in the Education and Labor Committee: looking for ways to increase economic opportunity and expand options for all workers.

We shouldn't be doing away with pipeline jobs, we shouldn't be raising taxes, and we shouldn't be decreasing options for people to work in this country; but that is what this administration is doing, and that is what the other side is doing.

The Democrat amendments and the underlying bill fail miserably in terms of increasing options and expanding economic opportunity. It is pushing people into the bands, making everybody the same and treating everybody as though they have no individuality, they shouldn't be innovative, they shouldn't be creative, and they shouldn't strive for more. That is not the way to go.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Democrat en bloc amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER-MEEKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 117–15.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise as the designee of Representative STEFANIK, and 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 of the bill and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be referred to as the ''Wage Equity Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(1) In 1963, Congress passed on a bipartisan basis the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages for equal work performed by employees for employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

(2) Following the passage of such Act, in 1964, Congress passed on a bipartisan basis the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Since the passage of both the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, women have made significant strides, both in the workforce and in their educational pursuits.

(3) Prior to the COVID–19 pandemic, there were over 77,000,000 women in the workforce, the most in American history. Of the 2,000,000 jobs created in 2019, 53 percent went to women. This follows a trend that has been rising for some time. Women are graduating from college at a higher rate than their male counter parts, making up 61 percent of all college degrees conferred in 2018. Additionally, according to a recent survey of working women, more than half are their family's primary breadwinner.

(4) The COVID–19 pandemic has had a significant impact on working women, resulting in over 2 million women leaving the workforce since February 2020.

(5) Despite these advances there is still concern among the American public that gender-based wage discrimination has not been eliminated.

SEC. 3. CLARIFYING SEX-BASED DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITION.

Section 6(d)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)(1)) is amended by inserting ''bona fide business-related'' after ''any other''.

SEC. 4. JOB AND WAGE ANALYSIS.

Section 16 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1) An employer shall not be liable in an action brought against the employer for a violation of section 6(d) if—

''(A) during the period beginning on the date that is 3 years before the date on which the action is brought and ending on the date that is 1 day before the date on which the action is brought, such employer completes a job and wage analysis audit to determine whether there are differentials in wage rates among such employees that may violate section 6(d);

''(B) such employer takes reasonable steps to remedy any such differentials; and

''(C) such job and wage analysis audit is conducted and such reasonable steps are taken in good faith to investigate whether any such differentials exist; and

''(D) such audit is reasonable in detail and scope with respect to the size of the employer.

''(2) A job and wage analysis audit under this section and remedial action taken in response to the findings of such audit—

''(A) may only be admissible by the employer for the purposes of showing—

''(i) such audit was conducted; and

''(ii) such reasonable steps were taken; and

''(B) shall not be discoverable or admissible for any other purpose in any claim against the employer.

''(3) An employer who has not completed a job and wage analysis audit under this subsection shall not be subject to a negative or adverse inference as a result of not having completed such audit.

''(4) An employer who has completed a job and wage analysis audit that does not meets the requirements of subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) but otherwise meets the requirements of such paragraph shall not be liable for liquidated damages under section 16(b).

''(5) In this section—

''(A) the term 'job and wage analysis audit' means an audit conducted by the employer for the purpose of identifying wage disparities among employees on the basis of sex; and

''(B) the term 'reasonable steps', with respect to differentials in wages among employees that may violate section 6(d), means steps that are reasonable to address such differentials taking into account—

''(i) the amount of time that has passed since the date on which the audit was initiated;

''(ii) the nature and degree of progress resulting from such reasonable steps toward compliance with section 6(d) compared to the number of employees with respect to whom a violation may exist and the amount of the wage rate differentials among such employees; and

''(iii) the size and resources of the employer.''.

SEC. 5. WAGE HISTORY; DISCUSSION OF WAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 7 the following new section:

''SEC. 8. PROVISIONS RELATING TO WAGE HISTORY AND DISCUSSION OF WAGE.

''(a) REQUIREMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO WAGE HISTORY.—It shall be an unlawful practice for a person after the date of enactment of the Wage Equity Act of 2021—

''(1) to rely on the wage history of a prospective employee—

''(A) in considering the prospective employee for employment, including by requiring that the wage history of a prospective employee satisfies minimum or maximum criteria as a condition of being considered for employment; or

''(B) in determining the rate of wage for such prospective employee; or

''(2) to seek, or to require a prospective employee to disclose, the wage history of such prospective employee.

''(b) VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE EXCEPTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply with respect to a prospective employee who voluntarily discloses the wage history of such prospective employee.

''(2) WAGE HISTORY VERIFICATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(2), a person may take actions necessary to verify the wage history of a prospective employee if such wage history is voluntarily disclosed to the person by such prospective employee.

''(c) PRIOR INQUIRIES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the wage history of an employee acquired by an employer before the date of enactment of the Wage Equity

Act of 2021, including a current employee's wage history with another employer that was requested and used to set an employee's starting wage before such date and which is embedded in an employee's pay and pay increases after such date.

''(d) PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DISCUSSION OF WAGES.—Subject to subsection (c), it shall be an unlawful practice for an employer—

''(1) to prohibit an employee from inquiring about, discussing, or disclosing the wage of—

''(A) the employee; or

''(B) any other employee of the employer if such employee has voluntarily disclosed the wage of such employee;

''(2) to prohibit an employee from requesting from the employer an explanation of differentials in compensation among employees; or

''(3) to take an adverse employment action against an employee for—

''(A) conduct described under paragraphs (1) or (2); or

''(B) encouraging employees to engage in conduct described in such paragraphs.

''(e) LIMITATIONS RELATING TO DISCUSSION OF WAGES.—

''(1) TIME AND PLACE LIMITATIONS.—An employer may impose reasonable time, place, and manner limitations on conduct described under subsection (c) if such limitations are written and available to each employee.

''(2) INVOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE.—An employer may prohibit an employee from discussing the wages of any other employee if such other employee did not voluntarily disclose such wages to the employee discussing such wages.

''(f) PAY EXPECTATION CONVERSATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a person from—

''(1) inquiring about the pay expectations of a prospective employee; or

''(2) providing information to such employee about the compensation and benefits offered in relation to the position.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 202) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) the term 'prospective employee' means an individual who took an affirmative step to seek employment with a person and who is not currently employed by such person, a parent, subsidiary, predecessor, or related company of such person, or an employer connected by a purchase agreement with such person; and

''(aa) the term 'wage history' means the wages paid to the prospective employee by the prospective employee's current employer or any previous employer of such employee.''.

(c) RETALIATION.—Section 15(a)(3) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 215(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or prospective employee'' after ''any employee''; and

(2) by inserting ''or prospective employee'' after ''such employee''.

(d) PENALTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(b)) is amended by inserting ''Any person who violates the provisions of section 8 with respect to an employee or prospective employee shall be liable to such employee in an amount equal to the difference between the amount that the employee or prospective employee would have received but for such violation and the amount received by such employee or prospective employee, and an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.'' after ''tips unlawfully kept by the employer, and in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages.''.

(2) CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY.—Section 16(e)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(e)(2)) is amended by striking ''6 and 7'' and inserting ''6, 7, and 8''.

SEC. 6. NEGOTIATION SKILLS EDUCATION.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Secretary of Education, is authorized to establish and carry out a grant program.

(2) GRANTS.—In carrying out the program under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor may make grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to carry out negotiation skills education programs for the purposes of addressing wage disparities, including through outreach to women and girls.

(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall be a public agency, such as a State, a local government in a metropolitan statistical area (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget), a State educational agency, or a local educational agency, a private nonprofit organization, or a community-based organization.

(4) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary of Labor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary of Labor may require.

(5) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity that receives a grant under this subsection shall use the funds made available through the grant to carry out an effective negotiation skills education program for the purposes described in paragraph (2).

(b) INCORPORATING EDUCATION INTO EXISTING PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall issue regulations or policy guidance that provides for integrating the negotiation skills education, to the extent practicable, into programs authorized under—

(1) in the case of the Secretary of Education, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), and other programs carried out by the Department of Education that the Secretary of Education determines to be appropriate; and

(2) in the case of the Secretary of Labor, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.), and other programs carried out by the Department of Labor that the Secretary of Labor determines to be appropriate.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall prepare and submit to Congress a report describing the activities conducted under this section and evaluating the effectiveness of such activities in achieving the purposes of this section.

SEC. 7. GAO STUDY.

The Comptroller General shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to Congress a study on the causes and effects of—

(1) wage disparities among men and women;

(2) with respect to employees that leave the workforce for parental reasons (commonly referred to as the ''Manager's Gap''), the impact on wages and opportunity potential; and

(3) the disparities in negotiation skills among men and women upon entering the workforce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Iowa.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, equal work deserves equal pay, and we owe it to women to constructively engage on addressing pay disparities in the workplace and put forward real solutions. Unfortunately, Democrats have put forth a bill that prioritizes lawsuits and government regulation over women's economic empowerment and advancement.

H.R. 7 would require employers to make intrusive data disclosures that would add compliance costs exceeding $600 million per year while posing serious threats to workers' privacy and their paychecks.

On top of these onerous new requirements, H.R. 7 will force America's businesses to prepare for an onslaught of frivolous lawsuits, which now will be open to unlimited compensatory and limited damages.

Forty percent of small businesses are run by women, and H.R. 7 would make it harder for these women business owners to succeed.

This issue is too important to leave to partisan solutions. Our amendment, the Wage Equity Act, offers a stark contrast to the approach laid out in H.R. 7. We look to innovation in the States to find bipartisan policy that is supported by both Republicans and Democrats and signed by Republican Governors—proof that equal pay for equal work is not a partisan issue.

The Wage Equity Act supports the empowerment of women in today's economy. America's businesses—particularly our small businesses—seek to do right by their employees. In recognition of this, the Wage Equity Act creates a voluntary pay analysis system to encourage the good-faith efforts of employers to self-identify and correct any wage disparities, should they exist, creating an environment of consistent self-reflection.

We believe every American should be able to negotiate employment based upon their qualifications and merit for the position, and that a victim of wage discrimination should not have this discrimination follow them to their next job and compound through the rest of their career.

This is why this amendment protects the employee's right to not disclose their salary history during the job interview process unless they wish to do so voluntarily. At the same time, we cannot erode the necessary negotiations that take place in a job interview.

The Wage Equity Act protects the ability for an employee and their prospective employer to have a pay expectation conversation, an important part of any negotiation.

Our amendment protects employees' ability to discuss compensation with

their colleagues while giving employers the ability to set reasonable limitations on the time, location, and manner of this activity to protect employees from harassment.

Furthermore, the Wage Equity Act seeks to put women on equal footing as men as they start their careers with a grant program targeted towards women in college and career tech programs to provide negotiation skills education.

Lastly, our amendment directs the GAO to study the manager's gap to give us a clearer sense of the impact new parents leaving the workforce have on an employee's future earning and opportunity potential.

These are commonsense proposals that are supported by both Democrats and Republicans alike. I encourage my colleagues to reject partisan Government overreach and to support practical, bipartisan solutions that improve the existing law of the land—equal pay for equal work—by voting for the Stefanik amendment.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. HAYES).

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Speaker, this amendment would allow employers to self-audit compensation disparity. Asking the same employer, who may be engaged in pay discrimination, to self-police their wage practices is a blatant conflict of interest.

Rather than actually incentivizing equal pay, as Ms. STEFANIK would claim, this amendment gives employers the tool to hide evidence of pay discrimination and delay any resulting lawsuit and accountability by 3 years. The very idea behind this provision is insidious. It presumes that employers should be given loopholes to avoid liability after breaking the law. Employers do not need a workaround to guard against these types of lawsuits. Their best defense is simple: do not engage in wage discrimination.

In fact, this amendment actually creates another means for employers to discriminate on the basis of sex by preserving a vague standard for employer defense when accused of wage discrimination. Unlike Ms. STEFANIK's proposed amendment, H.R. 7 makes clear that the ''any factor other than sex'' employer defense must be bona fide, job-related, and required by business necessity.

Employees must be judged by their education, training or experience instead of their gender. As women drop out of the workforce in historic numbers due to the pressures of COVID–19, we have a responsibility to take every precaution to ensure they do not face discrimination when they return to the workforce.

The Paycheck Fairness Act ensures all workers will get equal pay for equal work, regardless of gender. It will prohibit employers from paying women less simply because another employer paid them less in the past. It helps to oppose pay discrimination with more speed and transparency, and allows women to fight pay injustices they may experience. The Paycheck Fairness Act fixes a systemic injustice that women have suffered.

This amendment would only water down this landmark civil rights and labor legislation. Madam Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' to this amendment and stand up for equity.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment, which was also introduced earlier this week by Representative STEFANIK as a standalone bill, H.R. 2491, the Wage Equity Act of 2021.

Unlike the so-called Paycheck Fairness Act, which will unfairly punish businessowners and reward trial lawyers at the expense of workers, this amendment will effectively address pay discrimination in the workplace and help working women by ensuring pay differences among workers of the opposite sex are due to legitimate business-related reasons.

Among other commonsense provisions, this amendment will direct funds and research towards women's advancement in the workplace and will also authorize a grant program to educate women in college careers and technical programs on negotiating pay.

This amendment will also allow job applicants to disclose prior salary history voluntarily, ensuring they control this information as they see fit.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who is the sponsor of the underlying legislation.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the gender pay gap is a pervasive problem that demands thoughtful, multipronged solutions. The Paycheck Fairness Act represents a comprehensive response to the shortcomings of existing law and addresses the holes that have emerged over time.

Representative STEFANIK's substitute, the Wage Equity Act, is exactly what the Paycheck Fairness Act has been fighting over the years. It purports to offer protections, but, in reality, it creates loopholes that give a wink and a nod to discrimination. Not only would it offer empty protections, it would erode existing protections already in place.

The substitute includes inadequate protections for workers who discuss or disclose wages. While ostensibly protecting employees who disclose or discuss that pay, it allows employers to place limitations on when, where, and how employees may do so, negating the point of the provision.

Madam Speaker, you cannot remedy pay discrimination if you have no idea that you are making less than the man across the hall. When workers fear retaliation for talking about their pay, any wage gap they face is likely to continue to grow undiscovered in the shadows.

More egregiously, there is no mechanism for enforcement, as it would allow employers who conduct self-designed pay audits to escape accountability for unlawful pay disparities and deny a worker a remedy.

I think it bears repeating that corporations do not feel free to sell us spoiled meat, lock our daughters up in ninth-floor sweatshops with no fire escapes, employ our underage sons in coal mines, force us to work 13-hour shifts without overtime or a break because corporations experienced a moment of Zen and decided to evolve.

No. They were forced into greater accountability and social concern by the legitimate actions of a democratic government. In other words, if we depend on goodwill or a self-audit, then we are all screwed.

This amendment seeks to destroy the entire purpose of the bill and allows companies to evade accountability for violating the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment and a ''yes'' vote for the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would hope we would defeat the amendment. This just recreates the loopholes that we are trying to close. You have to start with the idea that there is a differential in pay. And what we are trying to do is—if you can explain this in any kind of way that is business-related, then they get away with it.

The Fair Pay Act says it has to be bona fide and required by the job. If it is not required by the job, why do you have a differential in pay?

We can do better than this, and I hope we defeat the amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. 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. 7 is postponed.

FRAUD AND SCAM REDUCTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1215) to establish an office within the Federal Trade Commission and an outside advisory group to prevent fraud targeting seniors and to direct the Commission to include additional information in an annual report to Congress on fraud targeting seniors, 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 13, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—396

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
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
Newman
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
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)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NAYS—13

Biggs
Brooks
Buck
Gaetz
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gosar
Greene (GA)
Hice (GA)
Massie
Norman
Roy
Sessions

NOT VOTING—20

Armstrong
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brady
Bush
Cawthorn
Chu
Curtis
Espaillat
Golden
Graves (LA)
Kahele
Matsui
Meng
Meuser
Newhouse
Rogers (KY)
Takano
Waters
Young

□ 1503

Mr. SESSIONS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois and Mr. MCHENRY 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.

Stated for:

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I was in a Zoom meeting with the Secretary of Transportation. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 104.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, the back up at the useless security screening onto the House floor was backed up preventing me from making the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 104.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 104.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I missed today's vote on the Fraud and Scam Reduction Act, as amended.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 104.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

NICHOLAS AND ZACHARY BURT MEMORIAL CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING PREVENTION ACT OF 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. 1460) to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes, 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 49, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—362

Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Axne

Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nehls
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—49

Allen
Arrington
Banks
Biggs
Boebert
Brooks
Buck
Burchett
Cammack
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Davidson
Donalds
Estes
Fleischmann
Franklin, C. Scott
Gaetz
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gosar
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hinson
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Loudermilk
Massie
Mast
McClintock
Miller (IL)
Murphy (NC)
Norman
Perry
Rose
Rosendale
Roy
Steube
Tiffany
Weber (TX)
Young

NOT VOTING—18

Adams
Aderholt
Bass
Brady
Cawthorn
Chu
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Kahele
Matsui
Meng
Morelle
Ross
Scott (VA)
Takano
Yarmuth

□ 1535

Messrs. ROSE and BANKS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Messrs. FEENSTRA and CLEAVER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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:

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I attended a Press Conference on pay equity. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 105.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I was with the Speaker at her press conference. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 105.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

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 117–15, 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 207, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—216

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman

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

NAYS—207

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

NOT VOTING—6

Cawthorn
Eshoo
Fitzpatrick
Guest
Higgins (NY)
Kahele

□ 1607

Messrs. TURNER, BENTZ, REED, RUTHERFORD, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. O'HALLERAN changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

Stated for:

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 106.

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I was inadvertently recorded voting aye on rollcall no. 106 and intended to vote nay.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KAHELE. Madam Speaker, on April 15, 2021, I was unable to vote on the first three votes in the series because I had unavoidable conflict. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 104; H.R. 1215, the Fraud and Scam Reduction Act; YEA on Roll Call No. 105; H.R. 1460, the Nicholas and Zachary Burt Memorial Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act of 2021; YEA on Roll Call No. 106; En Bloc No. 1.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Crdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (Garcìa (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER-MEEKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 4, printed in part B of House Report 117–15, 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 Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 244, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—183

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—244

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)

Hayes
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
Norman
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rosendale
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiffany
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Cawthorn
Dunn

□ 1642

Ms. BASS, Messrs. DeSAULNIER, SCHNEIDER, VARGAS, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. SCHRADER, RUPPERSBERGER, MAST, FULCHER, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WITTMAN and RUTHERFORD changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Graves (MO) Wagner
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 217, nays 210, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—217

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

NAYS—210

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

NOT VOTING—2

Cawthorn
Huffman

□ 1715

Mr. STIVERS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. DINGELL changed her 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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

TIMELY REAUTHORIZATION OF NECESSARY STEM-CELL PROGRAMS LENDS ACCESS TO NEEDED THERAPIES ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELBENE). 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. 941) to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes, 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—415

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
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
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
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)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—2

Boebert
Greene (GA)

NOT VOTING—12

Arrington
Brady
Calvert
Cawthorn
Donalds
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Grothman
Hollingsworth
Rodgers (WA)
Sires
Weber (TX)

□ 1749

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 109.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Gallego (Gomez)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

PROTECTING SENIORS FROM EMERGENCY SCAMS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). 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. 446) to require the Federal Trade Commission to submit a report to Congress on scams targeting seniors, and for other purposes, 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 8, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—413

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

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (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
McClintock
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
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
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)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NAYS—8

Biggs
Boebert
Gaetz
Gohmert
Greene (GA)
Massie
Norman
Roy

NOT VOTING—8

Cawthorn
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Letlow
Rogers (KY)
Sires
Waters
Young

□ 1821

Mr. PERRY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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:

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 110.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Gallego (Gomez)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

PROTECTING INDIAN TRIBES FROM SCAMS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1762) to direct the Federal Trade Commission to submit to Congress a report on unfair or deceptive acts or practices targeted at Indian Tribes or members of Indian Tribes, and for other purposes, 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 10, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—408

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
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
Newman
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
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
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—10

Biggs
Boebert
Burchett
Casten
Gaetz
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Massie
Norman
Roy

NOT VOTING—11

Bowman
Brady
Cawthorn
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Gallagher
Luetkemeyer
Miller (IL)
Newhouse
Simpson
Sires

□ 1855

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Gallego (Gomez)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

DEBARMENT ENFORCEMENT OF BAD ACTOR REGISTRANTS ACT OF 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. 1002) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to authorize the debarment of certain registrants, 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 5, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—411

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
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
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
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
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—5

Higgins (LA)
Massie
Mast
Norman
Rosendale

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Brady
Cárdenas
Cawthorn
DeFazio
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Garbarino
Luetkemeyer
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Stevens

□ 1927

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARBARINO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 112.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Pocan)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Raskin)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

ENSURING COMPLIANCE AGAINST DRUG DIVERSION ACT OF 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. 1899) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the modification, transfer, and termination of a registration to manufacture, distribute, or dispense controlled substances or list I chemicals, and for other purposes, 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 5, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—412

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
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
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—5

Casten
Escobar
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Higgins (LA)

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer
Cawthorn
Connolly
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Harris
Luetkemeyer
Pascrell
Raskin
Simpson
Sires
Yarmuth

□ 2000

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Pocan)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Wexton)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

TRIBUTE TO JOE NOVOTNY

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding service of the Reading Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, Joe Novotny, as he prepares for his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, as Reading Clerk, Joe Novotny has served as the voice of the House, and his trusted leadership and valued presence on this floor will be missed by Members and staff on both sides of the aisle.

Joe Novotny has dedicated his entire career to the people's House. First serving as a congressional page at age 16, Joe returned to the House after college, where he worked for the House Education and Labor Committee for 15 years, rising to become chief clerk.

His service was respected by all, including my friend, Chairman George Miller, who lauded Joe as ''an incredibly valuable asset to my staff whose unparalleled integrity and dedication helped our committee advance major policies that are making a difference in the lives of working families.''

Mr. Speaker, I just learned from our colleague DAN KILDEE that his uncle, Dale Kildee, a leading member of the Education and Labor Committee, was also a good friend and benefited from

the service and leadership of Joe Novotny.

In 2010, it was my great and proud honor as Speaker of the House to name Joe Novotny Reading Clerk, the first openly gay man to hold this position. I am proud of that.

His historic service has made our Congress more inclusive, diverse, and representative of the people we serve.

As the child of immigrants, Novotny's ascendance in the halls of the U.S. Capitol is, as he has proudly said, the story of the American Dream.

As Reading Clerk, Novotny has been vital in engaging the people of our country with their democracy. Each day, he ensures that measures debated in this House are clearly articulated not only to Members but to the American people and to people around the world.

His commitment to making Congress more accessible and efficient has been particularly important during this time of pandemic, as our institution has adjusted to remote and virtual operations.

Since day one, Joe has brought his steady presence, professionalism, and institutional expertise to the House floor. In doing so, he has helped advance the ability of the people's House to do the people's work.

I am taking this additional time, Mr. Speaker, because so many Members have told me what Joe means to them, and I wanted to express some of that in my remarks.

While Joe Novotny's service will be missed, his great love for the House and his dedication to our democracy stand as an inspiration for all who will follow in the path that he has blazed.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I wish him the best in the next stages of his journey, and I thank Joe for his patriotic service.

Thank you, Joe Novotny.

MICROLOAN IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 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. 1502) to amend the Small Business Act to optimize the operations of the microloan program, lower costs for small business concerns and intermediary participants in the program, and for other purposes, 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 Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 16, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—397

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Clyburn
Cohen
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
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
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—16

Biggs
Buck
Cloud
Clyde
Gaetz
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Harris
Harshbarger
Hice (GA)
Massie
Norman
Rosendale
Roy

NOT VOTING—16

Cawthorn
Cole
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Green (TN)
Hartzler
LaTurner
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Pascrell
Perry
Raskin
Simpson
Sires
Welch
Yarmuth

□ 2036

Messrs. GAETZ and GROTHMAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and 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. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 114.

MEMBERS RECORDED PRUSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Pocan)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Wexton)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rodgers (WA) (Joyce (PA))
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

MICROLOAN TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 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. 1487) to amend the Small Business Act to increase transparency, and for other purposes, 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 Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 4, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—409

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez, Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
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 (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
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
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Ross
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—4

Biggs
Casten
Escobar
Garcia (TX)

NOT VOTING—16

Bowman
Brady
Cawthorn
Costa
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Gonzalez (OH)
Johnson (GA)
Lamborn
Pascrell
Raskin
Scott, Austin
Simpson
Sires
Welch
Yarmuth

□ 2110

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Pocan)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Wexton)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

504 MODERNIZATION AND SMALL MANUFACTURER ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 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. 1490) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the loan guaranty program, enhance the ability of small manufacturers to access affordable capital, and for other purposes, 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 Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 16, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—400

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Auchincloss
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carl
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel, Lois
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gooden (TX)
Gottheimer

Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
LaTurner
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Letlow
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McCollum
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
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pfluger
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
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 Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—16

Biggs
Boebert
Brooks
Buck
Clyde
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gosar
Greene (GA)
Harris
Harshbarger
Hollingsworth
Massie
McClintock
Rosendale
Roy

NOT VOTING—13

Brady
Cawthorn
Costa
DeFazio
Doyle, Michael F.
Franklin, C. Scott
Pascrell
Raskin
Simpson
Sires
Vela
Welch
Yarmuth

□ 2142

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I want to state for the Record that, on April 15, 2021, I missed four roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: yes—Roll Call Vote 113—on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1899; yes—Roll Call Vote 114—on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1502; yes—Roll Call Vote 115—on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1487; and yes—Roll Call Vote 116—on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1490.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Wexton)
Babin (Fallon)
Cárdenas (Gonzalez, Vicente)
Cole (Lucas)
Crenshaw (Fallon)
Graves (MO) (Wagner)
Greene (GA) (Gosar)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Jayapal (Pocan)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Keating (Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McHenry (Banks)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mfume (Wexton)
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Underwood)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neal (Lynch)
Nehls (Fallon)
Norcross (Pallone)
Omar (Pressley)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Wexton)
Rush (Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Slotkin (Stevens)
Stefanik (Tenney)
Steube (Timmons)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wasserman Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

POSTAL NONBANK FINANCIAL SERVICES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, I am very honored to be co-leading efforts to provide $6 million for postal nonbank financial services in a pilot program through the U.S. Postal Service.

I am thankful to my House colleagues, Congressman BILL PASCRELL and Congresswoman ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, and our friends in the Senate for joining our effort.

The COVID–19 pandemic has demonstrated that many Americans are left behind by Wall Street bankers.

As unemployment soared in 2020, the U.S. Congress swiftly provided relief through economic stimulus payments, unemployment insurance, and so much more to America's workers, yet over 63 million Americans, including many who are impoverished, lacked the most basic banking services to access these funds and to conduct the simplest financial transactions. Like, for example, paying a utility bill.

Yes, according to the FDIC, some 63 million adults are considered underbanked in urban, suburban, and rural communities across our Nation.

In the last Congress, Congressman PASCRELL and I successfully led a Financial Services amendment to the FY21 Appropriations bill to include $2 million for postal financial services, and we look forward to reintroducing our bill and to getting it passed in both Chambers this year.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN PATRICK C. POLIS AS TENNESSEE'S SECOND DISTRICT VETERAN OF THE MONTH

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Captain Patrick C. Polis as Tennessee's Second District Veteran of the Month.

Captain Polis was drafted into the United States Army in 1966 as a private, then attended Officer Candidate School and earned the rank of second lieutenant. He served two combat tours of duty, Madam Speaker, during the Vietnam war, rising to the rank of captain during the war. He was later awarded the Bronze Star Medal and Army Commendation Medal for his service.

He left the Army in 1974 and, regrettably, he attended the University of Alabama, being we are from Tennessee, but he did graduate magna cum laude in 1981.

Following a career in business management, he returned to school at the Asbury Theological Seminary and earned a master's degree in divinity in 1993. He used his religious education to serve as a pastor at the United Methodist Church in Knoxville from 1993 to 2019. He also served as chaplain for the Knoxville Police Department.

In 2019, he was inducted into the Army Officer Candidate School Hall of Fame at Fort Benning, Georgia.

Captain Polis and his wife, Sandra, still reside in Knoxville. He remains active in the veteran community through the Vietnam Veterans of America, serving as president of the Captain Bill Robinson Chapter 1078.

I thank Captain Polis so much for his service to our country. It is my honor to recognize him today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, he is just an outstanding individual.

CARDINAL O'HARA LADY LIONS CAPTURE SCHOOL'S FIRST-EVER STATE BASKETBALL TITLE

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Cardinal O'Hara Lady Lions basketball team, which recently won the PIAA class 5A

girls championship, securing their first-ever State basketball title.

On March 27, the team defeated the defending champion, Chartiers Valley, 51–27, led by junior Sydni Scott's game-high 16 points.

The victory made history on several fronts. Not only was this the school's first State basketball championship, but it also marked just the third time a mother-daughter duo has won a PIAA state title, with Coach Chrissie Doogan at the helm and her daughter Maggie playing forward. O'Hara's win also gave the Philadelphia Catholic League the distinction of becoming the first league to win three straight girls' titles in the same year.

The young women of Cardinal O'Hara are an inspiration to our Delaware Valley community. Congratulations to the entire Lady Lions basketball team. Keep making HERstory.

□ 2150

OPPOSE PACKING THE SUPREME COURT

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

Mr. GIMENEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposal by some Members to pack the Supreme Court.

At first glance, you would think this came from Hugo Chavez or Nicolas Maduro, pictured here. It is sad to see that it actually comes from some people in this institution.

As a Cuban exile who fled the Communist Castro regime, I know the consequences of these dictatorial moves to centralize power in the hands of a few ideologues.

Packing the courts is a tactic used by brutal dictatorships, like Venezuela, to consolidate the Socialists' power, which resulted in tens of thousands of court rulings in its favor and basically destroyed the country.

Packing the courts sets the precedent for the judicial branch being expanded at every transition of power, with each President wanting to put their four or more additional Justices, which eventually could result in hundreds of Justices of the Supreme Court.

This proposal to fundamentally rebalance our judicial system towards one political ideology should not only be opposed, but must be condemned to the fullest extent.

I will fight to my last breath the attempts by anyone to fundamentally change government in such a militant manner.

WOMEN STILL DON'T EARN EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, it has been 58 years since the enactment of the Equal Pay Act, yet still women don't earn equal pay for equal work.

In my district, women only earn 78 cents for every dollar a man earns. The wage gap is even wider for Latina, Black, and Native-American women.

This isn't simply a women's issue. This is a family issue. When women earn too little, their families are shortchanged, too.

This is a civil rights issue. When employers discriminate against a woman, they undermine justice for everyone.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will give women the tools we need to challenge sex-based pay discrimination. It will give employers the guidance they need to pay their employees what they deserve.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to step up. Let this be the year that we work together to pass this landmark bill and send it to the President for his signature.

HONORING JACK MARSHALL JONES, JR.

(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 remember and honor Jack Marshall Jones, Jr., of Savannah, Georgia, who, sadly, passed away on April 3 at the age of 84.

Jack was born in Savannah and went on to graduate from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill with a degree in economics.

As an active member in the Savannah community, Jack served on several boards, including Armstrong State University Foundation, Savannah Country Day School, and the Savannah Rotary Club.

Jack was also a founder and director of First Bank of Savannah and the Savannah Bancorp.

In his free time, Jack enjoyed exploring the Wilmington River and the treasure of our beautiful coast.

However, it was his loving relationship with his wife of 60 years, his family—including his granddaughter and a former member of my staff, Caroline—and friends that fulfilled him.

I am thankful for the immense impact he had on the Savannah community, and I know his legacy will remain.

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

CELEBRATING YOM HA'ATZMAUT

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition and celebration of Yom Ha'atzmaut, Israel's Independence Day.

On this day 73 years ago, the Israeli Declaration of Independence was signed, marking a long-awaited historic day, the formation of the world's only Jewish state in its modern form.

As a proud American Jew and a proud supporter of Israel, it is a privilege to recognize Israel and its contributions to the international community.

Israeli innovation in areas like water, technology, and agriculture have yielded dramatic advancements with global impact.

I am proud the bills passed in this Chamber, including legislation to affirm Congress' overwhelming support for Israel and strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship.

We are witnessing a new era as Arab States normalize their relations with Israel, which will create incredible opportunities for cooperation in the Middle East. I look forward to supporting those growing ties.

I am proud to stand here today in strong support of Israel and the U.S.-Israel relationship on this 73rd Yom Ha'atzmaut.

IN HONOR OF ISRAEL

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

Ms. MANNING. Madam Speaker, 73 years ago, in the aftermath of the Holocaust, a courageous group of Jewish leaders declared the creation of the State of Israel. Eleven minutes later, President Truman announced the U.S. recognition of the new State.

Truman was persuaded that in an area like the Middle East, where there had never been any tradition of democratic government, it was important for the long range security of our country that a nation committed to a democratic system be established there.

Even today, Israel remains the only democracy in the Middle East with fair elections, a free press, free speech, a court system that is open to all, and protects the rights of women and minorities.

Israel has welcomed millions of immigrants fleeing persecution and war from across the globe. Its thriving economy has a vibrant, high-tech sector and medical breakthroughs that have benefited the world. Israel has literally made the desert bloom with innovative irrigation, desalinization, and agricultural techniques.

Israel is our most reliable ally in the Middle East. Our countries share military exercises and intelligence and have developed cutting-edge missile defense systems and border security technology.

Israel's brave founders created an extraordinary nation that has provided immeasurable value to our country and the world. May our countries be blessed with many more years of friendship.

PACKING THE SUPREME COURT IS AN ABSURD PROPOSAL

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, the absurd proposal brought forth now to pack the U.S. Supreme Court out of thin air with four new Justices is the latest in a breathtaking effort to seize and seal power for Democrats. They know their policies frequently don't win at the ballot box or in fair elections, so they seek to stack a Court with a new set of Justices that they hope will hand them victories outside of the hallowed legislative process.

Justice Breyer, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and even Joe Biden himself—who is quoted as saying packing the Court is a ''bonehead idea''—all disagree, at least at one time, that packing the Court to simply grab a majority is wrong-headed and un-American.

I am glad to enter into a constitutional amendment with Representative DUSTY JOHNSON to ''Keep the 9'' and save our Supreme Court, to keep it above politics.

This is one of the most blatant, naked power grabs we have seen, ever. If this effort is somehow successful and allowed to stand, then you will not recognize the America we know, once knew, as pure power politics will indeed have won over our process that the Founders put in place.

CELEBRATING ISRAEL

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in recognition and celebration of the independence of the State of Israel 73 years ago today.

Seventy-three years ago today, the United States became the first country to recognize Israel, and I am proud to join those here in the United States and around the world in wishing the people of Israel a happy Yom Ha'atzmaut.

Today, we reaffirm the critical, unbreakable bond between our two nations. The United States and Israel have a friendship rooted in our shared values that goes back decades. Israel is our strongest ally in the Middle East and one of our most important allies in the world. Today, the cultural and societal bonds between our two countries remains as strong as ever.

Today is a day of celebration for Israel: Celebrating her perseverance, economic growth, cultural achievements, and democratic values that have developed in the decades since their independence.

Israel's existence as a Jewish, democratic, secure state is vital to both the Jewish community and the peace of the entire Middle East.

I vow to continue to do my work supporting and strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship so that we can keep working together for our shared goals. Israel has become a country of innovation and growth, one where there are prospects for peace in the region. I look forward to continuing that relationship.

□ 2200

RECOGNIZING INDIANA'S OUTSTANDING YOUNG ATHLETES

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

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, as an avid basketball player, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the exceptional achievements of the high school basketball players in Northwest Indiana this past year, who safely showed up and put in the effort during the challenges of this health pandemic.

I also want to recognize the following programs who represented our region during the semi-State and beyond this past season.

First, congratulations to the Lady Bulldogs of Crown Point High School women's basketball team, who won the Indiana High School Athletic Association's 4A State Championship.

Congratulations also to the Gary West Side High School men's basketball team who won their regional championship game to advance to Indiana's Class 4A Semi-State.

And congratulations to the Kouts High School men's basketball team for winning their Semi-State Championship for the first time in the school's history.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing these outstanding young athletes for their skill, tremendous hard work, and dedication to the game. They make all of Northwest Indiana and their schools, families, and communities so very proud.

ISRAEL'S RESILIENCY

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

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, Israel embodies the resilience, the ingenuity, the can-do comeback spirit of humanity at its best.

One need not be Israeli to be inspired by the survival and success of Israel, which has persisted in the face of improbable odds. One need not be Jewish to be inspired by a Jewish state whose rebirth and resilience and resourcefulness is one of the greatest success stories the world has ever seen.

A tiny nation the size of New Jersey has emerged, in the span of a few decades, as a global power and a global innovator, as a start-up nation and as a water superpower.

The story of Israel's renaissance takes on special meaning in our present moment, at a time when our own country is reeling from the cataclysm of COVID–19. Israel reminds us that it is possible to overcome. It is possible to emerge stronger than ever. And it is possible, in the words of President Joe Biden, to ''build back better.''

Madam Speaker, Israel has endured for more than seven decades. And by the grace of God, may it endure for many more.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON COUGARS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to show exuberance and excitement and congratulations to the young men at the University of Houston who entered into the Final Four for the first time in 37 years.

Congratulations to Coach Sampson and these very fine young men, who had not only the ability and skill on the basketball court, but character and determination and hard work. We are so proud of them in the city of Houston, and certainly of the University of Houston. We congratulate them for standing up, marching onto that court, and dunking that ball.

Congratulations to the University of Houston basketball team entering the Final Four at the NCAA. We are excited about their success, and we congratulate them over and over and over again. Congratulations to the Cougars, University of Houston basketball team.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, it has been 85 days since President Biden halted the Keystone pipeline. We have yet to see those green jobs he promised. Promises won't pay the bills.

We stand with the hardworking Americans who were forced out of work and ask this administration, Where are the jobs? Knee-jerk policies here in Washington have life-altering implications for people like Mr. Neal Crabtree, a welder and union foreman from my district who lost his job on the Keystone pipeline.

Of course, if you bring up this topic with Climate Czar John Kerry, he will tell you all these workers can switch to working in solar energy.

Madam Speaker, from looking at salary data, a welding wand in the hand of a highly-skilled pipeline welder is worth more than two screwdrivers in the hands of solar panel installers.

These job-killing energy policies are yet another example of how out of touch the Biden administration is with the men and women who keep our country going.

Talk is cheap, action is harder. If President Biden is going to continue promising these elusive green jobs, then he needs a long-term plan in

place. A plan to have a plan is not enough.

Neal Crabtree and thousands of Americans like him are the people the Democrats are choosing to forget. We won't forget them.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE JOBS

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

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, with the stroke of his pen, President Biden canceled more than the Keystone XL pipeline. He canceled the jobs of over 1,000 men and women.

Each one of these jobs is a real person with real hopes for themselves and their families who are now out of work because they did not have a Biden administration ''approved job.'' The workforce that works on our energy sector is as diverse as our nation.

Madam Speaker, 24 percent of pipeline construction workers are women, and another 24 percent are minorities. The Biden administration is telling these pipeline workers their careers are over and to find a green job that they are not trained to do and that does not pay as much. They are telling single moms and single dads that they have to give up the jobs that supported their families.

Joe Biden should not destroy the jobs that support the workers and families who have provided the fuel for the American economy and that has lowered energy costs for American families.

Madam Speaker, this is an economic injustice that should not be tolerated. These workers and their families deserve better.

BIDEN'S CLIMATE EXECUTIVE ORDER

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

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Speaker, there are consequences to Biden's energy bans. They are job-killing impacts that affect my district, my State, and our Nation.

There are two drilling rigs operating in western Colorado right now. That number was once as high as 112 and in the last 13 years there were as many as 80 rigs. An economic analysis from Colorado Mesa University found that each drilling rig in the region supports the creation of 208 jobs. And now there are just two in the Piceance Valley.

Madam Speaker, 9,000 jobs in the oil and gas industry have been lost in the last year. Keep in mind that that does not include the jobs that we have lost from industries serving the rigs and their workers. These 9,000 jobs produce substantial paychecks for folks back home to feed their families and to put a roof over their head, and now they are gone.

Madam Speaker, this hits our schools, where superintendents from back home have spoken out on the need for these funds. Colorado's oil and natural gas industry provided $839 million for K–12 schools in 2015 and 2016.

And that is why I have introduced the Protecting American Energy Jobs Act. My legislation will nullify Biden's executive orders.

BIDEN BANS

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, right out of the gate, President Biden took unilateral action that dealt devastating blows to rural communities across the United States.

As chairman of the Western Caucus, I have heard firsthand how the cancellation of the Keystone pipeline and the moratorium on Federal oil and gas leases have directly impacted rural America.

From eliminating good-paying union jobs in Minnesota and decimating small businesses in South Dakota, to gutting local government and school district revenues in New Mexico, to harming State infrastructure budgets in Utah, these orders have negatively impacted workers, families, and business owners throughout the West.

But let's be clear: All Americans will feel the effects of President Biden's actions.

Also, let's be clear: Just because we cut domestic energy production, does not mean our energy needs decrease. Our Nation will face higher costs on energy, on goods, on transportation.

Under this ban, the President has throttled our economic recovery. We will continue working to reverse these misguided actions.

□ 2210

HIGHLIGHTING DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I am happy to join my fellow Republicans tonight to talk about the state of energy and the very dangerous Biden ban on energy production in this country.

This country needs a reliable, affordable supply of energy, but the Biden executive orders reduce access to energy sources.

America has only very recently achieved energy independence through innovation, lower regulations, and a free market, but these executive orders go the other way and will make us dependent on foreign energy producers.

Make no mistake about it, the energy will still be produced, maybe just not in the United States. But year over year, since 2005, America's carbon emissions have declined, in spite of increased production.

I draw attention to the data shared with the Congress by the Texas Oil and Gas Association: Reduction of flaring in the Permian Basin has really brought carbon emissions down.

We can't strangle ourselves. We need to have American energy. We need American energy independence.

DESTROYING THOUSANDS OF ENERGY JOBS

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, on day one of this administration, Joe Biden destroyed thousands of jobs at the stroke of a pen.

One of these jobs was held by my constituent, Patrick Thorssen, an operating engineer and a member of Local 49. By stopping the Keystone XL pipeline, Joe Biden devastated countless families and communities.

Madam Speaker, I am asking tonight: Mr. President, where are these 1 million jobs? These families and communities deserve better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

HIGH ENERGY COSTS HURT THOSE MOST VULNERABLE

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

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Madam Speaker, I fear that the recent actions by the administration to end energy development on Federal land will come at an extremely high cost to the people of the United States, and that cost will be borne disproportionately by the segment of our population who can least afford to pay it.

As an example, I offer my home State of California, which, according to the United States Census Bureau, has the highest rate of poverty of any State in the country. That poverty rate is driven in no small part by the extremely high cost of energy in California.

To take those misguided policies and extend them to the rest of the country would be an abdication of our responsibility to protect the most vulnerable segment of our population, the poor and the working poor, on whose backs the burden of higher energy costs will be felt most keenly.

CANCELING KEYSTONE HURTS ALREADY WEAKENED ECONOMY

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

Mr. ROSENDALE. Madam Speaker, on his first day in office, President Biden issued an executive order revoking the permit for the Keystone XL

pipeline. Instantly, 70 people in Fallon County, Montana, were out of their jobs.

This project would provide 12,000 American jobs and had already created 200 jobs in Montana alone. This picture beside me was taken in Fallon County, one of the areas the Keystone XL pipeline would have gone through. This empty lot would have been a housing complex for 1,200 workers, who would have contributed significantly to the local economy in Baker, Montana, a small town of 1,800 residents.

The cancellation of the pipeline deals Fallon County a loss of $7 million per year in tax revenue that would have been used to invest in schools, roads, and other public projects. As Fallon County Commissioner Steve Baldwin said: ''The cancellation for the XL pipeline will further exacerbate our already weakened economy. President Biden has an opportunity to signal that access to good-paying jobs is truly a priority for his administration.''

So my question is: Where are the jobs?

PLACATING THE LEFT

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, why would President Biden, with the stroke of a pen, in the middle of one of the worst recessions and economic recoveries, destroy thousands of good-paying pipeline jobs and the livelihoods and future of hardworking American families? Well, for the same reason he has imposed his open border mandates that have created an unprecedented crisis at our southern border. He is placating the left. He is putting them in charge. And he is allowing them to drive their radical agenda to transform our economy, our values, and our way of life.

Gaylord Lincoln, a pipeline mechanic from South Dakota, said it best: ''Come down here. See the destruction you caused. See the pain of job loss. You took our chance to have a decent life with a stroke of a pen. It is all BS in Washington. They are playing with our lives.''

Mr. Lincoln is right; it is BS. They are playing with their lives, and this President is leading the charge.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 16, 2021, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–804. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Innovation Center, Rural Development-Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revolving Fund Program--Water and Environmental Provisions of the Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 [Docket No.: RUS-20-WATER-0033] (RIN: 0572-AC52) received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC–805. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Establishment of a Domestic Hemp Production Program [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-19-0042; SC19-990-2 FR] received February 23, 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–806. A letter from the Congressional Assistant II, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule — Netting of Eligibility for Financial Institutions [Regulation EE; Docket No.: R-1661] (RIN: 7100-AF48) received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–807. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Higher-Priced Mortgage Loan Escrow Exemption (Regulation Z) [Docket No.: CFPB-2020-0023] (RIN: 3170-AA83) received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–808. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's rescission of statement of policy — Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition on Abusive Acts or Practices received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–809. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's interpretive rule — Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Discrimination on the Bases of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–810. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Major interim final rule — Emergency Capital Investment Program—Restrictions on Executive Compensation, Share Buybacks, and Dividends [Docket No.: TREAS-DO-2021-0004] (RIN: 1505-AC76) received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–811. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major interim final rule — Regulatory Capital Rule: Emergency Capital Investment Program (RIN: 3064-AF73) received April 1, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–812. A letter from the Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — COVID-19 Telehealth Program [WC Docket No.: 20-89] received February 23, 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–813. A letter from the Chief, Division of Regulations, National Park Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Glen Canyon National Recreation Area; Motor Vehicles [Docket ID: NPS-2018-0001; NPS-GLCA-27587; PPIMGLCAS1; PPMPSAS1Z.YP0000] (RIN: 1024-AD93) received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC–814. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division, Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds; Implementation of Vacatur (RIN: 1615-AA22) received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–815. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Security Bars and Processing; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No: USCIS 2020-0013] (RIN: 1615-AC57) received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–816. A letter from the Regulations Unit Chief, Office of Policy and Planning, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures and Standards for Declining Surety Immigration Bonds and Administrative Appeal Requirement for Breaches [DHS Docket No.: ICEB-2017-0001] (RIN: 1653-AA67) received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–817. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018 [AG Order No.: 4667-2020] (RIN: 1125-AA95) received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–818. A letter from the Legal Tech, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Oakland Ship-to-Shore Crane Arrival, San Francisco Bay, Oakland, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2020-0719] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–819. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Categories of Archaeological Material of Italy [CBP Dec.: 21-01] (RIN: 1515-AE59) received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–820. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Educator Expense Deduction under Section 62(a)(2) (Rev. Proc. 2021-15) received March 26, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–821. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Relief for Qualified Opportunity Funds and Investors Affected by Ongoing Coronavirus Disease 20219 Pandemic [Notice 2021-10] received February 23, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–822. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extension of Empowerment Zones (Rev. Proc. 2020-16) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–823. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Providing elections under Sec. 172 set forth in the CARES Act received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–824. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — United States and Area Median Gross Income Figures (Evergreen) (Rev. Proc. 2021-19) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–825. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's Major final regulations — Deduction for Foreign-Derived Intangible Income and Global Intangible Low-Taxed Income [TD 9901] (RIN: 1545-BO55) received April 12, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York: Committee on Oversight and Reform. Authorization and Oversight Plans for all House Committees (Rept. 117–17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CONSENSUS CALENDAR

Under clause 7 of rule XV, the following motion was filed with the Clerk: Motion No. 2, April 14, 2021 by Ms. KUSTER on H.R. 707

(Omitted from the Record of April 14, 2021)

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 2547. A bill to expand and enhance consumer, student, servicemember, and small business protections with respect to debt collection practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 2548. A bill to enact as law certain regulations relating to the taking of double-crested cormorants; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mrs. AXNE):

H.R. 2549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 2550. A bill to require GAO review of certain TSA screening protocols, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. STEWART, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MOORE of Utah):

H.R. 2551. A bill to designate and adjust certain lands in the State of Utah as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 2552. A bill to provide financial assistance for projects to address certain subsidence impacts in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 2553. A bill to establish an interagency Task Force to analyze Federal collateral underwriting standards and guidance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. MACE, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CARL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MAST, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida):

H.R. 2554. A bill to provide COVID-19 mitigation instructions for cruise ships, and other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2555. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to establish a grant program to provide grants to local agencies and clinics to improve the health of mothers and infants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 2556. A bill to support States in their work to end preventable morbidity and mortality in maternity care by using evidence-based quality improvement to protect the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period and to reduce neonatal and infant mortality, to eliminate racial disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 2557. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of tax returns of candidates for the office of President or Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. REED, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. HERN, and Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 2558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDERSON:

H.R. 2559. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to the authorization of foreign manufacturers of cylinders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 2560. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to authorize block grants to States for prekindergarten education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2561. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to establish a 3-year phase-in period for de novo financial institutions to comply with Federal capital standards, to provide relief for de novo rural community banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BENTZ (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2562. A bill to address the nationwide shortage of tree seedlings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Mrs. HINSON):

H.R. 2563. A bill to exclude from gross income $10,200 in wages or net earnings of certain taxpayers for taxable year 2020; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 2564. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Silver Cliff, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. MACE, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2565. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow manufacturers and sponsors of a drug to use alternative testing methods to animal testing to investigate the safety and effectiveness of a drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. ROY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, and Mrs. MCCLAIN):

H.R. 2566. A bill to prohibit certain individuals from downloading or using TikTok on any device issued by the United States or a government corporation; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BURCHETT (for himself, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2567. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick ''Roddie'' Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. NEAL, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 2568. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 2569. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connection for diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for veterans who served in close proximity to the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. LEVIN of California):

H.R. 2570. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require certain disclosures relating to climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 2571. A bill to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal and to otherwise modify the eligibility criteria for E visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 2572. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to restrict the debt collection practices of certain debt collectors; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 2573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself and Mr. CAWTHORN):

H.R. 2574. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate a portion of United States Route 74 in North Carolina as a future interstate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASE, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 2575. A bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BUSH, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 2576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate estate and generation-skipping taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Ms. MACE, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2577. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish a Federal regulatory budget and to impose cost controls on that budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, the Judiciary, Oversight and Reform, and Small Business, 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. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 2578. A bill to seek the renegotiation of the Paris Agreement on climate change or the negotiation of a new agreement, including the requirement for the Senate to provide its advice and consent to ratification of any such agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. BROOKS):

H.R. 2579. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that the Secretary of Homeland Security may waive certain environmental requirements to permit U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to search for unlawful border crossing tunnels on private land to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 2580. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connected disability for certain veterans who served in Palomares, Spain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HERRELL (for herself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2581. A bill to establish a biochar demonstration project and biochar grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 2582. A bill to amend the definition of eligible entity in the second draw loan program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 2583. A bill to modify the calculation of the maximum loan amount under the paycheck protection program for farmers, ranchers, and sole proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2584. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow for twelve associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 2585. A bill to conduct fire salvage on certain National Forest System lands burned by wildfire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. MANNING, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WILD, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2586. A bill to provide collective bargaining rights for fire fighters and emergency medical services personnel employed by States or their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN):

H.R. 2587. A bill to improve the ability of veterans with medical training to assist the United States in response to national emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CRIST, Ms. MACE, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2588. A bill to allow veterans to use, possess, or transport medical marijuana and to discuss the use of medical marijuana with a physician of the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized by a State or Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. MENG, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 2589. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to permit leave to care for a domestic partner, parent-in-law, or adult child,

or another related individual, who has a serious health condition, and to allow employees to take, as additional leave, parental involvement and family wellness leave to participate in or attend their children's and grandchildren's educational and extracurricular activities or meet family care needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. BUSH, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 2590. A bill to promote and protect the human rights of Palestinians living under Israeli military occupation and to ensure that United States taxpayer funds are not used by the Government of Israel to support the military detention of Palestinian children, the unlawful seizure, appropriation, and destruction of Palestinian property and forcible transfer of civilians in the West Bank, or further annexation of Palestinian land in violation of international law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS (for herself and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 2591. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs have physical locations for the disposal of controlled substances medications; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 2592. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide that children who have relocated from Puerto Rico to the States are fully considered for purposes of State allotments under the English Language Acquisition grants; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 2593. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for a legislative line-item veto to expedite consideration of rescissions, and cancellations of items of new direct spending and limited tax benefits; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GUEST, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARSON, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 2594. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the coinsurance requirement for certain colorectal cancer screening tests furnished under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 2595. A bill to establish a Rural Opportunities to Use Transportation for Economic Success Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 2596. A bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Ms. WILD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER):

H.R. 2597. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 1501 North 6th Street in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as the ''Judge Sylvia H. Rambo United States Courthouse'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 2598. A bill to amend title XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to expand access to maternal health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 2599. A bill to provide a duplication of benefits fix for Sandy CDBG-DR recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. BRADY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. PERRY, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. DAVIDSON):

H.R. 2600. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on the designation of the Reynosa/Los Metros faction of the Gulf Cartel, and the Cartel Del Noreste faction of Los Zetas as foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. VELA, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 2601. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify Congress regularly of reported cases of burn pit exposure by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2602. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for wage and economic stabilization in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2603. A bill to establish the policy of the United States regarding the no-first-use of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. EMMER, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 2604. A bill to improve the permitting process for critical mineral projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 2605. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a limitation on the time for the use of contributions or donations by candidates for election for Federal office, to prohibit candidates from using campaign funds to make contributions to charitable organizations which are owned or controlled by the candidate or immediate family members of the candidate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 2606. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to the acceptance and use of contributions for public-private partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 2607. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs procedures to determine presumptions of service connection based on toxic exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 2608. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and

Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 2609. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the requirement for an annual report on the material readiness of Navy ships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. BUCK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H. Res. 320. A resolution recognizing the critical importance of access to reliable, clean drinking water for Native Americans and Alaska Natives and confirming the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure such water access; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 cl. 3, To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, Among the Several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 2548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 2549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 2550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution:

''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 2551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 2552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 2553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SALAZAR:

H.R. 2554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 2555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 2556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 2557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 2558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Section 7&8 of Article 1 of the United State Constitution.

By Mr. BALDERSON:

H.R. 2559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 2560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 2561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BENTZ:

H.R. 2562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 2563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 2564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution allows Congress to ''To establish Post Offices and Post Roads.''

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 2565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to ''regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.''

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 2566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BURCHETT:

H.R. 2567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 2568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 2570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 2572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 2573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 2574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Artilce I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 2576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 2577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United. States constitution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 2580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. HERRELL:

H.R. 2581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 2582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 2583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 2584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, section 8, clause 18 and Article III, section 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 2585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.''

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 2587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2588.

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. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution

By Ms. McCOLLUM:

H.R. 2590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS:

H.R. 2591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1, which gives Congress the power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8, clause 3, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

Article I, Section 8, clause 18, which gives Congress the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 2593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 2595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority 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. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 2596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 2597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 2598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 2599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 2600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 2601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: ''The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority. on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to ''provide for the common defense,'' as enumerated in Article I, Section of United States Constitution.

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 2604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: ''To make all Laws which are necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 2605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof''

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 2607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer therof

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 2609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof. [Page H56]

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.J. Res. 40 .

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 5

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 51: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 67: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 69: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 82: Mr. JACOBS of New York and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 239: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 243: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

H.R. 279: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 322: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 332: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 333: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 350: Mr. EVANS and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 391: Mrs. KIM of California and Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 392: Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 471: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 472: Mr. MOORE of Alabama and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 500: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 521: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 563: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 564: Mr. BROWN.
H.R. 586: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 598: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 623: Ms. WILD, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 628: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 684: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 748: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 763: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 852: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 867: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 869: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 903: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SOTO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ROSS, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. OMAR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. García of Illinois, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 922: Mr. COSTA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 959: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 962: Mr. POSEY, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 970: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 1012: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MENG, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1022: Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.
H.R. 1080: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 1081: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1115: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. VELA, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1150: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 1155: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 1182: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 1183: Ms. CHU and Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 1208: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1210: Mr. JACOBS of New York.
H.R. 1219: Mr. LATURNER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LONG, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1226: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 1227: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 1259: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 1264: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1284: Mr. MOONEY.
H.R. 1297: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1332: Mr. CRIST, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 1345: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1346: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1364: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 1448: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JACOBS of New York, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1488: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1507: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1520: Ms. MACE.
H.R. 1534: Mr. POSEY, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. VAN DUYNE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 1554: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1568: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 1579: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 1581: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MANNING, Ms. CRAIG, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 1585: Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1592: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
H.R. 1596: Mr. COSTA and Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 1630: Mrs. KIM of California.
H.R. 1670: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. AXNE, and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 1676: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 1693: Mrs. SPARTZ.
H.R. 1712: Mr. JACOBS of New York and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1745: Mr. BOST, Mr. CARL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MACE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 1812: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 1834: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1843: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CASE, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1861: Mr. TIFFANY.
H.R. 1903: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1905: Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1957: Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 1974: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1988: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2002: Mrs. SPARTZ, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 2007: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 2028: Mrs. KIM of California and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 2037: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2041: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2060: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2096: Mr. TRONE and Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 2146: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2187: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2188: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BENTZ, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2209: Mr. GARCIA OF CALIFORNIA.
H.R. 2226: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 2228: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 2244: Mr. BACON, Mr. BOST, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 2248: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2283: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2286: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2349: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2354: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2372: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 2383: Mr. BACON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2413: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2446: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 2462: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2466: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2477: Mr. MORELLE.
H.R. 2483: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2485: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 2486: Mr. MANN and Mr. ROSENDALE.
H.R. 2487: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 2488: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 2490: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 2491: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2510: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2513: Mr. SUOZZI and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2520: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 2535: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2544: Mrs. HAYES.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr.
Fortenberry, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. COMER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BARR, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. PALMER, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. BRADY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. HILL, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GARCÍA of California, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. HERN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSE.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
H.J. Res. 19: Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H. Res. 39: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 114: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Res. 118: Mrs. STEEL, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CAWTHORN, and Mr. OWENS.
H. Res. 119: Ms. ROSS, Mr. BACON, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. MANNING, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H. Res. 157: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H. Res. 289: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 305: Mr. CARSON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H. Res. 313: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H. Res. 318: Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BACON, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. HERN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

PT-11. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 66-21, urging the United States Treasury to expedite the process to feature Harriet Tubman on the twenty-dollar bill for her legacy of equality, social justice, and freedom; and to reflect the history and diversity of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

PT-12. Also, a petition of the Council of the City of New York, NY, relative to Resolution No. 1418-A, calling on the United States Congress to pass, and the President to sign, legislation that would permit employment-based status holders to retain lawful status, after loss of employment, if such loss was related to the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PT-13. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 68-21, condemning the military coup in Burma and the detainment of its political leaders; and urging United States federal officials to take swift action to support their release and peaceful transition to democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PT-14. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San

Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 46-16, urging the National Park Service to work with the community and stakeholders to establish an immediate interim activation for the Cliff House, consistent with its historic use, while the competitive process for a long-term tenant is underway, and to maintain and protect the integrity of the vacant buildings and surrounding area.; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

PT-15. Also, a petition of the City Council of the City of Marathon, FL, relative to Resolution 2021-17, in support of SB 1086/HB 639 and additional amendment language addressing long-term anchoring, reflecting the continuing efforts of Florida fish and wildlife conservation commission to improve boater safety, reduce vessel dereliction, and improve marine sanitation to protect our natural marine resources, and in support of additional FWC staff and financial resources to adequately implement existing and new enforcement measures, and providing an effective date; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *117th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 2021 *No. 65*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are wisdom without end, mercy without limit, and strength beyond resistance. Lord, we glorify Your Name.

Today, lead our lawmakers around the obstacles that hinder them from accomplishing Your purposes. Lord, guide them around the stumbling blocks of resentment, pessimism, and unbelief that impede legislative effectiveness. Help our Senators to live to honor You. Fill their hours with Your redeeming radiance and their hearts with Your peace. May they work to advance the influence of Your Kingdom.

We pray, in Your loving 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, April 15, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

VIOLENCE AGAINST ASIAN AMERICANS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, yesterday, an overwhelming bipartisan majority of Senators voted to move forward on Senator HIRONO and Senator DUCKWORTH's anti-Asian hate crimes bill. I was pleased the vote was so substantial, 92 to 6. Rarely do you see 92 Senators agree to move forward with any piece of legislation. But if there was ever a topic that deserves a strong showing of bipartisan support, it is standing up to bigotry and racism against a particular group of Americans.

Today, we will continue to work on a bipartisan agreement regarding amendments. I have committed to start the process with the bipartisan Moran-Blumenthal amendment. I understand my Republican colleague from Maine has some modifications to the bill, which we welcome, and those negotiations are proceeding afoot. I expect the Republican leader and I, in consultation with the relevant committees, will be able to figure out an appropriate number of reasonable, germane, and non-gotcha amendments for the Senate to consider.

We are working with Senators MORAN, GRASSLEY, and COLLINS in a very bipartisan way, and we should be able to wrap up this bill next week. By doing so, the Senate will deliver a powerful message to Asian Americans that their voices are heard, their concerns are felt, and that their government will take swift, decisive action to protect them. They are not alone.

Before I move on, I just want to say to my Republican colleagues: This is how the Senate can work, even though it is closely divided. When there is a pressing issue, like the rising tide of anti-Asian violence, the Senate can act quickly and in a bipartisan way to address it.

We don't need to always distrust the other party. This bill was never intended to be a messaging bill or gotcha legislation. This bill is like a drive straight down the middle of the fairway—well-timed, modest, unobjectionable.

At the end of the day, we can achieve a result that has both substantive and symbolic importance: substantive because we are going to adjust the focus of the Justice Department to better respond to anti-Asian hate crimes and symbolic because both parties are standing up to deliver a message that racism and bigotry have no place—no place—in America. That is an undeniably good result.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another, less happy, matter, this afternoon the Senate will need to go through a rare procedure to discharge a nomination from the Judiciary Committee: Ms. Vanita Gupta to serve as Associate Attorney General.

The daughter of immigrants from India, Ms. Gupta is the first civil rights attorney and the first woman of color to ever be nominated for Associate Attorney General, the third ranking official at the Department of Justice. Her public track record is nothing short of exemplary.

In her very first case after law school, Ms. Gupta won the release of several African Americans who had

Printed on recycled paper.

been wrongly convicted by all-White juries in Texas, clients who eventually won a pardon from Texas Governor Rick Perry. She continued her work at the ACLU, where she launched a bipartisan criminal justice reform effort, before going on to lead the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department under President Obama.

Despite her sterling credentials, some of my Republican colleagues on the Judiciary Committee would have you believe that Ms. Gupta is some hair-raising, leftwing radical. In her hearing, Ms. Gupta was unfortunately subjected to a mind-numbingly repetitious line of questions about whether or not she supports the police or wants to decriminalize all drugs.

A conservative judicial organization launched a national ad campaign to smear her nomination. It was disgraceful. Just yesterday, a Republican Senator on the Judiciary Committee grilled another DOJ nominee, Kristen Clarke, over an obviously satirical piece she published for her college newspaper.

The political right seems to relish trying to score political points by connecting every Justice Department to hot-button partisan issues, whether or not they have any relevance, sometimes to the point of absurdity. And in the case of Ms. Gupta, the accusations of radicalism are especially false.

Ms. Gupta has worked with stakeholders and legislators from all corners, including a number of Republican Senators, during various criminal justice reform efforts. She has been endorsed by—listen to this—the National Fraternal Order of Police. Let me repeat that so my colleagues hear it. She has been endorsed by the National Fraternal Order of Police, as well as the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the National Sheriffs' Association. It is making the decrying that she is a crazy leftwing radical just absurd, and you wonder how and why they come to that conclusion.

Vanita Gupta will make an outstanding Associate Attorney General. The Senate should discharge her nomination from the Judiciary Committee this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, time and again, prominent Democrats show they are no longer content to work within the ground rules and norms of our institutions. They prefer to threaten the institutions themselves.

We have seen it in Presidential elections when Democrats say our democracy is sacrosanct when they win but illegitimate and broken if Republicans win.

We have seen it with the Senate's rules. Democrats just spent 4 years not only praising but using the legislative filibuster. But now that they hold the majority, they say it has actually been intrinsically evil all along and must be scrapped.

We are seeing it right now with voting regulations, where the mere fact that sometimes Republicans win elections has Democrats wanting to rewrite all 50 States' election laws right here in Washington and turn the Federal Election Commission into a partisan body.

And then there is the judiciary. In recent years, we have seen the Democratic leader stand on the steps of the Court and threaten that specific Justices ''won't know what hit them'' if they didn't rule the way he wanted. We have seen a number of Democratic Senators send a threatening brief suggesting the Court might need to be ''restructured'' if its rulings upset liberals.

Last week, President Biden, who was marketed to the country as a moderate and institutionalist, jumped in with both feet. He set up a pseudo-academic commission to study the merits of packing the Supreme Court. It is just an attempt to clothe this transparent power play in fake legitimacy.

But alas, the far left cannot even wait for the fake theatrics of the fake study to play out. Today, Democrats in the Senate and the House have announced they will once again threaten judicial independence from the steps of the Court. They are introducing a bill to add four new seats to the Supreme Court so that Democrats can pack the Court, destroy its legitimacy, and guarantee the rulings that liberals want.

Across the ideological spectrum, top jurists have been outspoken on what a terrible idea Court packing would be. The late liberal icon, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, explicitly warned against Court packing saying: ''If anything would make the Court appear partisan, it would be that.'' ''Nine seems to be a good number''—Justice Ginsburg.

Justice Stephen Breyer reaffirmed his own opposition just last week. The public, by the way, agrees. They see through this discredited concept. One survey late last year showed that a clear majority of Americans opposed packing the Supreme Court.

But the farthest left activists aren't interested in the common good. They want power. And the same Democrats and the same corporate media that spent the last 4 years hyperventilating and declaring a new constitutional crisis was under way every 30 seconds seem to be perfectly content to play along.

Now, if Republicans had introduced a bill to add four Supreme Court seats for the last President to fill, there would have been weeks of wall-to-wall outrage on every newspaper and cable TV channel nonstop. Now it seems the main strategies are either to shrug off, look the other way, or to actively play along and somehow lend credence.

It is not about whether this insane bill becomes law. Part of the point here is the threats themselves. The left wants a sword dangling over the Justices when they weigh the facts in every case. As the Democratic leader threatened just 2 years ago, Democrats want the Justices to know that they will ''pay the price'' for rulings that Democrats don't like.

The left wants these swords dangling over the Senate and State legislators and independent judges. The threats are the point. The hostage-taking is the point. And responsible people across the political spectrum have an absolute duty to denounce this.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 1133 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

TRIBUTE TO KATELYN CONNER BUNNING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Madam President, on one final matter, over the years, a lot of talented Kentuckians have joined my team at the start of their careers. I have gotten to watch them hone their skills and grow into real leaders.

Unfortunately, the privilege of working with ultratalented young people also means you often see a real all-star fly the nest, and today I have to offer a reluctant goodbye.

Katelyn Conner Bunning was from Louisville. She joined my personal office almost 11 years ago. She has done just about every job there is, from answering phones to mastering policy issues.

For the last 4 years, I have relied on her extensively as my legislative director. Katelyn has been a key adviser to me, a role model to junior staffers, a key link between my leadership office and my Kentucky-focused staff. Who better to help me deliver for the Commonwealth than the daughter of a former Mr. Kentucky Basketball?

Along the way, some of the trickiest issues facing the Bluegrass have landed on Katelyn's desk: securing retired miners' pensions and healthcare, revitalizing abandoned coalfields, strengthening Kentucky schools and helping students succeed, delivering certainty for Kentucky farmers while opening new doors for industrial hemp, even protecting kids' health by raising the minimum tobacco purchase age to 21.

Last year, I asked Katelyn to take charge of improving safety and medication standards in the thoroughbred racing industry. Even as a national publication was calling to end this sport altogether, Katelyn assembled owners, trainers, jockeys, breeders, and fans to preserve Kentucky's signature industry.

This is a long list of accomplishments. Yet it is only a short summary of Katelyn's impact on my team and our Commonwealth. She has set very high standards. She has helped everyone achieve them.

We are certainly going to miss her around here, but I am sure her husband Eric and their new daughter Alice are looking forward to seeing a bit more of her every day.

So, Katelyn, thank you for your ability, for your friendship. I wish you and your family all the best.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

COVID–19 HATE CRIMES ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 937, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 13, S. 937, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I feel very privileged to be here today to speak on behalf of Vanita Gupta, a dedicated public servant who is devoted, deeply devoted, to equal justice, civil rights, and the rule of law.

I have seen firsthand, and I know I am not the only one who has done so, her consummate dedication to the integrity of the Department of Justice, which is so vital to be restored at this moment in our history.

The support for her reflects a broad, professionally and ideologically diverse coalition of individuals and organizations that know she is eminently qualified to be Associate Attorney General.

When she is confirmed, she will not only be the first civil rights lawyer but also the first woman of color to serve as Associate Attorney General.

She is, in effect, the leader we need in that position now. And we need it right now. The Attorney General needs her right now. He has said so. And we should be proud to confirm this eminently qualified woman. Hers is the character that the Department of Justice requires to help restore trust and credibility.

Now, the fact is that she has been a target of a smear campaign, a vial and despicable campaign of lies and deception that are completely unfounded. These attacks are based on demonstrable lies and mischaracterizations.

Her previous tenure in the civil rights division makes absolutely clear her commitment to enforcing the law with integrity and honesty, with balance and insight. She has a proven record as a consensus builder and as a leader.

And her work with law enforcement is the reason why she has such support among law enforcement leaders, and that support is across party lines. In fact, every major law enforcement organization refers and supports her nomination.

Try as they might, unfortunately, our Republican colleagues continue to smear her. She has never—she has never called for defunding the police. She has never said many of the lies that are attributed to her. And even more than being unfounded, these attacks are really the height hypocrisy. It is unconscionable that Republicans would criticize this lifelong public servant and Justice Department veteran after they silently sat by when there was no Senate-confirmed Associate Attorney General for nearly 3 years during the Trump administration. The outrage that they feign should fall on deaf ears.

Our moment of reckoning is soon. It is not just our moment of reckoning; it is a moment of reckoning for the Nation because, in the last year, we have faced a global pandemic. We have grappled with racial justice issues that have been ignored for too long, and we have defended against an onslaught of hate and extremism.

We are at a pivotal moment. We urgently need her kind of leadership to combat domestic terrorism, extremist violence, and hate crimes. In fact, we are in the midst right now of considering a measure that will help combat hate crimes, including my No Hate legislation. We know hate crimes are surging, and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have been the target of them, particularly the alarming wave of vitriolic attacks most recently.

Vanita Gupta has been a leader in the fight against hate crimes. As the head of the civil rights division, she was the Nation's chief civil rights enforcer and prosecutor. And while leading that division, she also headed the first prosecutions under the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which expanded the Federal hate crime law to include, among other things, crimes motivated by a victim's sexual orientation—crimes motivated by whom a person loved.

During her confirmation hearing, she committed to using the Department of Justice tools to investigate and prosecute hate crimes where they happen and to use its bully pulpit to prevent hate from festering in communities around the country.

The plain truth is that Vanita Gupta is the right person at the right time for this job. The Senate should confirm her as supremely qualified for this eminently important assignment, and it should do so swiftly with bipartisan support.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I am feeling a sense of deja vu this morning. In March, Democrats used reconciliation to pass a massive, partisan bill that served as a cover for a collection of payoffs to Democratic interest groups in Democratic States.

Now, just over a month later, we are facing the prospect of round 2. Democrats are once again looking at reconciliation to pass a massive, partisan piece of legislation that serves to cover a long wish list of liberal priorities. The subject this time, of course, is infrastructure—like COVID relief, a subject that Republicans are very ready to tackle, but, just like with their COVID bill, Democrats aren't showing a lot of interest in bipartisan cooperation. Once again, their message seems to be ''Go along with everything we want or be completely excluded from any part of this bill.''

As I said, Republicans would be happy to take up infrastructure legislation. Our Nation is overdue for additional infrastructure investment. But an infrastructure bill should be focused on actual infrastructure: roads, bridges, airports, waterways, and digital infrastructure like broadband.

Democrats have some of that in their bill, but they also have been very busy expanding the definition of ''infrastructure'' to include a whole host of Democratic priorities. One Democratic Senator tweeted:

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

Well, actually, no, they are not. Neither is the Civilian Climate Corps or community colleges or support for Big Labor. None of those things are infrastructure.

Now, it may be that some—and I say ''some''—of Democrats' noninfrastructure proposals are things that we should have a discussion about here in Congress, a bipartisan discussion, but they are not infrastructure, and they

don't belong in an infrastructure bill. Democrats should stop rewriting the definition of ''infrastructure'' to suit their purposes. The word ''infrastructure'' is not, in fact, anything that Democrats say it is. ''Infrastructure'' has an actual meaning, and it is not childcare or assistance for unions.

Even Democrats' actual infrastructure spending is frequently problematic. Democrats' infrastructure proposals would cost $2.2 trillion. Less than 6 percent of that—less than 6 percent—would be spent on roads and bridges. Under the Democrats' plan, spending on electric vehicle promotion would exceed investments in roads, bridges, ports, and waterways combined. That includes tax credits and rebates for electric vehicles, measures that will primarily benefit wealthier car buyers and leave rural States like South Dakota, where electric vehicles remain impractical, behind.

The bill also includes a massive sum for transit and high-speed rail—substantially more than the bill spends on highways, roads, and bridges—despite Americans' limited interest in rail travel.

On the tax front, Speaker PELOSI has expressed her interest in including a lifting of the current cap on State and local tax deductions. Now, this one is really interesting. It is a very interesting priority for Democrats, considering that repealing the SALT deduction would mostly benefit wealthy taxpayers, including that evil 1 percent whom Democrats are always talking about. But I guess sometimes principle has to take a back seat to keeping Democratic donors happy.

While we are talking about taxes, let's talk about how Democrats plan to at least partially—and I say ''partially'' because a lot of this could go on to debt—pay for this bill. Democrats would like to partially pay for this legislation with the largest corporate tax increase in a generation. They would sharply increase the corporate tax rate, once again putting American companies at a disadvantage next to their foreign competitors and threatening American jobs and wages. It is pretty hard to think of any worse proposal right now, with our economy still trying to recover from the effects of the pandemic.

What, in effect, you are doing when you are raising taxes dramatically—when I say ''raising taxes dramatically,'' I am talking the largest or highest tax rate in the developed world. We will be leading the OECD when it comes to taxation of businesses if the Democrats get their way and raise the tax rate on businesses from 21 percent to 28 percent. What you are doing when you do that is not punishing some corporation; it is punishing workers who work for those companies. This is about jobs. It is fundamentally about jobs. When you raise taxes on businesses, it hurts jobs.

Now, there is a history of bipartisan collaboration on infrastructure legislation. Our last major transportation infrastructure bill, the FAST Act, was supported by both Democrats and Republicans, and it was a remarkably successful bill. Last Congress, the Environment and Public Works Committee here in the Senate developed bipartisan transportation infrastructure legislation. There is absolutely no reason—no reason—why we couldn't replicate past bipartisan success in this Congress.

The word is that next week the Democratic leader is going to bring up a bipartisan water infrastructure bill that recently passed the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously. I hope he will. That should be a model for a larger infrastructure bill, not the partisan process that Democrats embraced with their COVID legislation and not the partisan, wasteful proposal full of non-infrastructure-related measures that Democrats have put forward.

I saw an op-ed the other day that pointed out that ''President Biden promised to usher in a golden age of bipartisan cooperation, but instead he is showing a reverse Midas touch—taking issues that once united Republicans and Democrats and making them partisan and divisive.'' Sad but true. But the President has a chance to turn that around with infrastructure.

It is not too late for Democrats and the President to sit down at the table with Republicans and develop a substantial, bipartisan proposal that would address our country's infrastructure needs without spending taxpayer dollars on wasteful or extraneous proposals.

I am encouraged that President Biden is meeting with Republicans on infrastructure legislation, but I hope these meetings are not just for show. The President, as we all recall, met with Republicans on COVID legislation, too, before rejecting bipartisan cooperation. Let's hope he will choose a different path this time.

It is not too late for the President to start fulfilling his inauguration promise of unity and bipartisanship. He should start with this infrastructure bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1132

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit today about a subject that I have struggled with in terms of how to address, and I am going to finish my remarks by offering a bill up for the Senate's consideration.

Mr. President, I know you are aware of all of this, but we can't live without glucose. Glucose fuels our cells, and, of course, our cells make up our muscles and our tissues and our organs, and we can't live without insulin. Insulin is a hormone that regulates the amount of glucose in our blood. Thankfully, for most people, their pancreas produces insulin naturally. It is just an undeniable fact that without insulin, without glucose, you are dead.

Unfortunately, as you know, sometimes our pancreas does not create insulin or doesn't create enough insulin or creates it erratically, and that condition, of course, is called diabetes. Thankfully, 100 years ago, in 1920, there was a Canadian physician and scientist whose name was Dr. Frederick Banting. He invented a synthetic form of insulin to help people whose pancreas could not produce the hormone. He won a Nobel Prize for it. It was extraordinary.

He was so committed to helping humanity that he and his other colleagues who had patents on this synthetic insulin sold their insulin patents for $1, 1 buck. They wanted to make sure that insulin was affordable. God bless them.

Today, 34.2 million Americans have diabetes. Not all people who have diabetes need insulin, but of that 34.2 million people, 7.4 million people need synthetic insulin; otherwise, they are dead men; they are dead women. Eighty-eight million Americans have what we call prediabetes. That means they are just a hair away from having full-blown diabetes. It is a problem in Louisiana, Mr. President, as I am sure it might be in Colorado. Louisiana has about 500,000 people with diabetes, most of whom need insulin. That is 12 percent of my population.

Now, here is where the story becomes dark. Three pharmaceutical companies have a monopoly on synthetic insulin. These three companies control about 90 percent of the global supply of insulin. Diabetes is certainly not unique to Americans, and these three pharmaceutical companies control almost, well, virtually, 100 percent of the U.S. market. Their cost, as best I can tell, you might be surprised to learn that a lot of the cost of these pharmaceutical drugs—and that is what synthetic insulin is; some call it a biologic—but the cost, as best I can tell, to produce a vial of insulin is about 10 bucks in today's dollars. There is no viable generic. You have to buy a brand name from one of the three companies.

Now, the cost of synthetic insulin has increased fairly recently very dramatically. The average list price for insulin tripled from 2002 to 2013, and then from 2013 to 2016 it doubled again. In the last 10 years, the out-of-pocket costs because many people have insurance—not everyone, but many people have insurance—in the last 10 years, the out-of-pocket cost of insulin for the average patient has doubled. Most diabetes patients, to give you some context, require two, quite often, three vials a month.

Let me try to get out of the conceptual and be specific. One type of insulin, and I don't mean just to single them out, but it is called Humalog. It was released in 1996. Its price since 1996, which costs about 10 bucks to make it per vial, has increased 1,700 percent. It has gone from $21 a vial to $375 a vial. Now, that same vial in Canada that costs $375 here costs about 50 bucks in Canada. Remember, you need three vials, sometimes two, hopefully, a month to live, to survive. So if you use three vials a month at 375 bucks a crack, the cost has gone from $750 a year in 1996 to $13,500 a year. Nothing has changed about the insulin. This insulin is 100 years old—100 years old.

Now, that, of course, is the list price. As we know, many people have insurance, and there are all sorts of insurance plans with differing amounts of deductions and differing amounts of copays, but I think a recent report by the Health Care Cost Institute is instructive. It found that the average American with type 1 diabetes, who needs insulin, has out-of-pocket insulin costs every year of about $6,000. That is every year. You will not be surprised to learn that, as a result of that, about one in four Americans has to ration the insulin—they don't take their full doses—to make them last longer.

Now, I have a bill. It is called the Ending Pricey Insulin Act. I don't know where my staff comes up with these names. I can hardly say that. Anyway, it is to try to lower the cost of insulin. It is going to cap out-of-pocket costs for insulin if this bill, in its wisdom, passes the Senate. It is going to cap the cost at 50 bucks for a 30-day supply. It is going to cap the cost for people who have insurance. It is going to cap the cost for people who have Medicare. It is going to cap the cost for people who have Medicaid, and it is going to cap the cost for the people who don't have anything—no insurance whatsoever. It is going to cover high-deductible health plans. It is going to cover the CHIP program. It is going to cover veterans' health plans. It is going to cover TRICARE. It is going to cover everybody and have a maximum out-of-pocket cost per month of $50.

This bill would take effect for plan year 2022. Health plans, as the Presiding Officer knows, set their rates 6 to 9 months in advance, so I want to give them fair warning here. My bill provides a workable runway for the insurance plans to comply, but the bill does include a retroactive clause that insures any out-of-pocket costs above 50 bucks that people pay. After that, they will be reimbursed. The bill is only five pages long. I don't think it is complicated to fix this problem.

Now, I really struggled with whether to offer this bill. Let me say first that I am not trying to pick on our pharmaceutical drug companies. What they have done in the last year is nothing short of miraculous. To me, it is just evidence that American and human ingenuity can never be underestimated, and it is extraordinary what the private sector can accomplish when the government gets out of the way. I am talking, of course, about the coronavirus vaccines. I happen to have two brothers who are physicians, and I called both of them right after the coronavirus was determined to be the coronavirus.

I said: How long for a vaccine?

They both said: A minimum of 2 years, probably 3 or 4.

The pharmaceutical drug industry did it in less than a year. God bless them.

So I don't mean to criticize them. I understand they have research costs, and I understand they have marketing costs, and I certainly understand that the health insurance delivery system and the market itself is opaque. God, how did we design such a system? I yearn for the day—we all do—when we have a healthcare delivery system for pharmaceutical drugs that looks like somebody designed it on purpose.

I have spent a lot of time—I certainly don't pretend to be an expert—researching the problem surrounding the cost of insulin, and everybody blames everybody else. The pharmaceutical drug companies blame the PBMs. The PBMs blame the insurance companies. They all blame each other. Some of them blame the doctors. Some of them blame patients for whining. You know, at some point, you say: Gosh. You know, it is almost as if you are intentionally making it opaque, and that is a big part of our health insurance market problem.

I was reading an article the other day, and this is on a slightly different subject. As you know, the Trump administration issued an Executive order saying hospitals have to post their prices. The hospitals sued, and the government won. So now the hospitals have to post their prices.

The Wall Street Journal did a very interesting investigative piece. It really was a fine piece of work in this post-journalism, pay-to-play world that we live in. It looked at the websites of all of the major hospitals throughout the United States, and it found, I think—I don't remember the number—over 100 that had implemented or put it on their websites' software so that the posted prices for their services that they offered, which the Executive order required, were there on the websites, but you just couldn't see it, and consumers couldn't find it. Those who could find it had to go through about 10 different layers to get to it. When the Wall Street Journal contacted the hospitals, they said: Oh, whoops. It is just a software mistake. We will get it fixed.

So the market is opaque.

Look, some of my colleagues are going to oppose this bill, and I understand their point of view in their saying: Kennedy, this is price-fixing. We thought you were a free market guy. I am. I am. I don't want to have to do this, but we have been talking about this problem for years, and it just keeps getting worse and worse and worse.

I think the Members of the U.S. Senate—the most interesting group of people I have ever been around—are intelligent enough to understand nuance. They understand that this is price-fixing, but they also understand this argument of, well, you are going down a slippery slope. No, we are not. There is nothing in this bill that says we have to go down a slippery slope. I think most fair-minded people understand that insulin, as a biologic, pharmaceutical drug, is unique. We are not talking about a drug that the pharmaceutical industry has spent hundreds of billions of dollars developing and has taken on extraordinary risk. This is a product that has been around since 1920. It is virtually unchanged. It costs 10 bucks a vial to produce. There is virtually no risk, none whatsoever. It hasn't changed much in 100 years, and people have to have it. The costs were recouped long ago.

I am not accusing anybody of anything, but I think a big part of the problem is the fact that three companies have a monopoly, and there is no generic because some people engage in what is called evergreening, which is a very clever way devised by the patent lawyers to keep patents from ever running out. I am just tired of holding hearings and issuing press releases and talking to the press about it and then doing nothing.

I will just say—and I am going to end because I know Senator CRAPO has something he wants to say, and I want to hear him—that I really struggled with this. I guess I am being inconsistent, because I do believe in the free market. I don't believe in having the government set prices, but I don't know what else to do.

I don't think we are going down a slippery slope. Insulin is unique. We have all got good pairs of L.L. Bean and other boots to keep us from going down that slippery slope. There is no law that says the U.S. Senate can't consider issues on an ad hoc basis. Senators understand nuance, and in any event, I would rather be right than consistent.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1132, introduced earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, first of all, I want to respond to Senator KENNEDY.

The first thing I want to say to Senator KENNEDY is that I am impressed. He did this in only five pages. I wish we could all learn to write our legislation

in five pages or less. I don't disagree with the history Senator KENNEDY went through, with his powerful declaration, in that this is a critical issue that we must deal with, and I don't disagree with the fact that we have to have some serious pressure built here in the U.S. Congress to get this over the finish line.

That being said, I think we just got this language last night, and what Senator KENNEDY is asking us to do today is to bypass the committee and go immediately to the floor with his language. There are several reasons I am going to have to, ultimately, object to that.

The first is that he is correct. I and a number of my colleagues who would be here if I were not standing here have a real problem with the solution, the mechanism, that Senator KENNEDY has chosen—just outright price-fixing. Senator KENNEDY doesn't even try to deny that. It goes beyond imposing government regulatory price controls in government-run programs by going through the private market as well. That is a solution mechanism that I have opposed and many of my colleagues oppose in terms of dealing with this issue. That is one of the key reasons for my objection.

The other one, though, is that the Committee on Finance, of which I am the ranking member, is working on this. I know that this is not an answer, because the Committee on Finance has been working on this now for a year or 2 or more, but there is work underway in a number of different arenas to try to get a handle on how to solve this without having to take the drastic step of just having the government come in and take control over the private sector market.

I will just point to, for example, what happened under the Trump administration in just the last couple of years. Through the Trump administration's effort to try to deal with this, a demonstration project has been operating under Medicare Part D in which the effort was to try to get the monthly cost of insulin down to $35 a month, and they have had some success in that program to demonstrate how it can be accomplished.

Now, look. I get that Medicare Part D is different than private sector insurance and that it is different than Medicaid and that it is different than other pieces of our healthcare system; it is also different than CHIP, but in one sector, a pretty significant sector, we have some solutions that are starting to show real potential.

In addition, as Senator KENNEDY knows, I drafted legislation in the last Congress and am working on that legislation in this Congress that will deal not just with insulin but with many different other pieces of drug pricing in our system.

I can tell you that Senator WYDEN himself, my counterpart on the Democratic side on the Finance Committee, has been working on his own ideas, and he and I have been working hard to prioritize this to get to a solution in the committee. I know, as I talked to Senator WYDEN just before I came to the floor, that Senator WYDEN and I both welcome the opportunity to work with Senator KENNEDY as we try to put together that bipartisan solution.

I know that there would be other Senators on the other side of this issue who would stand here if I were not today and say they don't like this solution because they want it to go further in the other direction. They want to see a complete government takeover of the entire market and move to a single-payer system, that single payer being the government. That is another thing that some on my side have been working hard not to have happen.

There is a lot of political controversy over what the mechanism must be, and that is the primary reason I want this to be able to be worked on in the committee, in the proper way that we manage legislation in the Senate. I commit to Senator KENNEDY that he can be as engaged as he wants to be with us in that as we move forward, but it is not the time right now to come and bypass that whole process.

I think Senator KENNEDY would probably make a very powerful rejoinder that we have heard that we are working on it a lot and we need to now get to the point where we put solutions here on the floor for the entire Senate to consider, but today is not the day to do it by a unanimous consent request, and for that purpose I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from Idaho, knows how much I respect him, and I certainly appreciate the invitation to work with him and his committee, and I intend to do that.

And I know that the Senator didn't say this, but I don't believe in government-run healthcare. But we have a discrete problem here and a very unique situation that can be addressed. This is not a biologic, as I said earlier, that costs hundreds of millions of dollars to develop. This is insulin, and a lot of Americans need it or they will die.

There is a monopoly, and there are efforts that have been made to maintain that monopoly, and my people in Louisiana—I know the people in Idaho—many of them feel the same way, and that is why they applaud Senator CRAPO's efforts, but they are hurting.

You can die without insulin. You can die. And it costs 10 bucks a vial to make, and it has been around 100 years, and now it costs 375 bucks. And all you have to do is walk across the border into Canada, and you can buy it for 50 bucks.

The market is being manipulated. I know it is complicated, and I understand politics. I have been around it a good portion of my life, but this is an issue where we need to stop—we need to stop—talking about it, strutting around, issuing press releases, holding hearings, and doing nothing.

I don't want to price fix. I don't. It makes me real uncomfortable to be proposing this, but I don't know what else to do. There comes a point where patience—where patience—ceases to be a virtue.

And here is what I know. I mean, the bill has been objected to, and I appreciate it. You pass a bill like this or a similar bill like this; you are going to see a solution pretty fast. You are going to see a solution real fast. You are going to see some—this opaque market react with new energy. They are going to be running around like hounds from hell, trying to keep this from becoming the law, and that is why we need to hit this head-on.

But with that, I thank the President for his attention, and I thank my colleague for his eloquent remarks.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

COVID–19 HATE CRIMES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired, and the motion is agreed to.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 937) to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) would have voted ''no.''

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 152 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—6

Marshall	Portman	Sanders
Moran	Rounds	Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Judiciary Committee being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Senate Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the nomination of Vanita Gupta, of Virginia, to be Associate Attorney General.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Chair for clarification. It is my understanding there is 4 hours of debate, evenly divided between the Democrats and Republicans, on the discharge petition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, between the leaders or their designees.

Mr. DURBIN. And either side can yield back; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you.

Mr. President, let me be the first to rise today on our side and say that I am in strong support of the nomination of Vanita Gupta to be the Associate Attorney General.

The Justice Department has not had a Senate-confirmed Associate Attorney General in over 3 years because President Trump never put forward a nominee. The No. 3 position in the Department of Justice has been virtually vacant of a Senate-confirmed nominee for 3 years.

That position, by definition, oversees the Department's civil litigation components. This is no small deal. It is a big deal. The Department of Justice needs and deserves to have full leadership in place.

Vanita Gupta will be the first woman of color and the very first civil rights attorney to serve as Associate Attorney General. This historic nominee is also exceptionally well qualified. She is a veteran of the Justice Department. She has a proven record of working across political and ideological lines to uphold the rule of law in a nonpartisan fashion. I don't believe President Biden could have picked a better nominee.

Vanita Gupta first joined the Justice Department shortly after the shooting death of Michael Brown by a police officer in Ferguson, MO. I remember it. I am sure many of my colleagues do as well. It was a difficult moment for many. As the head of the Department's Civil Rights Division, Ms. Gupta worked closely with all of the stakeholders involved in police reform: community leaders, civil rights leaders, and law enforcement.

Not only did Ms. Gupta implement meaningful reforms in Ferguson, MO, and other cities, but she did so by helping to repair the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve. Can you think of a better qualification at this moment in time in our history?

Sadly, in recent days, our Nation has been rocked by controversial police shootings. Vanita Gupta is exactly the type of person we need at the Justice Department at this very moment. One strong piece of evidence is the incredibly broad range of support her nomination has received. When you say the words ''civil rights lawyer,'' you say, ''Oh, way off on the left. I will bet she is out of touch with reality.''

Not so. It is not just the civil rights groups that support her. Her nomination has the support of virtually every major law enforcement organization in the country. I want to repeat that because in the ensuing several hours, when we will discuss the discharge of her nomination, there will be assertions made which do not acknowledge the obvious.

Vanita Gupta has the support of virtually every major law enforcement organization in the country, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, just to name a few.

I can read numerous quotes from law enforcement groups praising Ms. Gupta. I am going to read one. In a letter to the Senate, David Mahoney, President of the National Sheriffs' Association, said:

''I strongly believe that Ms. Gupta is exactly the type of leader who is needed in the Justice Department today. She possesses immense credibility among law enforcement leaders and community leaders.''

Immense credibility, with both law enforcement and community leaders. Isn't that exactly the type of person we need in the Department of Justice at this moment in history?

It comes as no surprise when you look back on her background. Throughout her career, Ms. Gupta has worked across the partisan divide, forming broad coalitions to get things done when people said it was impossible. A great example of this is criminal justice reform. Over a number of years, Vanita Gupta partnered with numerous conservatives—certifiable, reported conservatives. Let me give you a couple names: Grover Norquist; Mark Holden, the former general counsel of Koch Industries.

These efforts helped lay the groundwork for the passage of the FIRST STEP Act, a bill which I worked on with Senator GRASSLEY, Senator LEE, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator CORNYN, a number of Democrats, CORY BOOKER included. We put together a bipartisan bill, signed into law by the President of the United States.

Vanita Gupta was part of that effort. She knew how to put Republicans and Democrats at the table and come up with a reasonable compromise. Isn't that exactly what we need at this moment in history?

The Judiciary Committee has received so many letters from Republicans supporting Ms. Gupta's nomination that I only have time to scratch the surface. Former Republican Congressman Tom Coleman, whom I served with in the House, put it very well. He represented Missouri's Sixth Congressional District for 16 years. He understood the challenge of Ferguson, and he understands the record of Vanita Gupta. Here is what he wrote: ''Ms. Gupta is a person who seeks the common good, without concern for partisan gamesmanship.''

He added: ''I urge you, my former colleagues, to recognize the truth with respect to Vanita Gupta: She is an ideal public servant. She possesses wisdom and an ability to work across partisan lines.''

Ms. Gupta has spent her career fighting to uphold the rule of law, almost always on behalf of those who had little power or little money. In her previous tenure at the Justice Department, Vanita Gupta undertook critically important work. In addition to police reform, she led efforts to prosecute human trafficking, combat religious discrimination, and protect the rights of servicemembers to ensure that they didn't have to be worried about being taken advantage of financially while they were protecting our Nation.

More recently, during her tenure at the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Ms. Gupta led initiatives on voting rights, criminal justice reform, and the census.

Ms. Gupta began her career as a civil rights lawyer with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. One of the first matters she worked on as a young attorney involved nearly 40 wrongfully convicted individuals in the small town of Tulia, TX. The individuals who had been wrongfully convicted were almost all African Americans, and they had been convicted of drug charges based solely on the false testimony of one corrupt, blatantly racist undercover police officer.

How about walking into that situation, trying to resolve that situation. She did. Despite being completely innocent, these individuals were sitting in jail, and their appeals had been rejected. Vanita Gupta took their case anyway.

As a result of her work, not only were these individuals exonerated, but they received pardons from the Republican Governor of Texas, Rick Perry, and Texas eventually paid out a $6 million settlement. That is nothing short of a political miracle, and she achieved it by hard work, being smart as can be, and reaching out to both sides to find some area of agreement.

Ms. Gupta's commitment to ensure the equal protection of the law has been praised by Republicans and Democrats alike. Michael Chertoff, former Secretary of Homeland Security under President George Bush, said about Ms. Vanita Gupta in a letter to the Senate. ''She is a relentless advocate for fairness and the rule of law.''

How would you like to have that as the lead sentence of your legal biography: ''a relentless advocate for fairness and the rule of law.'' How would we like to have a person like that in this administration, in the Department of Justice? Obviously, we would jump at the chance.

She is the right person at the right time. She will bring experience, dedication, and a nonpartisan approach to the role of Associate Attorney General, and I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Now, if you heard what I just said about Vanita Gupta, you might think: Why was this a tie vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee? First, it is an evenly divided committee: 11 Democrats, 11 Republicans. And there are a lot of things going on, on both sides of the table, when it comes to the final vote on nominees like this.

Several Republicans told me they might be leaning in her direction but they couldn't vote for her in the committee. I hope they will reconsider when it comes to the floor.

And there was another thing going on too. Rightwing groups were spending millions—millions—of dollars on television in Washington trying to attack the reputation and character of Vanita Gupta.

I think I have made it clear. Vanita Gupta is highly qualified and historic, with broad support from law enforcement and civil rights organizations, advocates across the political spectrum. She, clearly, on the merits, will be an outstanding Associate Attorney General.

But every step of the way, her detractors have tried to delay and obstruct her nomination. We saw that in our Judiciary Committee markup on March 25. I allowed committee Republicans to speak for 94 minutes about Ms. Gupta's nomination at markup. One Senator from Texas spoke for 29 minutes himself. I didn't cut him off.

But someone on the Republican side made the decision to invoke the 2-hour rule, a Senate rule that says that a committee cannot operate more than 2 hours after the Senate comes into session, to try to cut off the markup for the vote even before the vote.

I had received assurances earlier that the 2-hour rule would not be invoked, but at 11:55, with barely 5 minutes to spare, I was told the other side had changed their mind. Just as the previous two chairs of the committee, Senators Graham and Grassley, had done in the past, I ended debate, notwithstanding committee rule IV, and called for a vote on the nomination.

I won't go into a debate over committee rule IV other than to say it is a doomsday filibuster. Any Senator can object to the business in the Senate Judiciary Committee and virtually stop all proceedings indefinitely. There is no recourse.

I gave Republicans ample time to make their arguments in the committee. I was prepared to give them even more time until the 2-hour rule was invoked. But someone on the other side decided to force my hand. I had to act quickly.

I told Republicans in writing in a March 24 letter that we would hold a vote on Ms. Gupta's nomination the next day, and I meant it. In the future, I would be happy to limit the number of minutes that Senators can speak in order for all Senators to have an opportunity, but at this moment in time, we have to accept the obvious.

Vanita Gupta has been subjected to blatantly false attacks from many rightwingers and conservative, dark money groups. Republicans have falsely claimed that she supports defunding the police. Be prepared. You are going to hear this mantra again and again.

In reality, Gupta has the support of virtually every major law enforcement organization in America. Republicans have made false claims about Gupta's position on drugs. For example, the senior Senator from Texas alleged that Gupta previously advocated, ''All drugs should be legal.'' In reality, Vanita Gupta has never advocated that all drugs should be legal. As the senior Senator from Texas knows, Gupta did write, 9 years ago, that she favored decriminalizing the ''simple possession'' of ''small amounts'' of marijuana and other drugs.

Take a look at what we have done with sentencing and drug crimes in America, even under the Trump administration.

At her hearing, Ms. Gupta was completely forthright in explaining that she changed her mind over the years in terms of decriminalizing drug possession, due in part to a family experience with opioid addiction.

Republicans have criticized Ms. Gupta's past statements on Twitter, despite the fact that they strongly supported President Donald Trump and many of his nominees, many of whom were just White males, who made such harsh statements in speeches and social media posts that they were legendary.

Republicans have argued that Gupta is radical and dangerous. In reality, Vanita Gupta has a career-long record of working closely with conservatives, business leaders and community leaders and law enforcement. That is why she has the support of so many prominent Republican leaders now.

I am looking forward to voting for her and to watching her serve in the Department of Justice. She will follow the trail that she set in her legal career, looking for solutions, bringing us together. Can you think of a moment in history in this country when we needed that more? I can't.

Every day we have these conflicting stories coming at us, from the courts in Minnesota on a question of George Floyd and the culpability for his death to a situation here in the Capitol, where we are honoring law enforcement when Officer Billy Evans of the Capitol Hill Police gave his life serving this country.

We are torn trying to find the right combination for law enforcement that is sensible and principled and humane. We need someone like Vanita Gupta at the table in the Department of Justice, leading. I hope her critics will have second thoughts.

Give this outstanding woman an opportunity to serve her country even more than she has in the past.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The Senator from Utah.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, right now, I just want to speak about the motion to discharge as opposed to whether people should vote for or against Gupta.

I am opposed to this effort to discharge Gupta from the Judiciary Committee. In fact, it is not properly in order. In theory, we are moving this nomination because it failed in Committee by an even, tie vote. But that vote should never have been called, and it was improper when it was.

Under the committee rules, members have a right to unlimited debate. This can only be stopped either by a bipartisan vote to end debate under the rules or by a vote of the majority of the committee to set a time certain to vote under precedent. Because Republicans at Ms. Gupta's markup wanted

to talk, there couldn't have been a bipartisan vote to end debate. In fact, some, like my colleagues from North Carolina, didn't have a chance to speak and were still waiting their turn. And because the Democrats don't have a majority in the committee, they couldn't have set a time certain.

Under the rules and precedents of the committee, then, they had to let Republicans talk, and if it took more than one markup, so be it. The Democrats did this talkathon when I was chairman. During our second markup of 2017, in order to delay Senator Sessions' nomination to be Attorney General, Democrats filibustered in the Judiciary Committee. When it happened, I didn't interrupt anyone or break any rules. I simply continued the markup the next day, checking to see who would want to be recognized and for how long.

The fact is that the Democrats frequently used these filibuster tactics against us over the past 4 years. We simply dealt with them from a position of confidence in the rules and precedents of our committee. Sometimes being chairman and moving nominees takes hard work, but we did the job we needed to do.

That is not what happened in the discussion of Gupta. Instead, my colleague from Arkansas was interrupted and the roll was called while he was still speaking.

This was not the power of the majority being used. It was the power of the chairman. What is the point of having rules if you can just ignore them—just ignore them when you find yourself dealing with an unfamiliar situation.

So I don't think the even vote—the tie vote—in committee even properly happened. As far as I am concerned, Senator COTTON had the floor. That rollcall vote was illegitimate under committee rules, and so the one that we are going to have in the Senate this afternoon is just as illegitimate.

And why did the Chairman scrap the committee rules for this nominee? This isn't a Supreme Court nomination. The nominee is a sub-Cabinet official at the Justice Department. So I have to wonder why. I think it is because the Democrats know how really powerful she will be in the Justice Department.

As Judge Garland told us during his hearing, he didn't pick Ms. Gupta. He only got to know her after they were both picked. That is quite a position for a subordinate to be in.

The late Congressman Dingell famously said this—and I will clean it up a bit: ''You let me write the precedent, and I'll [beat] . . . you every time.''

The Judiciary Committee has done him one better: Now there is no procedure.

If the rules are not respected, the Senate is an institution that loses every time.

I urge my colleagues to vote no and protect the traditions of the body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I don't know that there is another Republican Senator that I have worked with as much and as effectively and with as much pleasure as Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa—and I mean it. We have done some good things together.

We sometimes started off in opposing positions and tried to find some common ground. The First Step Act was a good illustration of that, but it is not the only demonstration, and I trust that there will be more. I am sorry we disagree today.

Two points I will make. Rule 4, as described by Senator GRASSLEY, is virtually, as I mentioned earlier, a doomsday filibuster. There is just no way out of it, particularly with an evenly divided committee. I am not the first to discover that as chairman.

I will make as part of the RECORD, and I am going to share with my colleague from Iowa, the four or five instances when previous Republican chairs of the committee did exactly what I did with this nomination and said: We are moving forward; we are not going to pay attention to rule 4.

Senator GRAHAM, Senator GRASSLEY, and others have done just exactly that in the past. So I think we adopted that as a rule because it was already in the rules, and we were evenly tied in committee. But it sure ties the hands of a chairman or anyone who is trying to accomplish anything if there is one person who just stands and objects and objects and objects. It is a very difficult situation.

The second thing I will mention is—I am going to make this a part of the RECORD, and I don't have it at hand as I stand here—the quote from Merrick Garland in his nomination hearing when someone raised the question about Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke, another nominee working her way through the committee. Merrick Garland may not have known either one of them personally beforehand. He could have, but I am not sure. But he made it abundantly clear that this is the team he wanted to manage the Department of Justice—no ifs, ands, or buts about it. He totally committed and believed that each of them brought a perspective in the law and by their own legal experience valuable to him and the Department of Justice and to the Nation. So I don't think there is any question that he is committed to Vanita Gupta, as he should be.

I will yield back at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am sorry that I missed the incredibly thoughtful comments of the Democratic whip, who I think spoke on the topic—one of the topics—that I am going to speak about.

I think I have 10 minutes. Is that right?

OK. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Clarification: The Senator may use whatever time he needs to.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Presiding Officer and thank the—I want to thank the brilliant ruling of the Parliamentarian on that subject.

Mr. DURBIN. Excuse me. If I can have a clarification. As I understand it, we are in measured time, 2 hours to a side. Any speakers on our side will be taken from that 2-hour total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you very much.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to touch on two critically important subjects that the Senate is considering today. First, I want to rise in support of Vanita Gupta, President Biden's nominee to serve as the Associate Attorney General, the third highest ranking position in our Justice Department.

I think my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, has already spoken about Ms. Gupta. I want to make a personal note. First, that Vanita is a fellow Virginian. I am proud to say that she and her husband, Chinh Le, are raising their two sons in the Commonwealth. They live in Arlington.

Ms. Gupta is also an outstanding public servant. She served from 2014 to 2017 as the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Civil Rights Division at DOJ. She led the Division, as the Acting Assistant Attorney General, until 2015.

Since 2017, she has led one of the country's preeminent civil rights organizations—the Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights. This means that, if confirmed, Ms. Gupta will be the first civil rights leader in any of the top three positions at Justice.

The sheer depth and breadth of Ms. Gupta's legal and professional experience makes her an outstanding selection to serve as the Associate Attorney General. Perhaps that is why Ms. Gupta's supporters span the political spectrum.

My understanding is that my friend, the Senator from Illinois, has already pointed out some of this broad-based bipartisan support. Let me elaborate on some of that support. Grover Norquist calls her an ''honest broker'' in his endorsement letter.

Let me just state for the record that I have had interactions with Grover Norquist since before I was Governor, over 20 years, and Grover Norquist has never called me anything close to as nice as he called Vanita Gupta as an ''honest broker.''

Mark Holden, the former general counsel of Koch Industries, writes: ''Ms. Gupta is an exceptional lawyer, and among the most talented lawyers I have worked with in my career.''

Ms. Gupta has spent years and years collaborating with people from across the spectrum to promote a more fair and equal justice system.

And let me note for the record, as well, that I have not always agreed with Ms. Gupta. I was very involved in

housing finance reform. Ms. Gupta, as chairman of the Conference on Civil Rights, had a different opinion, but I always respected her intellect and her willingness to listen to alternative views and her willingness to really dig into the facts.

With that background as a civil rights leader in the thick of issues around policing, race, and criminal justice reform, she actually led the investigations of police departments in Ferguson, Chicago, and Baltimore.

At the same time, I have a long list of law enforcement groups that are supporting Ms. Gupta's nomination, including the National Fraternal Order of Police. Again, in terms of the FOP, I think in all my career, one time they endorsed me. Again, her receiving that endorsement is different than myself and perhaps even the Senator from Illinois.

Ms. Gupta has also led broad-ranging and robust enforcement and education efforts to combat hate crimes, including the first-ever prosecutions under the newly enacted Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

Under her leadership, the Civil Rights Division trained local and Federal law enforcement throughout the country in recognizing, investigating, and proving hate crimes; in educating communities and engaging them in a process of ensuring public safety; and in encouraging better hate crime reporting and data collection.

I would like to close on one other timely credential. As chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I have meticulously chronicled the corrosive effects of disinformation and foreign interference into our elections—something the Presiding Officer is also a national leader on.

Ms. Gupta has been a leading voice for election integrity, thoughtfully and firmly engaging social media platforms to address disinformation on their platforms, as well as voter suppression, hate, division, and violence.

Among the many important roles the Department of Justice has right now, securing our democracy itself is surely near the top of the list.

Vanita Gupta is a person of extraordinary ability. She has the right experience for this role, and I am honored to support her in her nomination today and hope that later today, we will get broad bipartisan support to move forward that nomination.

COVID–19 HATE CRIMES ACT

Mr. President, this may be a transfer to a second subject, which actually goes a little bit in concert with talking about Vanita Gupta, and that is rising in support of the COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act and the Jabara-Heyer NO HATE Act.

During the COVID–19 pandemic, our Nation has witnessed a surge in racism, xenophobia, and violence against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. In fact, between March of last year and February of this year, there were nearly 3,800 hate incidents targeting Asian Americans. It should go without saying that these actions have no place in our communities.

To address this spike in anti-Asian rhetoric and hate crimes, we must stand in solidarity with the AAPI community, and we must act against these heinous crimes. The COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act helps address this crisis head-on.

This bill, very simply, requires Attorney General Garland to designate a coordinator within the Department of Justice to expedite, review, and facilitate reporting of COVID–19 related hate crimes. Further, it requires the DOJ to issue guidance to State and local law enforcement, to equip them with the tools needed to deal with the disturbing surge in incidents targeting the AAPI community.

It is tragic but not surprising that hate crimes in America have always been critically underreported. In fact, reports released by the Department of Justice in recent years suggest that the majority of hate crimes are not even reported—not even reported.

Our current patchwork system, paired with inconsistent reporting and resources, guarantees that many instances of hate-related violence and crimes go uncounted. Not only does this mask the true scale of hate incidents across our Nation, it also means that investigative resources and support structures may not be available to victims who need it.

This problem can be exacerbated by cultural and language barriers and made even worse by the pandemic, which has made it more difficult for folks to get connected with reporting mechanisms or useful resources. Fortunately, the COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act seeks to address these challenges by providing a clearinghouse for these cases.

Over the past decade, our Nation has seen a steady rise in hate crimes. Groups and individuals targeting minority and religious groups have increasingly perpetrated sickening acts of violence fueled by hateful ideologies.

We saw that here on January 6. We also saw it earlier in my State, in Virginia. In Charlottesville, back in 2017, we saw this hate and violence on our streets when a White supremacist drove a car through a group of peaceful protesters, injuring many and killing a young woman named Heather Heyer.

It is critical that we give our law enforcement the tools they need to curb these horrific acts. That is why, on a related item, I am also cosponsor of the bipartisan Jabara-Heyer NO HATE Act. My hope is that it will be offered as an amendment to the COVID–19 bill that we hopefully will be addressing shortly.

This bill modernizes our reporting system for hate crimes so that we can respond to accurate data. It also provides grants to establish hate crime hotlines, to record information about hate crimes, and to redirect victims and witnesses to law enforcement and local support services as needed. Finally, this bill provides a Federal private right of action for hate crime victims and allows judges to sentence community-specific education and community service. Together, these changes create a new model for addressing these crimes and preventing them from going unreported or unpunished.

Both the COVID–19 Hate Crime Act and the Jabara-Heyer NO HATE Act are straightforward pieces of legislation that give victims and law enforcement officers the tools they desperately need to tackle the increasing prevalence of hate incidents in our country. I hope that we move quickly on both these pieces of legislation in major bipartisan fashion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Arkansas.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Vanita Gupta is President Biden's nominee to be Associate Attorney General. She is unfit for that role. She is unfit because of her radical view that every single American and every single institution in the United States is inherently racist. She is unfit because she lacks the temperament to do the job, as evidenced by her relentless attacks on the integrity and character of judges and Senators alike, seemingly anytime she had a mere disagreement with them. She is certainly unfit based on her attempts to mislead the Senate in her Judiciary Committee hearing.

Ms. Gupta has been before the committee many times as a partisan advocate. There is nothing wrong with that, but her past appearances do give us a glimpse of what she believes when she isn't seeking our votes for confirmation.

Less than a year ago, June of last year, she came before the Senate Judiciary Committee to testify on police reform. When she was asked ''Do you believe all Americans are racist?'' she replied under oath ''Yes, I do.'' Think about that. The person nominated by Joe Biden to oversee, among other things, the Federal Government's civil rights enforcement says that she believes every single American is racist.

This preposterous idea that anyone and everyone is inherently racist is at the core of the pernicious ideology pushed by the left called ''critical race theory.'' But this position was not an anomaly, a misstatement, or a new position for Mrs. Gupta. In 2005, she published an article in the Fordham Law Review on what she called ''Critical Race Lawyering.'' In that article, Ms. Gupta argued that ''the rule of law'' and ''equal justice for all'' and ''equal protection'' aren't the great bulwarks of our liberty, aren't the single achievements of our Republic and our constitutional form of government, but instead ''code words''—that is what she called them—for some kind of twisted racism. Anyone who thinks that the rule of law or equal justice for all or

equal protection are simply ''code words'' for racism is unfit for any position in our government but especially a position of leadership in the Department of Justice.

The concerns with Ms. Gupta's nomination are not limited to extreme views on these topics. Ms. Gupta has made a career over the last few years on social media attacking the character and integrity of Federal judges, judicial nominees, and Members of the Senate. She accused four different jurists currently on the Supreme Court of being liars, extremists, ''dangerous,'' or ''opposed to civil and human rights.'' She must have had a macro; she just hit a shortcut button that said ''opposed to civil and human rights.''

By my count, she has leveled incendiary attacks on the integrity and character of around 50 currently sitting Federal judges. It could be more. I may have lost count when it got so high. I asked her about these attacks. While she said during her hearings that she ''regrets'' some of her rhetoric, she steadfastly refused to renounce these attacks on those judges.

Ms. Gupta has leveled similarly caustic comments against Members of this body, posting online that dozens of Members of the Senate are—you guessed it—''opposed to civil and human rights.'' She accused one of our colleagues of being ''a disgrace,'' another of being a ''hypocrite,'' and another of ''failing her constituents.'' At one point, she commented: ''How many of us are done with SUSAN COLLINS's concerns?''

I want to be clear. Disagreement with or even deep dislike for Members of the Senate is not disqualifying for any position in the Federal Government. People are entitled to have their opinions. They are entitled to have their political views. But honestly, the Associate Attorney General of the United States must be able to effectively represent the United States in court while also working with Congress on important issues. It might be hard to represent the United States in court when you have accused dozens of Federal judges of being ''opposed to human and civil rights'' or being a ''disgrace'' or a ''liar.'' Likewise, I wonder what Senator COLLINS thinks about Vanita Gupta being done with her concerns.

Perhaps most concerning, though, is that Ms. Gupta repeatedly misled the Judiciary Committee under oath. Every single Republican member of the Judiciary Committee joined a letter on March 23 outlining some of her most blatant misrepresentations that she made during her hearing, and we asked the chairman of the committee for a second hearing. That request was promptly refused.

Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent that the March 23 letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2021.

Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DURBIN: On March 9, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing to consider the nominations of Lisa Monaco, nominee to be Deputy Attorney General of the United States, and Vanita Gupta, nominee to be Associate Attorney General of the United States. While under oath, Vanita Gupta misled the Committee on at least four issues: (1) Her support for eliminating qualified immunity; (2) her support for decriminalizing all drugs; (3) her support for defunding the police; and (4) her death penalty record. Unfortunately, in her responses a week later to our written questions, Ms. Gupta was no more forthcoming. In some cases, she doubled down on her misleading statements from the hearing, and in others she refused to answer altogether. In ''response'' to scores of our questions, she merely copied-and-pasted the same inapplicable, general statements for one question after another.

We urge you to immediately schedule a second hearing with Ms. Gupta so that she can answer for her misleading statements, and for her refusal to respond to our written questions. Indeed, Ms. Gupta herself asked for similar measures in the context of past nominees. On November 20, 2017, Ms. Gupta issued an open letter in which she wrote that, as a result of what she described as ''credible evidence'' that two nominees were not forthcoming with the Committee, ''Chairman Grassley must put politics aside and bring back both nominees before the committee so that they can be asked about their truthfulness under oath. Failure to do so would abdicate the independent role of the Senate . . . If the Senate Judiciary Committee is going to be taken seriously by this and future administrations, it must demand that nominees accurately respond to questions[.]''

Ms. Gupta's misleading statements to this Committee include, at minimum:

1. HER SUPPORT FOR ELIMINATING QUALIFIED IMMUNITY

During the hearing, Ms. Gupta was asked whether she supported eliminating the doctrine of qualified immunity. She responded that she doesn't ''support[] elimination one way or another.''

In June 2020, Ms. Gupta testified before this Committee that ''Congress should end qualified immunity in Section 1983 claims.''

When pressed about her June 2020 testimony before this Committee, Ms. Gupta claimed those were not her own opinions, but that she had been merely ''representing the consensus views of the Civil Rights Coalition at the Leadership Conference.'' But in June 2020, she said, ''I am pleased'' (not that the Leadership Conference was ''pleased'') that reforms she had recommended, including the elimination of qualified immunity, were ''included in the newly introduced Justice in Policing Act of 2020.''

Additionally, during the June 2020 hearing, when one of the other witnesses said that he believed qualified immunity should be eliminated, Ms. Gupta added, ''I agree.''

2. HER SUPPORT FOR DECRIMINALIZING ALL DRUGS

When asked whether she advocates for ''decriminalization of all drugs,'' Ms. Gupta answered, unequivocally, ''No, Senator, I do not.''

Ms. Gupta doubled down on this misleading statement in response to written questions, writing that she had ''never advocated for the decriminalization of all drugs.''

In a September 2012 op-ed in the Huffington Post, Ms. Gupta wrote that ''States should decriminalize simple possession of all drugs, particularly marijuana, and for small amounts of other drugs.'' This directly contradicts Ms. Gupta's answers.

A member of the Committee pressed Ms. Gupta for explanation during the hearing, and referred to the September 2012 op-ed. Ms. Gupta answered, ''Senator, I have advocated, as I believe President Biden has, for decriminalization of marijuana possession.''

Later in the hearing, another member of the Committee followed up on the question by reading aloud Ms. Gupta's statement from the 2012 op-ed, to which Ms. Gupta responded that she had only been ''speaking for [her] position today.'' But her answer had specifically referred to her past-tense advocacy when she stated she had only advocated for decriminalization of marijuana possession, and her written answers a week later explicitly claimed that she had ''never'' advocated for decriminalizing possession of all drugs.

3. HER SUPPORT FOR DEFUNDING THE POLICE

During the hearing, Ms. Gupta repeatedly stated that she did not ''support defunding the police.'' She added, ''I have, in fact, spent my career advocating where it's been necessary for greater resources for law enforcement.'' She later added that she had advocated for greater law enforcement resources ''at every point in [her] career.''

These statements directly contradict her sworn testimony before this very Committee on June 16, 2020, where she said that leaders must ''heed calls . . . to decrease police budgets and the scope, role, and responsibility of police in our lives.''

When pressed by a member of the Committee that her statement in June 2020 was, by any measure, advocating for defunding the police, Gupta responded that she ''disagree[d]'' with that characterization. But Ms. Gupta used the same characterization while speaking on a webinar just two days after her June 2020 testimony, saying, ''Localities have been overspending on criminal-justice system infrastructure and policing and divesting in housing, education, jobs, and healthcare. Some people call [changing this] 'defunding the police,' other people call it 'divest/invest.' ''

The Washington Post—the same outlet that you cited in defense of Ms. Gupta's nomination during a March 10 hearing on another topic—correctly noted that Ms. Gupta's June 2020 statement was ''exactly what 'defunding' the police is all about. Now Gupta says she has never supported the idea.''

A contemporaneous article by Reuters on June 8, 2020, also noted that ''defund the police'' was a term ''being used by activists to propose eliminating or cutting spending on police departments, often the largest expense for municipalities, and instead funneling the money to programs for education, social welfare, housing, and other community needs.''

Any claim that Ms. Gupta was not aware that the policies she espouses are what other activists mean by ''defunct the police,'' directly contradicts how she described her own policies just months ago.

4. HER DEATH PENALTY RECORD

In response to a question about her prior statements against the death penalty, Ms. Gupta said that, while she had been an opponent of the death penalty, ''I also know how to enforce the law. And I did so when I was in the Justice Department before, when Dylann Roof committed the heinous act against nine parishioners at the Charleston [Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal] Church. And that prosecution and conviction happened under my watch.''

Ms. Gupta's statement suggested that she had supported the application of the death

penalty in the Dylann Roof case because it met the requirements under the law, despite her personal feelings. That was not the case. Contemporaneous reporting by the Washington Post in 2016 noted that Attorney General Loretta Lynch approved prosecutors seeking the death penalty for Dylann Roof ''over the objections of some advising her, including . . . Vanita Gupta, the head of the Justice Department's civil rights division.''

What Ms. Gupta said was that the ''prosecution and conviction'' of Dylann Roof, including the application of the death penalty, ''happened under [her] watch.'' She misled Senators by neglecting to say that it also happened over her objection.

When asked about these contradictions in written questions, Ms. Gupta found a new way to avoid answering: She said it ''would not be appropriate . . . to discuss'' what she did at the Department of Justice, either on the Dylann Roof case ''or on any other matter [she] worked on during [her] prior government experience.''

Further, there remain significant questions about Ms. Gupta's temperament, about which she refuses to answer even simple questions. During her hearing, multiple members of this Committee asked her about her harsh rhetoric and her attacks on the character and integrity of sitting federal judges and members of the Senate. In response, she told the Committee that she ''regrets'' her rhetoric. Yet, in responses to written questions after the hearing, Ms. Gupta repeatedly and notably refused to renounce her previous attacks, such as her prior assertions that four different jurists on the Supreme Court are liars, extremists, ''dangerous,'' or ''opposed to civil and human rights.'' Instead, in response to written questions from multiple members about her attacks on senators or the federal judiciary, Ms. Gupta chose to copy-and-paste more than 40 times a generalized statement that she has either ''tremendous respect'' or ''immense respect'' for judges or for members of the United States Senate.

Our call for a second hearing is not due to Ms. Gupta's substantive views—either her longstanding views or her new ones claimed only since her nomination. It's about her lack of candor with the Committee. If her answers at the hearing were misleading about her record, and in written questions she shifted her answers again or refused to answer at all, the Senate Judiciary Committee cannot perform its role to consider her nomination.

The position of Associate Attorney General is the third-ranking position in the Department of Justice. The Associate Attorney General oversees, among other things, the civil litigation and enforcement apparatus of the United States. It is critical that the Associate Attorney General be someone who can be trusted to tell the truth. Further, the Senate must be able to trust that the testimony of public officials under oath will be truthful and complete.

Unfortunately, this is not the case with Ms. Gupta, and the Committee should immediately schedule a second hearing.

Sincerely,

Chuck Grassley, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary; John Cornyn, U.S. Senator; Ted Cruz, U.S. Senator; Josh Hawley, U.S. Senator; John Kennedy, U.S. Senator; Marsha Blackburn, U.S. Senator; Lindsey O. Graham, U.S. Senator; Michael S. Lee, U.S. Senator; Ben Sasse, U.S. Senator; Tom Cotton, U.S. Senator; Thom Tillis, U.S. Senator.

Mr. COTTON. Finally, Mr. President, I have to observe something independent of Ms. Gupta herself. The discharge petition filed today requires that there has been a valid, tied vote in committee. That is the rule we all agreed to in the beginning of this Congress. Yet Ms. Gupta still has not received a valid vote in the committee. In fact, during the markup of her nomination, just minutes into my 15-minute remarks, the chairman of the committee cut off my remarks midsentence and called for a vote, in violation of committee rules. I guess somehow allowing members to finish their statements, which are guaranteed under the committees rules, had somehow become inconvenient for the scheduling preferences of our Democratic colleagues, or perhaps the committee's meeting had been mismanaged and they were worried about the 2-hour rule. It wasn't just me. My remarks were interrupted. At least one Republican Senator didn't have an opportunity to speak at all. The Democrats simply broke the rules and voted out Ms. Gupta's nomination—not in accordance with Judiciary Committee rules.

There must be consequences when the Democrats break the rules. Here is what the consequences are going to be in this case. I will refuse consent or time agreements for the nomination of any U.S. attorney from any State represented by a Democrat on the Judiciary Committee. What we need to have is a valid vote in committee in accordance with the committee rules, not ramming through this nomination today.

Today we are faced not only with the choice of whether Ms. Gupta is fit to be the Associate Attorney General, we are also faced with the question of whether to legitimize yet again the partisan bulldozing of the Senate's rules if those rules are even marginally inconvenient, even in committee session. Going down this path is not going to improve the Senate.

I will be voting no, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to talk as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, President Biden has decided to withdraw all forces from Afghanistan by September 11, 2021. I believe this decision was one of the hardest President Biden will ever make.

As Washington Post columnist David Ignatius pointed out, ''Biden's military and intelligence advisers had presented him with three unpleasant alternatives: leave May 1 as previously agreed, even though this would probably mean the fall of the Kabul government and a return to civil war; stay for a limited period, perhaps negotiated with the Taliban, which would delay its eventual takeover; or stay for an undefined period, which could mean a long continuation of what is already the United States longest war.''

In effect, there were no good choices. The President exercised his best judgment to endorse a path that is most likely to protect the national security interests of the United States.

I believe there were several factors over 20 years of conflict in Afghanistan that shaped the President's decision. The most critical miscalculation over the past 20 years was the Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq.

We took our eye off the ball in Afghanistan at a crucial time and instead pursued a war of choice in Iraq. The attacks by al-Qaida on September 11 galvanized the world. The authorization for use of military force passed the Senate 98 to nothing, while the French newspaper Le Monde proclaimed, ''We are all Americans.'' Most notably, for the first time, NATO invoked article 5 of its charter, which calls upon its members to take action on behalf of any member nation which is attacked. The world was with us.

But before we could really gain momentum in Afghanistan, the United States diverted to an unnecessary war of choice in Iraq. As journalist Steve Coll wrote in his definitive history of the war in Afghanistan, months after 9/11, ''On November 21, 2001, then Central Commander Tommy Franks, who was planning our operations against Tora Bora, took a call from Donald Rumsfeld, who ordered him to start working on the plan for the invasion of Iraq. Rumsfeld told him to have something ready within a week.''

As a consequence, General Franks' attention was being forced elsewhere. As journalist Susan Glasser wrote in the Washington Post, in the Battle of Tora Bora, ''corrupt warlords allowed bin Laden to escape, while special forces pleaded with the Pentagon to let them get in the fight.'' As we now know, Osama bin Laden, the leader of al-Qaida and the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks, was not captured for another decade. This decision wasted a period when the Taliban was routed and the Afghan population was welcoming.

More recently, President Biden inherited a flawed agreement from the Trump administration. Known as the Doha agreement, it required the United States, its allies, and coalition partners to withdraw all military forces by May 1, 2021. Nondiplomatic civilian personnel, private security contractors, trainers, and advisers were also required to leave. In effect, the entire international presence that has been the foundation for almost two decades of the Afghanistan effort was to disappear on May 1. In exchange, the Taliban agreed not to attack the United States or its allies and promised not to allow ''other individuals or groups, including al-Qaida, to use the soil of Afghanistan to threaten the security of the United States and its allies.''

The only really verifiable condition on the Taliban of the Trump agreement was that the Taliban would not attack the United States or its allies. The remaining conditions were unenforceable and very, very difficult to certify. As General McKenzie, the commander of Central Command, testified to the Armed Services Committee just a few weeks after the agreement was concluded: ''We don't need to trust them; we don't need to like them; we don't need to believe anything they say. We need to observe what they do.''

What we have observed is alarming. While the Taliban may have adhered to one aspect of the deal by not attacking U.S. forces, they have violated the spirit of the agreement, as overall violence is on the rise.

The Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction assessed that enemy attacks against Afghan security forces and civilians increased by 50 percent in the third quarter of 2020. Former Acting Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan Laurel Miller described ''an uptick in targeted assassinations [which] has sent shock waves through urban areas.'' In mid-March, Secretary of Defense Austin noted that, after meeting with Afghan President Ghani, ''It's obvious that the level of violence remains pretty high in the country.''

Additionally, a United Nations report from last fall concluded that the relationship between al-Qaida and the Taliban had not been substantially changed by the February 2020 agreement between the Taliban and the United States. The U.N. assessment noted, alarmingly, that ''al-Qaida has been operating covertly in Afghanistan while still maintaining close relations with the Taliban'' and that the group is, in their words, ''quietly gaining strength in Afghanistan while continuing to operate with the Taliban under their protection.''

Beyond the substance of the Trump agreement, the manner in which it was concluded was also deeply flawed. To begin with, the Trump administration concluded a deal with the Taliban, a fundamentalist group using the name ''Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan.'' Even though the agreement states that the United States does not recognize such a state, its very formulation is a propaganda boon for the Taliban.

As former Pakistani Ambassador to the United States Husain Haqqani noted: ''Allowing the Taliban to refer to themselves as the Islamic Emirate, even in parentheses, allows them to build the narrative that they forced the U.S. to negotiate an exit from Afghanistan just as the mujahideen had forced the Soviets out. If the administration is eager to withdraw U.S. troops from Afghanistan, it would have done better to announce a no-deal exit than allowing the Taliban such a huge propaganda victory.''

Additionally, the Trump agreement was completed exclusively between the Trump administration and the Taliban. There was no involvement of the Afghan Government, reversing the long-standing position of the United States, which prioritized an ''Afghan-led, Afghan-owned reconciliation process.'' Further, there was no visible involvement of our NATO allies who went into Afghanistan after we were attacked on September 11, 2001, when article 5 of the NATO charter was invoked for the first time.

As the Afghan Study Group noted, the group led ably by General Dunford and our previous colleague Senator Ayotte: ''Our NATO allies in particular have been steadfast in their support and have shared the sacrifice; over 1,000 coalition troops have been killed since 2001.'' The Trump administration negotiated their exit without their say, without their involvement. There was no involvement either by regional partners despite potentially significant consequences for security in the region. As the Afghan Study Group further noted: ''An unstable Afghanistan risks destabilizing the region through continued trade in illicit drugs, the attraction of extremist ideologies and the possible exacerbation of the rivalry between India and Pakistan, two nuclear-armed powers.''

Trump's go-it-alone, rush-to-the-exits mentality led to a deal where the Taliban emerged as the key benefactor. The United States, its allies, and partners won very little from the Trump deal.

Now, we are approaching 20 years of warfare in Afghanistan, spanning over three different Presidential administrations or, perhaps more accurately, 1 year of warfare repeated 20 times as we rotated troops in and out of Afghanistan. In addition to the disastrous pivot to Iraq and the flawed agreement with the Taliban, despite all our efforts over multiple administrations, we have been unable to build an effective fighting force that could defeat the Taliban and hold territory. Afghan soldiers have fought bravely despite continuing pressure and massive casualties, and several components have emerged as particularly capable, such as the Afghan special security forces, but after 20 years, this is not sufficient progress.

As the Afghan Study Group assessed: ''The ongoing lack of capacity and inefficiency of the [Afghan National Defense and Security Forces or] ANDSF limit its strategic options against the Taliban. As a result, the ANDSF is generally on the defensive to provide security for much of the population.'' We were never able to change the ''checkpoint mentality'' of the Afghan forces. Their focus on static positions, as much for appearance as for tactical advantage, still persists today, making them extremely vulnerable to a more agile Taliban.

Moreover, two decades later, the Afghan forces still have no organic logistical capabilities. An assessment by the Department of Defense from last June noted: ''All components of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces will . . . continue to rely over the long term on contracted logistic support and on the United States for the vast majority of the funding needed to sustain combat operations.'' As I recall the agreement that the Trump administration negotiated, it requires the withdrawal of all contracted logistical support, and as Napoleon once commented, ''An army moves on its stomach.'' Without a logistical capability and without a tactically capable army, with few exceptions, the ability of the Government of Afghanistan and the military of Afghanistan to resist the Taliban is highly questionable. We should be looking seriously at ourselves because, for 20 years of efforts and billions of dollars, I would have hoped that we would have seen a credible, decisive, effective Afghan force.

Another crucial factor contributing immensely to the Taliban's success has been the inability of the United States to eliminate the sanctuary the Taliban was granted in Pakistan. Center for Strategic and International Studies terrorism expert Seth Jones wrote in 2018: ''The Taliban['s] . . . sanctuary in Pakistan and state support from organizations like [Inter-Services Intelligence or] ISI have been essential to their war effort, and the U.S. failure to undermine this safe haven may be Washington's most significant mistake [of the war].'' As the Afghan Study Group notes, these ''sanctuaries are essential to the viability of the insurgency.''

Additionally, Pakistan's ISI aided and abetted the Taliban while opportunistically cooperating with the United States. As Brookings scholar Vanda Felbab-Brown assessed in 2018: ''Pakistan provided direct military and intelligence aid . . . resulting in the deaths of U.S. soldiers, Afghan security personnel, and civilians, plus significant destabilization of Afghanistan.'' This support to the Taliban runs counter to Pakistani cooperation with the United States, including, as they have, allowing the use of airspace and other infrastructure for which the United States provided significant funding. As the Afghan Study Group noted: ''Pakistan has played both sides of the field.''

These dynamics further play out against a complex environment in Pakistan, which has implications for the national security of the United States, its allies, and partners. Pakistan is simultaneously fragile and armed with nuclear weapons, making its vulnerability particularly dangerous. To add to this toxic mix, Pakistan is in a longstanding struggle with its neighbor, India, which is also armed with nuclear weapons. As Seth Jones described: ''Pakistan and India have long been involved in a balance-of-power struggle in South Asia. Both lay claim to the Kashmir region, and have fought three wars over Kashmir since 1947. Afghanistan is not the ultimate objective of either country but rather an arena for competition in what has

long been called the 'great game.''' While bogged down politically and militarily in daily crises in Afghanistan and Iraq, the United States, over multiple administrations, has been unable to focus the necessary attention on Pakistan. Therefore, these problems have only gotten worse.

Another factor shaping the President's decision is that the United States and its coalition partners were never able to develop an Afghan Government that could gain the confidence of the people, especially beyond the cities, and provide basic services, including security, education, healthcare, and justice. A study by the World Bank in late 2019 found that 55 percent of Afghans were living below the poverty line, with even basic civilian services underfunded. The lack of the government's ability to meet such needs erodes the people's support for the government.

Afghanistan has also been undermined by profound corruption. The Afghan Study Group assessed that corruption has ''delegitimized the existing government and created grievances that are exploited by the Taliban to gain support and, at times, legitimacy.'' Corruption is a national security concern that further erodes the ability of the government to build faith and trust.

Additionally, the leadership of the Afghan Government is seen as being removed from the populace. This makes it harder to understand the needs of the people and to govern effectively. A prime example of this conundrum is the current President, Ashraf Ghani. Ghani was reelected after a 5-month delay in the polling results and following a longstanding dispute with his political rival. While Ghani is a serious scholar and technocrat who literally wrote a book on fixing failed states, he appears unable to fix his own state. As the New York Times reported just last week, ''From most advantage points, Mr. Ghani—well qualified for his job and deeply credentialed, with Johns Hopkins, Berkeley, Columbia, the World Bank, and the United Nations in his background—is thoroughly isolated. A serious author with a first class intellect, he is dependent on the counsel of a handful, unwilling to even watch television news, those who know him say, and losing allies fast.''

But even if President Ghani was a strong leader, it would likely not be enough. The instability of the central government, which has been fueled by rival factions seeking power resulting in inconclusive elections, has led to unwieldy power sharing arrangements. Beyond challenges between those political officials and technocrats who want to serve the government and may have competing visions, there is the fundamental tension between those trying to achieve the complex task of governing Afghanistan in Kabul and the Taliban, who have a single focus: ejecting foreign forces. There also appears to be a lack of willingness by the government to seriously negotiate with the Taliban and make tough choices that could have obtained, perhaps, a lasting peace deal.

The Afghan Government also remains unable to generate revenue to fund its operations. Instead, it relies almost solely on foreign contributions. This includes an average of $5 billion in security assistance, along with $3.5 billion in civilian assistance from the United States and the international donors each year. The World Bank assessed in late 2019 that even if there was a peace agreement between the Afghan Government and the Taliban, Afghanistan would still need as much as $7 billion a year from foreign forces to sustain its most basic spending.

With all of these complex dynamics at play, it underscores a further, albeit profoundly unsatisfactory conclusion facing the President. The alternative to withdrawal was not the status quo. More U.S. and NATO forces would have been required for self defense and especially if there was another attempt to ''surge'' forces to degrade the Taliban. It appears that the President concluded that more troops might buy more time and casualties, but more time would not create a government that could defeat the Taliban and effectively govern Afghanistan. As the old Afghan saying goes: ''You have all the watches; we have all the time.''

It is important to emphasize, though, that the President's decision should be seen as a transition, not closure. We still have vital security interests in the region. Afghanistan is not in the rearview mirror. Pakistan is not in the rearview mirror. There is a high probability that without NATO and U.S. support, the Afghan security forces will degrade and collapse, which will ultimately cause the Afghan Government to collapse. The Trump administration's agreement with the Taliban included the departure of all security personnel, logisticians, and contractors, which means that when the United States leaves, the international presence that, again, is the foundation for Afghan resistance is removed. The intelligence community's Annual Threat Assessment for 2021 noted: ''The Afghan government will struggle to hold the Taliban at bay if the coalition withdraws support.'' And according to the New York Times, American intelligence agencies assessed that if U.S. troops leave before a peace deal is reached between the Afghan Government and the Taliban, Afghanistan ''could fall largely under the control of the Taliban within two or three years after the withdrawal of international forces.'' We have already seen evidence of this trend even prior to the full withdrawal. The International Crisis Group assessed that ''as U.S. force levels have fallen, battlefield dynamics have steadily shifted in the insurgents' favor.'' Dexter Filkins described: ''Since 2001, the main arena of conflict in Afghanistan has been the countryside: the government held the cities, while the Taliban fought to control the villages and the towns, particularly in the south, their heartland. But by early this year, the paradigm had begun to fall apart. The Taliban were entrenched across the north; their shadow government had begun to creep into the cities.''

Another possibility, either in the interim or a permanent fact, is that the country could fracture with local warlords and the Taliban controlling different territory. This would further intensify conflict, increase instability, and create second order effects, such as the flow of internationally displaced persons and refugees. The International Crisis Group noted that the likelihood of fracture increases ''if U.S. and other funding declines'' and that it has the possibility of pulling Afghanistan's neighbors and other regional powers into backing proxies in a multisided struggle. Again, the Afghan Study Group warned: ''Any scenario in which the state collapses, as it did in 1992, will make it considerably more difficult for the United States to ensure its fundamental national security interests.''

If the Taliban reestablishes its emirate in Afghanistan, it would likely result in erasing all the progress that has been made toward building democracy and particularly the rights of women and girls. As Seth Jones, again, wrote in a recent article published by the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, ''The Taliban is in many ways a different organization from the one that governed Afghanistan in the 1990s. Yet most of their leaders are nevertheless committed to an extreme interpretation of Islam that is not shared by many Afghans, an autocratic political system that eschews democracy, and the persistence of relations with terrorist groups like al-Qa'ida.''

If NATO and the United States depart, another consequence is increasing pressure to limit or end international aid. Afghanistan cannot fund itself and, even under the best case scenario, would require $7 billion from international donors annually. It will be extremely difficult to administer programs and provide aid on the ground without oversight, and that, too, would very well lead to smaller international donations. Furthermore, the entire budget of the Afghan Ministry of Defense is paid for by international contributions. If soldiers are not getting paid, it would have a profound impact on national security.

Another likely consequence of withdrawal, which has been previously discussed, is the creation of a vacuum that allows the resurgence of terrorist groups, including al-Qaida and ISIS of the Khorasan Province. As the Afghan Study Group also pointed out, these groups are ''for now limited by the military presence of the United States and its allies, which allows the threat to be monitored and, when necessary, disrupted, while also enabling Afghan Security Forces to continue to put

pressure on these groups.'' However, the group warned: ''During its deliberations, the Study Group was advised that a complete U.S. withdrawal without a peace agreement would allow these groups to gradually rebuild their capabilities in the Afghanistan Pakistan region such that they might be able to attack the U.S. homeland within eighteen to thirty six months.'' This timeline is short, alarming, and has direct implications for our national security.

Also, an immediate concern as the United States begins to withdraw is an increase in attacks from Afghan forces against the United States and coalition forces, commonly referred to as ''green on blue attacks.'' Finally, we must anticipate a flood of refugees as Afghans flee the chaos. In addition, we must do our part to aid those Afghans who have aided us.

Given these facts and given the President's difficult decision to leave Afghanistan, I believe we must take serious actions to mitigate these threats. The withdrawal of U.S. forces should not mean an end to our counterterrorism efforts. Most importantly, we must ensure that Afghanistan will not be a source of planning, plotting, or projection of terrorist attacks around the globe, including against our homeland.

Instead, we must transition to a new type of presence leaving the country but staying in the region in a meaningful capacity. We must build an anti terrorism infrastructure on the periphery of Afghanistan. We must continue to direct the proper level of attention, intelligence, and resources to evaluate the evolving terrorist threat in the region. This also includes closer cooperation with our allies and partners.

We must continue to engage regional powers diplomatically, and the Biden administration has already begun to reinvigorate that process. We must use the power of our alliances and particularly those in the region who would endure severe consequences and instability from sharing a border with a failed Afghanistan. Working in cooperation, the United States and its allies and regional partners must be a check on potential instability.

President Biden is committed to ensuring that this is not a forever war. But he has also made it clear he won't allow Afghanistan to become a safe haven for terrorism. Our mission to protect the homeland remains. Our duty to do so remains. As we go forward, this is a moment of transition, not of closure; this is a moment to do all we can to protect this country and hopefully ensure a safer region.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand today in opposition to this illegitimate motion to discharge the nomination of Vanita Gupta to become the Associate Attorney General of the United States.

I say that this motion to discharge is illegitimate because it was—because the Senate Judiciary Committee and its chairman decided unilaterally to ram through a vote on Ms. Gupta in violation of the rules and precedents of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

As has been the longstanding tradition in the Judiciary Committee, members were debating the nomination of Vanita Gupta and expected that everyone would be given the opportunity to speak.

But in the middle of a speech being delivered by one of the Judiciary Committee's members, Senator COTTON from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, Senator DURBIN, cut him off and unilaterally proceeded to a vote, effectively nuking the committee rules that should have allowed Senator COTTON and others to speak.

Never, in the more than 10 years that I have served on the Judiciary Committee, have I seen a chairman of that committee so blatantly, brazenly violate rule and principle and precedent in this way. This behavior is not only unusual, but it is inexcusable.

Lengthy debate in committee markups is actually much more common than some in this Chamber might have you believe. For example, Democrats filibustered the nomination of former Attorney General Jeff Sessions for so long that then-Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY was forced to delay a consideration of his nomination until the next markup.

You have got that right. Chairman GRASSLEY actually followed the committee rules and allowed for all of our colleagues to speak, notwithstanding the fact that they disagreed with him, notwithstanding the fact that it was contentious, notwithstanding the fact that he didn't like what they were saying.

And by doing so, he was forced—because he was complying with the rules and the precedents of the Senate—to delay the consideration of Attorney General Sessions' nomination. But that is what he did. He did that instead because it was preferable to an act of unilaterally forcing a vote and thereby nuking the Judiciary Committee's rules.

Now, to put this in context, we need to understand that Judiciary Committee rule IV states:

> The Chair shall enter a non-debatable motion to bring a matter before the Committee to a vote. If there is objection to bringing a matter to a vote without further debate, a roll call vote of the Committee shall be taken, and debate shall be terminated if the motion to bring the matter to a vote without further debate passes with twelve votes in the affirmative, one of which must be cast by the minority.

Rule IV essentially preserves the right of minority members to speak.

Chairman DURBIN decided to nuke that part of rule IV in particular because he knew that he didn't have 12 votes to prematurely end debate.

Now, when you are in the majority, it can be tempting to run right past certain rules, knocking things over in the process in order to get your party's nominees confirmed. But I think it is important for us to resist that temptation in order to protect the rules of our institution from partisan passions.

Following these rules, respecting minority prerogatives, is precisely what allows us to maintain bipartisan cooperation in the Senate and lower the partisan tensions in our country. This is all the more important when we consider that there is no true majority in the Senate, and there is no majority at all on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Unfortunately, with this breach, it looks like some of my colleagues might prefer convenience over debate. I find that most unfortunate, especially because I have worked with so many of them on a bipartisan basis on so many issues.

Now, some of my colleagues may claim that Republicans have done this very thing many times. That, however, is not the case. On multiple occasions, we allowed for extended debate and even delayed reporting of matters before the committee, like Attorney General Sessions' nomination and the Crossfire Hurricane subpoenas, until the next markup. When we set votes with the consent of the majority, the chairman followed committee precedent and did so through a rollcall vote—again, consistent with committee precedent.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Now, you might ask why Republicans felt so strongly about speaking on Ms. Gupta's nomination before the vote was cast in the committee markup. Well, it might have something to do with the fact that Ms. Gupta's answers to questions were troubling to many members on the committee, including answers to questions regarding a wide range of topics, including the legalization of narcotics, eliminating qualified immunity, defunding police, the death penalty, among many others, and the fact that it appears that many of those answers were inconsistent with her past statements, and in other cases, difficult to defend.

When before the Judiciary Committee, Ms. Gupta provided answers to questions regarding some of these evolving positions. Many of those answers were less than compelling—indeed, she seemed to be intending to distance herself from fairly radical positions that she had, in fact, taken in the past.

Before the same committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, the very same Judiciary Committee that recently had this markup vote that ended in a violation of the Senate rules—before that very same committee last year, on June 16, 2020, Ms. Gupta testified under oath that leaders must ''heed calls . . . to decrease police budgets and the scope, role, and responsibility of police in our lives.'' When asked about her advocacy for defunding the police, Ms. Gupta said that she ''disagreed'' with that characterization.

Even the Washington Post, not exactly a conservative media outlet, caught Ms. Gupta's flip-flop, correctly characterizing her June 16, 2020, testimony as ''exactly what 'defunding the police' is all about. Now Gupta says she has never supported the idea.''

Now, does President Biden really think it is a good idea to put radical ideologues who have publicly espoused support for defunding the police in charge of the Department of Justice?

Well, perhaps he does, as evidenced by his nominations of Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke for top roles.

I am concerned about Ms. Gupta's apparent disregard for Americans who hold views dissimilar from her own. In 2018, she tweeted that Senator SUSAN COLLINS had failed her constituents based on her support for Justice Brett Kavanaugh and was ''sending a dangerous message'' to survivors of sexual assault.

While Ms. Gupta repeatedly asked Senators for forgiveness for her many inappropriate tweets and asked for a second chance, it is significant here that she didn't give that second chance to others when the shoe was on the other foot.

For example, when Ryan Bounds was nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Ms. Gupta said the following about some comments he had made when he was in college:

> While he has recently apologized for those comments, the timing of that apology suggests it is one of convenience rather than remorse, offered in a last-ditch effort to salvage his nomination and win the support of his home-state senators.

It appears here that Ms. Gupta perhaps wants to provide no grace, no second chance to others for things they wrote in college but then has asked for Senators to give her grace and a second chance for insensitive statements from only a few years ago or, in some cases, only a few months ago.

If past practices are any indication, I am concerned that she might begin to wield the Department of Justice as a weapon of sorts against anyone and anything holding different views from her own and that she may do so aggressively by conducting as many expensive, hostile pattern-and-practice investigations against State and local law enforcement as she can, whether they are warranted or not, if, in her view, they somehow deserve it or they somehow disagree with her. Based on her past use of pattern-and-practice investigations while she was running the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division, I worry that she might subject State and local law enforcement jurisdictions to lengthy and expensive review requirements, forcing them to buckle under her policy preferences and sending warning messages to other jurisdictions.

I am concerned that she might inappropriately rely on the outside activist groups for which she has lobbied to formulate policy and practices for the Department of Justice and State and local law enforcement agencies. I am concerned, too, that she will use third-party settlement agreements to reward the activist groups for which she has lobbied at the expense of others.

Now, advocates of Ms. Gupta claim frequently that she is a consensus builder. I don't doubt that. In fact, I would note here that Ms. Gupta and I have worked on the same side of issues that I care deeply about, and I note here that I find her to be a delightful person and a remarkably gifted mind and lawyer. She is very talented, and she is someone who seems to be a genuinely nice person in many, many ways. But if we are going to talk about consensus building, I think a fair test to evaluate whether someone is a consensus builder might involve looking at how they treat those with whom they disagree. Unfortunately, Ms. Gupta's public statements don't necessarily result in flying colors on that test. Again, the issue here is not whether she agrees with those who disagree with her. We have already established that she disagrees with those who hold different views than her own. The question is, How does she treat them?

Here is what Ms. Gupta said about Judge Sarah Pitlyk:

> Sarah Pitlyk is unqualified and unfit for a lifetime position on our federal courts. . . . She has defended the most extreme, anti-abortion laws our Nation has seen to date.

This is what she said about Judge Lee Rudofsky:

> Rudofsky . . . has challenged the constitutionality of reproductive rights under the Fourteenth Amendment and has effectively asked the Supreme Court to overturn Roe v. Wade and Casey v. Planned Parenthood. . . . Rudofsky is unfit and would bring a clear bias to the bench.

In a 2017 blog post, Ms. Gupta advocated for forcing Colorado baker, Jack Phillips, to create a custom-designed cake celebrating a same-sex wedding even though it would violate his religious beliefs. She said:

> Religious liberty is not a talisman that confers absolute immunity from any personal constraints at all: At times, the free exercise of religion yields to other foundational values, including freedom from harm and [freedom from] discrimination.

Now, fortunately, in this instance, Supreme Court Justices—seven of the nine Supreme Court Justices, in fact—disagreed with her position in the Masterpiece Cakeshop case.

Now, she has reiterated this sentiment time and time again. In 2017, she tweeted: ''Yes, freedom of religion is a fundamental right, but it is not an absolute right.''

After the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the conscience rights of the Little Sisters' of the Poor, she called the decision ''troubling'' and ''discrimination sanctioned by the Court,'' writing that ''this type of discrimination will potentially inflict harm on hundreds of thousands of people and disproportionately impact women of color and people in lower-income groups.''

Now, let me be very clear on this issue. Let me be very clear about what she was talking about. Ms. Gupta in that statement was indicating that she thought the government should force a convent of nuns who have taken vows of celibacy to provide birth control against their religious convictions.

That is troubling, and that is not consistent with our understanding of the free exercise of religion. Look, no one would argue that any one constitutional right is absolute, in that no other consideration can ever come into play. No one would argue that a generally applicable religiously neutral law can have no application ever where it conflicts in some way with an assertion of religious freedom. We are not talking here about whether it is absolute or not. But her own application of that would be deeply troubling I think to most Americans.

What also concerns me is whether, with the force of the U.S. Department of Justice behind her, whether she is capable of respecting the constraints of the law, of the Constitution, and of federalism.

In her efforts to push her policy preferences and reward those with whom she disagrees, I am very concerned that she might stretch the boundaries of her authority much further than it was ever intended to go.

Ms. Gupta has exhibited on Twitter and elsewhere that she is someone who holds very strident political views, views that many would regard as very radical, and I feel neither confident nor comfortable that she will respect those with views contrary to her own.

On that basis, I urge my fellow Senators to vote against Ms. Gupta and this illegitimate motion to discharge. I urge President Biden to send us nominees who will achieve his stated goal of unifying our country and not dividing it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my friend and colleague from Utah is not the first to come to the floor on the Republican side and raise questions about committee procedure that led to Vanita Gupta being considered today before the U.S. Senate.

They say it is unheard of, unthinkable, unimaginable, unfathomable that the Senate committee rules were not carefully followed and that their attempt at a filibuster was in some way diverted.

I would ask unanimous consent to have printed into the RECORD a memo entitled ''Senate Judiciary Committee Rule Violations by [Senate Judiciary Committee] Chairs Graham, Grassley, and Hatch.''

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

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE RULE VIOLATIONS BY CHAIRS GRAHAM, GRASSLEY, AND HATCH

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM RULE VIOLATIONS

Graham (116th Cong.)

a. Violation: Rule III

i. Date: July 25, 2019

ii. Summary: Chairman Graham's Secure and Protect Act was on the agenda. Then-Ranking Member Feinstein was the only Democrat in attendance. Graham stated that he would deem the bill held over at the following week's markup. This constituted ''conducting business'' under the Committee's rules, despite the lack of a quorum.

iii. Source: https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/meetings/07/25/2019/executive-business-meeting

2. Graham (116th Cong.)

a. Violation: Rule I; Rule IV; Rule V

i. Date: August 1, 2019

ii. Summary: At an August 1, 2019, markup, Chairman Graham forced a vote on his Secure and Protect Act despite a request to hold over the bill. Graham ignored Democratic requests to hold the bill over; called a vote—setting a time certain for final passage of the bill—without first allowing any Democratic members to speak; and did not allow any amendments to be offered.

iii. Source: https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/meetings/08/01/2019/executive-business-meeting

3. Graham (116th Cong.)

a. Violation: Rule III; Rule IV

i. Date: October 15, 2020

ii. Summary: Chairman Graham held a markup during which Committee Republicans held over Amy Coney Barrett's nomination to the Supreme Court. Chairman Graham also called a vote to vote on Barrett's nomination at a time certain the following week. However, Barrett's hearing had not yet concluded by this point—the witness panels were held in the afternoon on October 15, 2020, after the markup vote. Committee Democrats objected to holding this markup before the hearing concluded, and Senator Durbin—the only Democrat in attendance—moved to adjourn the markup. Graham overrode Durbin's motion on a roll call vote in violation of the Committee's quorum rule.

iii. Source: https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/meetings/nomination-of-the-honorable-amy-coney- barrett-to-be-an-associate-justice-of-the-supreme-court-of-the-united-states-day-4

Durbin Comments: https://twitter.com/SenatorDurbin/status/1316751184468865025?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1316751184468865025%7Ctwgr%5E%7Ctwcon%5Es1_&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.commondreams.org%2Fnews%2F2020%2F10%2F 15%2Funpreceden ted-lindsey-graham-openly-violates-committee-rules-schedule-vote-barrett

4. Graham (116th Cong.)

a. Violation: Rule III

i. Date: October 22, 2020

ii. Summary: Chairman Graham broke the Committee's business quorum rule, which states that nine Members of the Committee, including at least two Members of the minority, must be present to transact business. No Committee Democrats attended this markup, at which Amy Coney Barrett's nomination was voted out of Committee. Chairman Graham ignored this rule, and Committee Republicans voted 12–0 to advance Barrett along with the other nominees on the agenda that day.

iii. Source: https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/meetings/1 0/22/2020/executive-business-meeting

CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY RULE VIOLATIONS

1. Grassley (115th Cong.)

a. Violation: Rule IV

i. Date: September 13, 2018

ii. Summary: Then-Chairman Grassley violated Rule IV by passing a motion to cut off debate on Brett Kavanaugh's nomination without an affirmative vote from one member of the minority. At this markup, the Judiciary Committee held over Brett Kavanaugh's nomination. Numerous other items were on the agenda that day, most notably a motion from thenChairman Grassley to set a precise time at which the committee would vote on Kavanaugh's nomination the following week. Senators Leahy and Durbin argued that Grassley's motion violated Rule IV by cutting off debate without the consent of any member of the minority. Senator Durbin read Rule IV aloud and then summarized: ''The point is, you need 11 votes and one member of the minority to stop debate on any matter, let alone a nomination to the Supreme Court.'' Grassley responded, ''The answer to your question is no we don't, and we've checked with the Senate Parliamentarian.'' Grassley asserted that Chairman Hatch had done the same thing in 2003, setting a precedent that he was following.

Other items on the agenda that day included: six motions to subpoena various documents related to Kavanaugh' s record; 21 lower court judicial nominees; a nominee to be a U.S. Attorney; a nominee to be a U.S. Marshal; a nominee to be Director of National Drug Control Policy; and five legislative bills.

iii. Source: Video of the markup, from approximately minute marker 00:44:48 to 00:48:15: https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/meetings/09/13/2018/executive-business-meeting

CHAIRMAN HATCH RULE VIOLATIONS

1. Hatch (108th Cong.)

a. Violation: Rule IV

i. Date: February 27, 2003

ii. Summary: At a markup, Chairman Hatch ignored Rule IV by cutting short Committee debate on the nominations of John Roberts (D.C. Cir.) and Deborah Cook (6th Cir.). Pursuant to Rule IV, then-Ranking Member Leahy asked for a vote before Hatch ended debate, but Hatch refused, directing the clerk to call the roll and noting that ''[t]he Chairman's prerogative is to determine that we can go ahead to a vote'' and that Rule IV ''does not apply to executive nominations.''

iii. February 27, 2003 Executive Business Meeting Record, on file with the Senate Judiciary Committee Library

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank Senator DURBIN for his leadership, and following my colleague and friend, Senator LEE, I disagree with him vehemently about Vanita Gupta. She is someone I have worked closely with for years on voting rights, on police reform, and just last year I marched with her across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with the late John Lewis to mark the 55th anniversary of Bloody Sunday in Selma, AL.

After working alongside her to build a more just system, I have no doubt that she will take this job on with two words, two words that I think are so important right now to build trust with the people of this country: honor and integrity. That is what has marked her career.

As a civil rights lawyer, public servant, and as President of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the Nation's oldest, largest, and most diverse civil and human rights coalition, she has a record of fighting for all Americans, with dedication, consistency, and—and—a willingness to work across ideological lines to achieve results.

Why did she get those police endorsements and the kind of support that she got, even though she was taking on reform? It is because she earned people's respect. She is the right person for the right time in the Justice Department, and I say this coming from Minnesota, where my State is reeling after the killing of Duante Wright.

Our hearts break for Daunte's family and for our community, which is still in the midst of the George Floyd murder trial of Derek Chauvin. I was so proud and am so proud of the ordinary citizens that came forward and testified from my State: a clerk in the store, a man walking by, all of them having carried the burden—the burden—of this murder, looking inside themselves thinking: What could I have done better?

And that case will soon conclude, but those citizens coming forward and actually the law enforcement coming forward and testifying at all levels of law enforcement for the prosecution of Derek Chauvin—that meant something to the people of my State. I want to be able to go back and tell those citizens who testified that you don't carry this burden alone; that we have a Justice Department that is going to stand up for you.

And, for me, one of those key people is Vanita Gupta. She is exactly who we need right now to champion the cause of equal justice under the law.

She has described the Department as an institution she loves dearly because, as she said, it bears the name of a value—justice—one that carries a unique charge and North Star. It is the sacred keeper of the promise of equal justice under the law, and coming from the North Star State, that means a lot.

Her commitment to defending the Constitution and upholding the integrity of this important Agency is, for her, a professional calling. It is also a personal calling. As she has described, she inherited from her parents, who came to this country, a belief in the promise of America, one that carries with it a personal responsibility to make this country better for everyone.

We all know immigrants who think like that every day—people who have just arrived and people who have raised their families here. They are Vanita Gupta. There is no question that Ms. Gupta has the experience for this job.

As an attorney for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, she worked on the frontlines, fighting in court to protect the civil rights of some of the most vulnerable people. Later, at the American Civil Liberties Union, she brought cases on behalf of immigrant children and worked to end mass incarceration while keeping communities safe.

While serving as our country's chief civil rights prosecutor at the Department of Justice, during the Obama administration, she led critical work on criminal justice reform, prosecuting hate crimes and human trafficking, defending the right to vote, and protecting the rights of the LGBTQ community and those with disabilities.

Ms. Gupta's depth of experience at the Department of Justice and her years as a civil rights attorney make her imminently qualified to serve as Associate Attorney General. In that position, she will oversee the work of the Department's Civil Rights Division and will help direct the Department's work to reform our justice system. Having helped to lead the Federal review of police practices, she understands the need for systemic reform in our justice system, as well as ways to work with law enforcement—with law enforcement—to make necessary changes.

That is why she has the support of police chiefs, sheriffs, and major law enforcement groups across the country, including the National Sheriffs' Association, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and including the Major Cities Chiefs Association. They know that Ms. Gupta is a trusted partner who, as the Fraternal Order of Police wrote in a letter of support, has ''always worked with us to find common ground even when that seemed impossible.''

Grover Norquist, a Republican and president of Americans for Tax Reform, described Ms. Gupta as ''an honest broker; someone with an ability not only to understand but also appreciate different perspectives. She was someone who sought consensus,'' he said. That is exactly the kind of person we need at the Department right now.

I look forward to working with her on the next steps in our efforts to reform our criminal justice system, which we were able to discuss at her hearing. We talked about her commitment to police reform and the need to increase funding for alternatives to incarceration, such as drug court, which is something I have worked on for years since my time as county attorney, and her support for conviction integrity units to help States to review legal cases for people believed to be innocent. She gets that the work of a prosecutor is, yes, working for safety, but it is also to be a minister of justice and to make sure that people are treated equally under the law.

I also have talked to Ms. Gupta about the urgent need to finally reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, which I hope my colleagues and I will work to pass and get to President Biden's desk. In the Obama administration, she coordinated the Department of Justice's efforts to develop guidance supported by data on how law enforcement can prevent gender bias when responding to sexual assault and domestic violence. At our hearing, she affirmed the important role that the Department has in protecting victims of domestic violence, and I look forward to working with her on these issues.

As chair of the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, I am also pleased that Ms. Gupta committed to make vigorous antitrust enforcement a priority. I think there is agreement from both sides of the aisle that robust competition is essential to protect consumers, workers, and businesses, large and small.

I am confident that Ms. Gupta will lead the Department's efforts to confront monopoly power and restore competitive markets along with Lisa Monaco and along with, of course, the Attorney General himself, Merrick Garland.

Ms. Gupta's history as a champion of civil rights and record as a consensus builder makes her, as I said, the right person at the right time. She has the backing of more than 220 national civil and human rights organizations, including the ACLU, the NAACP, and the Human Rights Campaign.

She has, as I said, the support from law enforcement and from former Department of Justice leaders from both parties. She is a person who works to bring people together to get big things done. That is what we need right now, someone who sees that vision but also understands that the way we get to justice is by doing things step by step by step and bringing people with you as you march along. We need to do more than restore what has been undermined or lost. We need the courage of leadership to preserve and strengthen our democracy by protecting the rule of law.

I would like to finally acknowledge that her nomination is historic. In addition to Ms. Gupta's years of experience, dedication to justice, and support from across the ideological spectrum, she will be the first civil rights lawyer and the first woman of color to serve as Associate Attorney General. I look forward to confirming her to be Associate Attorney General, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Vanita Gupta's nomination to be the Associate Attorney General of the U.S. Department of Justice. Those of us who have had the joy and the honor of getting to know her and working with her know Ms. Gupta to be engaging and smart, a skilled and balanced lawyer and practitioner, and someone who will bring great values in leadership to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Ms. Gupta has devoted her career to public service and to protecting and advancing the civil and constitutional rights we all cherish as Americans. President Biden, Attorney General Garland, and Lisa Monaco, the President's nominee to be Deputy Attorney General, have all made clear Ms. Gupta would serve as an integral part of the leadership team at the Justice Department. She would bring to that critical role a long record of working with folks across the ideological spectrum in our country on some of our Nation's most difficult and most sensitive issues, some that are urgent and pressing like criminal justice reform and policing.

Unfortunately, a campaign launched against Ms. Gupta shortly after her nomination has painted a misleading portrait of her as a partisan and a radical. I won't repeat or rehash these unfounded critiques, but the fact is this caricature could not be further from the truth.

As letter after letter has come in from her supporters to the Judiciary Committee, in which I serve, we heard over and over that, at her core, Ms. Gupta is a person who seeks to build bridges, to understand others' points of view, and to build consensus and solve problems.

One of the elements of this campaign to mischaracterize her suggests that somehow she is anti-police or anti-law enforcement, and, in this particular instance, the distinction between those who worked with her and know her and what we have heard in this social media campaign and in our committee and here on the floor of the Senate could not be sharper.

We heard from multiple leading national law enforcement organizations that have worked with her in specific and clear and concrete terms. The National Sheriffs' Association, in their letter of support, said:

> Ms. Gupta has an open mind and a strong desire to understand the viewpoint of each stakeholder. She is able to find common ground with law enforcement.

They added:

> [Ms. Gupta] possesses immense credibility among law enforcement leaders.

And they said:

> [She is] exactly the type of leader who is needed in the Justice Department today.

From the Fraternal Order of Police:

> She always worked with us to find common ground, even when that seemed impossible. Her open and candid approach has created a working relationship grounded in mutual respect and understanding.

And the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association in their letter said:

> [Ms. Gupta has a] proven history of working with law enforcement agencies . . . and elected officials across the spectrum.

We even heard from a leading conservative advocate and activist, Grover Norquist, the leader of Americans for Tax Reform. Mr. Norquist wrote:

> I have come to know and respect Ms. Gupta through our common work on criminal justice reform issues. I found her strongly qualified, effective, principled, driven by a desire to seek common purpose and consensus. . . . At every step, Ms. Gupta was an honest broker, someone with an ability to understand, appreciate different perspectives, someone who sought consensus.

Last but not least, we heard from Mark Holden, general counsel of Koch

Industries, who worked with her on criminal justice reform and wrote the committee saying:

> I respected and admired how Ms. Gupta was not ideologically driven, but principled and solutions-oriented. . . . Ms. Gupta is a principled leader who seeks to find common ground and will work with anyone committed to making the system better and more effective.

I just plead with my colleagues to reflect for a moment: Are these the sorts of letters that we would have received in support of someone who is genuinely intolerant and in support of someone who is the radical activist this misleading campaign has attempted to portray her as being?

Instead, Vanita Gupta has demonstrated in her work and in her career that she is pragmatic, she is principled, and she is a relationship builder in search of solutions. Given this broad and bipartisan support in the letters that came to us on the committee and as Members of this body, I was surprised and disappointed that some of my colleagues on the other side have continued to levee this misleading barrage of unsubstantiated attacks.

So, in conclusion, I would ask my colleagues to consider her fairly and to listen to the range and the scores of groups that have described her as a principled, honest broker. She cares deeply about protecting the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans and about being fairminded and taking into consideration all points of view. She will bring that same approach to her service and leadership as Associate Attorney General.

This should not be a party-line, partisan vote. Vanita Gupta is the right leader at the right time to help our U.S. Department of Justice tackle some very difficult issues, and I am pleased to stand in support of her nomination and will vote for her confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, later this afternoon, the Senate will vote on whether to discharge the nomination of Vanita Gupta, the nominee for Associate Attorney General, from the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. Gupta is a polarizing figure, as reflected by the vote in the Judiciary Committee. It was a tie vote, 11 votes to 11. So she failed to receive a majority support from the committee, and now the Senate must vote on whether or not her nomination can come to the Senate floor for consideration.

I want to be clear, though, the passionate opposition of this nominee is not about politics. I voted to confirm the vast majority of President Biden's nominees, my attitude being that he won the election and he is entitled to populate a Cabinet and other important positions with people he has confidence in. But there are limits.

The President's nominees for the top two positions for the Department of Justice did not require this extraordinary step. I voted to support Ms. Monaco's nomination, who has been nominated for Deputy Attorney General, as well as the Attorney General himself, Judge Merrick Garland. As I said, those were not controversial nominees. This nominee is a polarizing, partisan activist and should not be confirmed to this important position.

The lack of support for Ms. Gupta is not a reflection on her political affiliation, nor of her gender, nor of her race, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee intimated. The opposition to Ms. Gupta is a direct result of her history of inflammatory public statements, radical policy positions, and a laundry list of misleading statements and flat-out lies during her sworn testimony before the Judiciary Committee.

The position of Associate Attorney General is not some bureaucratic paper-pusher. This is the third ranking position at the Department of Justice, the highest law enforcement Agency in America. The American people deserve to know that the individuals leading the Department have no agenda other than to fairly and impartially administer justice, but based on everything we now know about Ms. Gupta, I do not have faith in her ability to deliver on this most basic principle.

Ms. Gupta is not a career public servant. She is a partisan culture warrior with a radical agenda. During her tenure in jobs outside of government, during which she was a registered lobbyist, Ms. Gupta was quite outspoken about her views on just about every topic you can imagine. She slandered Supreme Court nominees. She vilified organizations that she disagreed with. She even took a crack or two at a number of our Senate colleagues.

But the words I find most troubling are those that relate directly to the policies of the Department of Justice itself. As the Judiciary Committee evaluated Ms. Gupta's qualifications, she was asked about her previous writings and her public statements on a variety of topics. There is a lot to sort through.

First, following the tragic killing of George Floyd last summer, people across the country engaged in an important discussion and debate about the use of force by police officers and responsible policing strategies.

The Judiciary Committee held a hearing on this very topic, and Ms. Gupta was one of the star witnesses. At the time, she was the president and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. She testified before the committee there, under oath, that it is ''critical for state and local leaders to heed calls . . . to decrease police budgets and the scope, [and] role, and responsibility of police in our lives.''

Well, for obvious reasons, the phrase ''decrease police budgets'' and ''defund the police'' lead to the same conclusion that she believes police departments need less—not more—resources in order to maintain public safety.

When Ms. Gupta was asked about this at her confirmation hearing, she did not mince words. She said she does not support defunding the police. So I followed up with a written question for the record. I asked Ms. Gupta, following the hearing, to explain the distinction between ''decrease police budgets'' and ''defund the police,'' so we could understand her views. After all, the Associate Attorney General will play an important role in making grants to fund States and local police departments. But Ms. Gupta offered no explanation. She simply said, once again, she does not support defunding the police.

Now, I can understand when people change their minds. I think reasonably intelligent people, as they acquire new information, maybe reflecting on their previous points of view, change their minds, but Ms. Gupta did not offer a single bit of information for this shift between her statement last summer saying that State and local leaders must heed calls to ''decrease police budgets'' and her current position, which is that she does not support defunding the police.

Then there were her statements on qualified immunity. This is an important issue for Congress to discuss and debate because it is qualified immunity that protects law enforcement officers, given the nature of the discretionary decisions they need to make in emergency circumstances. Again, there are people on both sides of that argument.

But in June 2020, less than a year ago, Ms. Gupta argued in a Washington Post opinion piece that it is time to revisit qualified immunity. Well, you can imagine I asked her about that at the hearing. And, again, she said, unequivocally, she does not support eliminating qualified immunity. But, once again, we received no explanation for her changed position.

And while her statements are intentionally, I believe, unclear at best, her words about previously held beliefs on drug policy represent an irreconcilable conflict. Back in 2012, Ms. Gupta authored an opinion piece on November 4, 2012, in the HuffPost. In that article, she argued that the States should decriminalize possession of all drugs—all drugs, not just marijuana, all drugs, presumably, to include prescription opioids, heroin, methamphetamine, fentanyl, you name it—all drugs.

Well, I don't have to remind Members of this Senate that more than 80,000 Americans have died from drug overdoses this last year alone, and much of it would include the sorts of drugs that, back in 2012, Ms. Gupta said should be legalized—or at least decriminalized, to be fair—decriminalized, although the distinction between that may be lost on some.

Well, I am sure that this will surprise no one that this is a controversial view. Congress has spent billions upon billions of dollars to fight the opioid epidemic in this country. We passed the Cures Act, the CARES Act, to try

to get at this epidemic of opioid addiction and abuse. But Ms. Gupta, circa 2012, said that these drugs—all drugs—should be decriminalized for personal use.

Well, I followed up with a question because, during the hearing, Ms. Gupta talked about how her views had evolved since 2012. Again, as we all have different experiences over time, we learn new information, perhaps reflect on our previously held views, I understand how people's views can change. But then she wasn't satisfied with that answer.

So I followed up with a written question. I asked Ms. Gupta if she ever made this statement that is printed in black and white in the HuffPost, dated circa 2012. She said: ''I have never''—never—''advocated for the decriminalization of all drugs.'' She said: ''States should decriminalize simple possession of all drugs.'' Compare that with ''I have never advocated for the decriminalization of all drugs.'' Those are irreconcilable positions.

And the fact is, if you believe Ms. Gupta circa 2012, it is simply a lie. It is a lie under oath, potentially perjury. I mean, why do we swear witnesses in if some of them will take the burden of their oath so lightly and they would lie with impunity? I mean, what is the purpose?

She didn't just lie to me. She lied to Chairman DURBIN. She lied to Senator WHITEHOUSE. She lied to every member of the Judiciary Committee. And, unfortunately, she is lying to the Senate. She has been given many opportunities to reconcile these radically conflicting statements. These are diametrically opposed positions. If she had a good answer, if she cared enough, if she respected Members of the Senate enough, she would have provided us an answer rather than just an outright lie.

Here is a fact check from the Washington Post, that great ultra or uberconservative publication. As you can see, they gave her a unique Pinocchio award. I have never seen a Pinocchio award like this. Ordinarily, they would say, well, you get one, two, or three, or four Pinocchios based on whether or not we find this to be a misrepresentation of the facts or a lie.

But here, they said: ''For this tango of previously unacknowledged flip-flops, Gupta [deserves] an Upside-Down Pinocchio''—''Upside-Down Pinocchio.'' They went on to say Vanita Gupta's shifting views on defunding the police, decriminalizing drugs deserve this Upside-Down Pinocchio, March 10, 2021.

If you published an op-ed saying the sky is purple and now you say the sky is blue, don't tell us you never thought the sky was purple. Have a little more respect for your obligation for one of the highest positions in the Department of Justice not to lie to the Judiciary Committee or the Senate. Have the courage to tell us the truth and stop trying to deceive the Senate in order to be confirmed.

As I said earlier, Ms. Gupta was a registered lobbyist and spent a good part of her career pushing a very specific agenda and a range of radical policies to go along with it. In the process, she disparaged individuals, organizations, and political parties who dared to oppose her beliefs.

She wrote about the growing number of conservatives on the Federal bench and said: ''Republicans have planted the seeds of this takeover for decades—and now, they are leaping into action.'' I wonder if she realized she might one day be in a position of advocating on the Department of Justice before the very same judges that she has disparaged.

She tweeted that Justice Kavanaugh ''lied'' to the Judiciary Committee and ''showed himself to be a partisan.'' And she is going to represent the American people in the highest Court in the land, populated by Justices she has called a liar? Well, she has called a number of other Federal judges—she has described a number of them with similar disdain.

Now, I find it hard to believe that these views, which are not from decades-old law school writings or that you can write off to immaturity or perhaps satire—like we heard yesterday from Ms. CLARKE, who has been nominated to the civil rights division—these are recent public statements which this nominee no longer claims to hold.

Like I said, if confirmed, she will supervise litigation in front of the many Federal judges she has disparaged, and she will be in an extraordinarily powerful position to bend the Department of Justice to her political whims.

Ms. Gupta is the daughter of a gentleman who heads up a chemical company that produces all sorts of chemicals for a variety of legitimate purposes. It looks like, from her financial disclosure statement, he has been very successful and so has Ms. Gupta, in family trusts worth tens of millions of dollars, much of it including the stock of Avantor, the company that her father heads.

I realize Ms. Gupta is not personally responsible, as a shareholder in this company, but it is clear, I believe, from an investigative journalism story by Bloomberg dated September 2020 that Avantor was selling acetic anhydride, an essential ingredient in converting poppies to heroin, for at least the last decade.

She owns tens of millions of dollars' worth of that stock.

I have asked the Attorney General and the Securities and Exchange Commission to look into Avantor's conduct because, if, in fact, an American chemical manufacturer has been selling acetic anhydride in the country where they know that it will be available to the criminal cartels and drug runners—and they should know that 92 percent of the heroin made in Mexico, using acetic anhydride, manufactured by Avantor and its subsidiary in Mexico—that is a serious, serious problem. So I have asked the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to look into it.

Asked about this, asked about Avantor's activities, Ms. Gupta said: ''I'm aware of the allegations.''

I do not have faith, nor should the Senate have faith, nor should the American people have faith that Ms. Gupta will act fairly and impartially if confirmed to this position. If she was willing to lie to the American people during her confirmation hearings before the Judiciary Committee, imagine how she might treat others with disdain, people who hold opposing views in our society, using the great weight and power of the Department of Justice perhaps to further some of her partisan, political, ideological agenda.

Can we really expect someone with this track record, this history, to live up to the highest ideals of the Justice Department? And, for example, we all know lawyers are taught that, if you have exculpatory information about a criminal defendant, you have a duty to disclose that to the other side. If you are the prosecutor, you have a duty to disclose it to the defendant so it can be cross-examined and used in the course of a jury trial.

Do we really expect someone who appears willing to lie with such disregard for the truth to disclose exculpatory material that a person sued by the Department of Justice would have a right to, or would she just try to sit on it?

Can we really expect her to hire people around her based on merit as opposed to some political litmus test? Can we really expect her to disclose material information to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or encourage folks under her supervision to be meticulous and forthright with the court when seeking warrants? I don't think so.

Given the incredible power of the Department of Justice and all the tools available to it, Ms. Gupta's radical beliefs and agenda—that she believes in sincerely, apparently—these would be more than words on a screen. Her views would be terribly dangerous to the American people. Based on her track record, I have no confidence in her ability to act with fairness, candor, or integrity.

As a member of the bar, as a lawyer, you have a higher duty, than even a regular citizen, of candor. The model disciplinary rules that apply to lawyers, members of the bar, like Ms. Gupta, who is a member of the New York bar as well as the Supreme Court bar—they are subject to discipline from grievance committees in those jurisdictions.

We know that they have real teeth because former President Clinton, as you may recall, lied under oath as a lawyer and was disbarred by the Arkansas Bar Association and also had to give up his membership in the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States.

If the Senate is going to make a habit of allowing witnesses to come in

and lie under oath in such a brazen way, why do we even go through this Kabuki theater? Why do we require them to take an oath in the first place if you can lie with impunity? What is the point of going to these hearings if the witnesses are not going to be truthful and answer our questions honestly?

As I say, I have grave concerns about this nominee's ability to separate her well-documented personal beliefs from her role as a high-ranking official at the Department of Justice.

So it will come as no surprise that I will oppose discharging Ms. Gupta's nomination from the committee. I think she should have to come back to the committee, as we have requested of Chairman DURBIN, to explain these inconsistencies, if she has a good answer. So far, Chairman DURBIN has declined to provide her and us that opportunity.

But if we want to maintain any sense of legitimacy and respect for the confirmation process, we need to hold people accountable who come here and lie under oath. And for that and many other reasons, I will oppose the motion to discharge this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before yielding to my colleague from Rhode Island, I would like to respond very briefly.

My, have we come a long way since we had a President who, for 4 years, refused to disclose his tax returns—first time ever. Oh, they are under audit. I will get back to you at some other time later.

Now we have witnesses and nominees coming before the committee, suggested by President Biden, who are producing the documentation and the things that are being requested by this committee so that everyone knows the answers.

So did Ms. Vanita Gupta produce 100 pages of documents? No. Did she produce 1,000? No, she produced 11,000 pages of documents, answering every question that was to be asked. And the suggestion the senior Senator from Texas raises—he raised it before in committee—that somehow, because her family made a business decision about selling a chemical, legally, into the nation of Mexico, she should be held responsible as a shareholder or as a member of the family?

You will notice, if you listen very carefully to what the Senator said, he is not saying there was any wrongdoing. He is saying there was an article once which made that allegation, and he has referred the question to others to decide. That is a long way from saying Vanita Gupta is responsible for whatever the company did, if it did anything, wrong. She has made that full disclosure, and I think raising this is unfair, just fundamentally unfair.

Secondly, on the question of decriminalizing drugs, narcotics, she says her position on it has evolved. Well, I think the Senator from Texas would be the first to acknowledge that the position of America has evolved on the question of drugs; has it not? Hasn't the position of Texas recently evolved on the decriminalization of some drugs and the possession thereof?

We are thinking differently about it. We are trying to find the most effective way to end addiction and save lives. We no longer want to lock everybody up, nor should we. We are deciding that there are some drug violations that shouldn't merit any time in jail, that some people just need help to break their addiction.

If Vanita Gupta has been part of that conversation in America over 9 or 10 years, she is in good company. We have all been part of it. Virtually all of us have been part of it.

And this notion of defunding the police—do you honestly believe the Fraternal Order of Police would be endorsing her if she wanted to defund the police?

She made it clear, as others have too, that reallocation of funds for law enforcement is just common sense. Putting a social worker in a delicate situation, putting a psychologist in a delicate situation, may spare a policeman a terrible choice that he has to make, and I think most of us agree that it is common sense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to express my support for the nomination of Vanita Gupta to serve as Associate Attorney General.

It is a little strange here on the floor today because under normal circumstances I would talk about Ms. Gupta's exemplary record of service and how she will excel as the third in command of the Department of Justice and that she would be a consensus nominee. But the extraordinary effort to scuttle her nomination on a partisan basis in spite of her exemplary record asks some questions about what is going on here.

Vanita Gupta is an accomplished lawyer with a record of working well with just about everyone. When she was last at the Department, working on really difficult issues like use-of-force guidelines for police, she built solid relationships with law enforcement. So they have thrown their full-throated support behind her nomination.

Here are the law enforcement agencies and leaders that are supporting her: the Fraternal Order of Police; the Major County Sheriffs of America; the International Association of Chiefs of Police; the Major Cities Chiefs Association; the Police Executive Research Forum; the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association; the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association; NOBLE, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives; and a whole array of distinguished law enforcement leaders.

These are influential groups and respected individuals, and, for some of my Republican colleagues, this kind of support from law enforcement is literally unbelievable.

So here is what my colleague, the junior Senator from Arkansas, asked Ms. Gupta about all these law enforcement endorsements during her confirmation hearing: ''Did you, or anyone on your behalf or anyone in or affiliated with the Biden campaign transition or administration, pressure those organizations with threats of retaliation if they did not support your nomination?''

''No, Senator,'' she answered.

And she wasn't kidding. Law enforcement doesn't brook threats from criminals, let alone Presidential candidates and executive nominees seeking their endorsement.

And, indeed, they stood up to dispute that insinuation. Here is what Jim Pasco, the executive director of the Fraternal Order of Police, said in response:

> I was kind of shocked by it. If [the Senator] really suspects that, then he doesn't really know the law enforcement organizations as well as he thinks he does, and he certainly doesn't know Vanita Gupta as well as I know her.

Chuck Wexler is the head of the Police Executive Research Forum, and here is how he responded:

> Do you really think you can stand up to law enforcement and threaten them? Do you really think that's going to work? We never forgot that she stood with us when it mattered.

That is the reason for her support from law enforcement: She stood with them when it mattered. And to say that she is such a radical and so against law enforcement and disdains those who disagree with her—which would presumably be law enforcement, if she is such an anti-law-enforcement radical, as my colleagues suggest—is completely blown to smithereens by their continued support for her—not disdain: ''She stood with us when it mattered.''

So when that effort to blow her up exploded in their face, colleagues went after an op-ed that she authored 9 years ago in which she supported decriminalization and defelonization of simple possession of small amounts of drugs. It could be read to say decriminalization of marijuana—other drugs, small amounts.

Well, we know a lot today about substance abuse that we didn't know then that people who have addictions require treatment and care, not punishment and incarceration. That is no radical position. The idea that you should not prosecute people for possession of small amounts is the basis of drug courts.

I started the drug court in Rhode Island. It has been a roaring success. It is the basis for diversion programs. As attorney general of my State with full criminal jurisdiction in my State of Rhode Island, we constantly did diversion of cases of possession of small amounts of drugs—all kinds of drugs—

because they don't belong in the criminal justice system. They get swept up, and you divert them out before prosecution.

This is nothing peculiar or unusual. This is the position of the World Health Organization. This is the position of the Organization of American States. This is the position of the International Red Cross. Heck, even former Speaker Boehner supported decriminalization of simple possession of some or all drugs.

So they had to get into rhetorical tricks to try to make the point look different than it actually is. And Republicans repeatedly asked her questions about that statement regarding small amounts with respect to what they call here ''the legalization of 'all drugs.''' In response to that, she said:

I have never advocated for the legalization or decriminalization of all drugs, and I do not support the legalization or decriminalization of all drugs.

If I were to come up to you, Mr. President, and say ''Do you support the legalization or decriminalization of all drugs?'' what will you take that question to mean? It would seem to mean blanket decriminalization or legalization of all drugs, not small amounts—all.

Well, they went on in this same vein. Here is a question for the record from Senator HAWLEY describing Senator CORNYN's question ''whether you advocate decriminalization of all drugs.''

That is not what she advocated. What she advocated was decriminalization of small amounts—consistent with diversion, consistent with drug court activity, consistent with the way the substance abuse and recovery community treats this issue, and consistent with the position of all those organizations and many, many more. This is the way we operate in law enforcement these days.

So then they try to focus in on the word ''never.'' Senator CORNYN, who was speaking on the floor a moment ago, ominously said to me, the most important word in that quote is ''never.'' As you can see, it is simply a misrepresentation of what she said in 2012.

Well, you could also argue—''I have never advocated for the decriminalization of all drugs.'' You could also argue that the key word in that sentence isn't ''never''; it is ''all.'' That is the subject of the sentence: ''all drugs.'' Kilos of cocaine, pounds of methamphetamine—no. Small, simple possession amounts—that is the way everybody treats drugs in law enforcement these days.

As lawyers, we know that it is important to get the question right, and it is not unusual for lawyers to flub the question. When you are asking a question in court and you flub the question, you often get an answer you don't like, and the remedy for that is not to call the witness who answered your question a liar. The remedy for that is to get the question right in the first place. And if the question is whether Vanita Gupta advocated decriminalization of all drugs, the answer is, in fact, no because small amounts of simple possession is a very different thing than ''all drugs.''

And now they are hanging this extraordinary rampart of invective—liar, deliberate liar—all over getting an honest answer to a question that they asked badly or, perhaps, worse yet, a trick question intended to trip her up that she answered honestly.

So what is going on? Why are they going through this exercise? Well, step back a little bit and look what is going on in our country. The first thing that is going on is that there is a massive dark money campaign for voter suppression. There is a guy named Leonard Leo who ran the dark money campaign that pushed three Supreme Court Justices onto the Court. The Washington Post reported that as a $250 million effort—$250 million.

After the Washington Post article came out and Leonard Leo was blown like a covert agent who suddenly is identified with all of this, he has to get out. Where does he go? He goes to something called the Honest Elections Project, which is the sister organization of a group called the Judicial Crisis Network, which—guess what—is running ads against Vanita Gupta.

They used to run ads for the Supreme Court nominees. They spent tens of millions of dollars running ads against Garland, for Gorsuch, for Kavanaugh, for Barrett—tens of millions of dollars. But with Biden in the White House, nobody is listening to them any longer. They are not getting their appointees through, so they moved to voter suppression. And all that money and that same guy, Leonard Leo, are now lined up behind voter suppression.

So you get dark money ads paid for by Judicial Crisis Network against the third-ranking person in the Department of Justice? They are used to going for the Supreme Court. They are going after the third-ranking person at the Department of Justice. Why? Because it is voter suppression—because she has been the head of the Civil Rights Division, which prosecuted voter suppression. She knows that stuff. She will supervise Kristen Clarke, whom you will hear a lot more nonsense about from the other side, who will run the Civil Rights Division and sue for voter suppression.

So what this is really about is the voter suppression project that you see alive and well in the country from the Republican Party. There are reports that say that every single legislative body in the country controlled by Republicans is pushing voter suppression measures. I don't know that it is true, but it sure looks like it is true. And if not, it is darn close. It is a pattern. Wherever you go in the country, Republicans in charge—boom—restrict the ballot.

They know people don't like what they stand for. They know people can't stand the dark money forces behind ads like this. So the secret, as my distinguished colleague Senator WARNOCK said: Some people don't want some people to vote.

So the two women who will be overseeing the Department of Justice voter suppression resistance, the legal fight against voter suppression, the enforcement of the Civil Rights Act, are being subjected to this treatment.

On this, I will stand with Ms. Gupta.

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

[From the Daily Beast, Mar. 22, 2021]

HOW RIGHT-WING DARK MONEY IS TRYING TO KNEECAP THE BIDEN DOJ

(By Sheldon Whitehouse)

Someone is targeting Biden Justice Department nominees Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke with attacks. Why? Both nominees hold exceptional records as litigators and civils rights activists. The respect they've earned extends beyond the civil rights movement and progressives to law enforcement and leading conservatives. They ought to be consensus picks.

But pull back the curtain, and strategy and motive take shape. Gupta and Clarke are poised to use their skills to defend Americans' right to vote, just as the Republican Party is going all in on voter suppression as its path to political victory in 2022.

Unraveling the strategy starts with the dark-money group running the ads: the so-called Judicial Crisis Network (JCN). This group's ordinary work has been to translate big donors' money into political attack ads in the ''Court capture'' mission that set out to remake the Supreme Court to the donors' advantage. JCN has placed more than 10,000 ads since 2012 in pursuit of that mission, and they've kept secret the identity of those big donors.

In Donald Trump and Mitch McConnell's courtpacking machine, this Judicial Crisis Network spent $7 million to oppose President Obama's Supreme Court nominee Merrick Garland, and then spent another $10 million to boost Trump's nominee Neil Gorsuch. JCN pledged $10 million or more for Brett Kavanaugh's nomination. It spent $10 million in under two months to support Amy Coney Barrett's bid. These campaigns were funded with tens of millions of anonymous dollars, primarily through four separate donations of at least $15 million. Those donations may well have been the same donor.

Eye-popping as that is, those millions are a tiny slice of the funding behind the overall dark-money operation. A 2019 Washington Post investigation revealed JCN is one of a web of front groups coordinated by Leonard Leo, the long-time executive vice president of the Federalist Society.

The Post tracked more than $250 million in dark money flowing through Leo's groups.

The groups see to the grooming and selection of reliable nominees, the lobbyists needed to shepherd nominees through confirmation, and the attack ads to motivate the confirmation votes. Then, more groups lobby the selected judges through amicus curiae briefs, signaling how their donors want the judges to rule.

The dark-money network has won an avalanche of victories for its donors. There are 80 partisan, 5–4 Supreme Court decisions that limit workers' rights and access to reproductive health care, erode environmental protections, block commonsense gun safety laws, undermine civil rights, and protect corporations from courtrooms. It is an astounding 80–0 rout for big right-wing donors.

After The Washington Post exposed the $250 million operation, Leo stepped back from his Federalist Society role and turned up at a new organization improbably named the Honest Elections Project. This project began voter suppression work in political swing states like Florida, Nevada, Wisconsin, and Michigan that included: negative ads against Democrats; threatening letters to election officials challenging voter rolls; and a barrage of lawsuits seeking voting restrictions for November's election.

''Trump's cronies at the Justice Department showed dark-money donors the value of a captive Department that would look away from voter suppression schemes.''

The media soon uncovered that the Honest Elections Project was a rebrand of the Judicial Education Project—which shared connections, donors, and aims with its sister group—yes, the Judicial Crisis Network. As a reporter for The Guardian observed, the Honest Elections Project melds two goals of the right-wing dark-money operation: first, pack the federal judiciary; and second, bring voting rights cases before the packed courts. Rigging elections through the courts is now a Republican judicial priority.

This brings us back to Gupta and Clarke. Gupta once ran the Civil Rights Division. She prosecuted hate crimes and human trafficking, promoted disability and LGBTQ rights, and fought discrimination in education, housing, employment, lending, and religious exercise. But most important, she challenged voter suppression. Gupta, if confirmed as assistant attorney general, will supervise the Civil Rights Division she once ran.

Accomplished civil rights attorney Clarke will fill Gupta's former role running the Division and enforcing voting rights. The Honest Elections Project, kin to the Judicial Crisis Network, wants no part of these two women, because they will be strong, motivated leaders against unlawful voter suppression. They preferred Trump's Civil Rights Division, which didn't bring one single Voting Rights Act case until late May of 2020.

That's the motive. The donor-approved Republican appointees to the Supreme Court may handcuff the Civil Rights Division with further judicial assaults on voting rights. But Trump's cronies at the Justice Department showed dark-money donors the value of a captive Department that would look away from voter suppression schemes. As Republicans hinge their election strategy on keeping Americans from voting, an active Civil Rights Division is a deadly threat.

I get it. If I were a right-wing special interest group, the last thing I would want is these two experienced lawyers wielding the power of the Justice Department to defend voting rights. But for everybody else, these women are two appointments to applaud.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I find it so interesting that my friend and colleague across the aisle is trying to deflect questions and concerns that we have by insinuations and some pretty disgusting slander, and I am sorry that we have listened to that here on the floor of this Chamber.

Yes, indeed, I am coming to the floor today to oppose discharging Vanita Gupta from this floor to be confirmed as the Associate Attorney General. And, yes, I have concerns. I have had questions in committee.

I will tell you I didn't expect to find a lot in common with her because I have had a difficult time finding a lot in common with some of the nominees that President Biden has sent over to us at Judiciary Committee. But as a member of that committee, it is my responsibility to approach each nomination with an open mind. Some I have decided were worthy of an ''aye'' vote. There are others, like Ms. Gupta, that I feel are not worthy of a confirmation vote.

Over the course of the review of information—and to my friend, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, 11,000 pages of documents—you can send in a million pages of documents, but if you are not answering the question, if you are trying to circumvent the question or nuance it or dance around it, it still doesn't answer the question. So the volume doesn't really matter.

What matters is someone who steps up and says: Here is my answer—clear, concise. That is what you want, and that is what the American people expect.

I arrived at the opinion that, no, I didn't think she was fit to take that No. 3 position, not because I disagreed politically but because the answers that she gave on some specific issues—police funding, drug legalization, qualified immunity—were so inconsistent with what she had previously said or what she had previously written that no one can say with any degree of certainty what she will do with the newfound power if we decided to give that to her. No one knows what she would do.

Due to the time constraints we have on the floor today, I want to go back to the 2012 article and use that as one example. There has been quite a bit said about that. Now, she was in the position of the ACLU's deputy legal director. She wrote an op-ed arguing—and I quote, and we have just heard a good bit about this—''States should decriminalize simple possession of all drugs, particularly marijuana, and for small amounts of other drugs.'' That is a quote.

Speaking as a Senator representing the interests of a State struggling to emerge from the opioid epidemic, this statement to me is a disqualifier. It is as simple as that.

Senator CORNYN added to that conversation with other specific items that have transpired in her past. In her hearing, which took place in March, Ms. Gupta almost got away with disavowing that op-ed. But when we pressed her on it, what did she have to say? That her position had evolved.

It seems there is an issue with some of these nominees that are coming before us. They are going through these just in time, road to Damascus, evolution processes. All of a sudden, they are evolving to a position of something that they think the committee wants to hear, that they think will help them skirt through, that they think will help them get confirmed so that they can hold the power.

Ms. Gupta has also evolved on criminal justice reform, on the fundamentals for that. And as we have discussed on this floor today, the fact checkers have had a pretty good time with that. Back in March, the Washington Post took her to task—Senator CORNYN talked about this—her evolving position, her shifting views on defunding the police, decriminalization of drugs. This is the Washington Post. This is the Washington Post that gave her the unusual upside-down Pinocchio because she was flip-flopping and evolving at such a rapid rate, they couldn't keep up with it.

Madam President, everyone has the right and the opportunity to change their mind. Absolutely, people have the right to change their mind, but trying to follow the many changes of her mind on the issue of drug crimes, on decriminalization, on defunding police—these are important issues to our communities. These are not a game. These are very important issues to the safety and security of our communities.

The number of inconsistencies in her testimony more than test the boundaries of understanding. Is she still evolving? Is she going to flip-flop, as the Washington Post says, back to her previous opinions of 2012? Is she going to flip-flop again? Would we see that in the next 11,000 pages of documents that were submitted that she has decided to change her mind one more time? From what standard is she going to work at the Department of Justice?

Each of these are concerns. Each of these are reasons that my hope is that this Chamber will refuse to discharge Vanita Gupta for a confirmation vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, before my distinguished friend's speech, I ask unanimous consent to have an article appended as an exhibit to the remarks I gave earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

REMEMBERING DOUGLAS BURTELL

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, 12 days ago, on April 3, we brought sad news of the passing of Douglas Burtell, of Bowman, ND, the last known World War II veteran residing in my State from the legendary 164th Infantry Regiment of the North Dakota National Guard. Tomorrow would have been his 97th birthday, April 16. I join in remembering and honoring him and the generation of heroes he represents to our State and to our Nation.

Douglas Burtell joined the National Guard in Fargo at the age of 16. In February of 1942, 2 months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, this Casselton native was among the 1,723 young men to mobilize in the 164th Infantry Regiment. Ten months later, the regiment sailed into history as the first U.S. Army unit to offensively engage the enemy in the Pacific when they landed at Guadalcanal on October 13, 1942. There they reinforced the 1st Marine Division and spent more than 600 days in the combat zone until August 1945.

His talent for illustration was noticed at the national regiment headquarters, where he was trained in intelligence and reconnaissance. There he interpreted aerial photography, analyzed captured materials, and drew maps based on patrol reconnaissance reports. His service included combat on the Philippine Islands, Bougainville, and Guadalcanal, and he received the Purple Heart after being wounded in action.

Returning to North Dakota after the war, Mr. Burtell earned his high school GED, attended art school in Minneapolis, and spent much of his life in lumber, millwork, and camper sales in Fargo. He spent his last years living near his daughter in Bowman, ND.

Often attending reunions of the 164th Regiment Infantry Association, he was present at its final gathering in October 2017. He helped relatives of other veterans with research about the war experiences of their loved ones.

And he painted throughout his life, generously sharing his work with friends. Mr. Burtell's artwork helped tell the everyday stories of the soldiers as they fought their way through the South Pacific. His illustrations are a lasting testament to the heroic contributions of the 164th Infantry Regiment to World War II. He was honored in March when North Dakota Adjutant General, Major General Al Dohrmann announced one of his sketches would be featured on a new recognition coin. Other artwork is etched in granite on the 164th Infantry Regiment Memorial located at the North Dakota Veterans Cemetery near Mandan, which is now Mr. Burtell's final resting place.

Madam President, on behalf of all Dakotans and a grateful nation, I offer my deepest condolences to Douglas Burtell's family and friends, including his daughter and son-in-law, Barb and Steve Conley, his two granddaughters, and five great-grandchildren.

Today, with most of our World War II veterans now gone, Mr. Burtell's artwork preserves the faces of so many brave North Dakotans and exemplifies their patriotism and dedication.

The 164th Infantry Regiment's motto in French, ''Je Suis Pret,'' ''I Am Ready,'' inspires today's North Dakota National Guard motto of ''Always Ready, Always There.'' God bless the memory of Douglas Burtell and the brave soldiers of World War II who were always ready.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

NOMINATIONS OF VANITA GUPTA AND KRISTEN CLARKE

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to express concerns over two of the Democrats' nominees. There have been a number of questionable nominees put forth by this new administration, but these two nominees may be the two most radical nominees put forth.

First, I would like to talk about Vanita Gupta. Today, we are set to vote on discharging Vanita Gupta's nomination out of the Judiciary Committee because Ms. Gupta could not garner a majority vote in the committee on moving her nomination forward to the full Senate.

The Judiciary Committee is deadlocked and for good reason. This nominee's record is that of an extreme partisan ideologue. I can assure the American people, Ms. Gupta is not a moderate, is not mainstream but is, rather, an extreme political activist whom the Democrats want to be the No. 3 lawyer at the Department of Justice.

When she testified before the Judiciary Committee last month, she consistently dodged questions. She wouldn't answer if she supported any restrictions, whatsoever, on abortion. She wouldn't answer—not partial-birth abortion, not anything.

When it comes to the Second Amendment, I asked Ms. Gupta if she thought the Heller decision, the landmark decision upholding the individual right to keep and bear arms, if that decision was rightly decided. She refused to answer that question.

For years, she has demonstrated a persistent hostility to religious liberty, such as when she defended the Obama administration's targeting and persecution of the Little Sisters of the Poor. Not too long ago, religious liberty was a bipartisan commitment in this body. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act was introduced by then-Representative CHUCK SCHUMER, now the Senate majority leader. It had passed the House unanimously. It passed the Senate 93 to 3 and was signed into law by Democratic President Bill Clinton.

Sadly, today's Democratic Party has abandoned religious liberty. That is no longer a commitment. Instead, today's Democratic Party embraces extreme ideas like the Equality Act, which has just come out of the House of Representatives. It is a radical piece of legislation that, among other things, explicitly repeals major parts of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act designed to take away your religious liberty.

Ms. Gupta has been a vocal defender of the misnamed Equality Act. She lobbied for its passage, a fact that she didn't disclose to the committee initially. When she was before the Judiciary Committee, I asked if she agreed with the provisions of the Equality Act that take away religious liberty protections from Americans. Again, Ms. Gupta refused to answer that question, too.

Ms. Gupta has demonstrated radical hostility to school choice, so much so that when she served in the Department of Justice during the Obama-Biden administration, she helped intervene in a case trying to kill a Louisiana school choice program, even though many of the African-American parents in Louisiana strongly supported and desperately needed that program. The Federal court involved in this case even reprimanded the Department of Justice under her leadership for ineffective lawyering in this case.

At the Judiciary hearing of Ms. Gupta last month, I asked if she regretted using the Department of Justice to fight against the school choice program that was providing hope and opportunity to low-income minority kids in Louisiana. Again, she refused to provide a straightforward answer.

When it comes to defunding the police, it is here that Ms. Gupta is most radical. Last year, Ms. Gupta, in a written filing with this Senate, encouraged Congress to ''reexamine Federal spending priorities and shrink the footprint of the police and criminal legal system in this country.'' She also encouraged reallocating resources, writing, ''Some people call it 'defunding the police,' other people call it 'divest-invest,' but whatever you call it, if you care about mass incarceration, you have to care about skewed funding priorities.''

These weren't Ms. Gupta's college writings. These weren't scribblings on a Post-it she made somewhere. These statements were from last year, submitted to the U.S. Senate. And on their face and unequivocally, they advocate for defunding the police.

There is no question on her record that Ms. Gupta is a hard-left partisan radical whose beliefs don't align with the majority of the American people. So why are Democrats so hell-bent on making sure she gets confirmed? Two reasons.

Reason No. 1: Headlines. Democrats care so deeply about looking good in the press, they continue to press through partisan bills and partisan activists for adulation by adoring media.

Reason No. 2: Today's Democrats are beholden to the far-left voices in their party, and they are fulfilling campaign promises that they made to the radical left.

That is why they nominated Ms. Gupta, and that is why they broke Judiciary Committee rules to move forward her nomination. Rule 4 of the committee, preserves the right of minority members to speak before a vote. It only allows for stopping debate and bringing a matter to a vote if a majority of the committee agrees, including at least one member of the minority party.

But the Democrats didn't have a majority. If they had tried to bring a matter to the vote under the rules, the vote would have failed. So, instead, Chairman DURBIN unilaterally silenced and stopped a member of the committee from speaking, midsentence, and forced a vote. He did so in flatout violation of the rules, without even a pretense of a justification under the rules.

The chairman knew that this was an abuse of power. Every Democrat on the committee knew it was an abuse of power. It was an abuse of power that had never been done against them when Republicans had the gavel for 6 years.

Yet today's Democrats are about power. So if the rules stand in the way, to heck with the rules. Ignore them. That is what the Senate Democrats did on the Judiciary Committee.

I also want to talk about Kristen Clarke, who has been likewise nominated to a senior position at the Department of Justice.

Like Ms. Gupta, Ms. CLARKE's record is that of an extreme radical. Last year, she wrote an op-ed in Newsweek, entitled: ''I Prosecuted Police Killings. Defund the Police—But Be Strategic.''

In that op-ed, Ms. CLARKE wrote about the protests that erupted last year and stated:

Into that space has surged a unifying call from the Black Lives Matter movement: ''Defund the police.''

Now, like Ms. Gupta, she tried to run away from her record. At the prompting of Senate Democrats and at the prompting of Chairman DURBIN, Ms. CLARKE said: No, no, no, no, no. I don't support defunding the police. She said: You know, it was just the headline of the article. I didn't write the headline. Ms. Gupta did the same thing. Both of them were instructed by their handlers to backpedal as quickly as possible from their repeated and explicit advocacy in writing. So Ms. CLARKE says she doesn't support defunding the police.

Yesterday, when Ms. CLARKE came before the Judiciary Committee, I asked her straightforwardly if she still thinks ''defund the police'' is a unifying call. That is what she wrote not 10 years ago, not 5 years ago but last year. She wouldn't answer the question. Instead, she just repeated her talking point: ''I do not support defunding the police.''

As I told Ms. CLARKE yesterday, that claim is objectively ridiculous. She asserted she doesn't advocate cutting the funding of police, which on its face was a lie.

In that same op-ed she wrote in Newsweek, there are no fewer than three separate paragraphs that begin with the following words: ''We must invest less in the police''—three paragraphs in a row. Now, when you write three paragraphs that begin with ''We must invest less in the police; we must invest less in the police; we must invest less in the police,'' you don't get to come and say: I don't support investing less in the police. That is objectively absurd, but, sadly, it is even worse.

Not only is Ms. CLARKE an extreme advocate for defunding the police, but she has a history of not just excusing but of celebrating murderers who have murdered police officers. It has been widely reported that, in college, Ms. CLARKE helped to organize a conference with speakers who referred to convicted cop killers as ''political prisoners.'' This included Mumia Abu-Jamal, who murdered a Philadelphia police officer, and Assata Shakur, who was convicted of murdering a New Jersey State trooper, who escaped from prison, and is on the FBI's Most Wanted list. Multiple speakers at the conference thanked Ms. CLARKE by name for inviting them to speak, and now the Democrats want Ms. CLARKE to head the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

I ask you the question that I asked Ms. CLARKE yesterday: What is a police officer in Philadelphia who is watching the proceedings before this body or a police officer in New Jersey who is watching C–SPAN today supposed to think about the Democrats nominating someone to a senior position at the Department of Justice, knowing that this individual participated in a conference celebrating and lionizing cop killers who murdered a Philadelphia cop and murdered a New Jersey State Trooper? How should a police officer today react to that news?

There are numerous Members of this body—Senate Democrats—who, when they go home to their States, like to tell their constituents they are not all that liberal; they are really quite reasonable; they are really quite moderate. Well, the nice thing about politics is that actions speak much more loudly than words. These two nominations—Ms. Gupta's, which we have before us right now, and Ms. CLARKE's, which I expect we will have before us relatively soon—are two of the most radical nominees ever to be put forward. Indeed, you could call the two of them the radical twins. They are zealots; they are ideologues; and they both are leading advocates for abolishing the police.

I say to my Democratic friends: This is a 50–50 Senate. That means just one of you—just 1 out of 50—could say: OK. Enough is enough.

How many Senate Democrats have gone home and said, ''I don't support abolishing the police''? Quite a few Senate Democrats, I suspect, are telling their constituents back home that they don't support abolishing the police.

Today, you have a vote because I will tell you, if you as a Senator vote to confirm the radical twins, both of whom are among the leading advocates for abolishing the police, your constituents back home will know exactly where you stand on abolishing the police. You don't get to put radicals who want to abolish the police in the top positions of the Department of Justice and claim you oppose abolishing the police.

President Obama nominated for a senior position in the Department of Justice another lawyer who had celebrated and defended a cop killer, who had lionized a cop killer, and this body, in one of the few instances, decided that was too much; that was too far; and they were not going to confirm that lawyer.

Unfortunately, the Democratic Party has changed. The Democratic Party today is radicalized. They hate Donald Trump. Now, I understand Donald Trump is a unique character. I understand that his existence and every word he uttered enraged the Democrats, but they have emerged from 4 years of the Trump administration more radical than any majority party in this body ever has been. There are quite a few Democrats who, when they are at home, like to pretend otherwise.

Today is a perfect opportunity to demonstrate that the pretense is not mere empty words. In fact, if you don't support abolishing the police, then don't support abolishing the police, and if you don't support celebrating cop killers, then don't confirm people who have celebrated cop killers to senior positions in the U.S. Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIRING ROBERT MONTGOMERY ''BOBBY'' KNIGHT AS THE HEAD COACH OF THE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I rise to honor the 50th anniversary of the signing of Coach Robert Montgomery Knight at Indiana University, who set the standard for excellence as a collegiate men's basketball coach.

Coach Knight had a legendary career as a college head coach for more than 40 years, 29 of which were at Indiana University. During those 29 years, Coach Knight had 11 Big Ten Conference championship teams, took 24 teams to the NCAA tournament, and earned 8 Big Ten Coach of the Year Awards. His 1975–1976 team at IU remains the last team to complete an undefeated season and win every game in the NCAA tournament. They got close this year.

Maureen, my wife, attended IU, and I can remember what a thrill it was to watch his teams play. Their drive and will to succeed were infectious. Coach Knight's success at IU continues to be a source of pride for the entire State of Indiana. Coach Knight never focused his coaching on winning a game but on the effort it takes to become a champion, saying that the will to succeed is important, but the will to prepare is even more important.

Due to his focus on his players' success on and off the court—this is amazing—Coach Knight had an astounding 98-percent graduation rate for all players whom he coached for at least 4 years—more than twice the average graduation rate for Division 1 schools. On the world stage, Coach Knight led the U.S. men's national basketball team to a Gold Medal in the 1979 Pan Am Games and to a Gold Medal in the 1984 Olympic Games.

Victory is fleeting, but Coach Knight both propelled young men toward greatness on the court and gave them experiences and lessons that have shaped their entire lives.

We honor the drive, determination, and character of Coach Knight and all

that he did in educating and mentoring hundreds of Indiana University players over three decades to bring pride to the State of Indiana.

For all the memories, Coach Knight, we give you a heartfelt thank you.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 157, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 157) honoring the 50th anniversary of hiring Robert Montgomery ''Bobby'' Knight as the Head Coach of the men's basketball team at Indiana University.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BRAUN. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 157) was agreed to.

Mr. BRAUN. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. BRAUN. I yield the floor.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, what is it about these nominees Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke that drives some of the Members on the other side of the aisle into a rage? Listen to how they describe them.

The senior Senator from Texas describes Vanita Gupta as a political ''culture warrior,'' slandering and vilifying people. Then, of course, the junior Senator from Texas calls her an ''extreme partisan ideologue.'' ''Radical twins,'' he calls them.

What is it about these two nominees that drives them into such a state of mind that they say these things about individuals seeking an opportunity to again serve our Federal Government?

It is amazing to me that the junior Senator from Texas suggests that they are in the thrall of handlers. Handlers. If you heard the story of the lives of these two women and what they have overcome to be where they are today, the last thing in the world you would use is a reference to handlers. They have defied handlers all throughout their lives—sons of immigrants, daughters of immigrants. Like so many of them, they know they have to work hard to prove themselves, and they have done it time and again.

Vanita Gupta. Can you picture that moment when the civil rights organizations said to Vanita Gupta: We want you to go to Tulia, TX, because something has happened there that looks like a terrible miscarriage of justice. Forty people have been arrested for drug crimes in Tulia, TX, and we want you to go down there, even though they are in jail and they have been convicted, and defend them and try to find a way that they will be released.

That is exactly what Vanita Gupta did. The net result was that they were not only released, but the lawman who had supposedly found them guilty was the one who was discredited and dishonored when it was over, and the Texas Governor—the Republican Texas Governor—acknowledged it with a pardon of these individuals and paying them millions of dollars for what they had lived through. Who led that charge? Vanita Gupta. Was she waiting for a message from a handler? No. She showed extraordinary courage there and throughout her life as an attorney fighting for the civil rights of others and as an attorney representing the Government of the United States of America and the Department of Justice.

When I listen to efforts to discredit her and her professionalism, I think, you haven't read the story. You would know in a second she doesn't wait to hear from a handler. She never has. She has shown exceptional courage and professionalism every step of the way.

Kristen Clarke, the same. Born in an area of New York City that I am sure Senator SCHUMER knows, in a public tenement type of building, she overcame all the odds. She graduated from law school and served in the Department of Justice.

When the junior Senator from Texas comes and refers to Vanita Gupta and Kristen Clarke as ''radical twins,'' zealots, ideologues, it is disgusting. It is terrible. It is a terrible reference to a fine life that each of them has lived.

And this notion that somehow they have fooled the Fraternal Order of Police into believing that they really do love police, when, in fact, as the Republicans argue, they just want to take all their money away—we know better. The fact that Vanita Gupta has the endorsement of every major law enforcement organization puts to rest some of the charges they have made against her.

I can't believe what they are saying about these two nominees, but I think that a majority of the Senate is ultimately going to judge that they are ready to serve this country again and should, and the Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. The Senator from Utah has graciously yielded back his remaining time, so I ask unanimous consent that I speak for a brief few minutes and then we vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. And then yield back the rest of our time after that.

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

NOMINATION OF VANITA GUPTA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate will soon vote on a motion to discharge the nomination of Vanita Gupta to serve as the next Attorney General—Associate Attorney General. The daughter of immigrants, she would be the first woman of color and the first civil rights attorney to serve as Attorney General.

Ms. Gupta is an exceptional nominee and an outstanding lawyer. It is confounding that her nomination has been tied up in the Judiciary Committee, requiring the Senate to take the extra procedural steps to move her nomination forward. But despite Republican obstruction, she will be confirmed by this Chamber in a few minutes.

Ms. Gupta's credentials speak for themselves. She most recently served as president and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and served 4 years at the Justice Department.

Her first case after law school involved securing the release of several African Americans wrongly convicted by all-White juries in Texas.

At a time when so many in our country call for action against civil injustices and racial violence, how can we not install one of the Nation's top civil rights lawyers at the Department of Justice?

Senate Republicans, rather than evaluate Ms. Gupta on the merits of her accomplishments, have spent the last few weeks appealing to outlandish accusations that she is an out-of-touch, far-left radical.

The questions she endured during her confirmation hearing were utterly inane—from accusations that she is anti-police to the insinuation that she wants to legalize all drugs. A conservative judicial organization even launched a shameful national ad campaign to smear her reputation—her nomination. These smear tactics are nonsense.

Gupta commands the respect of civil rights advocates and law enforcement and has the endorsement from the National Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association. There is no mystery to Ms. Gupta's broad support. She is outstanding at what she does. She knows how to listen and work with others, including Republican Senators, and is deeply knowledgeable in the field. That is exactly—exactly—she is exactly the kind of person we need at the Department of Justice.

So I look forward to now moving on Ms. Gupta's nomination.

I yield back the rest of our time.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. BLUNT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) would have voted ''nay.''

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 153 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—34

Blackburn	Fischer	Murkowski
Blunt	Graham	Rubio
Boozman	Grassley	Sasse
Capito	Hagerty	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Hawley	Scott (SC)
Collins	Hoeven	Shelby
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Sullivan
Cotton	Johnson	Tuberville
Cramer	Kennedy	Wicker
Crapo	Lankford	Young
Cruz	Lee	
Ernst	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—17

Barrasso	Marshall	Rounds
Braun	Moran	Tester
Burr	Paul	Thune
Daines	Portman	Tillis
Inhofe	Risch	Toomey
Lummis	Romney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). Pursuant to S. Res. 27 and the motion to discharge having been agreed to, the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 57.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read nomination of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 57, Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Michael F. Bennet, Tammy Duckworth, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Ossoff, Chris Van Hollen, Martin Heinrich, Mark R. Warner, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Gary C. Peters, Kyrsten Sinema.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 34.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gary Gensler, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2026. (Reappointment)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 34, Gary Gensler, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2026. (Reappointment)

Charles E. Schumer, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Michael F. Bennet, Tammy Duckworth, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Ossoff, Chris Van Hollen, Martin Heinrich, Mark R. Warner, Dianne Feinstein, Gary C. Peters, Kyrsten Sinema.

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, April 15, be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAY OF PIGS OPERATION

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the 60th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs operation.

Today, we commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs operation and pay tribute to the brave and courageous members of Brigada de Asalto 2506, Assault Brigade 2506. On April 17, 1961, a group of Cuban patriots landed at the Bay of Pigs to overthrow Fidel Castro's communist dictatorship. We remember the sacrifice made by these brave individuals, and their memory lives on in the fight that continues today.

There is no doubt that where we see instability, chaos, and violence in

Latin America, we also see the fingerprints of the Castro regime. The Cuban people have suffered decades of oppression under Castro's regime. So many courageous individuals have dedicated their lives to the freedom of Cuba, and their commitment and sacrifice have kept the hope of liberty alive.

It is time to show Castro that his era of influence in Latin America is over. The United States must always support those fighting for freedom and democracy, and I will never stop fighting to bring a new day of freedom to Cuba and all of Latin America.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ANNE STORDAHL

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Anne Stordahl of Pondera County for her commitment to supporting Montana small businesses.

Anne has been a small business owner in Conrad, Montana for 15 years. When the local candy shop closed in her community, Anne decided to help boost community morale by taking on a new project and business. She opened the 2B Sweet Candy shop right next to her hair salon, giving her customers a chance to grab some candy while waiting for their next haircut.

Anne enlisted the help of her three children to open a new candy store that could bring some joy back to their community, especially in a time of uncertainty when many small businesses were closing their doors. Her son handled the behind the scenes work of taking inventory and balancing the books while her daughters handled a variety of tasks like designing candy bouquets and serving customers.

Anne grew up on a farm and was able to use this experience to teach her children what a strong Montana work ethic looks like and the importance of family operations to our communities. At the beginning, she hoped the store would bring her family closer, and looking back, she would say this was a sweet success.

It is my honor to recognize Anne and her children for taking the initiative to successfully launch the 2B Sweet Candy Shop. It is now a proud part of the Conrad community.●

REMEMBERING JIM PUTEK

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on January 25, 2021, America lost a great patriot CPT James ''Jim'' Ronald Putek, 75, of Alpharetta, GA. Born in Chicago, IL, Jim was a decorated Army veteran having served in the Vietnam war, where he received the following awards: the National Defense Service Medal, the Bronze Star with one oakleaf Cluster, the Air Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with one Silver and one Bronze Service Star, the Army Aviator Badge, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

Captain Putek's heroism will live forever. Following his retirement from the Army, Jim continued his passion for aviation as a commercial airline pilot for Piedmont Airlines and US Airways.

Captain Putek is survived by his wife Tricia Putek, his sister Delores, his sister-in-law Mary, and his nieces and nephews Hank, Gwen, Joanne, Janet, and Jon. He was preceded in death by his parents Walter and Frances, and his brother Henry.

Jim Putek was a fine gentleman and a true hero, respected and revered by everyone who met him. When Captain Putek passed, we not only lost a good man, we lost a great American.●

TRIBUTE TO DOMINIC LAJOIE

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Dominic LaJoie of Van Buren, ME, who was recently named as National Potato Council, NPC, president for 2021. The National Potato Council is a grower-led organization managed by an Executive Committee and Board of Directors, which oversees its operations and provides guidance on its policy activities. It does not surprise me that Dominic LaJoie was chosen as the 2021 president to lead the council's Executive Committee because Dominic epitomizes the qualities that are needed to bring State potato grower organizations together at the national level. He has a proven history of promoting collaboration and respectful, healthy debate to further best practices and innovation in agriculture for years. Dominic has also served on the Maine Potato Board and has been a long standing and active participant of the National Potato Council in previous years including serving on the Trade Committee and as first vice president and vice president of the Environmental Affairs Committee.

But those are the only the highlights of one well-deserved appointment. What truly makes Dominic stand out is his heart for farming, for his family and for his community all while stepping up to serve in a national seat. Dominic and his family are fourth generation potato farmers. He is so humble and proud to work with his brother and nephew, along with the support of their wives and children, on the land that was farmed by their parents and their grandparents before them. Dominic's work ethic and character have shone through throughout his career as a farmer, but never one to just sit idle, their farm diversified and added grain and root vegetables, and they have worked to carve out new niche products in the natural snacks and health food markets. He is active in many civic activities and in his church, and when given a chance to speak of his wife and four children, his already genuine and wide smile broadens even further with an acknowledgment of his blessings.

I was pleased to tour their farm in Van Buren a couple of years ago and learned directly about their farm: the innovations and value added products; their focus on precision farming and efficiencies to enhance the productivity of their legacy farm and stewardship of the land they grew up on. Upon one of Dominic's awards received in recent years, he was asked if he had advice to those who are considering taking up farming, and he replied ''Never give up, be open-minded and embrace change, take chances.'' It was immediately clear to me that Dominic's successes through attention to detail, sound business practices, and a true commitment to the future of agriculture was what brought him to be nominated and appointed as president of the National Potato Council for 2021.

I would like to recognize and thank Dominic for his ongoing commitment to upholding the legacy of potato growers in our State and this country. I cannot speak highly enough of Dominic and look forward to his service as the president of the National Potato Council Executive Committee.●

RECOGNIZING HUNTER'S BAR-B-Q

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I will recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize a family-owned small business and southern Kentucky staple, Hunter's Bar-B-Q of Albany, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

On Hunter Shearer's 13th birthday, when other boys wanted skateboards or baseball gloves, Shearer asked for a new Weber gas grill. From that point on, he was cooking for family and friends every chance he could. As a welder, Shearer built his own mobile grill and smoker, which he used to cook at family and church events. He first sold barbeque to the public in 2009, at the 127 Yard Sale. Seeing a business opportunity, Shearer decided to pursue his boyhood dream of owning a restaurant. In 2012, Hunter began working with his father-in-law Mike Duvall to convert an old service station into a restaurant. Sixteen months later, Hunter's Bar-B-Q welcomed its first customers in 2014.

In 2021, Hunter's Bar-B-Q continues to serve up some of the best BBQ in southern Kentucky, and folks drive from all over the State to enjoy their signature hickory smoked meat and family-friendly hospitality. Hunter's care and attention to detail are evident in every aspect of his restaurant and catering business. At the restaurant, everything is made from scratch, from handmade picnic tables and cooking equipment to the smoke shack, pits, and charcoal makers. Even the charcoal is made on site, using hickory wood from local sawmills.

Locally, Hunter's Bar-B-Q is known as ''the place with the big flag.'' It

boasts a 25 by 40-foot American flag atop a 100-foot flagpole almost as big as the store. Thanks to the smokers and pits, Hunter's Bar-B-Q can feed around 3,000 people a day. The pulled pork and sliced shoulder are favorites, attracting customers from all over the country. Catering is also a large part of the business, with Hunter's Bar-B-Q catering events as far away as Louisville.

Together with his wife, Shannon, Hunter seeks to give back to their community in any way possible. Locally, Hunter's Bar-B-Q sponsors Little League and high school sports teams. They regularly support community organizations, including sponsoring Project Graduation, the All for Benny Fundraiser, and the American Cancer Society's Relay for Life. Additionally, Hunter's Bar-B-Q has supported numerous fundraisers that have covered emergency and medical expenses for local members of the community. Hunter's Bar-B-Q is a proud member of the Albany/Clinton County Chamber of Commerce. Notably, Hunter's Bar-B-Q is one of two caterers designated by the Lake Cumberland District Health Department to provide food for events in Clinton County, Kentucky.

Hunter's Bar-B-Q is a remarkable example of how hard work, ingenuity, and discipline can turn a childhood dream into reality. Small businesses like Hunter's Bar-B-Q form the heart of communities across Kentucky, regularly stepping up to support their communities. Congratulations to Hunter, Shannon, and the entire team at Hunter's Bar-B-Q. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER THAT DECLARES A NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE UNUSUAL AND EXTRAORDINARY THREAT TO THE NATIONAL SECURITY, FOREIGN POLICY, AND ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES POSED BY SPECIFIED HARMFUL FOREIGN ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—PM 7

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) (IEEPA), I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation.

I have determined that specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation—in particular, efforts to undermine the conduct of free and fair democratic elections and democratic institutions in the United States and its allies and partners; to engage in and facilitate malicious cyber-enabled activities against the United States and its allies and partners; to foster and use transnational corruption to influence foreign governments; to pursue extraterritorial activities targeting dissidents or journalists; to undermine security in countries and regions important to United States national security; and to violate well-established principles of international law, including respect for the territorial integrity of states—constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 15, 2021.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:34 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, without amendment:

S. 164. An act to educate health care providers and the public on biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

S. 415. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the scope of new chemical exclusivity.

S. 578. An act to improve the health and safety of Americans living with food allergies and related disorders, including potentially life-threatening anaphylaxis, food protein-induced enterocolitis syndrome, and eosinophilic gastrointestinal diseases, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 172. An act to reauthorize the United States Anti-Doping Agency, and for other purposes.

H.R. 189. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that the authority of the Director of the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities to make certain research endowments applies with respect to both current and former centers of excellence, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1766. An act to enhance cooperation between the Federal Trade Commission and State Attorneys General to combat unfair and deceptive practices, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 312. Resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Alcee L. Hastings, a Representative from the State of Florida.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 172. An act to reauthorize the United States Anti-Doping Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1766. An act to enhance cooperation between the Federal Trade Commission and State Attorneys General to combat unfair and deceptive practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 189. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide that the authority of the Director of the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities to make certain research endowments applies with respect to both current and former centers of excellence, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Navy nomination of Adm. John C. Aquilino, to be Admiral.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 1131. A bill to regulate firearm silencers and firearm mufflers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1132. A bill to establish a cap on out-of-pocket costs for insulin; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1133. A bill to direct the Director of the National Institutes of Health, in consultation with the Director of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, to establish a program to support or conduct research on valvular heart disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COTTON, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1134. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick ''Roddie'' Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1135. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KING, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 1137. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit gay and trans panic defenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1138. A bill to revoke or deny visas to Chinese officials involved in the formulation or execution of a policy that prevents innocent United States citizens from leaving China; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 1139. A bill to repeal the Military Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 1140. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to alter the maximum amount of a second draw loan under Paycheck Protection Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1141. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow for twelve associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1142. A bill to require a determination as to whether crimes committed against the Rohingya in Burma amount to genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1143. A bill to prohibit certain individuals from downloading or using TikTok on any device issued by the United States or a government corporation; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. SASSE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. THUNE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. LEE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1144. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1145. A bill to prohibit the placement in service or continued operation of certain natural gas compressor stations as part of a project that would lead to or facilitate natural gas exports; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1146. A bill to counter Saudi Arabia's possible pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1147. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1148. A bill to restrict the first-use strike of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BLUNT, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 1149. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the depreciation rules for property used predominantly within an Indian reservation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1150. A bill to authorize appropriations for the maritime environmental and technical assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1151. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connected disability for certain veterans who served in Palomares, Spain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1152. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide that children who have relocated from Puerto Rico to the States are fully considered for purposes of State allotments under the English Language Acquisition grants; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 1153. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to authorize block grants to States for prekindergarten education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 1154. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically-aerated bait containers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1155. A bill to reform Federal firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. HAWLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RISCH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1158. A bill to provide paid family and medical leave to Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1159. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to enhance the authority of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to share information with respect to merchandise suspected of violating intellectual property rights with rights holders and other interested parties; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1160. A bill to prioritize efforts of the Department of State to combat international trafficking in covered synthetic drugs and new psychoactive substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1161. A bill to promote focused research and innovation in quantum communications and quantum network infrastructure to bolster internet security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1162. A bill to improve access to the Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1163. A bill to withdraw all United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 1164. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons who engage in the hostage-taking or wrongful detention of United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1165. A bill to amend the national service laws to prioritize national service programs and projects that are directly related to the response to and recovery from the COVID–19 public health emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1167. A bill to eliminate subsidies for fossil-fuel production; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1168. A bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1169. A bill to address issues involving the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KING, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PADILLA, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1170. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1171. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit mandatory pre-dispute arbitration agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1172. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a grant program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 1173. A bill to establish a matched savings program for low-income students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1174. A bill to establish a national commission on fiscal responsibility and reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1175. A bill to categorize public safety telecommunicators as a protective service occupation under the Standard Occupational Classification System; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1176. A bill to establish a grant program to support the manufacture and stockpiling of essential generic antibiotic drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1177. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the eligibility criteria for E visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 1178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for employers of reservists; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1179. A bill to provide financial assistance for projects to address certain subsidence impacts in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. REED):

S. 1180. A bill to provide for the establishment of Medicare part E public health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1181. A bill to authorize the establishment of HOPE Account Pilot Projects, HOPE Action Plans Pilot Projects, and competitive grants for pilot projects; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1182. A bill to ensure that sales, exports, or transfers of F–35 aircraft do not compromise the qualitative military edge of the United States or Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 1183. A bill to allow veterans to use, possess, or transport medical marijuana and to discuss the use of medical marijuana with a physician of the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized by a State or Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1184. A bill to improve the program providing for private screening companies to conduct security screening at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1185. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to permit leave to care for a domestic partner, parent-in-law, or adult child, or another related individual, who has a serious health condition, and to allow employees to take, as additional leave, parental involvement and family wellness leave to participate in or attend their children's and grandchildren's educational and extracurricular activities or meet family care needs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 1186. A bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to improve the administration of antidumping and countervailing duty laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1188. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify Congress regularly of reported cases of burn pit exposure by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1189. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to establish a competitive grant program under which the Secretary of Agriculture provides grants to land-grant colleges and universities to support agricultural producers in adopting conservation and innovative climate practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1190. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced Federal matching payments for direct support worker training programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances in the energy credit and to extend the credit for residential energy efficient property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1192. A bill to amend subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act to authorize direct support worker career advancement demonstration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1193. A bill to establish a grant program at the Department of Homeland Security to promote cooperative research and development between the United States and Israel on cybersecurity; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1194. A bill to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E–1 and E–2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal and to otherwise modify the eligibility criteria for E visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KING, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 1195. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

S. 1196. A bill to amend subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act to fund additional projects that focus on competency-based training for personal or home care aides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1197. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to apply public-private talent exchange programs in the Department of Defense to quantum information sciences and technology research, to increase coordination across agencies and emphasize opportunities in the Department for quantum information sciences and technology research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1198. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and expand the Solid Start program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 1199. A bill to release a Federal reversionary interest in Chester County, Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WARNER):

S.J. Res. 17. A joint resolution requiring the advice and consent of the Senate or an Act of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, 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 Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 157. A resolution honoring the 50th anniversary of hiring Robert Montgomery ''Bobby'' Knight as the Head Coach of the men's basketball team at Indiana University; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 158. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. REED, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 159. A resolution designating the week of April 17, 2021, through April 25, 2021, as ''National Park Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. Res. 160. A resolution commending and congratulating the Stanford University Cardinal women's basketball team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's basketball championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. PAUL):

S. Res. 161. A resolution commending and congratulating the Baylor University Men's Basketball Team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's basketball championship; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 162. A resolution designating April 14, 2021, as ''National Assistive Technology Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. Res. 163. A resolution relating to the death of the Honorable William ''Bill'' Emerson Brock III, former United States Senator for the State of Tennessee; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 56

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support services for families and caregivers of people living with Alzheimer's disease or a related dementia.

S. 65

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 65, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 70

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize cybersecurity operations and missions to protect critical infrastructure by members of the National Guard in connection with training or other duty.

S. 101

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 101, a bill to establish the Environmental Justice Mapping Committee, and for other purposes.

S. 145

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 145, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that the United States Postal Service prepay future retirement benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 172

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 172, a bill to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 248

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 248, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 282

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 282, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 289

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 289, a bill to authorize appropriations for offsetting the costs related to reductions in research productivity resulting from the coronavirus pandemic.

S. 331

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 331, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 360

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 360, a bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to modify the national space grant college and fellowship program, and for other purposes.

S. 385

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 385, a bill to improve the full-service community school program, and for other purposes.

S. 420

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 420, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes.

S. 452

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 454

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 454, a bill to provide health care and benefits to veterans who were exposed to toxic substances while serving as members of the Armed Forces at Karshi Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, and for other purposes.

S. 464

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

S. 501

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to prohibit earmarks.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 586, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting.

S. 621

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 621, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to add membership in a significant transnational criminal organization to the list of grounds of inadmissibility and to prohibit the provision of material support or resources to such organizations.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls''.

S. 773

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 773, a bill to enable certain hospitals that were participating in or applied for the drug discount program under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act prior to the COVID–19 public health emergency to temporarily maintain eligibility for such program, and for other purposes.

S. 784

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 810

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to create protections for financial institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 937

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 937, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

S. 966

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 966, a bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish a Climate Change Education Program, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and to expand eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation paid to certain survivors of certain veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 978

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 978, a bill to provide for

the adjustment or modification by the Secretary of Agriculture of loans for critical rural utility service providers, and for other purposes.

S. 986

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 986, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a 5-year extension of the carbon oxide sequestration credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1020

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1020, a bill to ensure due process protections of individuals in the United States against unlawful detention based solely on a protected characteristic.

S. 1042

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1042, a bill to prevent maternal mortality and serve maternal morbidity among Black pregnant and postpartum individuals and other underserved populations, to provide training in respectful maternity care, to reduce and prevent bias, racism, and discrimination in maternity care settings, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to enact as law certain regulations relating to the taking of double-crested cormorants.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to provide incentives for agricultural producers to carry out climate stewardship practices, to provide for increased reforestation across the United States, to establish the Coastal and Estuary Resilience Grant Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S.J. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review''.

S. RES. 37

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 37, a resolution expressing solidarity with the San Isidro Movement in Cuba, condemning escalated attacks against artistic freedoms in Cuba, and calling for the repeal of laws that violate freedom of expression and the immediate release of arbitrarily detained artists, journalists, and activists.

S. RES. 46

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 46, a resolution calling on the President of the United States to take executive action to broadly cancel Federal student loan debt.

S. RES. 72

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 72, a resolution opposing the lifting of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran without addressing the full scope of Iran's malign activities, including its nuclear program, ballistic and cruise missile capabilities, weapons proliferation, support for terrorism, hostage-taking, gross human rights violations, and other destabilizing activities.

S. RES. 116

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 116, a resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs operation and remembering the members of Brigada de Asalto 2506 (Assault Brigade 2506).

S. RES. 133

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 133, a resolution condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID–19.

S. RES. 140

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 140, a resolution condemning the horrific shootings in Atlanta, Georgia, on March 16, 2021, and reaffirming the commitment of the Senate to combating hate, bigotry, and violence against the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community.

AMENDMENT NO. 1412

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1412 intended to be proposed to S. 937, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1437

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1437 intended to be proposed to S. 937, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1133. A bill to direct the Director of the National Institutes of Health, in consultation with the Director of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, to establish a program to support or conduct research on valvular heart disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, on an entirely different matter, colleagues in Congress and my fellow Kentuckians were heartbroken last June when our dear friend, Carol Leavell Barr, suddenly and unexpectedly passed away.

She left behind two beautiful young daughters and an adoring husband in Congressman ANDY BARR. She was only 39 years old. Since then, we have learned her fatal heart attack was likely the result of an underlying condition called mitral valve prolapse.

Carol was diagnosed at a young age. Like millions of Americans with heart valve defects, she lived for many years with no apparent symptoms. Tragically, it only took an instant for her condition to turn deadly. Approximately 25,000 Americans each year lose their lives from this heart valve disease. Her passing deprived the Barr family of an extraordinary wife and mother. We all lost a warm and uplifting friend.

One of the most troubling aspects of this syndrome is just how much we still don't know. So Congressman BARR is taking action. He introduced the Cardiovascular Advances in Research and Opportunities Legacy Act, the CAROL Act. It would encourage new research into valvular heart disease, help us better understand the risks, and bring together top experts to identify potential treatments.

With this legislation, we can help prevent more families from enduring this tragedy. More than 120 House colleagues have already cosponsored the CAROL Act. It has also earned the support of major health advocacy groups.

So today, I am proud to introduce the CAROL Act here in the Senate. I am grateful to partner with Senator SINEMA, one of Congressman BARR's friends from their days serving together in the House. This important legislation is a fitting tribute to a wonderful Kentuckian. It embodies Carol's lifetime of service to others, and I look forward to its passage.

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. 1133

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 ''Cardiovascular Advances in Research and Opportunities Legacy Act''.

SEC. 2. GRANTS FOR VALVULAR HEART DISEASE RESEARCH.

Subpart 2 of part C of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285b et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 424C the following:

''SEC. 424D. GRANTS FOR VALVULAR HEART DISEASE RESEARCH.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institutes of Health, in consultation with the Director of the Institute, shall support or conduct research regarding valvular heart disease.

''(b) SUPPORT GUIDELINES.—The distribution of funding authorized in subsection (a) may be used to pursue any of the following outcomes:

''(1) Using precision medicine and advanced technological imaging to generate data on individuals with valvular heart disease.

''(2) Identifying and developing a cohort of individuals with valvular heart disease and available data.

''(3) Corroborating data generated through clinical trials to develop a prediction model to distinguish individuals at high risk for sudden cardiac arrest or sudden cardiac death from valvular heart disease.

''(4) Other outcomes needed to acquire necessary data on valvular heart disease.

''(c) MITRAL VALVE PROLAPSE WORKSHOP.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the Institute shall convene a workshop composed of subject matter experts and stakeholders to identify research needs and opportunities to develop prescriptive guidelines for treatment of individuals with mitral valve prolapse.

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.''.

SEC. 3. PROGRAMS OF CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

Part J of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 393D the following section:

''SEC. 393E. PREVENTION OF SUDDEN CARDIAC DEATH AS A RESULT OF VALVULAR HEART DISEASE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, may carry out projects to increase education, awareness, or diagnosis of valvular heart disease and to reduce the incidence of sudden cardiac death caused by valvular heart disease. Such projects may be carried out by the Secretary directly or through awards of grants or contracts to public or nonprofit private entities. The Secretary may directly (or through such awards) provide technical assistance with respect to the planning, development, and operation of such projects.

''(b) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—Projects carried out under subsection (a) may include—

''(1) the implementation of public information and education programs for—

''(A) the prevention of sudden cardiac death from valvular heart disease;

''(B) broadening the awareness of the public concerning the risk factors for, the symptoms of, and the public health consequences of, valvular heart disease; and

''(C) increasing screening, detection, and diagnosis of valvular heart disease; and

''(2) surveillance of out-of-hospital cardiac arrests to improve patient outcomes.

''(c) GRANT PRIORITIZATION.—The Secretary may, in awarding grants or entering into contracts pursuant to subsection (a), give priority to entities seeking to carry out projects that target populations most impacted by valvular heart disease.

''(d) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure that activities under this section are coordinated, as appropriate, with other agencies of the Public Health Service that carry out activities regarding valvular heart disease.

''(e) BEST PRACTICES.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall—

''(1) collect and analyze the findings of research conducted with respect to valvular heart disease; and

''(2) taking into account such findings, publish on the website of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention best practices for physicians and other health care providers who provide care to individuals with valvular heart disease.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.''.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1155. A bill to reform Federal firearmslaws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, it is painfully clear that existing Federal policies do not provide a comprehensive approach to address the national epidemic of gun violence. In fact, in 2019, for the third consecutive year, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported gun violence as a leading cause of premature death in the United States resulting in the loss of 39,707 American lives—that is 109 American lives lost each day. And unfortunately, 2020 was no different. Even as the Country was enduring an unprecedented global pandemic, communities across the country were left dealing with the ever-present threat of gun violence.

There is single legislative action that can eradicate the complex and deeply rooted issues of gun violence. However, we must undertake the correct approach by focusing on many issues, including improvements to our mental health system, better security protocols, and commonsense rules about gun use and safety, such that keep firearms out of the hands of dangerous individuals.

Virginians know all too well the heartbreaking consequences of gun violence. We have seen it in the tragedies of Virginia Tech and Virginia Beach and the countless drive-by shootings, domestic violence, and suicides by firearms. Yet the Commonwealth has chosen to acknowledge and address its unfortunate history of gun violence, and this past year adopted a series of gun violence prevention measures. These measures include legislation to enact an Extreme Risk Protective Order; an expansion of background checks on all gun sales; a mandate to report lost and stolen firearms; safeguards that prevent children from accessing firearms; and a reinstatement of Virginia's successful one-handgun-a-month policy. The Virginia Plan to Reduce Gun Violence Act of 2021 builds on the newly adopted Virginia framework by creating a comprehensive package of policies at the federal level to reduce gun violence across the nation.

With public support for commonsense rules at the highest it has ever been, we cannot wait until the next senseless tragedy before enacting commonsense gun policies. It is important to remember that gun violence is preventable and requires we take an evidence-based approach to create a more peaceful society, free of gun violence. I believe that the ''Virginia Plan'' will pave the way to advance meaningful gun reform and ultimately save lives.

Now is the time to act.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1161. A bill to promote focused research and innovation in quantum communications and quantum network infrastructure to bolster internet security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1161

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 ''Quantum Network Infrastructure and Workforce Development Act of 2021''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ESEA DEFINITIONS.—The terms ''elementary school'', ''high school'', ''local educational agency'', and ''secondary school'' have the meanings given those terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the National Quantum Initiative Act (15 U.S.C. 8801).

(3) INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.—The term ''Interagency Working Group'' means the Interagency Working Group on Workforce, Industry, and Infrastructure under the Subcommittee on Quantum Information Science of the National Science and Technology Council.

(4) Q2WORK PROGRAM.—The term ''Q2Work Program'' means the Q2Work Program supported by the National Science Foundation.

(5) QUANTUM INFORMATION SCIENCE.—The term ''quantum information science'' has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the National Quantum Initiative Act (15 U.S.C. 8801).

(6) STEM.—The term ''STEM'' means science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

SEC. 3. QUANTUM NETWORKING WORKING GROUP REPORT ON QUANTUM NETWORKING AND COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Quantum Networking Working Group within the Subcommittee on Quantum Information Science of the National Science and Technology Council shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing a plan for the advancement of quantum networking and communications technology in the United States.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a framework for interagency collaboration on the advancement of quantum networking and communications research;

(2) a plan for interagency collaboration on the development and drafting of international standards for quantum communications technology, including standards relating to—

(A) quantum cryptography and post-quantum classical cryptography;

(B) network security;

(C) quantum network infrastructure;

(D) transmission of quantum information through optical fiber networks; and

(E) any other technologies considered appropriate by the Working Group;

(3) a proposal for the protection of national security interests relating to the advancement of quantum networking and communications technology;

(4) recommendations to Congress for legislative action relating to the framework, plan, and proposal set forth pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(5) such other matters as the Working Group considers necessary to advance the security of communications and network infrastructure, remain at the forefront of scientific discovery in the quantum information science domain, and transition quantum information science research into the emerging quantum technology economy.

SEC. 4. QUANTUM NETWORKING AND COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH.

(a) RESEARCH.—The Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology shall carry out research to facilitate the development and standardization of quantum networking and communications technologies and applications, including research on the following:

(1) Quantum cryptography and post-quantum classical cryptography.

(2) Quantum repeater technology.

(3) Quantum network traffic management.

(4) Quantum transduction.

(5) Long baseline entanglement and teleportation.

(6) Such other technologies, processes, or applications as the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Under Secretary shall carry out the research required by subsection (a) through such divisions, laboratories, offices and programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology as the Under Secretary considers appropriate and actively engaged in activities relating to quantum information science.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS.—For quantum technologies deemed by the Under Secretary to be at a readiness level sufficient for standardization, the Under Secretary shall provide technical review and assistance to such other Federal agencies as the Under Secretary considers appropriate for the development of quantum network infrastructure standards.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Scientific and Technical Research and Services account of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to carry out this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

(2) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) shall supplement and not supplant amounts already appropriated to the account described in such paragraph.

SEC. 5. ENERGY SCIENCES NETWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') shall supplement the Energy Sciences Network User Facility (referred to in this section as the ''Network'') with dedicated quantum network infrastructure to advance development of quantum networking and communications technology.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of subsection (a) is to utilize the Network to advance a broad range of testing and research, including relating to—

(1) the establishment of stable, long-baseline quantum entanglement and teleportation;

(2) quantum repeater technologies for long-baseline communication purposes;

(3) quantum transduction;

(4) the coexistence of quantum and classical information;

(5) multiplexing, forward error correction, wavelength routing algorithms, and other quantum networking infrastructure; and

(6) any other technologies or applications determined necessary by the Secretary.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section such sums as are necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.

SEC. 6. QUANTUM WORKFORCE EVALUATION AND ACCELERATION.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS.—The National Science Foundation shall enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct a study of ways to support the next generation of quantum leaders.

(b) SCOPE OF STUDY.—In carrying out the study described in subsection (a), the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine shall identify—

(1) education gaps, including foundational courses in STEM and areas in need of standardization, in elementary school, middle school, high school, and higher education curricula, that need to be rectified in order to prepare students to participate in the quantum workforce;

(2) the skills and workforce needs of industry, specifically identifying the cross-disciplinary academic degrees or academic courses necessary—

(A) to qualify students for multiple career pathways in quantum information sciences and related fields;

(B) to ensure the United States is competitive in the field of quantum information science while preserving national security; and

(C) to support the development of quantum applications; and

(3) the resources and materials needed to train elementary, middle, and high school educators to effectively teach curricula relevant to the development of a quantum workforce.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine shall prepare and submit to the National Science Foundation, and programs or projects funded by the National Science Foundation, an executive summary of progress regarding the study conducted under subsection (a) that outlines the findings of the Academies as of such date.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine shall prepare and submit a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a) to Congress, the National Science Foundation, and programs or projects funded by the National Science Foundation that are relevant to the acceleration of a quantum workforce.

SEC. 7. INCORPORATING QISE INTO STEM CURRICULUM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Science Foundation shall, through programs carried out or supported by the National Science Foundation, prioritize the better integration of quantum information science and engineering (referred to in this section as ''QISE'') into the STEM curriculum for each grade level from kindergarten through grade 12.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The curriculum integration under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) methods to conceptualize QISE for each grade level from kindergarten through grade 12;

(2) methods for strengthening foundational mathematics and science curricula;

(3) age-appropriate materials that apply the principles of quantum information science in STEM fields;

(4) recommendations for the standardization of key concepts, definitions, and curriculum criteria across government, academia, and industry; and

(5) materials that specifically address the findings and outcomes of the study conducted under section 6 and strategies to account for the skills and workforce needs identified through the study.

(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the National Science Foundation, including the STEM Education Advisory Panel and the Advancing Informal STEM Learning program and through the National Science Foundation's role in the National Q–12 Education Partnership and the Q2Work Program, shall coordinate with the Office of Science and Technology Policy, EPSCoR eligible universities, and any Federal agencies or working groups determined necessary by the National Science Foundation.

(d) REVIEW.—In implementing this section, the National Science Foundation shall review and provide necessary updates to the related report entitled ''Key Concepts for Future QIS Learners'' (May 2020).

SEC. 8. QUANTUM EDUCATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Science Foundation, through the National Science Foundation's role in the National Q–12 Education Partnership and the Q2Work Program, and in coordination with the Directorate for Education and Human Resources, shall carry out a pilot program, to be known as the ''Next Generation Quantum Leaders Pilot Program'', to provide funding for the education and training of the next generation of students in the fundamental principles of quantum mechanics.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the pilot program required by subsection (a), the National Science Foundation shall—

(A) publish a call for applications through the National Q–12 Education Partnership website (or similar website) for participation in the pilot program from elementary schools, secondary schools, and State educational agencies;

(B) coordinate with educational service agencies, associations that support STEM educators or local educational agencies, and partnerships through the Q–12 Education

Partnership, to encourage elementary schools, secondary schools, and State educational agencies to participate in the program;

(C) accept applications for a period of 5 months in advance of the academic year in which the program shall begin;

(D) select elementary schools, secondary schools, and State educational agencies to participate in the program, in accordance with qualifications determined by the Interagency Working Group, in coordination with the National Q–12 Education Partnership; and

(E) in coordination with the National Q–12 Education Partnership, identify qualifying advanced degree students, or recent advanced degree graduates, with experience in the field of quantum information science to provide feedback and assistance to educators selected to participate in the pilot program.

(2) PRIORITIZATION.—In selecting program participants under paragraph (1)(D), the Director of the National Science Foundation shall give priority to elementary schools, secondary schools, and local educational agencies located in jurisdictions eligible to participate in the Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (commonly known as ''EPSCoR''), including Tribal and rural elementary, middle, and high schools in such jurisdictions.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The National Science Foundation shall carry out this section in consultation with the Interagency Working Group.

(d) REPORTING.—

(1) REPORT AND SELECTED PARTICIPANTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall submit to Congress a report on the educational institutions selected to participate in the pilot program required under subsection (a), specifying the percentage from nontraditional geographies, including Tribal or rural school districts.

(2) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall submit to Congress a report on implementation of the curricula and materials under the pilot program, including the feasibility and advisability of expanding such pilot program to include additional educational institutions beyond those originally selected to participate in the pilot program.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(f) TERMINATION.—This section shall cease to have effect on the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1179. A bill to provide financial assistance for projects to address certain subsidence impacts in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the ''Canal Conveyance Capacity Restoration Act,'' which I introduced today. Representatives JIM COSTA (D–CA) has introduced companion legislation in the House.

The bill has two major provisions, benefiting both drought resilience and the environment:

First, it would authorize more than $653 million to restore the capacity of three canals of national importance. Restoring these canals would improve California's drought resilience and help the nation's leading agricultural economy comply with limits on groundwater pumping under the state's Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.

Second, the bill authorizes an additional $180 million to restore salmon runs on the San Joaquin River. The funding is for fish passage structures, levees and other improvements that will allow the threatened Central Valley Spring-run Chinook salmon to swim freely upstream from the ocean to the Friant Dam.

The bill authorizes a ⅓ Federal cost-share for restoring the capacity of the Friant-Kern Canal, the Delta-Mendota Canal, and the California Aqueduct.

Coordinated legislation in the State legislature introduced by State Senator Melissa Hurtado would authorize a ⅓ state cost-share for restoring the canals' capacity. Under the coordinated Federal and State legislation, the locals would also be responsible for a ⅓ cost-share for the canal restoration projects.

This legislation would help California water users and California's nation-leading agricultural industry comply with a recent State requirement to end the overpumping of groundwater. The stakes are huge: bringing groundwater into balance will reduce the water supply of the San Joaquin Valley by about 2 million acre-feet per year.

Unless local water agencies and the State and Federal governments take action, a recent U.C. Berkeley study has projected severe impacts from these water supply losses:

798,000 acres of land would have to be retired from agricultural production, nearly ⅙ of the working farmland in an area that produces half the fruit and vegetables grown in the nation; and

$5.9 billion would be lost in annual farm income in a region that is almost entirely reliant on agriculture and has been called ''the Appalachia of the West'' due to its severe economic disadvantage.

One of the most cost-effective and efficient ways to restore groundwater balance is to convey floodwaters to farmlands where they can recharge the aquifer. California has the most variable precipitation of any State. When we get massive storms from atmospheric rivers, there is plenty of runoff to recharge aquifers—but only if we can effectively convey the floodwaters throughout the San Joaquin Valley to recharge areas.

Here is where the challenge arises. For a variety of reasons, the ground beneath the major canals has dropped by as much as 10 to 20 feet, which has caused canals designed to convey floodwaters to buckle and drop in many places. Other parts of the canals have not subsided, so the amount of water that the canal conveys must be reduced so that the canals don't overrun.

As a result, these essential canals for conveying floodwaters have lost as much as 60% of their conveyance capacity. The bill I am introducing today would provide Federal assistance to help fix these Federal canals.

Specifically, the bill would authorize $653.4 million in a Federal funding-cost share for three major projects to repair Federal canals damaged by subsidence to achieve their lost capacity:

$180 million for the Friant-Kern Canal, which would move an additional 100,000 acre-feet per year on average;

$183.9 million for the Delta Mendota Canal, which would move an additional 62,000 acre-feet per year on average; and

$289.5 million for California Aqueduct repairs, which would move an additional 205,000 acre-feet per year on average. While parts of the California Aqueduct are state-owned, the majority of the repairs are on its federally-owned portion.

If the Federal government covers a portion of the cost of restoring these three essential Federal canals for conveying floodwaters, it will give local farmers a fighting chance to bring their groundwater basins into balance without being forced to retire massive amounts of land.

Critically, the ability to deliver floodwaters through restored Federal canals will allow the water districts to invest in their own turnouts, pumps, detention basins and other groundwater recharge projects. The South Valley Water Association, which covers just a small part of the Valley, provided my office with a list of 36 such projects for its area alone.

The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) has determined that groundwater recharge projects are the best option to help the San Joaquin Valley comply with the new state groundwater pumping law. PPIC projects that the Valley can make up 300,000 to 500,000 acre feet of its groundwater deficit through recharge projects.

A study commissioned by the coalition group called the ''Water Blueprint for the San Joaquin Valley'' estimates that required reductions in groundwater could cause a loss of up to 42,000 farm and agricultural jobs in the San Joaquin Valley. Another 40,000 jobs or more could be lost statewide each year due to reductions in Valley agricultural production, putting the total at approximately 85,000 jobs statewide. Most of these impacts will fall disproportionately on economically disadvantaged communities. These impacts will be significant unless we address them through collaborative planning, policies, infrastructure, recharge and necessary financial support.

Let me now turn to the three critical canals that the bill would authorize assistance to restore. The Friant-Kern Canal is a key feature of the Friant Division of the Federal Central Valley Project on the Eastside of the San Joaquin Valley. For nearly 70 years, the Friant Division successfully kept groundwater tables stable on the

Eastside. This provided a sustainable source of water for farms and for thousands of Californians and more than 50 small, rural, or disadvantaged communities who rely entirely on groundwater for their household water supplies.

But unsustainable groundwater pumping in the Valley has reduced the Friant-Kern Canal's ability to deliver water to all who need it. Land elevation subsidence caused by overpumping means that not all of the supplies stored at Friant Dam can be conveyed through the canal. In some areas, the canal can carry only 40 percent of what it's designed to deliver.

In 2017, a very wet year in which we should have been banking as much flood water as possible, the Friant-Kern Canal couldn't deliver an additional 300,000 acre-feet of water that it would have been able to convey had its capacity not been limited by subsidence. This significant amount of water would have been destined for groundwater recharge efforts in the south San Joaquin Valley, where the impacts of reduced water deliveries, water quality issues and groundwater regulation are expected to be most severe.

The California Aqueduct serves more than 27 million people in Southern California and the Silicon Valley and more than 750,000 acres of the Nation's most productive farmland. But despite its name, much of the California Aqueduct is owned by the Federal government and serves portions of Silicon Valley, small towns and communities in the northern San Joaquin Valley, and farms from Firebaugh to Kettleman City. The aqueduct represents a successful 70–year partnership between the Federal Government and the State of California.

In recent years, particularly recent drought years, the California Aqueduct has subsided. It has lost as much as 20% of its capacity to move water to California's families, farms and businesses. California is leading efforts to repair the aqueduct and is working to provide its share of funding, but the Federal government will also need to pay its fair share. The bill I am introducing today would authorize $289.5 million toward restoring the California Aqueduct.

The Delta-Mendota Canal stretches southward 117 miles from the C.W. Bill Jones Pumping Plant along the western edge of the San Joaquin Valley, parallel to the California Aqueduct. The Delta-Mendota Canal has lost 15% of its conveyance capacity due to subsidence. The bill I am introducing today would authorize $183.9 million toward restoring its full ability to convey floodwaters to farms needing to recharge their groundwater, and to wildlife refuges of critical importance for migratory waterfowl along the Pacific Flyway.

This bill responds to a potential crisis that very possibly could cause the forced retirement of nearly 1/6 of the working farmland in an area that produces half of America's fruits and vegetables.

These are Federal canals, and the federal government must help give these farmers and communities reliant on the agricultural economy a fighting chance to keep their lands in production.

In addition, this legislation helps to restore an historic salmon run on California's second-longest river, the San Joaquin.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1185. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to permit leave to care for a domestic partner, parent-in-law, or adult child, or another related individual, who has a serious health condition, and to allow employees to take, as additional leave, parental involvement and family wellness leave to participate in or attend their children's and grandchildren's educational and extracurricular activities or meet family care needs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1185

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 ''Family Medical Leave Modernization Act''.

SEC. 2. LEAVE TO CARE FOR A DOMESTIC PARTNER, SON-IN-LAW, DAUGHTER-IN-LAW, PARENT-IN-LAW, ADULT CHILD, GRANDPARENT, GRANDCHILD, OR SIBLING OF THE EMPLOYEE, OR ANOTHER RELATED INDIVIDUAL.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) INCLUSION OF RELATED INDIVIDUALS.—Section 101 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2611) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) ANY OTHER INDIVIDUAL RELATED BY BLOOD WHOSE CLOSE ASSOCIATION IS THE EQUIVALENT OF A FAMILY RELATIONSHIP.—The term 'any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship', used with respect to an employee, means any person with whom the employee has a significant personal bond that is or is like a family relationship, regardless of biological or legal relationship.

''(21) DOMESTIC PARTNER.—The term 'domestic partner', used with respect to an employee, means—

''(A) the person recognized as the domestic partner of the employee under any domestic partnership or civil union law of a State or political subdivision of a State; or

''(B) in the case of an unmarried employee, an unmarried adult person who is in a committed, personal relationship with the employee, is not a domestic partner as described in subparagraph (A) to or in such a relationship with any other person, and who is designated to the employer by such employee as that employee's domestic partner.

''(22) GRANDCHILD.—The term 'grandchild' means the son or daughter of an employee's son or daughter.

''(23) GRANDPARENT.—The term 'grandparent' means a parent of a parent of an employee.

''(24) NEPHEW; NIECE.—The terms 'nephew' and 'niece', used with respect to an employee, mean a son or daughter of the employee's sibling.

''(25) PARENT-IN-LAW.— The term 'parent-in-law' means a parent of the spouse or domestic partner of an employee.

''(26) SIBLING.—The term 'sibling' means any person who is a son or daughter of an employee's parent (other than the employee).

''(27) SON-IN-LAW; DAUGHTER-IN-LAW.—The terms 'son-in-law' and 'daughter-in-law', used with respect to an employee, mean any person who is a spouse or domestic partner of a son or daughter, as the case may be, of the employee.

''(28) UNCLE; AUNT.—The terms 'uncle' and 'aunt', used with respect to an employee, mean the son or daughter, as the case may be, of the employee's grandparent (other than the employee's parent).''.

(2) INCLUSION OF ADULT CHILDREN AND CHILDREN OF A DOMESTIC PARTNER.—Section 101(12) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2611(12)) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''a child of an individual's domestic partner,'' after ''a legal ward,''; and

(B) by striking ''who is—'' and all that follows and inserting ''and includes an adult child.''.

(b) LEAVE REQUIREMENT.—Section 102 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2612) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''spouse, or a son, daughter, or parent, of the employee, if such spouse, son, daughter, or parent'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, or a son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, if such spouse, domestic partner, son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece, or such other individual''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''spouse, or a son, daughter, or parent of the employee'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, or a son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''spouse, son, daughter, parent, or next of kin of a covered servicemember'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, sibling, uncle or aunt, nephew or niece, or next of kin of a covered servicemember, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the covered servicemember'';

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, parent, or covered servicemember of the employee, as appropriate'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, nephew or

niece, or covered servicemember of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''spouse, or a son, daughter, or parent, of the employee'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, or a son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate,''; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', or domestic partners,'' after ''husband and wife''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''or parent-in-law'' after ''parent''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', or those domestic partners,'' after ''husband and wife'' each place it appears.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—Section 103 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2613) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, or parent of the employee, or of the next of kin of an individual in the case of leave taken under such paragraph (3), as appropriate'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or the next of kin of an individual, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, or parent and an estimate of the amount of time that such employee is needed to care for the son, daughter, spouse, or parent'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate, and an estimate of the amount of time that such employee is needed to care for such son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece, or such other individual''; and

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking ''son, daughter, parent, or spouse who has a serious health condition, or will assist in their recovery,'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece, with a serious health condition, of the employee, or an individual, with a serious health condition, who is any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate, or will assist in the recovery,''.

(d) EMPLOYMENT AND BENEFITS PROTECTION.—Section 104(c)(3) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2614(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, or parent of the employee, as appropriate,'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)(ii), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, or parent'' and inserting ''employee's son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece, or (with relation to the employee) any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship, as appropriate,''.

SEC. 3. LEAVE TO CARE FOR A DOMESTIC PARTNER, SON-IN-LAW, DAUGHTER-IN-LAW, PARENT-IN-LAW, ADULT CHILD, GRANDPARENT, GRANDCHILD, OR SIBLING OF THE EMPLOYEE, OR ANOTHER RELATED INDIVIDUAL FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) INCLUSION OF A DOMESTIC PARTNER, SON-IN-LAW, DAUGHTER-IN-LAW, PARENT-IN-LAW, ADULT CHILD, GRANDPARENT, GRANDCHILD, OR SIBLING OF THE EMPLOYEE, OR ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL RELATED BY BLOOD.—Section 6381 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (11) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) the term 'any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship', used with respect to an employee, means any person with whom the employee has a significant personal bond that is or is like a family relationship, regardless of biological or legal relationship;

''(14) the term 'domestic partner', used with respect to an employee, means—

''(A) the person recognized as the domestic partner of the employee under any domestic partnership or civil union law of a State or political subdivision of a State; or

''(B) in the case of an unmarried employee, an unmarried adult person who is in a committed, personal relationship with the employee, is not a domestic partner as described in subparagraph (A) or in such a relationship with any other person, and who is designated to the employing agency by such employee as that employee's domestic partner;

''(15) the term 'grandchild' means the son or daughter of an employee's son or daughter;

''(16) the term 'grandparent' means a parent of a parent of an employee;

''(17) the terms 'nephew' and 'niece', used with respect to an employee, mean a son or daughter of the employee's sibling;

''(18) the term 'parent-in-law' means a parent of the spouse or domestic partner of an employee;

''(19) the term 'sibling' means any person who is a son or daughter of an employee's parent (other than the employee);

''(20) the terms 'son-in-law' and 'daughter-in-law', used with respect to an employee, mean any person who is a spouse or domestic partner of a son or daughter, as the case may be, of the employee;

''(21) the term 'State' has the same meaning given the term in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203); and

''(22) the terms 'uncle' and 'aunt', used with respect to an employee, mean the son or daughter, as the case may be, of the employee's grandparent (other than the employee's parent).''.

(2) INCLUSION OF ADULT CHILDREN AND CHILDREN OF A DOMESTIC PARTNER.—Section 6381(6) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting ''a child of an individual's domestic partner,'' after ''a legal ward,''; and

(B) by striking ''who is—'' and all that follows and inserting ''and includes an adult child''.

(b) LEAVE REQUIREMENT.—Section 6382 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''spouse, or a son, daughter, or parent, of the employee, if such spouse, son, daughter, or parent'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, or a son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association with the employee is the equivalent of a family relationship, if such spouse, domestic partner, son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece, or such other individual''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''spouse, or a son, daughter, or parent of the employee'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, or a son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''spouse, son, daughter, parent, or next of kin of a covered servicemember'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, sibling, uncle or aunt, nephew or niece, or next of kin of a covered servicemember, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the covered servicemember''; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, parent, or covered servicemember of the employee, as appropriate'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, nephew or niece, or covered servicemember of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''spouse, or a son, daughter, or parent, of the employee'' and inserting ''spouse or domestic partner, or a son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, parent, parent-in-law, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate,''.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—Section 6383 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, or parent of the employee, as appropriate'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(4)(A), by striking ''son, daughter, spouse, or parent, and an estimate of the amount of time that such employee is needed to care for such son, daughter, spouse, or parent'' and inserting ''son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling,

uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece of the employee, or any other individual related by blood whose close association is the equivalent of a family relationship with the employee, as appropriate, and an estimate of the amount of time that such employee is needed to care for such son or daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, spouse or domestic partner, parent, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, uncle or aunt, or nephew or niece, or such other individual''.

SEC. 4. ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL LEAVE UNDER THE FMLA FOR PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND FAMILY WELLNESS.

(a) LEAVE REQUIREMENT.—Section 102(a) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (29 U.S.C. 2612(a)), as amended by section 2(b), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) ENTITLEMENT TO ADDITIONAL LEAVE FOR PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND FAMILY WELLNESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B) and section 103(g), an eligible employee shall be entitled to leave under this paragraph to—

''(i) participate in or attend an activity that is sponsored by a school or community organization and relates to a program of the school or organization that is attended by a son or daughter or a grandchild of the employee; or

''(ii) meet routine family medical care needs (including by attending medical and dental appointments of the employee or a son or daughter, spouse, or grandchild of the employee) or attend to the care needs of an elderly individual who is related to the employee through a relationship described in section 102(a) (including by making visits to nursing homes or group homes).

''(B) LIMITATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An eligible employee shall be entitled to—

''(I) not to exceed 4 hours of leave under this paragraph during any 30-day period; and

''(II) not to exceed 24 hours of leave under this paragraph during any 12-month period described in paragraph (4).

''(ii) COORDINATION RULE.—Leave under this paragraph shall be in addition to any leave provided under any other paragraph of this subsection.

''(C) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this paragraph:

''(i) COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION.—The term 'community organization' means a private nonprofit organization that is representative of a community or a significant segment of a community and provides activities for individuals described in section 101(12), such as a scouting or sports organization.

''(ii) SCHOOL.—The term 'school' means an elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)), a Head Start program assisted under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), and a child care facility licensed under State law.''.

(b) SCHEDULE.—Section 102(b)(1) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2612(b)(1)) is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following new sentence: ''Subject to subsection (e)(4) and section 103(g), leave under subsection (a)(5) may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule.''.

(c) SUBSTITUTION OF PAID LEAVE.—Section 102(d)(2) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2612(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT LEAVE AND FAMILY WELLNESS LEAVE.—

''(i) VACATION LEAVE; PERSONAL LEAVE; FAMILY LEAVE.—An eligible employee may elect, or an employer may require the employee, to substitute any of the accrued paid vacation leave, personal leave, or family leave of the employee for any part of the period of leave under subsection (a)(5).

''(ii) MEDICAL OR SICK LEAVE.—An eligible employee may elect, or an employer may require the employee, to substitute any of the accrued paid medical or sick leave of the employee for any part of the period of leave provided under clause (ii) of subsection (a)(5)(A), except that nothing in this title shall require an employer to provide paid sick leave or paid medical leave in any situation in which such employer would not normally provide any such paid leave.

''(iii) PROHIBITION ON RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.—If the employee elects or the employer requires the substitution of accrued paid leave for leave under subsection (a)(5), the employer shall not restrict or limit the leave that may be substituted or impose any additional terms and conditions on the substitution of such leave that are more stringent for the employee than the terms and conditions set forth in this Act.''.

(d) NOTICE.—Section 102(e) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2612(e)), as amended by section 2(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) NOTICE RELATING TO PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND FAMILY WELLNESS LEAVE.—In any case in which an employee requests leave under paragraph (5) of subsection (a), the employee shall—

''(A) provide the employer with not less than 7 days' notice, or (if such notice is impracticable) such notice as is practicable, before the date the leave is to begin, of the employee's intention to take leave under such paragraph; and

''(B) in the case of leave to be taken under subsection (a)(5)(A)(ii), make a reasonable effort to schedule the activity or care involved so as not to disrupt unduly the operations of the employer, subject to the approval of the health care provider involved (if any).''.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—Section 103 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 2613) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) CERTIFICATION RELATED TO PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND FAMILY WELLNESS LEAVE.—An employer may require that a request for leave under section 102(a)(5) be supported by a certification issued at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe.''.

SEC. 5. ENTITLEMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES TO LEAVE FOR PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND FAMILY WELLNESS.

(a) LEAVE REQUIREMENT.—Section 6382(a) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 3(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B) and section 6383(f), an employee shall be entitled to leave under this paragraph to—

''(i) participate in or attend an activity that is sponsored by a school or community organization and relates to a program of the school or organization that is attended by a son or daughter or a grandchild of the employee; or

''(ii) meet routine family medical care needs (including by attending medical and dental appointments of the employee or a son or daughter, spouse, or grandchild of the employee) or to attend to the care needs of an elderly individual who is related to the employee through a relationship described in section 6382(a) (including by making visits to nursing homes and group homes).

''(B)(i) An employee is entitled to—

''(I) not to exceed 4 hours of leave under this paragraph during any 30-day period; and

''(II) not to exceed 24 hours of leave under this paragraph during any 12-month period described in paragraph (4).

''(ii) Leave under this paragraph shall be in addition to any leave provided under any other paragraph of this subsection.

''(C) For the purpose of this paragraph—

''(i) the term 'community organization' means a private nonprofit organization that is representative of a community or a significant segment of a community and provides activities for individuals described in section 6381(6), such as a scouting or sports organization; and

''(ii) the term 'school' means an elementary school or secondary school (as such terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)), a Head Start program assisted under the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), and a child care facility licensed under State law.''.

(b) SCHEDULE.—Section 6382(b)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting after the third sentence the following new sentence: ''Subject to subsection (e)(4) and section 6383(f), leave under subsection (a)(5) may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule.''; and

(2) in the last sentence, by striking ''involved,'' and inserting ''involved (or, in the case of leave under subsection (a)(5), for purposes of the 30-day or 12-month period involved),''.

(c) SUBSTITUTION OF PAID LEAVE.—Section 6382(d) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) An employee may elect to substitute for any part of the period of leave under subsection (a)(5), any of the employee's accrued or accumulated annual or sick leave. If the employee elects the substitution of that accrued or accumulated annual or sick leave for leave under subsection (a)(5), the employing agency shall not restrict or limit the leave that may be substituted or impose any additional terms and conditions on the substitution of such leave that are more stringent for the employee than the terms and conditions set forth in this subchapter.''.

(d) NOTICE.—Section 6382(e) of such title, as amended by section 3(b)(2), is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) In any case in which an employee requests leave under paragraph (5) of subsection (a), the employee shall—

''(A) provide the employing agency with not less than 7 days' notice, or (if such notice is impracticable) such notice as is practicable, before the date the leave is to begin, of the employee's intention to take leave under such paragraph; and

''(B) in the case of leave to be taken under subsection (a)(5)(A)(ii), make a reasonable effort to schedule the activity or care involved so as not to disrupt unduly the operations of the employing agency, subject to the approval of the health care provider involved (if any).''.

(e) CERTIFICATION.—Section 6383(f) of such title is amended by striking ''paragraph (1)(E) or (3) of'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(E), (3) or (5) of''.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WARNER):

S.J. Res. 17. A joint resolution requiring the advice and consent of the Senate or an Act of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the

United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, throughout his time in office, President Donald Trump repeatedly disparaged our NATO allies and reportedly threatened withdrawal from the NATO alliance, the bedrock of European and American security for over seventy years. Although our current President has recommitted the United States to NATO and our transatlantic partnerships, it is still necessary for the Senate to consider legislation that prevents any President from withdrawing the United States from this critical defense treaty. This legislation would not only help address present national security challenges by reaffirming the U.S. commitment to Europe, it would also provide clarity to important constitutional questions regarding the role of Congress in terminating U.S. participation in treaties and alliances. Particularly with a treaty obligation that is as central to U.S. security as NATO, no President should be allowed to unilaterally withdraw without the advice and consent of the Senate.

Over the past several years, NATO allies, many of whom we have fought alongside since World War II and earlier in some cases, have questioned our allegiance for the first time in the history of NATO. In response to the only invocation of Article 5 of the NATO Treaty following the 9/11 attacks, more than 1,000 servicemembers from these allied nations gave their lives fighting alongside the United States. While the United States must continue to press every country to increase defense spending to meet the agreed-upon goal of 2 percent of GDP by 2024, and ensure that our European allies contribute to their own defense, U.S. withdrawal from NATO should not be considered without Congressional input. For this reason, we must use our constitutional powers of advice and consent and of the purse to block any unilateral executive withdrawal, and preemptively authorize legal proceedings to challenge any decision to terminate U.S. membership.

The legislation I am introducing today with Senators RUBIO, COLLINS, BLUMENTHAL, COONS, DUCKWORTH, DURBIN, FEINSTEIN, GRAHAM, KING, KLOBUCHAR, MERKLEY, MORAN, SHAHEEN, and WARNER would provide the necessary tools to prevent a President from unilaterally withdrawing the United States from the NATO treaty without the consent of Congress. The Senate has repeatedly indicated its support for NATO through previous legislation, including the original vote of 82–13 in 1949 to grant the Senate's consent to join NATO, and the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act, which called for the United States to ''remain ironclad in its commitment to uphold its obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty.''

I am proud to have bipartisan support for this bill to ensure that the safety of the American people is prioritized through our continued membership in NATO, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this legislation is swiftly considered by the Senate.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 157—HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIRING ROBERT MONTGOMERY ''BOBBY'' KNIGHT AS THE HEAD COACH OF THE MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 157

Whereas Coach Bobby Knight had a legendary career as a college basketball head coach for more than 40 years, 29 of which were with Indiana University, starting on March 27, 1971;

Whereas the success of Coach Knight has led to his induction into the National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Hall of Fame and the Indiana University Hoosier Basketball Hall of Fame;

Whereas Coach Knight—

(1) earned an NCAA National Championship as a player at The Ohio State University in 1960;

(2) won 3 NCAA National Championships as the Head Coach of the men's basketball team at Indiana University in 1976, 1981, and 1987; and

(3) won a National Invitational Tournament championship as the Head Coach of the men's basketball team at Indiana University in 1979;

Whereas, during his 29 years at Indiana University, Coach Knight—

(1) coached 11 Big Ten Conference Championship teams;

(2) took 24 teams to the NCAA tournament; and

(3) earned 8 Big Ten Coach of the Year awards and 4 national coach of the year awards;

Whereas the 1975–76 men's basketball team at Indiana University, which was coached by Coach Knight, is the last team to complete the entire regular season and NCAA tournament without a single loss;

Whereas Coach Knight coached the United States men's national basketball team to a gold medal in the 1979 Pan American Games and to a gold medal in the 1984 Olympic Games;

Whereas Coach Knight had an 80 percent graduation rate for his players, with an astounding 98 percent graduation rate for all players who he coached for at least 4 years, more than twice the average graduation rates for other Division I schools;

Whereas, even after 40 years as a head coach, none of the teams coached by Coach Knight were ever cited for a recruiting or academic violation while competing at the highest levels of the sport;

Whereas Coach Knight attained 902 wins during his overall head coaching career at the United States Military Academy, Indiana University, and Texas Tech University, by perfecting—

(1) the motion offense, which emphasized discipline, teamwork, selflessness, and perimeter passing to control the game and increase the percentage of successful shots; and

(2) smothering man-to-man defense;

Whereas Coach Knight had a reputation as a passionate player and coach, a man who never accepted defeat, who pushed himself and his teams to achieve, and created a persona in line with the great Vince Lombardi and Woody Hayes;

Whereas Coach Knight never focused his coaching on winning a game, but on the effort it took to become a champion, saying ''The will to succeed is important, but what's more important is the will to prepare''; and

Whereas Coach Knight earned the NCAA Naismith Award for Men's Outstanding Contribution to Basketball in 2007: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Coach Robert Montgomery ''Bobby'' Knight set the standard for excellence as a collegiate men's basketball coach at Indiana University;

(2) the success of Coach Knight was in turn the success of the entire Indiana University system and a source of continuing pride for the entire State of Indiana;

(3) we honor the drive, determination, and character of Coach Knight and all that Coach Knight did in educating and mentoring hundreds of Indiana University players over 3 decades;

(4) few can ever achieve greatness, but Coach Knight has propelled young men to touch greatness for at least a moment, giving them experiences and lessons that have shaped their entire lives; and

(5) for all the memories, Coach Knight, we give you a heartfelt thank you.

SENATE RESOLUTION 158—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 158

Whereas public safety telecommunications professionals play a critical role in emergency response;

Whereas the work that public safety telecommunications professionals perform goes far beyond simply relaying information between the public and first responders;

Whereas, when responding to reports of missing, abducted, and sexually exploited children, the information obtained and actions taken by public safety telecommunications professionals form the foundation for an effective response;

Whereas, when a hostage taker or suicidal individual calls 911, the first contact that individual has is with a public safety telecommunications professional, whose negotiation skills can prevent the situation from worsening;

Whereas, during crises, public safety telecommunications professionals, while collecting vital information to provide situational awareness for responding officers—

(1) coach callers through first aid techniques; and

(2) give advice to those callers to prevent further harm;

Whereas the work done by individuals who serve as public safety telecommunications professionals has an extreme emotional and

physical toll on those individuals, which is compounded by long hours and the around-the-clock nature of the job;

Whereas public safety telecommunications professionals should be recognized by all levels of government for the lifesaving and protective nature of their work;

Whereas major emergencies, including natural disasters and the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID–19) pandemic, highlight the dedication of public safety telecommunications professionals and their important work in protecting the public and police, fire, and emergency medical officials; and

Whereas public safety telecommunications professionals are often called as witnesses to provide important testimony in criminal trials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week;

(2) honors and recognizes the important and lifesaving contributions of public safety telecommunications professionals in the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to remember the value of the work performed by public safety telecommunications professionals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 159—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF APRIL 17, 2021, THROUGH APRIL 25, 2021, AS ''NATIONAL PARK WEEK''

Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. REED, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BURR, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. TESTER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 159

Whereas, on March 1, 1872, Congress established Yellowstone National Park as the first national park for the enjoyment of the people of the United States;

Whereas, on August 25, 1916, Congress established the National Park Service with the mission to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of current and future generations;

Whereas the National Park Service continues to protect and manage the majestic landscapes, hallowed battlefields, and iconic cultural and historical sites of the United States;

Whereas the units of the National Park System can be found in every State and many territories of the United States and many of the units embody the rich natural and cultural heritage of the United States, reflect a unique national story through people and places, and offer countless opportunities for recreation, volunteerism, cultural exchange, education, civic engagement, and exploration;

Whereas visits and visitors to the national parks of the United States are important economic drivers for the economy, responsible for $21,000,000,000 in spending in 2019;

Whereas the dedicated employees of the National Park Service carry out their mission to protect the units of the national parks system of the United States so that the vibrant culture, diverse wildlife, and priceless resources of these unique places will endure for perpetuity; and

Whereas the people of the United States have inherited the remarkable legacy of the National Park System and are entrusted with the preservation of the National Park System throughout its second century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of April 17, 2021, through April 25, 2021, as ''National Park Week''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States and the world to responsibly visit, experience, and support the treasured national parks of the United States while protecting public health during the coronavirus pandemic.

SENATE RESOLUTION 160—COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING THE STANFORD UNIVERSITY CARDINAL WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PADILLA) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 160

Whereas, on April 4, 2021, the Stanford University Cardinal women's basketball team won the third National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the ''NCAA'') Division I women's basketball championship (referred to in this preamble as the ''national championship'') in school history by defeating the University of Arizona Wildcats by a score of 54 to 53, completing the season with an overall record of 31-2;

Whereas head coach Tara VanDerveer has led the Cardinal to 3 national championship titles during her tenure at Stanford University, as well as 13 NCAA Final Four appearances, 23 Pac-12 regular-season titles, 14 Pac-12 Tournament crowns, and 32 trips to the NCAA Tournament;

Whereas senior guard Kiana Williams—

(1) led the Cardinal in scoring throughout the regular season with 14 points per game; and

(2) was named Most Outstanding Player of the Pac-12 Conference Women's Basketball Tournament, scoring 26 points in the tournament title game;

Whereas sophomore guard Haley Jones, named the Most Outstanding Player of the Final Four, showed tenacity and leadership on the journey to the national championship, including by—

(1) making a last-minute shot to defeat the University of South Carolina Gamecocks in the semi-final game; and

(2) scoring 17 points in the national championship game to defeat the University of Arizona Wildcats;

Whereas all of the following players should be congratulated for their dedication, teamwork, and display of impressive athletic talent: Francesca Belibi, Cameron Brink, Jenna Brown, Agnes Emma-Nnopu, Lacie Hull, Lexie Hull, Alyssa Jerome, Haley Jones, Hannah Jump, Ashten Prechtel, Jana Van Gytenbeek, Kiana Williams, and Anna Wilson;

Whereas behind the players is a team of staff, without whom the players could not have been successful;

Whereas the Cardinal displayed confidence and poise, surviving 2 last-second shots to defeat the University of South Carolina Gamecocks and the University of Arizona Wildcats to win the 2021 national championship;

Whereas the members of the 2020-2021 Stanford University Cardinal women's basketball team have continuously pursued excellence in both athletics and academics;

Whereas the Cardinal resiliently withstood immense challenges presented by the COVID–19 pandemic, including extended changes to housing and playing accommodations, to post an impressive season of 31 wins and only 2 losses and championship titles in both the Pac-12 women's basketball tournament and the Pac-12 regular season;

Whereas the accomplishments of the Cardinal in their 2020-2021 season highlight the persistence, skill, and sportsmanship of the Cardinal; and

Whereas the Cardinal represent their loyal fans, current students, and alumni with heart and a commitment to excellence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends and congratulates the Stanford University Cardinal on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's basketball championship and completing a successful 2020-2021 season;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the success of the Cardinal during the 2020-2021 season; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Stanford University President Marc Tessier-Lavigne;

(B) Stanford University Director of Athletics Bernard Muir; and

(C) Stanford University women's basketball team head coach Tara VanDerveer.

SENATE RESOLUTION 161—COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING THE BAYLOR UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ON WINNING THE 2021 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION 1 MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. PAUL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 161

Whereas, on April 5, 2021, the men's basketball team of Baylor University won its first National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's basketball championship (referred to in this preamble as the ''national championship'') by defeating Gonzaga University by a score of 86–70 and completing the season with an impressive overall record of 28–2;

Whereas Head Coach Scott Drew fulfilled a promise he pledged to Baylor fans when he first came to Baylor University in 2003 that he would help lead the Bears to a national championship;

Whereas junior guard Jared Butler, named the Most Outstanding Player of the Final Four, exhibited impressive skill and exemplary leadership by leading the Bears

through the NCAA Tournament, to the Final Four, and ultimately the national championship;

Whereas all of the following players should be congratulated for their teamwork, dedication, and display of impressive athletic talent: Flo Thamba, LJ Cryer, Jordan Turner, Adam Flagler, Mark Vital, Jared Butler, Jackson Moffatt, Jonathan Tchamwa Tchatchoua, Matthew Mayer, MaCio Teague, Zach Loveday, Mark Peterson, Dain Dainja, and Davion Mitchell;

Whereas the Baylor Bears displayed impressive skill and poise facing off against the Bulldogs of Gonzaga University, who had beaten the Bears in the second round of the NCAA Tournament in the 2018–2019 season;

Whereas the men of Baylor University's 2020–2021 men's basketball team have continuously pursued excellence not only in athletics, but in academics as well, with multiple student-athletes earning spots on the first and second Academic All-Big 12 Men's Basketball Teams;

Whereas the men's basketball team of Baylor University has embodied fortitude and perseverance throughout this season, overcoming interruptions in play, cancelled games, and other hurdles testing their resolve;

Whereas the accomplishments of the Baylor University men's basketball team's 2020–2021 season inspire strength, unity, and cooperation in the hearts of Texans from all walks of life across the Lone Star State; and

Whereas the Baylor Bears are the pride of their loyal fans, current students, alumni, and the State of Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates the Bears of Baylor University on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's basketball championship and completing a successful 2020–2021 season.

SENATE RESOLUTION 162—DESIGNATING APRIL 14, 2021, AS ''NATIONAL ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 162

Whereas assistive technology is any item, piece of equipment, or product system that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities and older adults;

Whereas the term ''assistive technology service'' means any service that directly assists an individual with a disability or an older adult in the selection, acquisition, or use of an assistive technology device;

Whereas, in 2018, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported that 1 in 4 individuals in the United States, or almost 61,000,000 individuals, has a disability;

Whereas, in 2019, the Department of Education reported that there were more than 7,100,000 children with disabilities;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported that, among adults 65 years of age and older, 2 in 5 have a disability;

Whereas assistive technology allows individuals with disabilities and older adults to be included in their communities and in inclusive classrooms and workplaces;

Whereas assistive technology devices and services are necessities, not luxury items, for millions of individuals with disabilities and older adults, without which they would be unable to live in their communities, access education, or obtain, retain, and advance gainful, competitive, integrated employment;

Whereas the availability of assistive technology in the workplace promotes economic self-sufficiency, enhances work participation, and is critical to the employment of individuals with disabilities and older adults; and

Whereas State assistive technology programs support a continuum of services that include—

(1) the exchange, repair, recycling, and other reutilization of assistive technology devices;

(2) device loan programs that provide short-term loans of assistive technology devices to individuals, employers, public agencies, and others;

(3) the demonstration of devices to inform decision making; and

(4) State financing to help individuals purchase or obtain assistive technology through a variety of initiatives, such as financial loan programs, leasing programs, and other financing alternatives, that give individuals affordable, flexible options to purchase or obtain assistive technology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 14, 2021, as ''National Assistive Technology Awareness Day''; and

(2) commends—

(A) assistive technology specialists and program coordinators for their hard work and dedication to serving individuals with disabilities who are in need of finding the proper assistive technology to meet their individual needs; and

(B) professional organizations and researchers dedicated to facilitating the access and acquisition of assistive technology for individuals with disabilities and older adults in need of assistive technology devices.

SENATE RESOLUTION 163—RELATING TO THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM ''BILL'' EMERSON BROCK III, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. HAGERTY (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 163

Whereas William ''Bill'' Emerson Brock III (referred to in this preamble as ''Bill Brock'') was born in Chattanooga, Tennessee;

Whereas Bill Brock began his lifetime of service as a member of the Armed Forces, serving in the Navy from 1953 to 1956;

Whereas Bill Brock was a Tennessean who honorably served the State of Tennessee and the United States for more than 50 years;

Whereas Bill Brock served 4 terms in the United States House of Representatives, to which he was first elected in 1962;

Whereas Bill Brock served with honor and distinction during his 1 term in the United States Senate, to which he was elected in 1971;

Whereas Bill Brock served as United States Trade Representative from 1981 to 1985 and as United States Secretary of Labor from 1985 to 1987;

Whereas Bill Brock contributed greatly to the ''Era of Cooperation'' in Congress between 1971 and 1977, during which major reform was accomplished, including passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the ''Clean Water Act'') (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.), and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), all of which passed without opposition votes in the Senate;

Whereas Bill Brock was a force in the Republican Party, both nationally, serving as chairman of the Republican National Committee from 1977 to 1981, and in the State of Tennessee;

Whereas Bill Brock laid the foundation for a long lineage of Republican Members of Congress from Tennessee; and

Whereas Bill Brock served the State of Tennessee proudly and left a legacy of exceptional service to those who elected him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable William ''Bill'' Emerson Brock III, former Member of the United States Senate from the State of Tennessee; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate—

(A) communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(B) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of the Honorable William ''Bill'' Emerson Brock III.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1441. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1442. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 937, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1443. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 937, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1444. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 937, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1441. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 8, strike ''sole''.

On page 2, line 9, strike ''expedited''.

On page 2, beginning on line 20, strike '', except that the Attorney General may extend such period as appropriate''.

Beginning on page 2, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 3, line 8 and insert the following: ''States Code) that is motivated by the actual or perceived race, ethnicity, age, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or disability of any person.''.

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 4, line 2.

SA 1442. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 8, strike ''sole''.

SA 1443. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 2, strike ''COVID–19''.

On page 2, line 4, strike ''**COVID–19**''.

On page 2, beginning on line 9, strike ''COVID–19''.

Beginning on page 2, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 3, line 8.

On page 3, beginning on line 21, strike ''**RELATING TO COVID–19 PANDEMIC**''.

On page 3, beginning on line 22, strike ''and the Secretary of Health and Human Services''.

On page 3, beginning on line 23, strike ''the COVID–19 Health Equity Task Force and''.

On page 4, beginning on line 1, strike ''in describing the COVID–19 pandemic''.

SA 1444. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Following the spread of COVID–19 in 2020, there has been a dramatic increase in hate crimes and violence against Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders.

(2) According to a recent report, there were nearly 3,800 reported cases of anti-Asian discrimination and incidents related to COVID–19 between March 19, 2020, and February 28, 2021, in all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

(3) During this timeframe, race has been cited as the primary reason for discrimination, making up over 90 percent of incidents, and the United States condemns and denounces any and all anti-Asian and Pacific Islander sentiment in any form.

(4) Roughly 36 percent of Asian-American and Pacific Islander businesses have been the targets of discrimination incidents during this time period.

(5) More than 1,900,000 Asian-American and Pacific Islander older adults, particularly those older adults who are recent immigrants or have limited English proficiency, may face even greater challenges in dealing with the COVID–19 pandemic, including discrimination, economic insecurity, and language isolation.

On page 2, strike line 4 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. REVIEW OF HATE CRIMES.

On page 2, line 5, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''7 days''.

On page 2, line 8, strike ''sole''.

On page 2, beginning on line 9, strike ''COVID–19 hate crimes'' and insert ''hate crimes (as described in section 249 of title 18, United States Code)''.

On page 2, line 11, strike ''or local'' and insert ''local, or Tribal''.

Beginning on page 2, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 3, line 8 and insert the following:

(b) APPLICABLE PERIOD DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''applicable period'' means the period beginning on the date on which the officer or employee is designated under subsection (a), and ending on the date that is 1 year after the date on which the emergency period described in subparagraph (B) of section 1135(g)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b–5(g)(1)) ends, except that the Attorney General may extend such period as appropriate.

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 20 and insert the following:

SEC. 4. GUIDANCE.

(a) GUIDANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—The Attorney General shall issue guidance for State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, pursuant to this Act and other applicable law, on how to—

(1) establish online reporting of hate crimes or incidents, and to have online reporting that is equally effective for people with disabilities as for people without disabilities available in multiple languages as determined by the Attorney General;

(2) collect data disaggregated by the protected characteristics described in section 249 of title 18, United States Code; and

(3) expand public education campaigns aimed at raising awareness of hate crimes and reaching victims, that are equally effective for people with disabilities as for people without disabilities.

Beginning on page 3, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 4, line 2 and insert the following: ''based organizations, shall issue guidance aimed at raising awareness of hate crimes during the COVID–19 pandemic.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 2021, at to be determined, to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 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 Thursday, April 15, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 2021, at 9:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 2021, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 2021, at 11 a.m., to conduct a business hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION, TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND THE INTERNET

The Subcommittee on Communication, Technology, Innovation, and The Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 15, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ben Marsden, my law clerk, be given access to the floor for the duration of this Congress.

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

REAFFIRMING THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 16, S. Res. 22.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 22) reaffirming the partnership between the United States and the Republic of Ecuador and recognizing the restoration and advancement of economic relations, security, and development opportunities in both nations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 22) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 28, 2021, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

REAFFIRMING THE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MONGOLIA AND RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEMOCRACY IN MONGOLIA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 23, S. Res. 36.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 36) reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mongolia and recognizing the 30th anniversary of democracy in Mongolia.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic and an amendment to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

Whereas the United States and Mongolia established diplomatic relations in January 1987, and since that time the relationship has grown stronger based on shared strategic interests, security cooperation, democratic values, good governance, and respect for human rights;

Whereas, since its peaceful democratic revolution in 1989, through a series of initiatives, Mongolia has charted a successful path to multiparty democracy and a free market economy;

Whereas, in 1990, the Government of Mongolia declared an end to a one-party and authoritarian political system and adopted democratic and free market reforms;

Whereas, in 1992, Mongolia adopted a constitution establishing a democracy, becoming the first country in Asia to transition from communism to democracy;

Whereas Mongolia has shown its commitment to a ''third neighbor'' relationship with the United States by sending troops to support United States operations in Iraq from 2003 through 2008 and Afghanistan since 2009, and in addition has a strong record of troop contributions to international peacekeeping missions;

Whereas successive Mongolian governments have taken notable steps to strengthen civil society, battle corruption, and spur economic development;

Whereas the Parliament of Mongolia, the State Great Khural, has engaged with Congress, including through the House Democracy Partnership, thereby promoting responsive and effective governance through peer-to-peer cooperation;

Whereas Mongolia began as a partner to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in 2004, graduated to become a participating state in 2012, and participates actively in the OSCE's work promoting stability, peace, and democracy;

Whereas Mongolia has regularly invited the OSCE and other organizations to send monitoring teams for its presidential and parliamentary elections;

Whereas Mongolia has also been an active member of the Community of Democracies (CoD), a global coalition of states that support adherence to common democratic values and standards, and Mongolia has not only remained active since the founding of the CoD in 2000, but successfully chaired the CoD from 2011 through 2013;

Whereas, in addition to supporting the OSCE and the CoD, Mongolia supports democratic initiatives while participating in a wide range of other global institutions;

Whereas, most recently, on June 24, 2020, Mongolia successfully organized parliamentary elections, strengthening its commitment to democracy and the rule of law;

Whereas the success of Mongolia as a democracy and its strategic location, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and ability to pursue an independent foreign policy are important to the national security of the United States;

Whereas the United States has provided support to Mongolia through the Millennium Challenge Corporation via an initial 2007 compact designed to increase economic growth and reduce poverty, as well as a second compact signed in 2018 involving investments in water infrastructure, including supply and wastewater recycling, as well as water sector sustainability;

Whereas, on September 20, 2018, the United States and Mongolia released a joint statement and the ''Roadmap for Expanded Economic Partnership between the United States and Mongolia,'' outlining the intent to deepen the bilateral commercial relationship, including through full implementation of the obligations under the Agreement on Transparency in Matters Related to International Trade and Investment between the United States of America and Mongolia, signed at New York September 24, 2013 (in this preamble referred to as the ''United States-Mongolia Transparency Agreement''), and collaboration in supporting Mongolian small- and medium-sized enterprises through various programs and projects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, trade between the United States and Mongolia is modest but growing, with total trade in 2019 between the two countries of approximately $217,400,000 in goods, including $192,800,000 in United States exports to Mongolia and $24,600,000 in United States imports from Mongolia;

Whereas Mongolia is a beneficiary country under the Generalized System of Preferences program, but its use of the program remains low, as, in 2018, only $3,200,000 of exports from Mongolia to the United States were under the program; and

Whereas, on July 31, 2019, the United States and Mongolia declared the bilateral relationship a Strategic Partnership and noted the shared desire—

(1) to intensify cooperation as strong democracies based on the rule of law through safeguarding and promoting democratic values and human rights, including the freedoms of religion or belief, expression, including internet and media freedom, assembly, and association, as well as anticorruption and fiscal transparency, and youth and emerging leader development;

(2) to cooperate in promoting national security and stability across the Indo-Pacific region so that all countries, secure in their sovereignty, are able to pursue economic growth consistent with international law and principles of fair competition;

(3) to deepen national security and law-enforcement ties through collaboration on bilateral and multilateral security, judicial, and law-enforcement efforts in the region;

(4) to strengthen cooperation in multilateral engagements such as peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and disaster preparedness and relief operations;

(5) to expand trade and investment relations on a fair and reciprocal basis, support private sector-led growth, fully implement the United States-Mongolia Transparency Agreement, promote women's entrepreneurship, and continue to explore support for infrastructure under the new United States International Development Finance Corporation with the new tools provided under the BUILD Act of 2018 (22 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.);

(6) to strengthen border security, prevent illegal transshipment and trafficking, expand cooperation on civil aviation safety and oversight, and efficiently facilitate legitimate travel between Mongolia and the United States;

(7) to increase cooperation in addressing transnational threats such as terrorism, human trafficking, drug trafficking, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyberattacks, transnational organized crime, pandemics, and other emerging nontraditional security threats;

(8) to continue to develop an environment in which civil society, social media, and a free and independent media can flourish; and

(9) to maintain high-level official dialogues, encourage bilateral exchanges at all levels of government, and further develop people-to-people exchanges to deepen engagement on issues of mutual interest and concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of the relationship between the United States and Mongolia and remains committed to advancing this Strategic Partnership in the future;

(2) emphasizes the importance of free and fair elections in Mongolia;

(3) applauds the continued engagement of Mongolia in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the Community of Democracies, congressional-parliamentary partnerships, including continued high-level parliamentary exchange, and other institutions that promote democratic values, which reinforces the commitment of the people and the Government of Mongolia to those values and standards;

(4) encourages the United States Government to help Mongolia use its benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences program and other relevant programs to increase trade between the United States and Mongolia;

(5) urges the United States International Development Finance Corporation to expand activities in Mongolia to support economic development, diversification of the economy, and women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises;

(6) urges private and public support to help diversify the economy of Mongolia through increased cooperation and investments, as well as infrastructure and other vital projects;

(7) urges the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other relevant agencies to continue to support Mongolia's democratic and economic development and efforts on anticorruption;

(8) reaffirms the importance of civil society to the continued democratic development of Mongolia;

(9) encourages the Government of Mongolia to build a regulatory system that supports and encourages the growth and operation of independent nongovernmental organizations and continues to pursue policies of transparency that uphold democratic values; and

(10) encourages the Government of Mongolia to continue legal reform, institutional capacity building, and to improve the independence of other democratic institutions.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask further that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be considered and agreed to; that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 36), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 36

Whereas the United States and Mongolia established diplomatic relations in January 1987, and since that time the relationship has grown stronger based on shared strategic interests, security cooperation, democratic values, good governance, and respect for human rights;

Whereas, since its peaceful democratic revolution in 1989, through a series of initiatives, Mongolia has charted a successful path to multiparty democracy and a free market economy;

Whereas, in 1990, the Government of Mongolia declared an end to a one-party and authoritarian political system and adopted democratic and free market reforms;

Whereas, in 1992, Mongolia adopted a constitution establishing a democracy, becoming the first country in Asia to transition from communism to democracy;

Whereas Mongolia has shown its commitment to a ''third neighbor'' relationship with the United States by sending troops to support United States operations in Iraq from 2003 through 2008 and Afghanistan since 2009, and in addition has a strong record of troop contributions to international peacekeeping missions;

Whereas successive Mongolian governments have taken notable steps to strengthen civil society, battle corruption, and spur economic development;

Whereas the Parliament of Mongolia, the State Great Khural, has engaged with Congress, including through the House Democracy Partnership, thereby promoting responsive and effective governance through peer-to-peer cooperation;

Whereas Mongolia began as a partner to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in 2004, graduated to become a participating state in 2012, and participates actively in the OSCE's work promoting stability, peace, and democracy;

Whereas Mongolia has regularly invited the OSCE and other organizations to send monitoring teams for its presidential and parliamentary elections;

Whereas Mongolia has also been an active member of the Community of Democracies (CoD), a global coalition of states that support adherence to common democratic values and standards, and Mongolia has not only remained active since the founding of the CoD in 2000, but successfully chaired the CoD from 2011 through 2013;

Whereas, in addition to supporting the OSCE and the CoD, Mongolia supports democratic initiatives while participating in a wide range of other global institutions;

Whereas, most recently, on June 24, 2020, Mongolia successfully organized parliamentary elections, strengthening its commitment to democracy and the rule of law;

Whereas the success of Mongolia as a democracy and its strategic location, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and ability to pursue an independent foreign policy are important to the national security of the United States;

Whereas the United States has provided support to Mongolia through the Millennium Challenge Corporation via an initial 2007 compact designed to increase economic growth and reduce poverty, as well as a second compact signed in 2018 involving investments in water infrastructure, including supply and wastewater recycling, as well as water sector sustainability;

Whereas, on September 20, 2018, the United States and Mongolia released a joint statement and the ''Roadmap for Expanded Economic Partnership between the United States and Mongolia,'' outlining the intent to deepen the bilateral commercial relationship, including through full implementation of the obligations under the Agreement on Transparency in Matters Related to International Trade and Investment between the United States of America and Mongolia, signed at New York September 24, 2013 (in this preamble referred to as the ''United States-Mongolia Transparency Agreement''), and collaboration in supporting Mongolian small- and medium-sized enterprises through various programs and projects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, trade between the United States and Mongolia is modest but growing, with total trade in 2019 between the two countries of approximately $217,400,000 in goods, including $192,800,000 in United States exports to Mongolia and $24,600,000 in United States imports from Mongolia;

Whereas Mongolia is a beneficiary country under the Generalized System of Preferences program, but its use of the program remains low, as, in 2018, only $3,200,000 of exports from Mongolia to the United States were under the program; and

Whereas, on July 31, 2019, the United States and Mongolia declared the bilateral relationship a Strategic Partnership and noted the shared desire—

(1) to intensify cooperation as strong democracies based on the rule of law through safeguarding and promoting democratic values and human rights, including the freedoms of religion or belief, expression, including internet and media freedom, assembly, and association, as well as anticorruption and fiscal transparency, and youth and emerging leader development;

(2) to cooperate in promoting national security and stability across the Indo-Pacific region so that all countries, secure in their sovereignty, are able to pursue economic growth consistent with international law and principles of fair competition;

(3) to deepen national security and law-enforcement ties through collaboration on bilateral and multilateral security, judicial, and law-enforcement efforts in the region;

(4) to strengthen cooperation in multilateral engagements such as peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and disaster preparedness and relief operations;

(5) to expand trade and investment relations on a fair and reciprocal basis, support private sector-led growth, fully implement the United States-Mongolia Transparency Agreement, promote women's entrepreneurship, and continue to explore support for infrastructure under the new United States International Development Finance Corporation with the new tools provided under the BUILD Act of 2018 (22 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.);

(6) to strengthen border security, prevent illegal transshipment and trafficking, expand cooperation on civil aviation safety and oversight, and efficiently facilitate legitimate travel between Mongolia and the United States;

(7) to increase cooperation in addressing transnational threats such as terrorism, human trafficking, drug trafficking, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyberattacks, transnational organized crime, pandemics, and other emerging nontraditional security threats;

(8) to continue to develop an environment in which civil society, social media, and a free and independent media can flourish; and

(9) to maintain high-level official dialogues, encourage bilateral exchanges at all levels of government, and further develop people-to-people exchanges to deepen engagement on issues of mutual interest and concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of the relationship between the United States and Mongolia and remains committed to advancing this Strategic Partnership in the future;

(2) emphasizes the importance of free and fair elections in Mongolia;

(3) applauds the continued engagement of Mongolia in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the Community of Democracies, congressional-parliamentary partnerships, including continued high-level parliamentary exchange, and other institutions that promote democratic values, which reinforces the commitment of the people and the Government of Mongolia to those values and standards;

(4) encourages the United States Government to help Mongolia use its benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences program and other relevant programs to increase trade between the United States and Mongolia;

(5) urges the United States International Development Finance Corporation to expand activities in Mongolia to support economic development, diversification of the economy, and women-owned small- and medium-sized enterprises;

(6) urges private and public support to help diversify the economy of Mongolia through increased cooperation and investments, as well as infrastructure and other vital projects;

(7) urges the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other relevant agencies to continue to support Mongolia's democratic and economic development and efforts on anticorruption;

(8) reaffirms the importance of civil society to the continued democratic development of Mongolia;

(9) encourages the Government of Mongolia to build a regulatory system that supports and encourages the growth and operation of independent nongovernmental organizations and continues to pursue policies of transparency that uphold democratic values; and

(10) encourages the Government of Mongolia to continue legal reform, institutional capacity building, and to improve the independence of other democratic institutions.

EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH THE SAN ISIDRO MOVEMENT IN CUBA, CONDEMNING ESCALATED ATTACKS AGAINST ARTISTIC FREEDOMS IN CUBA, AND CALLING FOR THE REPEAL OF LAWS THAT VIOLATE FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AND THE IMMEDIATE RELEASE OF ARBITRARILY DETAINED ARTISTS, JOURNALISTS, AND ACTIVISTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 24, S. Res. 37.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 37) expressing solidarity with the San Isidro Movement in Cuba, condemning escalated attacks against artistic freedoms in Cuba, and calling for the repeal of laws that violate freedom of expression and the immediate release of arbitrarily detained artists, journalists, and activists.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an

amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic, and with an amendment to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic as follows:

Whereas artists, journalists, and activists in Cuba have faced increased censorship, persecution, and arbitrary detention by the Government of Cuba as a result of Decrees 349 and 370, which seek to restrict artistic freedoms and silence independent media in Cuba;

Whereas, in December 2018, Decree 349 entered into force, requiring that artists and those who hire them receive prior approval from the Government of Cuba to operate in public or private spaces or otherwise be subject to confiscation of materials, fines, or sanctions without the right to an appeal;

Whereas, in July 2019, Decree 370 entered into force, regulating and imposing sanctions with respect to the free distribution of information through the internet and leading to increased repression, arbitrary detentions, and censorship by the Government of Cuba;

Whereas international human rights organizations, including Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, have condemned Decrees 349 and 370 as violating fundamental freedoms and contradicting Article 54 of the 2019 Constitution of Cuba, which guarantees freedom of expression;

Whereas, in 2018, the San Isidro Movement (MSI), an organization of artists, activists, academics, and journalists, began to peacefully protest increased censorship and persecution in Cuba;

Whereas Denis Solís González, a musician and member of the San Isidro Movement, was detained on November 9, 2020, and sentenced to 8 months in prison on ''contempt of authority'' charges after sharing a live video online of a police officer entering his home without a warrant;

Whereas, on November 19, 2020, artists and activists from the San Isidro Movement launched a day of poetry and gathered at a private residence to discuss actions to protest the arbitrary detention of Denis Solís González, and during that peaceful activity, state police blocked access to the house, confiscating all food and humanitarian supplies;

Whereas, in response to the events of November 19, 2020, 14 independent artists and activists went on a 7-day hunger strike at the private residence, during which state authorities allegedly contaminated water sources in order to sicken the artists, activists, and those supporting them through the strike;

Whereas, on November 26, 2020, state security agents forcibly entered the protest site to remove the 14 artists and activists and 6 others supporting them through the strike, blocking internet connectivity and communications throughout Cuba during the raid;

Whereas, on November 27, 2020, approximately 300 people gathered outside the Ministry of Culture of Cuba to peacefully protest the lack of artistic freedom in Cuba and the arbitrary arrest of Denis Solís González and other artists and activists in an unprecedented demonstration against the Government of Cuba, and, despite the use of tear gas by state security forces, the protesters were undeterred;

Whereas, as a result of the protest on November 27, 2020, Cuban officials met with 30 artists and activists, including 5 leaders of the San Isidro Movement, and agreed to stop harassment of Cuban artists and initiate a dialogue between the San Isidro Movement, other activists, and the government;

Whereas, despite that commitment by Cuban officials, the Government of Cuba subsequently escalated its attacks against the artists and activists who participated in the meeting, including by surrounding and blocking access to their homes;

Whereas the Cuban regime used state-controlled media to label the hunger strikers as committing acts of terrorism;

Whereas, on December 4, 2020, the Government of Cuba unilaterally ended the dialogue process with Cuban artists and independent civil society and political activists;

Whereas, on January 27, 2021, officials of the Ministry of Culture, led by Minister Alpidio Alonso and Vice Ministers Fernando Rojas and Fernando León Jacomino, physically assaulted a group of 20 to 30 artists who had gathered outside the Ministry of Culture to restart a dialogue process with authorities and demand an end to the repression of the artistic community;

Whereas, following the assault on the group by Minister Alonso and Vice Ministers Rojas and Jacomino, Cuban state security forces violently detained protesters; and

Whereas, despite the suspension of the dialogue process by the Government of Cuba, artists, activists, and independent journalists continue to bravely advocate for fundamental freedoms and denounce human rights violations in Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses solidarity with the members of the San Isidro Movement and their efforts to advance freedom of expression in Cuba;

(2) calls on Cuban authorities to engage in a meaningful dialogue process with the members of the San Isidro Movement and other artists and activists seeking to advance freedom of expression in Cuba;

(3) calls on the Government of Cuba to immediately release Denis Solís González and other arbitrarily imprisoned artists and journalists;

(4) urges the officials of the Ministry of Culture of Cuba to refrain from physical violence and any other acts of repression against Cuban artists and journalists;

(5) calls for the immediate repeal of Decrees 349 and 370 and other laws in Cuba that violate freedom of expression;

(6) urges governments and legislatures in Europe and Latin America to renew their support for democratic activists in Cuba and speak out against the repression of artists and journalists in Cuba; and

(7) encourages the Secretary of State to condemn the persecution, threats, and intimidation of Cuban artists and journalists.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be considered agreed to; that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the committee-report amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 37), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 37

Whereas artists, journalists, and activists in Cuba have faced increased censorship, persecution, and arbitrary detention by the Government of Cuba as a result of Decrees 349 and 370, which seek to restrict artistic freedoms and silence independent media in Cuba;

Whereas, in December 2018, Decree 349 entered into force, requiring that artists and those who hire them receive prior approval from the Government of Cuba to operate in public or private spaces or otherwise be subject to confiscation of materials, fines, or sanctions without the right to an appeal;

Whereas, in July 2019, Decree 370 entered into force, regulating and imposing sanctions with respect to the free distribution of information through the internet and leading to increased repression, arbitrary detentions, and censorship by the Government of Cuba;

Whereas international human rights organizations, including Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, have condemned Decrees 349 and 370 as violating fundamental freedoms and contradicting Article 54 of the 2019 Constitution of Cuba, which guarantees freedom of expression;

Whereas, in 2018, the San Isidro Movement (MSI), an organization of artists, activists, academics, and journalists, began to peacefully protest increased censorship and persecution in Cuba;

Whereas Denis Solís González, a musician and member of the San Isidro Movement, was detained on November 9, 2020, and sentenced to 8 months in prison on ''contempt of authority'' charges after sharing a live video online of a police officer entering his home without a warrant;

Whereas, on November 19, 2020, artists and activists from the San Isidro Movement launched a day of poetry and gathered at a private residence to discuss actions to protest the arbitrary detention of Denis Solís González, and during that peaceful activity, state police blocked access to the house, confiscating all food and humanitarian supplies;

Whereas, in response to the events of November 19, 2020, 14 independent artists and activists went on a 7-day hunger strike at the private residence, during which state authorities allegedly contaminated water sources in order to sicken the artists, activists, and those supporting them through the strike;

Whereas, on November 26, 2020, state security agents forcibly entered the protest site to remove the 14 artists and activists and 6 others supporting them through the strike, blocking internet connectivity and communications throughout Cuba during the raid;

Whereas, on November 27, 2020, approximately 300 people gathered outside the Ministry of Culture of Cuba to peacefully protest the lack of artistic freedom in Cuba and the arbitrary arrest of Denis Solís González and other artists and activists in an unprecedented demonstration against the Government of Cuba, and, despite the use of tear gas by state security forces, the protesters were undeterred;

Whereas, as a result of the protest on November 27, 2020, Cuban officials met with 30 artists and activists, including 5 leaders of the San Isidro Movement, and agreed to stop harassment of Cuban artists and initiate a dialogue between the San Isidro Movement, other activists, and the government;

Whereas, despite that commitment by Cuban officials, the Government of Cuba subsequently escalated its attacks against the artists and activists who participated in the meeting, including by surrounding and blocking access to their homes;

Whereas the Cuban regime used state-controlled media to label the hunger strikers as committing acts of terrorism;

Whereas, on December 4, 2020, the Government of Cuba unilaterally ended the dialogue process with Cuban artists and independent civil society and political activists;

Whereas, on January 27, 2021, officials of the Ministry of Culture, led by Minister Alpidio Alonso and Vice Ministers Fernando Rojas and Fernando León Jacomino, physically assaulted a group of 20 to 30 artists who had gathered outside the Ministry of Culture to restart a dialogue process with authorities and demand an end to the repression of the artistic community;

Whereas, following the assault on the group by Minister Alonso and Vice Ministers Rojas and Jacomino, Cuban state security forces violently detained protesters; and

Whereas, despite the suspension of the dialogue process by the Government of Cuba, artists, activists, and independent journalists continue to bravely advocate for fundamental freedoms and denounce human rights violations in Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses solidarity with the members of the San Isidro Movement and their efforts to advance freedom of expression in Cuba;

(2) calls on Cuban authorities to engage in a meaningful dialogue process with the members of the San Isidro Movement and other artists and activists seeking to advance freedom of expression in Cuba;

(3) calls on the Government of Cuba to immediately release Denis Solís González and other arbitrarily imprisoned artists and journalists;

(4) urges the officials of the Ministry of Culture of Cuba to refrain from physical violence and any other acts of repression against Cuban artists and journalists;

(5) calls for the immediate repeal of Decrees 349 and 370 and other laws in Cuba that violate freedom of expression;

(6) urges governments and legislatures in Europe and Latin America to renew their support for democratic activists in Cuba and speak out against the repression of artists and journalists in Cuba; and

(7) encourages the Secretary of State to condemn the persecution, threats, and intimidation of Cuban artists and journalists.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 159, S. Res. 160, S. Res. 161, and S. Res. 162.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RELATING TO THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM ''BILL'' EMERSON BROCK III, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 163, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 163) relating to the death of the Honorable William ''Bill'' Emerson Brock III, former United States Senator for the State of Tennessee.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 163) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

APPOINTMENTS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–595, and further amended by Public Law 113–281, and upon the recommendation of the Ranking Member of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, reappoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: The Honorable ROGER WICKER of Mississippi and The Honorable DAN SULLIVAN of Alaska.

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 93–112, as amended by Public Law 112–166, and further amended by Public Law 113–128, the reappointment of the following to serve as a member of the National Council on Disability: Andres J. Gallegos of Illinois.

Mr. SCHUMER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, April 19; 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 resume consideration of S. 937, the COVID hate crimes legislation; that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Monaco nomination and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination; that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be considered expired and the vote on confirmation occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, on Tuesday, April 20; finally, that following the cloture vote, the Senate resume legislative session.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2021, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 6:42 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 19, 2021, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUSANNA V. BLUME, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF COST ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE ROBERT DAIGLE, RESIGNED.

CHRISTINE ELIZABETH WORMUTH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE RYAN MCCARTHY.

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

MEERA JOSHI, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, VICE RAYMOND MARTINEZ.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU, OF ALASKA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE KATHARINE MACGREGOR.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JONATHAN DAVIDSON, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE BRIAN MCGUIRE.

LILY LAWRENCE BATCHELDER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE DAVID J. KAUTTER.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ROBERT LUIS SANTOS, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2021, VICE STEVEN DILLINGHAM.

ROBERT LUIS SANTOS, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2026. (REAPPOINTMENT)

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

CHRISTINE ABIZAID, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL COUNTERTERRORISM CENTER, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE, VICE CHRISTOPHER C. MILLER.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

UR MENDOZA JADDOU, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE LEE FRANCIS CISSNA.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CHRISTOPHER H. SCHROEDER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE STEVEN ANDREW ENGEL.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MICHAEL F. MCALLISTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN

THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 305:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PAUL F. THOMAS

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination pursuant to S. Res. 27 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

VANITA GUPTA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING ARMY BRIGADIER GENERAL ISABEL RIVERA SMITH

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of an extraordinary woman and hometown heroine, Brigadier General Isabel Rivera Smith of Lorain, Ohio.

BGen Smith, who was born and raised in Lorain, Ohio, was a member of Sacred Heart Parish and a graduate of Admiral King High School.

She first enlisted into the active Army in October of 1985 as a Motor Transport Operator, with her first duty station at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

In 1988, she enlisted in the North Carolina Army National Guard and in 1989 she transferred to the New York Army National Guard. She was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps after graduating from Officer Candidate School.

BGen Smith's command assignments and operational deployment include Commander of HHD, 53rd Troop Command, Commander of the 369th Special Troops Battalion and Deputy Team Chief-Iraq Police National Headquarters in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, 2010.

Her key staff assignments include Assistant Operational Officer at the 27th Rear Area Operations Center; personalist for the 369th Corps Support Battalion, Assistant Chief of Staff for Personnel, G1 for the 53rd Troop Command, Executive Officer of the 106th Regional Training Institute, Deputy Director of Logistics (J4) for the New York National Guard, Executive Officer for the Office of the Adjutant General, and the Chief of Staff for the 53rd Troop Command.

BGen Smith's awards include the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, and the Humanitarian Service Medal. She is also the recipient of the 2017 Latina Style Military Service Award.

BGen Smith holds a bachelor's degree in Human Services from Mount St. Mary's College, a master's degree in Education in Counseling and Development from Long Island University and a master's degree in Strategic Studies from the United States Army War College.

She and her husband Peter have six daughters: Antoinette, Amelia, Karissa, Kassandra, Jessica, and Shannon, and one son: Jamarr. They are also the proud grandparents of nine grandchildren.

Our country could not be prouder of Brigadier General Isabel Rivera Smith, a daughter of Ohio, trailblazer, and a true American patriot. The words of Army General Omar Bradley aptly capture BGen Smith's professional accomplishments: ''Leadership is intangible, and therefore no weapon ever designed can replace it.''

CHEYENNE MYLA VERHAEGHE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cheyenne Myla Verhaeghe for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Cheyenne Myla Verhaeghe is a 12th grader at Thornton High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cheyenne Myla Verhaeghe is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cheyenne Myla Verhaeghe for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL ''MICKEY'' DEPALO

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Michael ''Mickey'' DePalo for his innumerable contributions to veterans and the residents of the City of Burbank, California.

Mickey has been a Burbank resident for sixty-five years. He graduated from Burbank High School in 1964, and the following year, began his four-decades-long career with the City of Burbank Parks and Recreation Department. Shortly after graduating from college, Mr. DePalo briefly left the City of Burbank to honorably serve in the U.S. Army for two years during the Vietnam War.

As a child, Mickey played many sports, including flag football, baseball, softball and basketball. His love of sports continued into adulthood, and along with participating in Burbank sports leagues, he has generously volunteered his time and knowledge to the sports organizations for decades. He was a volunteer baseball, flag football and basketball coach for the City's Parks and Recreation Department, and a volunteer assistant coach for his son, Michael's youth basketball teams. Additionally, Mr. DePalo was Loyola High School Cross Country Team's volunteer coach and the race director for Burbank's Run for the Hungry for ten years.

A staunch advocate for veterans and their welfare, Mickey has been Chairperson of the Burbank Veterans Commemorative Committee and the emcee for the Veterans Day and Memorial Day ceremonies at McCambridge Park in Burbank for over thirty years. Under his leadership, the committee has organized numerous veterans events in Burbank, including one event that Mr. DePalo is most proud of—assisting the City in 1998 to be selected as a site to host The Moving Wall, a replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C. that tours the nation. He also worked on the Hands Across the Battlefield program, which partners with community businesses and individuals to collect and send supplies to our troops, and has raised funds for youth and veterans organizations in his role as Sr. Vice Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 8310.

A few of the numerous community awards and commendations Mr. DePalo has received include the Burbank Association of Realtors' Citizen of the Year Award, an induction into the City of Burbank's Athletics Walk of Fame, the L.A. County Older Americans Volunteer Service Award, and the Veteran of the Year Award from both Assemblyman Paul Krekorian in 2009 and from Assemblymember Laura Friedman in 2017.

It is my honor to call Michael ''Mickey'' DePalo a friend and I want to thank him for over half a century of extraordinary support and dedication to our nation's veterans and the community of Burbank. I ask all Members to join me in paying tribute to this extraordinary American patriot.

RECOGNIZING THE FRONTLINE HEALTHCARE WORKERS OF SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 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: Amanda Thedens, Mariah Theel, Megan Theesfeld, Erin Theis, Rebecca Theisen, Brooke Theisen, Melynda Thelen, Kristi Theobald, Tamara Theobald, Lisa Theocharis, Amy Therkelsen, Cheryl Theusch, Katelyn Thibeault, Kari Thie, Brittney Thiel, Tareza Thiele, Karey Thieman, Susan Thies, Kierra Thies, Amy Thiesse, Shelly Thiewes, Kari Thill, Kristi Thill, Amy Thill, Jennifer Thimgan, Chelsie Thiry, Breanna Thiry, Helen Thiry-Chmela, Carol Thissell, Teresa Thode, Cynthia Thoene, Mickale Thoene, Cynthia Thomas, Jolene Thomas, Teri Thomas, Patricia Thomas, Lynn Thomas, Jane Thomas, Loretta Thomas, Darla Thomas, Gertrude Thomas, Kelly Thomas, Collin Thomas, Kimberly Thomas, Brooke Thomas, Haley Thomas, Dixie Thomas, Laura Thomas, JoElle Thomas, Kelsey Thomas, Laura Thomas, Lori Thomas,

Mary Thomas, Veronica Thomas-Star Comes Out, Stacy Thomlison, Sateera Thompsen, Jean Thompson, Marsha Thompson, Diane Thompson, Lynne Thompson, Robin Thompson, Elizabeth Thompson, Heather Thompson, Misty Thompson, Carmen Thompson, Stacie Thompson, Dona Thompson, Donna Thompson, Marsha Thompson, Anna Thompson, Michael Thompson, Amy Thompson, Alison Thompson, Sarah Thompson, Kathleen Thompson, Lindsey Thompson, Amelia Thompson, Jacob Thompson, Nicholas Thompson, Clay Thompson, Andra Thompson, Heather Thompson, Chelsey Thompson, Lindsay Thompson, Presley Thompson, Kristin Thompson, Joanne Thompson, Tiffany Thompson, Josy Thompson, Barbara Thompson, Amanda Thoms, Lacey Thomson, Allison Thomson, Vickie Thon, Colby Thoreson, Tanner Thorfinnson, Rebecca Thorn, Kayla Thornberry, Nancy Thornburg, Jecelyn Thorne, Yvonne Thornton, Brenda Thornton, Candace Thorpe, Isabel Thorpe, Susan Thorson, Linda Thorson, David Thorson, Christopher Thorson, Mark Thorson, Tadd Thorson, Sandra Thorson, Jaclyn Thorson, Sarah Thorson, Nina Thorstenson, Shelayne Thuen, Nancy Thum-Thomas, Rhonda Thurlow.

Erin Thurlow, James Thurman, Shelly Thurness, Deb Thurston, Sarah Thury, Annie Thury, Mary Thury, Julie Thyberg, Lois Thyne, Norma Tibbitts, Mika Tibbs, Katharine Tibbs, Shelly Tibke, Jill Tice, Grace Tidball, Anita Tidemann, Shelby Tidemann, Rona Tiede, Seth Tiedeman, Alisa Tielke, Joanne Tieman, Jodi Tieman, Mary Tierney, Michelle Tierney, Lori Tiesen, Debra Tieszen, Heather Tietjen, Tasha Tietz, Tiffany Tietz, Kennedy Tietz, Tessa Tigert, Pamela Tiggelaar, Vicki Tigner, Oluwabusayo Tijani, Amber Tilberg, Amanda Tilberg, Tia Tiller, Steven Tilley, Katie Tillisch, Alexa Tillma, Jennifer Tillma, Penelyn Tilton, April Timat, Jennifer Timm, Amy Timm, Chelsey Timmerman, Bonnie Timmons, Barbara Timperley, Jeanine Tims, Mackenzie Tims, Kayla Tinker, Rachel Tinker, Melinda Tinkle, Kathleen Tinklenberg, Jana Tinnell, Stephanie Tipton, Katie Tirrel, Sadie Tisdale, Peggy Tisdel, Jackie Tish, Melanie Tish, Jacquelyn Tish, Megan Tish, Stacy Tisher, Joan Titus, Lindsey Titus, Kenda Titze, Erin Tivis, Miranda Tjeerdsma, Ermias TMariam, Jennifer Toates, Robin Tobin, Kristin Tobin, Jill Tobin, Amy Tobin, Shannon Tobin, Erin Tobin, Jill Tobin, Shauna Tobin, Judith Toennies, Mary Toering, Sheri Tokheim, Jessica Toland, Brianna Tolbert, Debra Tollefson, Kelly Tolley, Kimberly Tollman, Desiree Tolo, Marcia Tolsma, Paula Tolsma, Lora Tolsma, Rebecca Tolsma, Mary Tolvstad, Jodi Tolzin, Linda Tom, Dawn Tomac, Kenneth Tomek, April Tomes, Cheryl Tomjack, Laura Tommeraasen, Jerilyn Tommeraasen, Melissa Tompkins, Patricia Tompkins, Cori Tonjes, Shelbi Tooley, Elizabeth Toomajian, Desirae Toomey, Gloria Top, Kristen Top, Tammy Top, Megan Topf, Jordan Toquinto, Baylee Tordsen, Meghan Torgerson, Jordan Torigian, Rita Torkelson, Laura Torkildson, Allison Torrance, Luis Torres Negron, Norma Torres Ortiz, Penny Toth, Andra Toth, Diane Tounsley, Lindsey Tounsley, Patrick Tousignant, Mary Tow, Aimee Tow, Jody Towey, Lynssa Towne, Lynda Townsend, Brenda Townsend.

Todd Townsend, Andrew Townsend, Hayley Townsend, Elizabeth Townsend, Monica Trabing, Joy Tracy, Kelly Tracy, Floramae Traefald, Holly Traen, Rebekah Trahms, Larissa Trainer, Christine Trainor, Molly Tramp, Tiffany Tramp, Elizabeth Tramp, Anthony Tran, Chau Tran, Marcie Tranquill, Christina Trant, Heather Traphagen, Mary Lee Trapp, Patti Trapp, Trisha Trapp, Kari Trapp, Angela Trask, Melissa Traub, Makenzie Traufler, Sheri Traupel, Mary Travis, Dawn Traviss, Eric Traviss, Kaitlin Travnicek, Lisa Traxler, Stacey Trease, Erica Trebesch, Heather Trebesch, Emily Trebil, Kristin Treeby, Brandi Trego, Jessica Trei, Christy Treib, Keylee Treiber, Zachery Treiber, Mary Treinen, Barbara Trevett, Lisa Trewin, Kessa Tribby, Kaley Triebwasser, Vicki Triggs, MacKenzie Trimble, Kasey Tripp, Thomas Trobak, Mackenzie Trom, Jenny Trople, Megan Trotter, Jade Trottier, Vernal Trove, Amanda Trowbridge, Mary Truckenmiller, Nicole Trudeau, Mandy Trudeau, Cydney Trudeau, Karen Trueblood, Terence Truex, Lorie Truhe, Ashley Trulock, Lisa Tryon, Megan Tryon, Johney Tsai, Lindsay Tschakert, Jennifer Tschetter, Lois Tschetter, Gail Tschetter, Larry Tschetter, Connie Tschetter, Gary Tschetter, Melissa Tschetter, Donna Tschetter, Molly Tschetter, Lisa Tschetter, Brianna Tschetter, Sydney Tschetter, Roxanne Tschudy, Valentina Tsymbalist, Jessica Tubergen, Sandra Tucholke, Autumn Tucker, Kylie Tucker, Katie Tuff, Melinda Tuffs, Michele Tufty, Lexi Tuholsky, Andrea Tuley, Samantha Tully, Julie Tulowetzke, Courtney Tulson, Dereck Tuntland, Justin Tuntland, Carol Tupper, Jordan Tupper, Susan Tupy, Kimberly Turbak, Michele Turbak, Roselie Turcotte, Kristin Turek, Jennifer Turek, Connor Turek, Mia Turgeon, Aubry Turman, Katherine Turner, Stephanie Turner, Sueann Turner, Rachel Turner, Amy Turner, Hillary Turner, Rebecca Turner, Susan Turner, Delinda Turner, Katherine Turner, Marissa Turner, Patricia Turnwall, Emily Turnwall, Barbra Tuschen, Cynthia Tuschen, Jolene Tuschen, Eric Tuschen, Tara Tuscherer.

Melanie Tuttle, Brooke Tuttle, Molly Tuttle, Ashlee Tuttle, Jourdan Tuttle, Karen Tvedt, Joanne Tvedt, Jessica Tvedt, Siri Tvedt, Darcie Tveidt, Sharina Tveit, Jayme Tveter, Debra Tvinnereim, Elizabeth Twamley, Chelsea Twamley, Linda Twedt, Lola Twedt, Kristin Twedt, Deborah Tweed, Diana Twidwell, Ashlee Twite, Karen Kim Ty, Rachel Tycz, Robyn Tyler, Julie Tyler, Tena Tyree, Madeline Tyrell, Madison Uchytil, Davonne Uecker, Jodi Uecker, Sara Ugland, Melinda Ugland, Katie Uhall, Sara Uhen, Brooke Uherka, Tina Uhing, Benjamin Uhlich, Tricia Uhlir, Donna Uhrich, Megan Uhrich, Aimee Uhrig, Jillian Uhrig, Brandi Uithoven, Joseph Ulin, Danielle Ullmann, Renee Ullom, Aimee Ullom, Jennifer Ulmer, Meagan Ulmer, Heather Ulmer, Lindsay Ulmer, Liza Ulmer, Lindsey Ulrich, Abbey Ulrich, Stephanie Ulses, Brylie Ummach, Alberta Underbaggage, Brandy Underberg, Brittany Underberg, Cynthia Underhill, Heather Underwood, Heidi Underwood, Courtney Unruh, Luann Unterseher, John Unterseher, Lori Unzelman, Susan Urbach, Michelle Urban, Tiffany Urban, Kelie Urbanec, Taryn Urbaniak, Regena Urevig, Katie Urevig, Macy Urrutia, Charlene Usera, Jessica Utecht-Whillock, Callie Utemark, Jennifer Uthe, Juliana Uttecht, Lacey Uttecht, Jill Utter, Dawn Utzman, Allyson Vaca, Travis Vaca, Jana Vacek, Kristen Vail, Edward Vail, Jennifer Vaith, Bryan Vakiner, Taylor Vaksdal, Robert Valandra, Tarah Valandra, Erwin Valdez, Alondra Valdovinos, Bernalyn Vale, Dena Valentine, Erik Valer, Dawn Valer, Alexandra Valerio, Anthony Valese, Glenn Vallecera, Tamara Vallejo, Uchechi Val-Okolie, Sabrina Valsvig, Marcia Van Arkel, Elizabeth Van Beek, Ashley Van Beek, Candance Van Beek, Erika Van Beek, Twila Van Boven, Christi Van Buren, Nancy Van Dam, Stephanie Van Dam, Taylor Van Dam, Tanya Van De Stroet, Michelle Van Demark, Melissa Van Den Berg, Joan Van Den Hemel, Sarah Van Den Top, Kenneth Van Der Molen, Lois Van Der Vliet, Emily Van Deraa, Debra Van Diemen, Jessica Van Diepen.

David Van Dixhoorn, Marissa Van Driel, Nicole Van Dyke, Juli Van Engen, Betsy Van Genderen, Ashley Van Hill, Aimee Van Horssen, Jacob Van Horssen, Kimberly Van Iperen, Brittany Van Iperen, Sierra Van Iperen, Melissa Van Leeuwen, Jamie Van Lent, Morgan Van Maanen, Heather Van Marion, Kayla Van Meeteren, Dana Van Middendorp, Sarah Van Muyden, Whitney Van Ommeren, Nan Van Osdel, Alexandra Van Pelt, Nathan Van Peursem, Shaun Van Roekel, Earl Van Scooter, Erica Van Surksum, Brittany Van Tilburg, Mallary Van Tol, Marissa Van Veldhuizen, Jamie Van Vliet, Karmen Van Voorst, Erica Van Vugt, Kelli Van Vuuren, McKenzie Van Wagner, Jill Van Well, Sydney Van Wettering, Brittany Van Winkle, Marisa Van Winkle, Cami Van Wyhe, Stephanie Van Wyhe, Jennifer Van Wyhe, Heath Van Wyhe, Amanda Van Wyk, Tosha Van Zee, Deanna Van Zee, Melinda Van Zee, Lindsey Van Zee, Bailey Van Zee, Deborah Vanbeek, Linda VanBeek, Rebecca VanBeek, Laura VanBeek, Frances VanBockel, Jill VanBockern, Kimberly VanBockern, Sarah VanBriesen, Mary VanBuskirk, Kristin VanBuskirk, Miranda Vance, Sheila Vandam, Julie Vandam, Stephanie Vande Brake, Janelle Vande Griend, Mindi Vande Kamp, Natalie Vande Kamp, Adam Vande Kamp, Rebecca Vande Kieft, Jerica Vande Kop, Erin Vande Lune, Leah Vandeberg, Diane Vandekamp, Jacob VandeKamp, Stephanie Vandel, Stephenie Vanden Berge, Paige Vanden Bosch, Larissa Vanden Bosch, Kelsey Vanden Brink, Sandra Vanden Hoek, Ashley Vanden Hoek, Molly VandenBoogart, Lori Vandenbos, Laurel Vandenbosch.

Roxanne Vandendries, Evan VanDenEinde, Kari Vandenhemel, Darlene VandenHeuvel, Charles Vandeputte, Debra Vander Haar, Alex Vander Hoek, Jennylyn Vander Laan, Eric Vander Lee, Starla Vander Molen, Beverly Vander Pol, Carlie Vander Pol, Denise Vander Vliet, Robin Vander Vorst, Abbie Vander Zee, Aleta Vanderbeek, Lisa Vanderberg, Jessica Vanderham, Brianne VanderLeest.

Amy Vanderlei, Michelle Vandermay, Nicole VanderMay, Rebecca VanderMay, Aleigha VanderPoel, Haley Vanderpol, Laurinda VanderPol, Mark Vandersnick, Katie Vandersnick, Tiffany Vandersnick, Teresa VanderStouwe, Sheri Vanderwal, Mariah VanderWal, Jeannie VanderWeide, Donna VanderWeide, Austin Vanderweide, Christina Vanderwerff, Diana VanderWoude, Ramona VanderZee, Emily VanderZiel, Cindy Vandesteeg, Claudia VandeWalle, Brenda VanDewater, Gillian VanDiepen, Kylee VanDieren, Kari VanDonge, Sherra Vandonkersgoed, Barbara Vandonslear, Jennifer VanDriel, Rebecca VanDuyn, Carla Vandyke, Susan Vandyke, Alyssa VanDyke, Douglas Vanecek, Carol VanEmmerik, Stephanie VanGelder, Carrie Vangenderen, Lisa VanGerpen, Rachel VanHeel, Nancy Vanheerde, Carolyn VanHeerde, Terri Vanheuveln, Jessica VanHoorn, Linda Vanhove, Michelle VanHove, Heather VanKley, Lora VanLaecken, Rhonda Vanleur, Mindy VanLeur, Miranda VanLeur, Susan Vanliere, Emily Vanlith, Wendy Vanloan, Amy VanMaanen, Pamila VanMeeteren, Lynn VanMeeteren, Brian VanMeeteren, Danielle VanMeter, Melvin VanMeter III, Kari VanMeveren, Joy Vanorny, Jeffery Vanorny, Sarah Vanorny, Janine Vanosdel, Christine VanOsdol, Shelby Vanoverschelde, Charlotte VanRoekel, Amber VanRoekel, Cynthia VanRooyen, Vicki VanSchoiack, Janice VanSickle, Brandi Vansickle, Katelyn VanSteenberg, Carrie VanStryland, Angela Van Veldhuizen, Daniel Van Veldhuizen, Ashley Vanvoorhis, Christopher VanWassenhove, Barbara VanWassenhove, Wanda Vanwormer, Tara VanWye, Rachel VanZee, Tyniah VanZee, Lisa Varenhorst, Julia Vargas, Jean Vargas, Elyssa Vargo, Cassandra Varilek, Ann Varilek, Brandon Varilek, Jayme Varilek, Gayle Varty, Jamie Varuska, Gordon Varuska, Jami Varuska, Stephanie Vasgaard, Andrey Vasilevskiy, Patricia Vaska, Alicia Vasquez, Teri Vaughan, Constance Vaughn, John Vavra, Teresa Vavruska, Bonnita Vavruska, Meagan Veeder, Jane Veerman, Tiffany Veflin, Andrea Vega.

Carly Veil, Jannette Veit, Lisa Veit, Catherine Veit, Candace Veit, Juan Velarde, Jessica Velasquez, Debra Velazquez, Rhiannon Velazquez, Tammy Veld, Ladene Veldhouse, Christopher Veldhuisen, Rebecca Veldhuisen, Lora Veldhuizen, Jennifer Veldhuizen, Amile Veldkamp, Megan Veldkamp, Alexandra Velgersdyk, Christopher Velk, Brenda Vellek, Kelli Vellema, Deborah Venable, Maria Venard, Daniel Vendt, Tonya Venhuizen Matt, Marla Venjohn, Susan Venohr, Peggy Venteicher, Cindy Ver Burg, Megan Ver Steeg, Emma Verby, Candace Verdoorn, Shaun Verdouw, Donna Verhelst, Patrick Verley, Marlene Vermeer, Lyla Jo Vermeer, Alicia Vermeulen, Ashley Vermeulen, Sonja Vermillion, Katherine Verner, Susan Verschoor, Claude Vershure, Elaine Vesely, Courtney Vesely, Hilary Veskrna, Sheri Vetsch, Angelene Vetter, Heidi Vetter, Paulette Veurink, Jared Veurink, Angela Veurink, April Veurink, Melinda Veurink, Katie Veurink, Ashley Veurink, Glenda Vice, Kayla Vickerman, Travis Vickers, Jamie Vickery, Angela Victor, Cheryl Vidal, Britton Vidal, Mary Vidoloff, Julie Viereck, Thomas Viereck, Karin Viereck, Abby Viereck, Kara Viereck, Brittany Vierhout, Mellissa Vig, Debbie Vigness, Mary Vigoren, Susan Vik, Julie Vikhorev, Tara Viktora, Barbara Villmow, Dorothy Vincent, Sophia Vining, Janet Virchow, Christine Virchow, Lanny Virchow, Danielle Vis, Stacy Vis, Courtney Visaya, Stacy Visker, Jeanine Visser, Jessica Visser, Sandra Visser, Michelle Vissers, Gabrielle Vizcarra, Jolynn Vlaminck, Amanda Vlaminck, Stephanie Vlaminck, Lynette Vlastuin, Noelle Vlastuin, Racheal Vockler, Mary Vockrodt, Penny Voegele, Gaylene Voegeli, Victorria Voegeli, Sheila Voelsch, Nicolle Voeltz, Kathleen Vogel, Staci Vogel, Kristen Vogel, Elizabeth Vogelsong, Jane Vogt, Melinda Vogt, Kristal Vogt, Susan Vogt, Erin Voight, Tina Voigt, Dorinda Vojta, Dolores Volek, Juneanne Volk, Roxanne Volk, Jennifer Volk, Barb Volker, Courtney Volker, Linda Vollan, Nicole Vollan, Kristi Voller, Rachelle Vollmer, Brittny Vollmer, Jacqueline Volz.

Colleen Volzke, Marlys Volzke, Kara Von Holtum, Jane Von Wald, Rebecca Vonderohe, Samantha Voneye, Bunpeng Vongkaenchan, Phuong Anh Vongkhamchanh, Bouakhine Vongphachan, Amanda Vongroven, Jeanette Voorhees, Dawn Voorhees, Karli Voorhees, Rebecca Voris, Sarah Vortherms, Sarah Vorvick, Kristi Vos, Sara Vosler, Mary Voss, Victoria Voss, Jo Voss, Mindy Voss, Staci Voss, Nicole Voss, Brian Voss, Megan Voss, Erika Voss, Mitchell Voss, Janai Voss, Rebecca Vossler, Jordan Voss Severson, Naomi Vostad, Tamara Vottero, Sasha Vreugdenhil, Kiera Vroegop, Kimberly Vulpe, Jamie Vuong, Dawn Waack, Patty Waage, Morghan Waage, Alicia Waala, Shelby Waba, Taylor Waba, Sarah Wabuge, Amber Wachter, Katherine Wackel, Darilee Waddell, Rachel Waddell, Corey Waddell, Douglas Wade, Shantelle Wade, Ann Wade, Belinda Wagemann, Melanie Wagenaar, Kea Wager, Jill Waggoner, Kevin Waggoner, Kerry Wagner, Carla Wagner, Joyce Wagner, Theresa Wagner, Connie Wagner, Nicole Wagner, Diane Wagner, Jessica Wagner, Nicholas Wagner, Ashley Wagner, Madisen Wagner, Jennifer Wagner, Wanda Wahl, Tamela Wahl, Tana Wahl, Judy Wahlen, Billie Wainman, Cari Wainwright, Lenel Waite, Jenny Waite, Shelby Waite, Victoria Waitman, Janice Walberg, Clare Wald, Andrea Wald, Brittany Waldal, Ashley Walder, Chase Walder, Amber Walder, Jessica Waldman, Jackie Waldner, Karen Waldner, Anna Waldner, Dawn Waldner, Shanon Waldner, Brittany Waldner, Melissa Waldner, Kendra Waldner, Vanessa Waldner, Rachel Waldner, Dylan Waldner, Rhoda Waldner, Alfred Waldo, Elizabeth Waldow, Breah Waldron, Tammie Waldrop, Andrea Waletich, LaVonne Walker, Leah Walker, Diane Walker, Dotta-Jo Walker, Adam Walker, Brandalyn Walker, Joanne Walker, Rachel Walker, Katie Walker, Chaska Walker, Sindle Walker, Justine Walker, Alan Walker, Megan Walker, Amy Walker, Danielle Walker, Cyla Walker, Angela Walker, Dorothy Walker Lewis, Nancy Walkins-Anderson, Cynthia Wallace.

Denise Wallace, Amber Wallace, Erin Wallace, Hunter Wallace, Amy Wallace, Mariah Wallace, Shanna Wallen, Megan Wallenberg, Karen Wallenberg, Jeffrey Wallenberg, Hope Wallenstein, Vida Waller, Jennifer Waller, Mary Wallin, Coty Wallin, Twila Wallmann, Joel Wallner, Pamela Walloch, Mary Walloch, Janet Walls, Vicky Walls, Emily Wallum, Amanda Wallum, Sammie Waln, Anna Walraven, Julie Walsh, Kristen Walsh, Karla Walsh, MacKenzie Walsh-Keeley, Anita Walsh-Sunde, Shelly Walstead, Barbara Walter, Marian Walter, Justina Walter, Vanessa Walter, Susan Walter, Ashley Walter, Mackenzie Walter, Deborah Walter Laws, Darcel Walters, Connie Jo Walters, Suzanne Walth, Shelly Waltjer, Jon Waltjer, Madisyn Waltjer, Patricia Waltman, Sharon Waltner, Audrey Waltner, Polly Waltner, Kieran Waltner, Brennan Waltner, Kelly Walton, Abby Walton, Lisa Walton, Erica Walton, Holly Walton, Scott Walton, Taylor Walvatne, Karissa Walz, Cathy Walz, Christa Walz, Debra Walz, Tammy Walz, Olga Wamara, Elizabeth Wambua, Mica Wamstad, Alexandria Wang, Brittany Wangsness, Terry Wangsness Jr, Milkah Wanjohi, Christine Wanless, Annette Wanner, Keith Wanner, Robin Wanous-Williamson, Debra Waples, Patricia Ward, Luanne Ward, Lynn Ward, Abbie Ward, Rebecca Ward, Lynn Ward, Justin Ward, Courtney Ward, Cassandra Ward, Jennie Warden, Jordan Wardenburg, Alex Warkenthien, Molly Warkenthien, Vicki Warne, Rodney Warneke, Mackenzie Warner, Daniel Warner, Judith Warnke, Carla Warnke, Kellyna Warnke, Daniel Warnke, Meghann Warnke, Stephanie Warnke, Mindy Warns, Mary Warns-Anderson, Dawn Warren, Jennifer Warren, Amy Warren, Alicia Warrington, Robyn Warrington, Leslie Washegesic, Danielle Washegesic, Wayne Washenberger, Kimberly Washenberger, Bethany Washington, Marguerite Washnok, Rebecca Washnok, LuAnn Wasilk, Heather Wasilk, Kelly Wasko, Alexandria Wasko, Cheryl Wasland, Molly Wasserburger, Kalleen Wasson, Joanne Waterbury, Jo Waters, Heidi Waters.

Mariah Waters, Sheena Watkins, Carla Watkins, Danielle Watkins, Hailee Watkins, Lori Watson, Diane Watson, Ronnie Watson, Cynthia Watson, Julie Watson, Elizabeth Watson, Chelsey Watson, Megan Watson, Sara Watson, Darien Watson, Johnna Watt, Melanie Watt, Karen Watterson, Erin Wattier, Haley

Watzek, Lyndsey Watzek, Kandace Wauer, Abigail Waylander, Cassandra Weatherford, Katie Weatherill, Susan Weaver, Angela Weaver, Troy Weaver, Joy Weaver, Nicolle Weaver, Debra Webb, Nancy Webb, Melissa Webb, Jennifer Webb, Jami Webb, Ryan Webb, Alicia Webb, Danielle Webb, Andrea Camille Webb, Heather Webb, Kari Webber, Gloria Weber, Colleen Weber, Lori Weber, Karen Weber, Janice Weber, Anthony Weber, Darcy Weber, Kathleen Weber, John Weber, Michele Weber, Jon Weber, Nichole Weber, Betty Weber, Robyn Weber, Crystal Weber, Brooke Weber, Lindsay Weber, Courtney Weber, Chase Weber, Kherdine Weber, Catherine Weber, Justyne Weber, Adam Weber, Mariah Weber, Kaitlyn Weber, Abigail Weber, Krystal Weber, Ashley Weber, Eric Weber, Sloane Weber, Marissa Weber, Kelsey Weber, Emily Weber, Chantel Weber, Alec Weber, Brooke Weber, Dominick Weber, Gayle Webert, Jessica Webster, Rikka Webster, Jennifer Wechsler, Diane Weck, Paige Weeden, Holly Weeg, Tristina Weekley, Tiffany Weeks, Katrina Weeks, Kali Weelborg, Charish Weeldreyer, Rebecca Weeldreyer, Sandra Weeldreyer, Rebecca Weeman, Tara Weeman, Kortney Weems, Koressa Weems, Marlys Weerts, Savannah Weg, Daniel Wegehaupt, Lori Wegehaupt, Rebecca Wegener, Brooke Wegener, Donna Wegman, Teri Wegner, Kristie Wehrkamp, Elizabeth Wehrkamp, Tami Weich, Jenna Weich, Jacqueline Weidauer, Paula Weideman, Jade Weideman, Brittney Weidenbach, Heather Weidner, Theresa Weidner Eichstadt, Michelle Weidner-Jordan, Lisa Weier, Dawn Weier, Michelle Weier, Abby Weier, Anissa Weier, Jeff Weifenbach, Esther Weightman, Diana Weiland, Rosemary Weiland, Stacey Weinkauf.

Sandra Weinmaster, Jodi Weins, Abigail Weinzetl, Kayla Weis, Tamera Weis, Sarena Weis, Kelly Weis, Allison Weisbeck, Kristi Weisbeck, Laura Weisberg, Charleen Weismantel, Anne Weiss, Beverly Weiss, Sandra Weiss, Rhonda Weisser, Patrice Weisser, Louise Weisser, Katie Weiszhaar, Rebecca Weitbrecht, Jacqueline Wek, Laurel Wek, Alyssa Welbig, Tina Welbig, Kristen Welbig, Brittnay Welbig, Renee Welch, Scott Welch, Franki Welch, Aaron Welch, Justin Welch, Kayley Welch, Mandy Welk, Tandra Welk, Kathleen Welken, Brooke Welker, Kathryn Weller, Kay Weller, Dody Weller, Annette Weller, Naomi Wellman, Christi Wellman, Rachel Wellner, Jessica Wellnitz, Diane Wells, Kimberly Wells, Michelle Wells, Emily Wells, Steven Wells, Rita Welsh, Reta Welsh, Megan Welsh, Joseph Welty, Wendy Welty, Chelsea Welty, Denaeh Wemhoff, Isabella Wen, Debbie Wendelboe, Carmen Wendell, Barbara Wendell-Schechter, Marjell Wendland, Mikayla Wendland, Marlaina Wendland, Ashley Wendler, Nicole Wendling, Teresa Wendling, Sarah Wendorff, Karrie Wendt, Brenda Wendt, Tod Wendt, Megan Wendt, Kalen Wenger, Valerie Wengler, Elizabeth Wengler, Samantha Wenker, Terrence Wensing, Katherine Wenwoi, Jackie Wenz, Wyman Wenz, Rachel Wenzel, Myra Werkmeister, Bryan Wermers, Lisa Wermers, Krissa Wermers, Kathryn Wermers, Dana Wermers, Suzanne Werner, Joseph Werner, Melissa Werner, Paige Werner, Joan Werning, Lois Werning, Janet Wernisch, Laurie Wernke, Douglas Wernke, Maureen Wernsmann, Elizabeth Wersal, Lenora Werth, Nanci Wescott, Kyle Wescott, Meghan Wesely, Andrea Wessel, Veronica Wesseling, Robyn Wessels, Stephanie Wessels, Sandra Wessendorf, Blake West, Brandon West, Janice Westall, Debra Westberg, Chantell Westberg, Kari Westenkirchner, Jenna Westerberg, Lynn Westerdahl, Eli Westerdahl, Loralyn Westergaard, Wendy Westergaard, Chelsea Westerman, Tara Westhoff, Holly Westley, Libby Westman, Megan Weston, Shelbi Westover, Katherine Westphal, Nicole Westra, Kelli Westra, Samantha Wetch, Julie Wetering, Jason Wetsch, Megan Wetsit, Jessica Wettestad, April Wetz, Marie Weverstad, Emily Wevik, Carter Wevik, and Carmen Wexler.

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.

TREVOR FIGASZEWSKI

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Trevor Figaszewski for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Trevor Figaszewski is a student at Arvada K–8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Trevor Figaszewski is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Trevor Figaszewski for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, unfortunately I was unable to be present for one of the votes on April 14, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 101.

RECOGNIZING MONTAGUE WILDCATS' GIRLS GOLF TEAM STATE TITLE

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the Montague Wildcats on their incredible Division 4 golf state title at Forest Akers West Golf Course in East Lansing, MI.

This team has shown a great level of resilience and skill throughout this past year in their quest to the state title. Notably, the Wildcats displayed extraordinary talent on the course finishing with a combined team score of 343; a full 27 shots ahead of the nearest competitor.

I would like to congratulate each player and coach of the Montague Wildcats who played an integral role in capturing the state title:

Players: Mackenzie Goudreau, Gabriella Moreau, Katie Unger, Megan Brown, Orianna Bylsma, Isabelle McKeown, Claire Meacham, and Natalie Kellogg;

Coach: Phil Kerr.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Montague Wildcats Division 4, golf state title and for being a Michigan symbol of resilience in the face of this ongoing pandemic.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GRACE PUGH

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to honor the life of Grace Pugh, a West Covina resident who died on April 6, 2021.

For over 38 years, Ms. Pugh served as a volunteer for the American Cancer Society, and as a Legislative Ambassador with the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network. She was a three-time breast cancer survivor and saw first-hand its devastating impact. Ms. Pugh lost both her mother and her grandson to cancer, and her two sisters were cancer survivors. This personal experience helped drive her deep and profound commitment to fight back against cancer.

As an advocate with the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Ms. Pugh used her boundless energy and passion to help build bipartisan support for legislation to help advance the fight against cancer. She traveled multiple times to Washington, D.C. and Sacramento, CA to meet with her elected representatives, and regularly visited their district offices, sent emails, and made phone calls to convey the importance and urgency of making the fight against cancer a top priority.

Ms. Pugh devoted countless hours of her time and worked tirelessly to help educate people about prevention and early detection, and support for patients, survivors, and caregivers. She dedicated herself to the American Cancer Society's patient support services, including the Reach to Recovery Program, which provides one-on-one support to those diagnosed with breast cancer.

I extend my sincere sympathies to Ms. Pugh's three children, Bud, Kathy, and Ken, her six grandchildren, eight great-grandchildren, and to the extended Pugh family and friends. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join us to honor this fearless advocate.

ELIAS VAUGHNS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Elias Vaughns for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Elias Vaughns is a 6th grader at Pinnacle Charter School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Elias Vaughns is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Elias Vaughns for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING NORTHWEST INDIANA HIGH-SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAMS

HON. FRANK J. MRVAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. MRVAN. Madam Speaker, as an avid basketball player, it gives me great pleasure to recognize the exceptional achievements of all of the high-school basketball players in Northwest Indiana this past year, who safely showed up and put in the effort during the challenges of this health pandemic. I also want to recognize the following high-school basketball programs from Indiana's First Congressional District who represented our region during Semi-State and beyond this past season. Those teams include the Crown Point women's team, the Gary West Side men's team, and the Kouts men's team.

First, congratulations to the Lady Bulldogs of the Crown Point High School women's basketball team who won the Indiana High School Athletic Association's 4A State Championship on February 27, 2021. Special recognition also to Coach Chris Seibert who was appropriately named the 2021 Girls Basketball Coach of the Year by our leading local newspapers, the Post-Tribune and the Northwest Indiana Times, and also Jessica Carrothers who was named the Northwest Indiana Times 2021 Girls Basketball Player of the Year. I am inspired by the camaraderie of their team and the demonstration of how their hard-work has truly paid off.

Additionally, congratulations to the Gary West Side High School men's basketball team who won their Regional championship game to advance to Indiana's Class 4A Semi-State on March 20, 2021. The Cougars fought their way for every second, taking the game to overtime where they lost by a mere five points. I applaud Coach Chris Buggs, his coaching staff, and the men who gave it their all to the very end.

And I also congratulate the Kouts High School men's basketball team for winning the Semi-State Championship for the first time in the school's history. The Mustangs competed in the IHSAA Class IA State Tournament on April 3, 2021, and ended their season with an overall record of 29–3. I applaud Coach Kevin Duzan and these young men for their successful season and the legacy they have left.

These truly remarkable teams achieved great success during this very challenging year. For their skill, tremendous hard work, dedication to the game, and for representing our region, these outstanding young athletes deserve to be recognized and congratulated for their incredible seasons.

Madam Speaker, please join me again in congratulating our basketball players on their achievements and for making all of Northwest Indiana and their schools, families, and communities so very proud.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. SWALWELL. Madam Speaker, I missed one vote on Friday, February 26, 2021 and one vote on March 10, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Roll Call Vote Number 46 (Ordering the Previous Question): YES; and Roll Call Vote Number 71 (Motion to Adjourn): NO.

ANABEL MARTINEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Anabel Martinez for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Anabel Martinez is an 11th grader at Northglenn High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Anabel Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Anabel Martinez for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING MICHELLE BREWER FOR HER APPOINTMENT TO THE ONESTAR NATIONAL SERVICE COMMISSION

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Michelle Brewer for her appointment by Governor Abbott to the prestigious OneStar National Service Commission. The Commission actively seeks out opportunities for Texas volunteers and charitable organizations to engage and connect with one another, and accelerates their impact on local communities. Furthermore, OneStar manages and operates the Rebuild Texas Fund, an organization dedicated to assisting Texans who are still feeling the devastating effects of Hurricane Harvey.

Michelle's time and experience with Hardin County Strong as Disaster Recovery Director has more than prepared her for this role. Over her past four years as director, Michelle was fundamental in helping her community recover from Hurricane Harvey, and she was able to use critical connections, resources, and her vast wealth of knowledge to bring desperately needed assistance to Hardin County in an expedited manner.

The most important duty of every public servant is giving back to the community they serve. Madam Speaker, I would like to honor my friend, Michelle Brewer, for her work experience and time in Hardin County that demonstrate she more than exceeds this expectation. I cannot think of an individual better suited for this position.

RECOGNIZING WWII VETERAN LEONARD CROFFORD ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Leonard Crofford, who turns 100 years old today. Born on April 15th, 1921 and raised in Poplar Bluff, Missouri, Leonard met the love of his life, Rosaline (Rosie), when he was 15, and they got married shortly before he joined the Navy two years later. He first served in the U.S. Navy at Wheeler Army Airfield near Pearl Harbor in 1939. Leonard was just 15 miles away when Japan launched its December 7, 1941 attack on the base, throwing him from his bunk due to the aftershock from a bomb blast. Two years later, he joined the U.S. Army, spending most of his service overseas as a mechanic and teaching other soldiers how to repair tanks. In 1945, he was honorably discharged as a Master Sergeant. On October 6, 1945, Leonard married Rosie in Hammond, Indiana; and together they raised five children: Ronnie, Leonard, Diane, Connie, and Sharon. Forty years ago, Leonard and Rosie moved to Thompsonville, Illinois, spending the remainder of their remarkable 75-year marriage together, until Rosie passed away at the age of 97 on February 22, 2020. Leonard has carried on the traditions they shared, like attending Parish Church and gardening. Every

year he tends to a strawberry garden that he shares with family and friends. He is very much loved by his children and grandchildren and supported by the congregation of his church.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring Leonard Crofford of Thompsonville on his milestone 100th birthday. I thank him for his service and wish him a happy birthday.

SYDNEY HUYSER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sydney Huyser for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sydney Huyser is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sydney Huyser is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their I ives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sydney Huyser for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JODEY C. ARRINGTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to be present for one of the votes on March 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 87.

CONGRATULATING THE FAIRMONT HIGH SCHOOL BOYS BOWLING TEAM FROM KETTERING, OHIO ON WINNING THE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the Fairmont High School Boys Bowling Team in Kettering, Ohio, which is in my congressional district, on winning the Division I state championship.

After nine previous appearances in the state tournament, this year's win was a fitting finish to an historic season that saw the Fairmont Firebirds bowling team bring home its first-ever state title. Months of preparation, practice, and experience enabled these talented athletes to out-bowl the competition and roll to victory in the tournament. These young men have set an example for all of us that success in life comes to those who are willing to set goals, and work hard to achieve them.

I congratulate Head Coach Jeremy Fleck and Assistant Coach Matt Mahaffey on their victory in the state championship, and especially the student athletes: Dayton Foster; Dylan Potts; Tyler Milton; Tyler Stegemoller; Colton Mahaffey; and Isaiah Shannon.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the young men on the Fairmont High School Bowling Team on their hard-fought victory. They have made all of us from the Miami Valley proud.

ADELAIDE ROMO SONNEMAN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Adelaide Romo Sonneman for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Adelaide Romo Sonneman received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Adelaide Romo Sonneman is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Adelaide Romo Sonneman for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LAUREN BOEBERT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Speaker, there was a glitch with my voting card. I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 101.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TED BUDD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I was away from the Capitol around dinner time and could not return before the vote closed. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 102.

SYDNEY HARPER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sydney Harper for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sydney Harper is a student at Three Creeks K–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sydney Harper is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sydney Harper for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING MADISON DIAMOND'S POWERLIFTING STATE TITLE

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate Montague Wildcats' powerlifter, Madison Diamond, on her state title in the 145-pound weight class at the State Powerlifting Meet in Ionia, MI.

Competing in high school sports this year has been a challenge with the ongoing pandemic. Nevertheless, Madison triumphed. In addition to her state title, Madison Diamond set the state record in deadlift for her weight class and then beat it two more times. The exclamation mark came with a 355-pound lift, totaling 710 pounds.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating this Montague Wildcat on her powerlifting state title and for being named the pound-for-pound champion across all weight classes.

REMEMBERING CORA CRAWFORD

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor my constituent, Mrs. Cora Crawford and celebrate her incredible life and legacy.

Mrs. Crawford moved to Palm Springs in the 1950s from Carthage, Texas, where she began her lifelong work as a community advocate. She attended the College of the Desert where she obtained her teaching credentials and a masters in education. As a substitute teacher in the City of Palm Springs, Mrs. Crawford was a devoted educator who put her heart and soul into every class she taught.

Mrs. Crawford carried her passion for education and community development with her outside of the classroom. She served as the local director for the Child Development Center and worked hard to secure the resources local students needed to succeed. In fact, she was a key advocate in obtaining $350,000 in federal dollars from the Community Development Block Grant to benefit Desert Highland Park. Thanks to her efforts, Desert Highland Park now offers essential community services for local students and their families, including recreational, educational, and vocational programs.

The legacy of Mrs. Crawford's work is incredible. In the 1980s, she helped organize the very first Black History Month Parade in Palm Springs—a parade our community continues to proudly host each year. In all her years of volunteering and service, her tremendous work did not go unnoticed. The Palm Springs City Council and the California Baptist Convention Women's Auxiliary awarded her numerous conunendations. In 1997, she was honored with the Terra Volunteer Award from the Palm Springs Chamber of Commerce. In 2012, she was recognized yet again for her commitment as a community leader and educator when Riverside County awarded her the Community Service Award.

Mrs. Crawford is survived by her children, Benita, Gil, Gwendolyn, and Randy. She is also survived by her nine grandchildren, Symeyon, Kenneth, Jarvis, Kristen, Usavia, Nyssa, Kyle, Deiter, and Javanni. I extend my deepest condolence to each of them. I also want to share my special condolences and support for my friend and her grandson, Jarvis. He, like his grandmother, continues to advocate for his community through social justice initiatives and uphold her legacy of making sure those who are in need, can find solace in community.

May Mrs. Crawford's work continue to uplift and inspire.

TAYLER PAINE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Tayler Paine for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Tayler Paine is a student at Arvada West H.S. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Tayler Paine is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Tayler Paine for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION AND HONOR OF THE LIFE OF ELANA THOMAS

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of a special member of my community, Ms. Elana Thomas, who went to be with her Savior on March 1, 2021.

Elana was born May 7, 1948, in the small rural community of Sneads, Florida. Surrounded by pine forests and agricultural land, Sneads and greater Jackson County are home to hard-working men and women, many of great faith and fortitude. Elana was no exception.

Her life was not marked by monetary wealth or great business achievements, but her impact within her community was vast. She was not an elected official, but she was a leader to those who knew her. She was a trusted counselor and friend to many, a sounding board, and a valued advisor. She will be sorely missed, but those who knew her in life are assured she is in a much better place. Her faith in God was the bedrock she built her life upon.

Elana was a devoted church member of St. Peter Missionary Baptist Church for more than 30 years, often serving as a lay speaker or leading songs during services. She taught teens during Sunday School and was the president of the church's ushers' ministry. She had a comprehensive knowledge of the Bible, which she read and studied every day. She would often quote scripture to folks in crisis, providing them with relatable passages that might help them get through the period of turmoil they were experiencing. She counseled those in distress, providing loving and kind advice and direction to those who sought it from her.

She ministered with members of her church to inmates at nearby Apalachee Correctional Institution, volunteering her time and treasure to help men who had strayed from the path regain their footing for an eventual successful restoration back to their communities. She performed local missionary work, helping those less fortunate with a helping hand, a kind word, and a shoulder to lean upon.

When her mother fell ill, she diligently visited her every day she was able, in the assisted living facility, even after her own health made it difficult to do so. When her mother passed away, it was Elana who gave the eulogy, speaking eloquently and from the heart about her mother to the assembled family and friends who came to mourn her passing. Elana never let her health issues deter her from the service she was called to do.

Madam Speaker, allow me this moment to express condolences to Elana's family, friends, and colleagues. Though her presence will be sorely missed by many, I pray we may find solace in remembering her legacy for years to come. On March 13, 2021, family and friends traveled from far and near to celebrate her life and her church family was in attendance in great numbers. In the words of Bishop Adrian Abner of St. Peter Missionary Baptist Church, ''Elana lived a life of devotion to those less fortunate. She was a woman of great faith and prayer and a treasured member of this church and our community. She touched many with her kindness in word and deed.'' She leaves treasured memories with one son, Eddie D. Lovett, II and wife Susan of Raleigh, North Carolina; one brother, Jimmy Walker of Oxon Hill, Maryland; two grandchildren; and a host of relatives and friends. I join the entire community in honoring Elana Thomas for her dedicated life of service to others.

TRIBUTE TO THE OHIO NATIONAL GUARD

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio to express sincere gratitude to the dedicated men and women of the Ohio National Guard for their exemplary commitment to service and to our great State.

Since the creation of the force in 1788, these extraordinary individuals have prioritized the health and safety of communities from Wilmington to McConnelsville, from Hilliard to McArthur. But in the past year, the citizen-soldiers of the Buckeye State have truly embraced their role as a ''trusted team of soldiers, airmen, and civilians,'' serving through ''agility, collaboration, excellence, and leadership.''

Through a once-in-a-generation pandemic, the Ohio National Guard provided invaluable support. From manning food banks and managing COVID–19 testing locations at the onset of the pandemic, to now administering vaccines to their fellow Ohioans, our State is incredibly grateful for their service.

As the coronavirus raged, our nation saw a period of social unrest unlike anything in recent decades. Once again, the Ohio National Guard answered the call. Whether it was the Statehouse in Columbus, or the Capitol in Washington, our soldiers were willing to put their own safety in jeopardy in order to ensure the wellbeing of their fellow citizens.

Perhaps at no point in recent history has more been asked of our National Guard, and at no point have they answered with more conviction. They worked diligently day-in and day-out, never failing to embody the motto, ''Always Ready. Always There.''

As a Major General, and as a Member of Congress, I am filled with pride and gratitude of these men and women and of the sacrifices that they have made. It is an honor to recognize their hard work, and I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in expressing thanks for all that they have done, and all that they will do, for Ohio and our nation.

VINCENT VIGIL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Vincent Vigil for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Vincent Vigil is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because his

determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Vincent Vigil is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Vincent Vigil for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, due to the COVID–19 pandemic, I was absent on April 13, 2021. I designated Mr. GOSAR as my proxy. Mr. GOSAR attempted to proxy vote for me, but was advised by floor staff that he was not the proxy. Because of this misunderstanding, Mr. GOSAR did not proxy vote on my behalf. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 98.

CELEBRATION OF THE LIFE OF JOHN YOUNG

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the life of John Young, a remarkable community leader and activist who spent more than 30 years uplifting underserved communities in the North Bay Area.

John was born on October 25, 1952 in San Francisco, CA. He grew up in Marin City and attended Tamalpais High School and College of Marin. John went on to study public policy at San Francisco State University, where he developed a passion for social justice.

Recognizing the need to confront economic, health, and education inequities, John committed his career to championing more inclusive social policies. At the Marin City Community Development Corporation, John went to bat for the community that raised him, helping to plan and launch critical revitalization projects. The Canal Neighborhood in San Rafael benefitted from John's talents as an organizer and housing specialist for the Canal Community Alliance. John also successfully managed more than $5 million in grants for programs supporting low economic and disadvantaged populations across the Bay Area.

John was a skilled problem solver who was able to effect change by bringing people together. In founding the Marin County Grassroots Leadership Network, he assembled a coalition for underrepresented residents to unite and speak with one voice. This helped secure more equitable policy outcomes, including housing, transportation, labor, and voting rights. In addition, more than 300 rising leaders were mentored and trained through the organization.

Friends, family, and colleagues knew John for his big personality that could brighten any room. With a deep sense of compassion and a people-first attitude, John embodied all the qualities of a fierce community organizer. Although he will be sorely missed, John's legacy will live on through the lasting positive impact he had on our community and beyond.

John's hard work made a transformative difference in the lives of many. Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that you join me in extending condolence to John's family and friends and in expressing our deep appreciation for John's extraordinary career and life.

IN RECOGNITON OF THE ANNISTON HIGH SCHOOL BOYS VARSITY BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Anniston High School Boys Varsity Basketball Team on their recent 4A state title.

The Anniston team beat Booker T. Washington-Tuskegee 54–52 in Birmingham at CrossPlex's Bill Harris Arena, clenching the state title.

This marks the school's first state title since 2009.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the Anniston High School Boys Basketball Team. Congratulations to Coach Torry Brown and the Anniston High School staff and students. Go Bulldogs.

INSULAR AREA MEDICAID PARITY ACT

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Northern Mariana Islands Wage and Economic Stability Act. This legislation delays for 18 months, in the Marianas only, any national increase in the federal minimum wage that Congress may enact. My bill, also, requires a Government Accountability Office report on the economic impact in the Marianas of such a national wage increase.

Unlike the rest of our nation, where minimum wage has been static, the minimum wage in the Marianas has more than doubled over recent years to reach the federal level of $7.25.

These substantial increases have made life better for thousands of Marianas families and encouraged more U.S. workers to enter the workforce.

But I had to carefully time those increases year-by-year with legislation and based on the help of Government Accountability Office reports to ensure—successfully—that wages went up without jeopardizing jobs.

Economic conditions in the Marianas remain separate from the national situation. Whereas Gross Domestic Product rose nationally in 2019, in the Marianas GDP plunged 11.2 percent that year. That decline came after a 19.3 percent decrease in 2018. And it is reasonable to expect the picture in the Marianas for 2020 will be no better. Our tourism-based economy will remain dormant until the pandemic has passed. Meanwhile, nationally, we expect growth on the order of 6 percent this year.

My point is simply this: If we are going to raise the wage in the Marianas—and, believe me, I do—then we must do it as we did before: with a close eye on the economic conditions in the islands. They are vastly different than conditions in the nation as a whole.

Again, I fully support raising the minimum wage in our country. It has been static too long. I am a cosponsor of the Raise the Wage Act—I want workers to earn more.

I believe the best way to accomplish that goal in the insular area I represent, however, is through my legislation, the Northern Mariana Islands Wage and Economic Stability Act. My bill will give Congress the analytical tools and the time to consider how best to schedule wage increases in the Marianas to improve the lives of workers and their families, while ensuring the businesses employing those workers can thrive.

TREY BELLAMY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Trey Bellamy for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Trey Bellamy is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Trey Bellamy is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Trey Bellamy for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

JOHN LEWIS NIMHD RESEARCH ENDOWMENT REVITALIZATION ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 189, the John Lewis NIMHD Research Endowment Revitalization Act of 2021, which expands eligibility for research endowments available through the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD) to include former centers of excellence at health professional schools and biomedical and behavioral research institutions

that meet criteria related to the inclusion of underrepresented minority individuals in programs and activities.

NIMHD leads scientific research to improve minority health and eliminate health disparities by researching and evaluating all minority health and health disparities research at NIH.

The NIMHD's Centers of Excellence (COE)'s program fosters collaborative research in minority health and health disparities, and awards grants to institutions that have a specific unifying focus on addressing minority health and health disparities.

NIMHD Centers of Excellence program grants are awarded in order to:

Support innovative multi- and trans-disciplinary research to promote minority health and reduce health disparities;

Strengthen exemplary research training and education activities support the development of well-trained researchers from minority and health disparity populations;

Increase the number of individuals from minority and other health disparity populations participating in research activities; and

Provide support for engaging minority and other health disparity communities in effective and sustainable activities aimed at improving the health of their communities.

Racial health inequalities in the U.S. is the cumulative result of both past and present discrimination throughout U.S. culture, and the NIMHD centers of racial excellence program grants are essential to addressing these inequalities.

African Americans are not only more susceptible to disease and illness, they are also more likely to die from them.

This past year, as COVID–19 has ravaged African Americans and communities of color, we have seen firsthand the fruits of these inequalities.

According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), African Americans face increased risks if they are stricken with COVID–19, including asthma, diabetes, high blood pressure, heart disease and pulmonary illness.

African American lives are placed at greater risk because of a health care system that denies access to the poor and work conditions that have long neglected conditions that leave them with a higher incidence of diseases that for far too long have gone under diagnosed and untreated.

There are many reasons for this but they include the refusal of several states to expand Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act; the resistance of small business employers to provide health care to workers until required by their state government to do so, and too little access to medical doctors who are trained to provide care to this COVID–19 at-risk population.

Since 2003, I have been working on major legislation to address the problem with several of my colleagues including Representatives Elijah E. Cummings, Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), Delegate Donna Christensen, Chair of the CBC Health Braintrust, U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy, and the leadership of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and the Native American Caucus.

Together we produced, the ''Healthcare Equality and Accountability Act of 2003,'' a truly comprehensive bill designed to address the disparities that face our communities.

During my time in office, I have fully and eagerly supported all legislation that has given increased attention to HIV/AIDS, including the Ryan White CARE Act, which is currently slated to receive about $2.2 billion in funding for FY2007.

I have supported legislation to reauthorize funding for community health centers (H.R. 5573, Health Centers Renewal Act of 2006), including the Montrose and Fourth Ward clinics in my home city of Houston, as well as supported legislation to provide more nurses for the poor urban communities in which many of these centers are located (H.R. 1285, Nursing Relief Act for Disadvantaged Areas).

I have also supported and introduced legislation aimed to better educate our children (H.R. 2553, Responsible Education About Life Act in 2006) and eliminate health disparities (H.R. 3561, Healthcare Equality and Accountability Act and the Good Medicine Cultural Competency Act in 2003, H.R. 90).

Mr. Speaker, we need strong collaborations and research based upon asking the right questions in specific areas, and the COEs are poised to emphasize scientific inquiry that will promote health equity.

Government has an obligation to seek the best for our nation's people, especially our nation's children.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 189, the John Lewis NIMHD Research Endowment Revitalization Act of 2021, because improved public health benefits all Americans, no matter who they are or where they are from.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GUY RESCHENTHALER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I was detained during the vote series on April 14, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. S. 578.

PROTECTING INDIAN TRIBES FROM SCAMS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1762, the ''Protecting Indian Tribes from Scams Act,'' which requires the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), after consultation with Indian tribes, to report on unfair or deceptive practices that target tribes or tribal members.

The FTC must submit the report to Congress and make it publicly available.

The FTC is directed to update its website to include information for consumers and businesses on identifying and avoiding unfair or deceptive practices that target tribes or tribal members.

Scammers are targeting Native people.

Scammers may say extra money is waiting for a small price upfront or that a testing kit or treatment for the coronavirus is available for a fee.

Other scams attempt to benefit from the $1,200 Economic Impact Payment coming to most U.S. citizens; and more are expected to target stimulus checks authorized under the America Rescue Plan.

At least one tribal leader has warned tribal citizens of an email scam related to the coronavirus.

In an April 14 Facebook post, Ojibwe Chief Executive Melanie Benjamin wrote that an email purporting to be her had tribal citizens to purchase gift cards to help a citizen who tested positive for the coronavirus.

Benjamin asks those that may have received the scam email from a Gmail account to contact tribal police.

This bill will help protect our diverse Native American communities from scammers by providing valuable information that will help identify fraudsters and arm people with tools to protect themselves.

Our friends in the Native American communities across the nation have faced tremendous challenges during COVID–19 and they need our help to keep their nation's physically and financial safe during COVID.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

HOUSE RESOURCES REPUBLICAN FORUM

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 2021

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, it is a unique responsibility to be the sole Congressman for Alaska in the House of Representatives.

It's easy for legislators to forget that life is different in Alaska, and it is my highest priority to ensure that Alaskans are not overlooked here in Washington, D.C.

One of the principal lessons I have learned in my years of service are the check and balances between the three branches of government inscribed by our Founding Fathers in our Constitution.

While the President of the United States governs the Executive Branch, Congress writes our laws and that's something we too often forget here.

Article I of the Constitution states: ''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

That said the President can only enforce legislation that Congress has drafted and approved.

The real power of this country lies within this Capitol building and we need to act like it.

For over 48 years I have worked tirelessly to address the crucial infrastructure and energy needs throughout Alaska.

Before being elected to public office, I saw firsthand Alaska's lack of traditional infrastructure while I was a tug and barge operator along the Yukon River.

But I could also see the potential economic development that communities and rural villages could achieve if they were given the resources to put ideas into action.

It is that driving knowledge that guides me as I work to support federal investment in Alaska's energy infrastructure.

Unfortunately, the Biden Administration is continuing Obama-era attacks against Alaska.

By reviewing federal rules that support Alaska and by placing a moratorium on energy development in ANWR, President Biden seems intent to surrender to his party's environmental extremists.

I want the President to know this: Alaskans have shown for decades that energy development and environmental protection can go hand in hand.

The executive actions he has taken in his first days in office serve only to hinder our state's economy, stifle energy independence, and prevent the Alaska Native community of Kaktovik from responsibly using their lands.

Tomorrow I will be proudly introducing Alaska's own Mathew Rexford, at the House Natural Resources Republican Forum titled, ''Where are the Jobs?''

Mr. Rexford is the President of the Kaktovik Inupiat Corporation and a strong leader.

The Alaska community of Kaktovik has long advocated for access to their lands and the opening of ANWR.

Development in the 1002 Area of ANWR would create countless jobs, revenue streams, provide for infrastructure and improve the health and economic well-being of the indigenous people.

While the United States should continue working to reduce emissions, doing so in a way that denies the opportunity for incremental improvements and technological innovations over time is unreasonable.

Resource development in ANWR would be a major win for out nations energy independence and security for decades to come.

I'm proud to stand with my friend Mathew Rexford to ensure that Kaktovik is heard on this issue.

I hope that the administration will listen and engage with native leaders like Mathew Rexford and I look forward to our forum tomorrow.

PROTECTING SENIORS FROM EMERGENCY SCAMS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 446, the ''Protecting Seniors from Emergency Scams Act,'' which requires the Federal Trade Commission to report on, and increase awareness regarding, scams targeting older adults.

The FTC must: report on the number and type of scams that target older adults and provide policy recommendations to prevent such scams; revise the commission's web portal with current information about such scams, including contact information for law enforcement and protective services agencies; and coordinate with media outlets and law enforcement to disseminate such information.

Our seniors should not be victims of scams during coronavirus pandemic.

This bipartisan legislation will help protect seniors from fraud during this public health crisis and prevent emergency-related scams in the future.

Every year scam artists target senior citizens resulting in financial losses between $2 billion and $12 billion, and now during the COVID–19 pandemic, these scammers are using fear and uncertainty to take advantage of our vulnerable populations.

Our seniors have borne the brunt of this pandemic in high infection rates and deaths.

Now many seniors are being targeted by scammers who prey on their COVID–19 fears.

We must pass this bill and work to educate our seniors and those who care for them to look out for scams.

There is a moral obligation to stop these con artists by empowering seniors with facts and information while aggressively targeting criminals with all the resources available through the Federal Trade Commission.

Throughout the pandemic, uncertainty has led to many Houstonians falling victim to scam callers especially vulnerable populations like seniors.

Houston police and the Harris County District Attorney have made an arrest in an international cyber-scam that bilked unsuspecting, mostly elderly victims out of more than $1 million.

One victim of the scam, Asuncion Peppers, 74, a retired medical technician knows that first hand; She was bilked out of her life savings.

Hackers contacted Ms. Peppers on Facebook, pretending to be one of her Facebook friends.

She was told she was eligible for a government grant of almost one million dollars and all she had to do was send a check to pay taxes.

Investigators believes the scammers were operating from Nigeria, defrauding senior citizens in the U.S. and around the world.

Before Peppers realized she was being conned, she sent checks totaling $87,000 hard-earned money.

She said that she worked three jobs to build her life savings.

In her case the person who received the funds was 65-year-old Joe Reyes, who washed the funds through several local banks.

Reyes was receiving funds from scams and then converting them into Bitcoin to send back to the scammers.

Peppers and her husband are just two of 38 victims bilked out of more than $1.3 million before the fraud was discovered.

Reyes is now charged with money laundering and other charges that could send him to prison for years.

Our seniors need our help to be physically and financial safe during COVID.

The Protecting Seniors from Emergency Scams Act is endorsed by the Elder Justice Coalition; American Society on Aging; and the National Adult Protective Services Association.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

NICHOLAS AND ZACHARY BURT MEMORIAL CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING PREVENTION ACT 0F 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1460, the ''Nicholas and Zachary Burt Memorial Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act of 2021'', named after two young Minnesotan brothers who died of carbon monoxide poisoning, which directs the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) to award grants to states and tribal organizations to install carbon monoxide alarms in the homes of lowincome families and older adults and facilities that commonly serve children or older adults.

The Nicholas and Zachary Burt Memorial Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act would also authorize the CPSC to establish a federal grant program to fund education and installation of CO detectors by state, local and tribal governments.

With better, commonsense safeguards in place, we can address the danger of accidental death by carbon monoxide poisoning, which represents a real danger for individuals and families.

According to the Center for Disease Control, at least 430 people in the U.S. die each year from carbon monoxide poisoning and approximately 50,000 people are forced to seek medical attention for accidental CO poisoning.

Carbon monoxide poisoning is an unimaginable way to die—it prevents blood from being able to buy into oxygen; causing suffocation while still being able to breathe.

Mr. Speaker, the devastating and unprecedented winter storm in Texas finally gave this important issue the national attention it deserves; but it came at the cost of the lives and health of Texans.

The plunging temperatures and persistent power outages this past / February found residents in my district searching for warmth increasingly from dangerous sources.

In one dark week in February, fire departments in Harris County alone responded to over 475 carbon monoxide calls.

During this week, like millions of Texans, Etenesh Mersha lost power during the storm.

In order to provide warmth for herself, her husband, and their two children, she turned on her car in an attached garage, leading to carbon monoxide poisoning for herself and her family.

Etenesh left the car running, and by the time help arrived, she and her daughter, Rakeb, died; Her husband and 8-year-old son were rushed to the hospital and survived.

A mother and daughter died while trying to stay warm because regulators in Texas had decided to forgo federal and state regulation.

At least 300 other cases of carbon monoxide poisoning, were reported in Harris County, making it a disaster within a disaster.

Although carbon monoxide is not visible, there are concrete ways we can protect against this unseen threat, including for those who are most vulnerable, like children and the elderly.

This legislation bolsters states' efforts to reduce the risk of carbon monoxide poisoning and help prevent these tragedies in Texas and across the nation.

Mr. Speaker, the CPSC must take action to better educate and inform families about the risks associated with improper methods to heat and power homes and work with the media to share this critical information.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1460, the Nicholas and Zachary Burt Memorial Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act of 2021, because the tragic deaths in Texas has shown that this danger must be addressed.

MICROLOAN IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1502—the ''Microloan Improvement Act of 2021,'' revises the microloan program managed by the Small Business Administration (SBA) to provide certain financial assistance to small businesses through designated intermediaries.

Specifically, the bill authorizes an intermediary to offer a line of credit to a small business, and it increases the average amount for loans from an intermediary to participating small businesses that makes the intermediary eligible for a reduced interest rate on SBA loans.

The bill also places limits on the repayment term for a microloan, and it prohibits the SBA from imposing any additional limitation on the term for repayment of a microloan.

Further, the SBA must:

reserve 15 percent of new loan funds that are made available for disbursement as microloans to designated underutilized states and make the remaining 85 percent available for any state;

establish a process for an intermediary to provide the major credit reporting agencies with information about a borrower that is relevant to credit reporting, and

include information regarding equitable distribution of loan funds in its annual report.

The SBA Microloan program approves up to $50,000 to small businesses to provide businesses with working capital, or to purchase inventory, supplies, and equipment.

Loans for $50,000 may not seem like a lot to a small business, but the micro small businesses that fill our neighborhoods would benefit from having access to these funds.

A micro enterprise employs nine people or fewer, and this is the most common kind of private-sector business in the United States.

Small business statistics show that while this might be the most common kind of enterprise, its share of employees is very small, providing only 10.5 percent of all private-sector jobs.

The fortunes of micro businesses during COVID–19 has been fraught with risks.

We know that:

82 percent of businesses that fail do so because of cash flow problems;

Small businesses employ 59 million people in the U.S.A;

50 percent of all small businesses are operated from home;

84 percent of small business owners indicate that they're feeling optimistic about the future of their companies;

64 percent of small business owners begin with only $10,000 in capital;

Approximately a quarter of small businesses begin with no financing whatsoever;

Only 40 percent of small businesses are profitable; and

Only 64 percent of small businesses have their own website.

Thousands of minority-owned small businesses were shown to be at the end of the line in applying to the government's Paycheck Protection Program (PPP).

According to an Associated Press analysis of the low-interest government loans, minority owners struggled more than white owners to find banks that would accept their applications; or otherwise were disadvantaged by the terms of the program.

Data from the Paycheck Protection Program released December 1 and analyzed by the Associated Press show that many minority owners desperate for a relief loan did not receive one until the PPP's last few weeks, while many more white business owners were able to get loans earlier in the program.

The program, which began April 3 and ended August 8 and handed out 5.2 million loans worth $525 billion, helped many businesses stay on their feet during a period when government measures to control the coronavirus forced many to shut down or operate at a diminished capacity.

The PPP program struggled to meet its promise of aiding communities that historically have not gotten the help they needed.

The PPP program was especially difficult to access for micro businesses.

A micro business employs nine people or fewer, and this is the most common kind of private-sector business in the U.S. Small business statistics show that while this might be the most common kind of enterprise, its share of employees is very small, providing only 10.5 percent of all private-sector jobs.

As the economy continues to recover, we should not forget that not all businesses will recover at the same rate, just as all workers are not heading back into the workforce with the same opportunities to find or resume employment.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill that will provide much needed financial support to our mom and pop businesses.

FRAUD AND SCAM REDUCTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1215, the Fraud and Scam Reduction Act, which will create the Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Group and the Senior Fraud Advisory Office to improve the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) prevention and response efforts against senior fraud and scams through enhanced coordination with key industries, consumer advocacy groups, appropriate law enforcement agencies, and consumers.

Every day, and far too often, vulnerable seniors in Texas and across the country fall victim to financial scammers.

Seniors have worked their entire lives with the promise of a safe and secure retirement, but unfortunately criminals are taking advantage of uncertainty surrounding the pandemic and working overtime to target them.

Retirement accounts are not the only damage these scams harm—they damage the independence and trust of a vulnerable community.

During the COVID–19 pandemic, we have seen instances of fraud rise in unprecedented numbers, as scammers attempt to take advantage of senior citizens and deprive them of their hard-earned savings.

Bad actors preying on older Americans is, unfortunately, nothing new. But in the midst of a global pandemic impacting Americans' lives and livelihoods, cracking down on those scams must be a priority.

One such scam was thwarted by Houston police and the Harris County District Attorney, who made an arrest in February in an international cyber-scam that bilked unsuspecting, mostly elderly victims out of more than $1 million.

This bill is aimed at cracking down on these scams by bringing public and private stakeholders together, so that we might give our seniors the resources they need to tackle these predatory schemes.

Although 1 in 20 seniors in the U.S. is a target of fraud schemes, the National Adult Protective Services Association has found that only 1 in 44 seniors report that they are victims of a fraud scheme.

The Senior Fraud Advisory Office will address these low reportingrates by directing the FTC to educate seniors, families, and caregivers of the process for contacting law enforcement after being targeted in a fraud scheme.

It will also direct the FTC to help improve the nation's fraud response efforts by reforming FTC's complaint system as well as enhancing fraud surveillance through better coordination with law enforcement agencies.

The Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Group will bring together relevant government agencies, consumer advocates, and industry representatives to collect and develop model educational materials for retailers, financial institutions, and wire transfer companies to use in preventing scams on seniors.

The FTC will coordinate efforts to educate the public and even the employees of key industries who often find themselves on the front lines of anti-scamming activities, helping prevent fraud before it happens.

Mr. Speaker, we need to strengthen federal prevention efforts and ensure leaders in the public and private sectors are collaborating on effective safeguards.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1215, the Fraud and Scam Reduction Act, which is critical to protecting seniors' hard-earned savings and stopping fraudulent schemes before it's too late.

504 MODERNIZATION AND SMALL MANUFACTURER ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 2021

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1490, the ''504 Modernization and Small Manufacturer Enhancement Act,'' which modifies the Small Business Administration (SBA) 504 Loan Program an opportunity to modernize and expand.

The SBA 504 Loan Program allows small businesses to access SBA financing through a certified development company (CDC) for expansion or modernization.

Specifically, the bill adds policy goals, at least one of which a CDC must demonstrate to be eligible for assistance.

These include: enhancing the ability of a small business to reduce costs by using energy efficient products and generating renewable energy, and aiding the revitalization of any area for which a disaster has been declared or determined. The bill also authorizes a CDC to take specified actions to facilitate the closing of a 504 loan, such as correcting borrower or lender information on loan documents or reallocating up to 10 percent of the cost of a project.

The birth of modern manufacturing can be traced to the early 1780s, when American inventor Oliver Evans began experimenting with the first automated flour mill.

He developed the concept of continuous process milling, which relied on five so-called bulk material handling devices.

His machines and processes soon caught on across the country because they reduced manpower by 25 percent while increasing output—the era of automation had begun.

Today, small manufacturers are making new products that provide the best opportunities to ignite startups or help existing manufactures find new markets.

This bill increases the maximum loan amount from $5.5 million to $6.5 million, reduces the amount that they must contribute to project costs, increases job retention requirements, and revises collateral requirements and debt refinancing considerations.

Further, each SBA district office must partner with a resource partner to provide certain training for small manufacturers.

One of President Biden's first acts after becoming President was to sign an Executive Order to support manufacturers, businesses, and workers to ensure that our future is made in all of America by all of America's workers.

President Biden's Executive Order ensures that when the federal government spends taxpayer dollars, they are spent on American made goods by American workers and with American-made component parts.

This Executive Order fulfills President Biden's promise to make Buy American real and close loopholes that allow companies to offshore production and jobs while still qualifying for domestic preferences.

This bill is making it possible for President Biden's executive action to be fulfilled.

We need to support small manufacturers to produce what we need right here in the United States.

The COVID–19 pandemic was a lesson we should not forget, when the nation did not have enough personal protective equipment in the form of masks, gloves or face shields to protect health care workers or citizens from COVID–19.

It was essential that our nation never again be so ill prepared to weather a crisis like COVID–19.

Manufacturing creates good jobs for low and highly skilled workers across the nation.

In 2018, manufacturers in the United States accounted for 11.39 percent of the total output in the economy, employing 8.51 percent of the workforce.

Total output from manufacturing was $2,334.60 billion in 2018.

In addition, there were an average of 12.8 million manufacturing employees in the United States in 2018, with an average annual compensation of $84,832.13 in 2017.

We can make sure that Made in America means made in the thousands of towns and communities across the nation where people live, and work today.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1951–S1999

Measures Introduced: Sixty-nine bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1131–1199, S.J. Res. 17, and S. Res. 157–163.

Pages S1980–82

Measures Passed:

Hiring of Robert Montgomery "Bobby" Knight Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 157, honoring the 50th anniversary of hiring Robert Montgomery "Bobby" Knight as the Head Coach of the men's basketball team at Indiana University. **Pages S1975–76**

Partnership between the United States and the Republic of Ecuador: Senate agreed to S. Res. 22, reaffirming the partnership between the United States and the Republic of Ecuador and recognizing the restoration and advancement of economic relations, security, and development opportunities in both nations. **Page S1994**

Partnership between the United States and Mongolia: Senate agreed to S. Res. 36, reaffirming the strategic partnership between the United States and Mongolia and recognizing the 30th anniversary of democracy in Mongolia, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Pages S1995–96

San Isidro Movement in Cuba: Senate agreed to S. Res. 37, expressing solidarity with the San Isidro Movement in Cuba, condemning escalated attacks against artistic freedoms in Cuba, and calling for the repeal of laws that violate freedom of expression and the immediate release of arbitrarily detained artists, journalists, and activists, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Pages S1996–98

National Park Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 159, designating the week of April 17, 2021, through April 25, 2021, as "National Park Week". **Page S1998**

Commending and congratulating the Stanford University Cardinal women's basketball team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 160, commending and congratulating the Stanford University Cardinal women's basketball team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I women's basketball championship. **Page S1998**

Commending and congratulating the Baylor University Men's Basketball Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 161, commending and congratulating the Baylor University Men's Basketball Team on winning the 2021 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's basketball championship.

Page S1998

National Assistive Technology Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 162, designating April 14, 2021, as "National Assistive Technology Awareness Day". **Page S1998**

Death of former Senator William "Bill" Emerson Brock III: Senate agreed to S. Res. 163, relating to the death of the Honorable William "Bill" Emerson Brock III, former United States Senator for the State of Tennessee. **Page S1998**

Measures Considered:

COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act: Senate began consideration of S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID–19 hate crimes, after agreeing to the motion to proceed. **Pages S1953–56**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the bill at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, April 19, 2021. **Page S1998**

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101–595, and further amended by Public Law 113–281, and upon the recommendation of the Ranking Member of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, re-appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Senators Wicker and Sullivan. **Page S1998**

National Council on Disability: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 93–112, as amended

by Public Law 112–166, and further amended by Public Law 113–128, reappointed the following individual to serve as a member of the National Council on Disability: Andres J. Gallegos of Illinois.

Page S1998

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order that declares a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–7) **Page S1979**

Gupta Nomination: By 49 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 152), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination Vanita Gupta, of Virginia, to be Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice. **Page S1956**

By 49 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. EX. 153), Senate agreed to the motion to discharge the nomination, from the Committee on the Judiciary. Subsequently, the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 27, relative to Senate procedure in the 117th Congress.

Pages S1957–75, S1976–77

Monaco Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General. **Page S1977**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, April 15, 2021, a vote on cloture will occur at approximately 5:30 p.m., on Monday, April 19, 2021. **Page S1977**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1977**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1977**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senate resume consideration of the nomination at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, April 19, 2021; and Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination; that if cloture is invoked, all post-cloture time be considered expired, and the vote on confirmation of the nomination occur at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader in consultation with the Republican Leader on Tuesday, April 20, 2021. **Page S1998**

Gensler Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Gary Gensler, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. **Page S1977**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Page S1977

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1977**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1977**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Susanna V. Blume, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

Christine Elizabeth Wormuth, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army.

Meera Joshi, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

Tommy P. Beaudreau, of Alaska, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Jonathan Davidson, of Maryland, to be Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Lily Lawrence Batchelder, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Robert Luis Santos, of Texas, to be Director of the Census for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2021.

Robert Luis Santos, of Texas, to be Director of the Census for a term expiring December 31, 2026.

Christine Abizaid, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Ur Mendoza Jaddou, of California, to be Director of the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security.

Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Attorney General.

2 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral. **Pages S1998–99**

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination were discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Vanita Gupta, of Virginia, to be Associate Attorney General, which was sent to the Senate on January 20, 2021, from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. **Page S1999**

Messages from the House: **Page S1979**

Measures Referred: **Page S1979**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S1979**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S1979–80**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1982–84**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1984–93**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1976–79**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1993–94**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1994**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1994**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—153) **Pages S1957, S1977**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:42 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, April 19, 2021. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1998.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FUTURE CYBERSECURITY ARCHITECTURES

Committee on Armed Services: On Wednesday, April 14, 2021, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity concluded a hearing to examine future cybersecurity architectures, after receiving testimony from David McKeown, Senior Information Security Officer/Chief Information Officer for Cybersecurity, Department of Defense, and Rear Admiral William E. Chase III, USN, Senior Military Advisor for Cyber Policy to the Under Secretary for Policy/Deputy Principal Cyber Advisor to the Secretary, both of the Department of Defense; and Robert E. Joyce, Director of Cybersecurity, National Security Agency.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported one nomination in the Navy.

FAST ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine public transportation infrastructure investment and FAST Act Reauthorization, including S. 940, to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a National Transit Frontline Workforce Training Center, and S. 267, to increase the Federal share of operating costs for certain projects that receive grants under the Formula Grants to Rural Areas Program of the Federal Transit Administration, after receiving testimony from Darryl Haley, Southwest Ohio Regional Transportation Authority, Cincinnati; John Samuelsen, Transportation Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, Beth Osborne, Transportation for America, and David Ditch, The Heritage Foundation, all of Washington, D.C.; and Baruch Feigenbaum, Reason Foundation, Los Angeles, California.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the cost of inaction on climate change, after receiving testimony from Robert B. Litterman, Chair, Climate-Related Market Risk Subcommittee, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; David Wallace-Wells, *New York*, and Joseph E. Stiglitz, Columbia University, both of New York, New York; George Oliver, Johnson Controls, Glendale, Wisconsin; and Richard J. Powell, ClearPath Inc., Washington, D.C.

COMMUNICATING TRUSTED VACCINE INFORMATION

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Communication, Media, and Broadband concluded a hearing to examine communicating trusted vaccine information, after receiving testimony from former Senator Gordon H. Smith, National Association of Broadcasters, Washington, D.C.; Tracie Collins, New Mexico Department of Health Secretary, Santa Fe; and Yonaira M. Rivera, Rutgers University School of Communication and Information, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

AMERICAN ENERGY INNOVATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the leading role of the Department of Energy in American energy innovation and how its research, development, demonstration, and deployment programs may be enhanced to further boost the economic competitiveness of the United States, after receiving testimony from Thomas Mason, Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Department of Energy; Paul M. Dabbar, Bohr Quantum Technologies, Scarsdale, New York; Sarah Ladislaw, RMI, U.S. Program, Washington, D.C.; and Lara M. Pierpoint, Actuate, Oakland, California.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Andrea Joan Palm, of Wisconsin, to be Deputy Secretary, who was introduced by Senator Baldwin, and Chiquita Brooks-

LaSure, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Service, who was introduced by Senator Menendez, both of the Department of Health and Human Services, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Victoria Nuland, of Virginia, to be an Under Secretary (Political Affairs), and Uzra Zeya, of Virginia, to be an Under Secretary (Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights), who was introduced by Senator Kaine, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of James Richard Kvaal, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of Education, after the nominee, who was introduced by former Representative George Miller, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Bureau of Prisons, after receiving testimony from Michael D. Carvajal, Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 63 public bills, H.R. 2547–2609; and 2 resolutions, H.J. Res. 40; and H. Res. 320, were introduced.

Pages H1840–43

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1844–45**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

Committee on Oversight and Reform. Authorization and Oversight Plans for all House Committees (H. Rept. 117–17). **Page H1840**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Craig to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1795**

Paycheck Fairness Act: The House passed H.R. 7, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, by a yea-and-nay vote of 217 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 108. **Pages H1799–H1829**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–15, shall be considered as adopted.

Page H1799

Agreed to:

Scott (VA) en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–15: Beyer (No. 1) that requires the EEOC to provide for an annual collection of compensation data from employers disaggregated by the sex, race, and national origin of employees; Newman (No. 2) that requires employers to inform employees of their rights established under this act through currently required workplace posters and electronically; Ocasio-Cortez (No. 3) that directs the Secretary of Labor to establish a program to award contracts and grants for the purpose of training employers about the role that salary negotiation and other inconsistent wage setting practices can have on allowing bias to enter compensation; Torres (NY) (No. 5) that requires a review on the gender wage gap in the teenage workforce; and Williams (No. 6) that reestablishes the National Equal Pay Enforcement Task Force, a federal interagency task force focused on improving compliance, public education, and enforcement of equal pay laws (by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 106).

Pages H1819–22, H1826–27

Rejected:

Miller-Meeks amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–15) that sought to revise the bill to provide a safe harbor for employers who conduct

self-audits to identify and rectify potentially unlawful pay disparities and allows for reasonable employer defenses against trial lawyer abuses (by a yea-and-nay vote of 183 yeas to 244 nays, Roll No. 107). **Pages H1822–25, H1827–28**

H. Res. 303, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 7) and (H.R. 1195) was agreed to yesterday, April 14th.

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures. Consideration began Wednesday, April 14th.

Fraud and Scam Reduction Act: H.R. 1215, amended, to establish an office within the Federal Trade Commission and an outside advisory group to prevent fraud targeting seniors and to direct the Commission to include additional information in an annual report to Congress on fraud targeting seniors, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 396 yeas to 13 nays, Roll No. 104; **Page H1825**

Nicholas and Zachary Burt Memorial Carbon Monoxide Poisoning Prevention Act of 2021: H.R. 1460, to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 362 yeas to 49 nays, Roll No. 105; **Pages H1825–26**

Timely ReAuthorization of Necessary Stem-cell Programs Lends Access to Needed Therapies Act of 2021: H.R. 941, to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 415 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 109; **Page H1829**

Protecting Seniors from Emergency Scams Act: H.R. 446, to require the Federal Trade Commission to submit a report to Congress on scams targeting seniors, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 413 yeas to 8 nays, Roll No. 110; **Pages H1829–30**

Protecting Indian Tribes from Scams Act: H.R. 1762, to direct the Federal Trade Commission to submit to Congress a report on unfair or deceptive acts or practices targeted at Indian Tribes or members of Indian Tribes, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 408 yeas to 10 nays, Roll No. 111; **Pages H1830–31**

Debarment Enforcement of Bad Actor Registrants Act of 2021: H.R. 1002, amended, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to authorize the debarment of certain registrants, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas to 5 nays, Roll No. 112; **Pages H1831–32**

Ensuring Compliance Against Drug Diversion Act of 2021: H.R. 1899, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the modification, transfer, and termination of a registration to manufacture, distribute, or dispense controlled substances or list I chemicals, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas to 5 nays, Roll No. 113; **Page H1832**

Microloan Improvement Act of 2021: H.R. 1502, to amend the Small Business Act to optimize the operations of the microloan program, lower costs for small business concerns and intermediary participants in the program, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 397 yeas to 16 nays, Roll No. 114; **Page H1833**

Microloan Transparency and Accountability Act of 2021: H.R. 1487, to amend the Small Business Act to increase transparency, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 409 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 115; and **Page H1834**

504 Modernization and Small Manufacturer Enhancement Act of 2021: H.R. 1490, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the loan guaranty program, enhance the ability of small manufacturers to access affordable capital, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 400 yeas to 16 nays, Roll No. 116. **Page H1834**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he declared a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 117–29). **Page H1798**

Senate Referral: S. 400 was held at the desk. **Page H1799**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1799.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Thirteen yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1825, H1825–26, H1826–27, H1827–28, H1828, H1829, H1829–30, H1830–31, H1831–32, H1832, H1833, H1834, and H1834–35.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 p.m. and adjourned at 10:17 p.m.

Committee Meetings

INCREASING RISKS OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND NOAA'S ROLE IN PROVIDING CLIMATE SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Increasing Risks of Climate Change and NOAA's Role in Providing Climate

Services''. Testimony was heard from Nicole LeBoeuf, Acting Assistant Administrator, Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; and Stephen Volz, Assistant Administrator, National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service, and performing the duties of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the U.S. Southern Command. Testimony was heard from Admiral Craig S. Faller, Commander, U.S. Southern Command.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Health and Human Services. Testimony was heard from Xavier Becerra, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs. Testimony was heard from Denis R McDonough, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Jon Rychalski, Assistant Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the U.S. Forest Service. Testimony was heard from Victoria Christiansen, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and Andria Weeks, Acting Director of Strategic Planning, Budget, and Accountability, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Transportation. Testimony was heard from Pete Buttigieg, Secretary, Department of Transportation.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN EUROPE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in Europe''. Testimony was heard from Laura Cooper, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia, Department of Defense; and General Tod Wolters, U.S. Air Force, Commander, U.S. European Command.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL AND THE SERVICES INSPECTOR GENERALS: ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled ''Department of Defense Inspector General and the Services Inspector Generals: Roles, Responsibilities and Opportunities for Improvement''. Testimony was heard from Sean O'Donnell, Acting Inspector General, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Leslie C. Smith, Inspector General of the Army; Lieutenant General Sami D. Said, Inspector General of the Air Force; Vice Admiral Richard P. Snyder, Naval Inspector General; and Major General Robert F. Castellvi, Inspector General of the Marine Corps.

MEETING THE MOMENT: IMPROVING ACCESS TO BEHAVIORAL AND MENTAL HEALTH CARE

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled ''Meeting the Moment: Improving Access to Behavioral and Mental Health Care''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE CLEAN FUTURE ACT AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: PROTECTING FRONTLINE COMMUNITIES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled ''The CLEAN Future Act and Environmental Justice: Protecting Frontline Communities''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BANKING INNOVATION OR REGULATORY EVASION? EXPLORING TRENDS IN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CHARTERS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions held a hearing entitled ''Banking Innovation or Regulatory Evasion? Exploring Trends in Financial Institution Charters''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE END OF LIBOR: TRANSITIONING TO AN ALTERNATIVE INTEREST RATE CALCULATION FOR MORTGAGES, STUDENT LOANS, BUSINESS BORROWING, AND OTHER FINANCIAL PRODUCTS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship and Capital Markets held a hearing entitled "The End of LIBOR: Transitioning to an Alternative Interest Rate Calculation for Mortgages, Student Loans, Business Borrowing, and Other Financial Products". Testimony was heard from Dan Coates, Senior Associate Director, Office of Risk Analysis and Modeling, Federal Housing Finance Agency; John Coates, Acting Director, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission; Brian Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Federal Finance, Department of the Treasury; Mark Van Der Weide, General Counsel, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Kevin Walsh, Deputy Comptroller, Market Risk Policy, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury.

10 YEARS OF WAR: EXAMINING THE ONGOING CONFLICT IN SYRIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism held a hearing entitled "10 Years of War: Examining the Ongoing Conflict in Syria". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a business meeting on H. Res. 316, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress; and Committee Resolution 117–13, a Resolution to Approve Franked Mail Allowances for Committees for the 117th Congress. H. Res. 316 and Committee Resolution 117–13 were agreed to.

OVERSIGHT OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE AND PREPARATIONS FOR AND RESPONSE TO THE ATTACK OF JANUARY 6TH

Committee on Administration: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Oversight of the United States Capitol Police and Preparations for and Response to the Attack of January 6th". Testimony was heard from Michael A. Bolton, Inspector General, U.S. Capitol Police.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: On April 14, 2021, Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1333, the "National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Nonimmigrants Act"; H.R. 1573, the "Access to Counsel Act of 2021"; H.R. 40, the "Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans Act"; and the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law report on Final Report on Investigation of Competition in Digital Markets. The report on Investigation of Competition in Digital Markets was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 1333, H.R. 1573, and H.R. 40 were ordered reported, as amended.

BUILDING BACK BETTER: CREATING JOBS AND REDUCING POLLUTION BY PLUGGING AND RECLAIMING ORPHANED WELLS

Committee On Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled "Building Back Better: Creating Jobs and Reducing Pollution by Plugging and Reclaiming Orphaned Wells". Testimony was heard from Representative Leger Fernandez and public witnesses.

REACHING THE LIGHT AT THE END OF THE TUNNEL: A SCIENCE-DRIVEN APPROACH TO SWIFTLY AND SAFELY ENDING THE PANDEMIC

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a hearing entitled "Reaching the Light at the End of the Tunnel: A Science-Driven Approach to Swiftly and Safely Ending the Pandemic". Testimony was heard from the following Department of Health and Human Services officials: Anthony S. Fauci, M.D., Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institute of Health; David Kessler, M.D., Chief Science Officer, COVID Response; and Rochelle P. Walensky, M.D., Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

REIMAGINING OUR INNOVATION FUTURE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Reimagining our Innovation Future". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARD A CARBON-FREE MARITIME INDUSTRY: UPDATES ON FUELS, PORTS, AND TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled "Practical Steps Toward a Carbon-Free Maritime Industry: Updates on Fuels, Ports, and Technology". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on H.R. 234, the "Korean

American VALOR Act''; H.R. 344, the ''Women Veterans TRUST Act''; H.R. 958, the ''Protecting Moms Who Served Act''; H.R. 1448, the ''PAWS for Veterans Therapy Act''; H.R. 1510, the ''Veterans' Camera Reporting Act''; legislation on DOULA for VA Act; legislation on Sgt. Ketchum Rural Veterans Mental Health Act of 2021; legislation to clarify the role of doctors of podiatric medicine in the Department of Veterans Affairs; and legislation on Providing Benefits Information in Spanish and Tagalog for Veterans and Families Act. Testimony was heard from Chairman Takano, and Representatives Underwood, Stivers, Jeffries, Axne, and Lawrence; Clifford A. Smith, Director, Analytics, Innovations and Collaborations, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

WORLD WIDE THREATS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''World Wide Threats''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Scott Berrier, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency; William Burns, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; Avril Haines, Director, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; General Paul Nakasone, Director, National Security Agency, Department of Defense; and Christopher Wray, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Part of this hearing was closed.

MAKING THE CASE FOR CLIMATE ACTION: THE GROWING RISKS AND COSTS OF INACTION

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Select Committee on the Climate Crisis held a hearing entitled ''Making the Case for Climate Action: The Growing Risks and Costs of Inaction''. Testimony was heard from Shawn Gillen, City Manager, Tybee Island, Georgia; and public witnesses.

MEMBER DAY HEARING

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Member Day Hearing''. Testimony was heard from Chairman Takano, and Representatives Davids of Kansas, Aguilar, Taylor, Scanlon, Arrington, Jacobs, Lee, Case, Schrier, Cicilline, McCollum, Jeffries, LaMalfa, Hoyer, Clark of Massachusetts, Hinson, Obernolte, Gottheimer, Scalise, Rice of New York, Moulton, Smith of Missouri, and Meijer.

Joint Meetings

VACCINATIONS AND ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Joint Economic Committee: On Wednesday, April 14, 2021, Committee concluded a hearing to examine vaccinations and economic recovery, after receiving testimony from Paul Romer, New York University, Celine Gounder, New York University School of Medicine and Bellevue Hospital, and Belinda Archibong, Barnard College, all of New York, New York; and Alexander Tabarrok, George Mason University Mercatus Center, Fairfax, Virginia.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D329)*

H.R. 1868, to prevent across-the-board direct spending cuts. Signed on April 14, 2021. (Public Law 117–7)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 2021

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations and Global Corporate Social Impact, hearing entitled ''Innovation in Development Policy: Maximizing Impact and Results'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled ''Hearing on Agency Compliance with the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act (FITARA)'', 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Webex.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

3 p.m., Monday, April 19

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of S. 937, COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act.

At 5:30 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Friday, April 16

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 1195—Workplace Violence Prevention for Health Care and Social Service Workers Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Arrington, Jodey C., Tex., E398, E400
Babin, Brian, Tex., E399
Boebert, Lauren, Colo., E400
Bost, Mike, Ill., E399
Budd, Ted, N.C., E400
Dunn, Neal P., Fla., E401
Greene, Marjorie Taylor, Ga., E402
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E402
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E398, E400
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E402, E403, E404, E404, E405, E405, E405
Johnson, Dusty, S. Dak., E395
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E395
Mrvan, Frank J., Ind., E399
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E398
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E395, E398, E399, E399, E400, E400, E400, E401, E401, E402
Reschenthaler, Guy, Pa., E403
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E402
Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E400
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E402
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E395
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E401
Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E399
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E400
Young, Don, Alaska, E403

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.